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Abstract

JUDGING OFFENSIVENESS AS A METHOD OF UNCOVERING COVERT PREJUDICE AND SELF-HATE

by

Karen Lyn Schneider

Master of Arts in Psychology, Community/Clinical

This study is an attempt to tease out prejudice and self-hate from a syllogistic survey which asks subjects to rate how offensive a particular syllogism is a) to himself or herself personally and b) if the subject was a member of the minority group in question. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale and several personal measures of identification with ethnic and religious groups were
given. One hundred and twenty-six subjects were used in four minority groups: Blacks, Mexican-Americans, Jews and gays. A multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the data, along with a priori contrasts. The results showed a significant interaction between ethnicity and type of scale for personal ratings. Mexican-Americans found the Jewish Scale to be more offensive than did subjects from the other groups. Jews found the Jewish Scale to be less offensive than did subjects from the other groups. Blacks and Jews found the Gay Scale to be the most offensive of the four scales. There was a statistically significant multivariate analysis of variance when subjects were asked to rate the syllogisms as if they were members of other groups. Here Blacks rated the Mexican-American Scale as less offensive than the other scales. Mexican-Americans rated the Jewish and Gay Scales as more offensive than the other scales. There was no statistically significant difference among the subjects from the various ethnic groups in self-esteem scores.
Judging Offensiveness as a Method of Uncovering Covert Prejudice and Self-Hate

CHAPTER ONE

Introduction

Throughout history there have been powerful people proclaiming that "pure blood" and "pure races" are necessary for the good of the people in any given society (Hitler, 1944 pg. 45). Despite their long residence in the United States, some minorities have been prevented from melding into the American melting pot. They continue to face discrimination in the fields of employment, housing, the armed services, education, and politics. This study will focus on some similarities as well as some differences in four different minority groups: Jews, Blacks, Mexican-Americans and homosexuals. These four groups were selected as being critical focal points of prejudice in the United States at the present time.

A minority is a group whose members suffer oppression and various disabilities at the hands of another group. Vander Zanden (1984, pg.215) believes that a minority is a human-constructed reality. It is not a naturally self-constituted or self-contained entity; rather, it is a mental model fabricated through the process of social interaction. People come to be lumped together on the
basis of some shared (real or imagined) attribute (as in the Black or Jew) or on the basis of their way of life (as in the homosexual).

This study makes an attempt to examine prejudice against other groups as well as prejudice against one's own group—what Gilman (1986) and Lewin (1941) call "self-hatred".

Self-hatred occurs when an individual within a particular minority group comes to accept the stereotypes of his group that other powerful in-groups exhibit. Some people who are in the out-group may perceive the fault as being inherent in themselves; that they are not as good, intelligent, normal, etc., as the people in the in-group are.

Because of the possible loss of self-identity, self-hatred can fragment a personality and cause an individual to confuse reality with fantasy. The member of the minority group who is self-hating then rejects the disliked trait in himself/herself, represses it, and when this same trait is implied or displayed by the self-hating minority, the self-hater chides himself/herself for acting like the disfavored group. This person does this in order to gain acceptance from the group which labels him as an outsider.
Although prejudice in the early half of this century was vaguely prohibited by national law and creed, some prejudicial activity was actually in conformity with local legislation (Johnson, 1943). This included inequality in the enjoyment of free choice of employment, inequality of opportunity for education, inequality in services rendered, inequality in access to public office, forced slavery, (as in the widespread mistreatment of the Blacks) and public libel of certain groups (e.g., the Ku Klux Klan's derogation of Jews, Blacks, and Catholics). Johnson (1943) also found that denial of residence or equal housing facilities was common and especially widespread at the time. Approval of violence against the minority, assertion of the rights of the majority over those of the minority, avoidance of minority group members, discrimination and even segregation are just a few of the responses that were (and are) found in America.

Mass overt aggression against minorities was seen in the Detroit riot of 1919, where an imagined threat to white security and population and housing problems triggered active combat between whites and Blacks (Brown, 1944). Hitler's mass extermination of millions of Jews during World War II had its echoes here in the United States. Chicanos are still often perceived as robbers, kidnappers, bandits, gamblers or knife throwers (Cooper,
1972). The problem of not speaking English well has further prevented them from being fully accepted as citizens in the United States (Duran & Bernard, 1973 pg. 435-441). Homosexuality was considered a mental illness until 1975 when ego-syntonic homosexuality was removed from the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders. A few openly gay people were labelled and sent to "doctors" who could possibly change the individual's sexual orientation. Some were even institutionalized. Renewed attempts to prohibit them from educating our children have been going on for quite some time (Beaver, 1968 pg. 21; Galloway, 1983 pg. 19-34).

Stereotypes, which may arise in part from limitations in the accessibility of facts, perpetuate prejudicial behavior towards minorities (Lippman, 1922). Stereotypes simplify the cues needed to elicit a pattern of responses. Stereotypes are really abstractions which conveniently categorize traits and characteristics so that a typical "trait" can be ascribed to a group. Stereotypes shared by a large number of persons become socially significant. Although the stereotype may be accurate in some areas, it is often grossly false in others (Allport, 1954 pg. 19). Stereotyping may be considered as a prejudice because a judgment is made on the basis of inadequate evidence. The
customs, traditions, standards and fashions which control the behavior of any racial or ethnic group quickly become the objects of stereotypes. Usually group differences are exaggerated. The more stereotypes employed about a group, the greater the likelihood of social distance between it and the majority group (Berkowitz, 1959). Typical stereotypes about Mexican-Americans are that they are robbers and bandits. The stereotypes for Jews include perceptions that they are shrewd, devious and mercenary. The stereotypical homosexual is an effeminate man who is creative and artistic, but prone to psychosis, and the stereotypical Black is slaphappy, lazy and criminal (Cooper, 1972; Masters, 1962 pg. 1-19).

Thomas Szasz (1970, pg. 285) talks about cannibalism (spiritual or existential) as being basic to man's social nature. To save the primary group from dissolution and disintegration, the group must sacrifice a scapegoat. Szasz (1970, pg. 285) and Berdyaev (1952, pg. 16) further contend that defining a person who is not of our social group as deviant or subhuman, is also important to man's sense of self. Hence it seems natural that the betrayal of the "outsider" is supreme proof of loyalty to the "inside" group. Only through ritual destruction of the other can a person be admitted to membership in the dominant group. Szasz (1970 pg. 287) calls this "existential cannibalism".
Since humans are social animals and are always a member of a group, the conditions of his/her membership must be to attack and sacrifice nonmembers. If nonmembers are not available, humans will convert members of their own group into nonmembers so that they may then be attacked and sacrificed. This occurred with the persecution of witches, Jews, Blacks and communists. Humans are perhaps the only animal who ritually destroys their fellow human beings. Humans validate themselves as good through their invalidation of their enemy as bad. This appears to be one of the basic, invariant rules of social behavior (Szasz, 1970 pg. 288).

It therefore follows that the members of the dominant group say that their scapegoats and enemies are less than human (Hitler, 1944). This derogation of minorities has been characteristic in enslavement and mass murders. Whether the victim is truly a proper human being was one of the most basic issues of the anti-Semitism in Germany, and of American Negro slavery, and continues to be central in the worldwide persecution of the homosexual. If enemies are less than human, they cannot stake any claim to the rights featured in the Declaration of Independence any more than a horse or cow or any other nonhuman being (Szasz, 1970).
The prejudice directed at different minority groups may be distinctly different. Chicanos and Blacks are persecuted for their race and national origin, homosexuals are discriminated against because of their sexual preference. Jews seem to be persecuted for their religion but even when Jews have converted to Christianity sometimes they still have been persecuted. By understanding the history of each group, we can get a better understanding of why and how these minorities have been wronged over the centuries.

**History of Anti-Semitism**

Christian anti-Semitism is largely explained by the refusal of Jews to accept the Gentile god. The Jew worshipped by the Gentiles as the Messiah is not recognized by the Jews as being such. The idea that God could present himself as a man appeared to be a sacrilege to the Jews. The Jews believe in one God rather than the Holy Trinity—a man can be a prophet but never a God (Berdyaev, 1952 pg.20-21). The rejection of Jesus as the Messiah casts doubt on the Christian's most cherished belief. The Jews rejected what the Gentiles accepted, and in turn, the Gentiles rejected the Jews.

To add further fuel to the fire, some Christians see contemporary action implications as they read passages in
the Gospels accusing the Jews of being responsible for the death of Jesus. Though crucifixion was a Roman, not a Jewish type of execution, and other circumstances in the accounting of Jesus' death conform to neither Jewish law nor custom, many Christians believed and continue to believe that the Jews killed Jesus. (Van Den Haag, 1969; Prager & Telushkin 1981).

The defense mechanisms of projection and rationalization appear to be often at the core of prejudice. Allport (1954) states that when people do things that they feel guilty about, the guilt feelings can be removed by blaming others for their sins. This projection of guilt onto others in the out-group is a classic sign of prejudice. Bettelheim (1950) believes that there is a close correlation between overt prejudice and deep rooted personality traits (such as sexual rigidity, authoritarianism, a closed way of thinking and an allegiance to those with similar beliefs). The psychodynamicists believe that prejudicial behavior (that is, blaming a minority group for his personal failures and projecting undesirable characteristics denied in himself onto members of the outgroup) is a direct result of a lack of ego strength favoring evasion rather than logical action. The prejudiced individual also blames a lack of control of minorities on authority.
Some hostile people use intolerance for outlets of hostility. If this hostility is not discharged, severe disintegration of the personality may lead to more anxiety and more hostility. Intolerant people avoid reality testing. They use stereotypes, as they are unable to see Jews, Blacks, Chicanos and gays as individuals. If an individual of one of the minority groups came to be looked on as being different than what the stereotype had predicted, it was viewed as the exception to the rule. In this way it is possible to retain the stereotyped attitudes. Bettelheim (1950, pg. 33) found that the more outspoken about a minority group an individual is, the higher the amount of negative stereotypes employed.

Hitler blamed the Jews for crimes against decency and morality of which Hitler himself was very guilty. The Jews over the centuries have served as a convenient out-group target for projection, particularly as Christianity has become more powerful numerically and politically. The Jews, however, denied their guilt over Jesus' death. The very existence of the Jews brought the Christians together. By attracting hostility to themselves, the Jews actually solidified the Christian's identification with each other. Internal solidarity develops when the majority group recognizes the existence of an external enemy.
Though in the past the Western world attributed whatever was unpleasant or undesirable to supernatural evil (i.e., witches), with increasing secularization, these symbols of evil have been replaced by evil human groups (Jews, Blacks, Mexicans, homosexuals, etc...). For example, Hitler blamed the defeat of Germany in World War I to the Jews and accused them of stabbing Germany in the back. The belief that the Jews caused World War II has been cited by Bettelheim (1950) as a cause of prejudice by the Germans. Hitler (1944) believed that the evils of the world are caused by a wrong system maintained by a small group (the Jews) who benefit from it and deliberately use the system to exploit the great majority. And, as human nature would have it, the superior majority has the historical mission of eliminating the corrupt minority. This is what Szasz (1970, pg. 287) means by existential cannibalism.

A further item that added to the enigma of the Jews was that Jews are not distinguishable by physical looks alone. A German Jew may look more German than Jewish. French or Arab Jews may seem more French or Arab than Jewish. Furthermore, Jews have often risen to the top echelons of society, despite the hostility they have faced. From the anti-Semitic point of view, it seems that Jews are everywhere, and are secretly powerful. Selznick and Steinberg (1969, pg. 13) explain why some people find
credible the claim that Jews are taking over the business world. They point out that Jews tend to be in highly visible occupations and are found in large numbers in the professions.

It is hard to define exactly what Judaism is, as at varying times in history Jews have said that Judaism is a race and at other times they deny that being Jewish is purely racial (Grayzel, 1969 pg. 53). Jews have often claimed that Judaism is just a religion, and at other times the Jews have insisted that it isn't necessarily just a religion (Grayzel, 1969). What, then, have the Jews been persecuted for? Hitler, (1944) was partially correct in recognizing that Judaism goes beyond being a mere religion. Even if a person had an ancestor who was Jewish, he was considered Jewish by the Nazi party and was persecuted for it. Here, as at other times, even if a Jew converted to Christianity, he was still persecuted as a Jew. So obviously there is more than just a religious component that has led to the extreme hostility Jews have received.

In the early days of anti-Jewish prejudice it was possible for a Jew to convert to Christianity to escape being scapegoated; however, Jews rarely converted (Grayzel, 1969). To further compound the problem, during
the Age of Revolution it was no longer fashionable to have anti-Jewish biases for purely religious reasons, so the racial reason, what we call anti-Semitism, was substituted. This was an even more convenient reason to hate Jews since a person can change religions but it is quite impossible to change one's racial character. Arendt (1978 pg. 20) points out a distinction between Jewishness and Judaism. "Jewishness" is an existential given that one cannot escape, while "Judaism" is a system of beliefs which one can adopt or reject. The definition of a Jew has often been problematic to the Jews themselves, as well as to their Christian neighbors.

Because of the Jews' ability to "pass" as one of the majority, occasionally it was possible for Jews to enter into "Gentiles Only" organizations where they often heard a great many anti-Semitic remarks. Many Jews blamed on their Jewishness the fact that they were not promoted in their jobs or allowed higher political status. Some Jews internalized the Gentile's negative image and viewed their Jewishness with disdain. Klein (1977) found that Jewish college students who do not identify with the Jewish culture showed low self-esteem and high self-contempt. They also condemned themselves for stereotypical traits shared with the Jewish group. Klein (1977) demonstrated this by giving groups of Jewish college students the
Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale as well as attempting to determine which ones felt a strong bond to their religion and which ones did not. The Jews who showed the least amount of identification with the Jewish religion also had the lowest self-esteem. Lewin (1941) calls this concept self-hate. He states that there is some evidence that some Jewish people are themselves anti-Semitic, which he feels is not an unpredictable phenomenon. Ironically, he found that self-hating Jews are surprisingly seldom prejudiced against other groups.

Allport, in Fried's (1969) book on Jews in the Modern World (pg. 262-263) found that Jewish subjects who felt victimized because of their religion tended to be more anti-Semitic than Jewish subjects who said they didn't feel victimized. A questionnaire was given to a group of Jewish students which asked the following question: "To what extent do you feel that you yourself have been a victim of prejudice because of your membership in a minority group?" a) to a great extent; b) more than average; c) average; d) less than average; e) not at all. This group of subjects were then separated according to "high" victimization or "low" victimization. The results showed that the more victimized the subjects felt, the more anti-Semitic they became. It appears that
aggression or hostility which is built up as a reaction to being the object of persecution and discrimination is redirected toward certain members of one's own group, perhaps in part because of fear of reprisals that would follow should the resentment be directed against the Gentile persecutors (Fried, 1969).

The problem with projecting self-hate onto one's own minority group is that it is almost impossible to create a complete break from it. The minority subconsciously knows that underneath the skin, he/she is really a part of the minority group. This type of thinking can fragment an individual's identity (Gilman, 1986).

Further proof of Jewish self-hate is cited by Arendt (1978, pg. 58) where she states that the suicide rate of Jews before World War II was almost nil (although she quotes no references nor statistics) but very high after World War II, indicating a disenchantment or an underlying sadness in the post World War II Jews.

Although relegated to the ghetto, often Jews were still able to rise in socioeconomic status and become successful in the community (Goldscheider, 1986 pg. 107-115). To many Gentiles, it didn't make sense. Where Jews once lived in the ghetto apartment buildings in East Los Angeles, they now owned them.

Tsukashima (1983) found that over half the Blacks
used in his sample endorsed the statement "Most slumlords are Jewish." Tsukashima (1983) suggests that anti-Semitism among Blacks may reflect a hostility towards whites in general, but then states that Black animosity may be partly due to their view of middle-man minorities as potential economic threats to their personal interests. He does not indicate why his Black respondents exaggerated the role of Jews as owners of ghetto property.

A sizable proportion of Tsukashima's (1983) sample did perceive Jews in this middle-man capacity. To the statement "Jews have too much economic power in the Black community" a full 59% said "agree." One third endorsed the statement that "the Black community would be better off if the stores run by Jews left the Black community." In the Selznick and Steinberg study (1969, pg. 34), the protocols of Black respondents sometimes mentioned unpleasant personal experiences with Jewish shopkeepers and employers.

Tsukashima (1983) notes that anti-Semitism is most widespread among the uneducated and the poor, yet Blacks in general have been rising in overall educational level. In fact, his study utilized highly educated Blacks, and he still found high levels of anti-Semitism. He therefore believes that education does not necessarily reduce Black
anti-Semitism. If this is true, we may expect a high level of anti-Semitism from our university sample of Blacks.

Prejudice Against Blacks

Prejudice directed at Blacks is distinctly different from prejudice directed at Jews. For one thing, Blacks are more easily recognizable by looks alone and do not have their ethnicity in doubt initially as do the Jews. Furthermore while the Jews have an extensive historical culture on which to fall back, the Blacks had theirs taken away from them when the Black slaves were brought over from Africa (Drewry & Drewry, 1971 pg. 42-49). Whatever tribal religion they may have practiced in Africa was denied them by the missionaries and slave traders who captured them and converted them to Christianity. Africans did not come to this country as traditional immigrants as there was absolutely no element of free will. The second and third generation of Blacks born in this country were Christian by birth and spoke English as their native language. Only today have Blacks begun to redefine their culture and are relating more and more to their ancient tribal roots (Drewry & Drewry, 1971 pg. 42-49). When the Jews felt persecuted by the Gentiles, they could always retreat to their Jewish temple and their Jewish culture with its rich history and customs.
Blacks did not and still do not have direct access to their heritage in Africa. Because of this deprivation many Blacks feel they have nowhere to turn culturally. Jews in America who were once in the same position can empathize with the Blacks. They often have tried to reach out to the Blacks and have tried to deal with them directly as in the civil rights struggles in the 1960's and 1970's (Fried, 1969).

Deutsch and Collins (1951) conducted a survey of racial attitudes in two housing projects. One project was completely integrated, apartments were rented to families regardless of race, color or creed. The other project, although integrated was arranged so that Black and White families were living in separate buildings in the same project. These people were all put on a waiting list, then randomly assigned to the segregated or the integrated project. The findings indicated that there was less racial prejudice in the completely integrated housing arrangement than in the "segregated biracial" project. Deutsch and Collins (1951) traced these differences to two factors: (1) the intermingling of Whites and Blacks in the integrated project and (2) the favorable attitude that Whites showed toward those Whites who mingled with Blacks in the integrated project. Whites who were friendly with Blacks in this project met with approval from their White
neighbors. This was not the case in the segregated project. The problem with this study is that, unfortunately, the researchers did not consider the self-selected factors that made for initial acceptance of integrated housing. Their conclusion that increased familiarity with the object of prejudice can cause an individual to change his or her attitudes positively is questionable.

It is also possible that increased contact among Blacks and Jews in recent times may actually perpetuate the Black people's negative feelings towards them (Tsukashima, 1983).

Meyers (1936) reports that when teachers were exposed to a course in race relations and other problems in education, it resulted in an overall reduction of "friendliness" scores by the Whites to the Blacks and vice versa. Pearlin (1954) found in a study of college women that the process of changing to more favorable attitudes toward Blacks is twofold: it involves both dis-attachment from previous reference groups unfavorable to Blacks and attachment to new reference groups favorable to them. Rosenfield (1982) has also shown that Blacks, in general are more anti-Semitic than Whites.

There is the general assumption that "warped social
perceptions" underlie many efforts to combat prejudice, and that "correct facts" will alter hostile feelings. MacIver, a prominent sociologist in the field of race relations, observed in 1948 that instruction of the purely factual kind tends to mitigate some of the more extreme expressions of prejudice, but it tended not to alleviate some of the more ambivalent prejudiced person--what Kurt Lewin (1941) called the "marginal man." A "marginal man" is a person who can be easily swayed by argument to be either prejudiced or not towards an individual minority group. The "marginal man" may only have a vague idea of his real feelings surrounding a minority group and hence may be persuaded either way. Mere "education" by itself, will not necessarily eliminate intense prejudice. This continues to be the verdict of most specialists in the field of race relations (Van Der Zanden, 1984 pg. 413-443).

Of all the minorities, Blacks are the only ethnic group which occupied a slave status in American history. Further, American attitudes toward the Blacks cannot be explained satisfactorily without reference to this unique fact of past slavery. Van Der Zanden (1984 pg. 413-443) states that current attitudes of prejudice and hostility can definitely be traced to the institution of slavery which depended for its existence upon a legal and
psychological separation of Blacks and Whites. The stereotype of the Black slave stemmed from White perceptions of their traditions, customs and beliefs. These stereotypes of Blacks are found in many subtle aspects of American culture.

Homosexuality and Mental Illness

Homosexuals have usually been considered deviant, perverted, and sinful (Galloway, 1983 pg. 19-34). Some of the anti-homosexual biases started long ago in ancient times. Since then, it has been fashionable for people to consider gay people as mentally ill (e.g., Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders, 1952). Unlike Black people, gay people are very hard to distinguish among other members of the population. If their homosexuality is not obvious (external) it follows that their differences are internal. Mental illness is considered an internal process and is used as "proof" by anti-gays that homosexuals are in need of psychotherapy and incarceration in mental hospitals (Szasz, 1970).

Some hypothesize that homosexuals who internalize the beliefs and values of heterosexuals and have learned to regard homosexuality as criminal, deviant, sick, perverted or sinful are probably more self-hating than gays who are open about their homosexuality and have come to accept it
(Aiken, 1976). Because our homosexual sample is a group of homosexuals who have revealed themselves as gay by joining a gay organization, the researcher doesn't expect to see much self-hatred expressed. Greenberg (1976) conducted a study involving two groups of gay men who were affiliated with a gay organization, and found they had lower alienation scores and higher self-esteem ratings than the gay men who did not belong to a homophile organization.

Prejudice against homosexuals is more commonly vocally expressed today than other forms of prejudice (Kite, 1985). Several arguments are used by anti-gays to perpetuate these anti-homosexual beliefs, e.g., that two homosexuals cannot bear children together, that the Bible prohibits homosexuality, and that homosexuality is a statistical abnormality in the general population (Masters, 1962 pg. 1-19). Further, "gay bashing" is a fashionable sport among "real" men where heterosexual men go to a gay area, pick up a gay man and beat him up (Landers, 1986).

Hood (1973) found that the more dogmatic an individual is, the more negative the evaluation of the homosexual. He used Rokeach's Dogmatism Scale to separate the high dogmatics from the low dogmatics and found that the high dogmatics had the most prejudiced feelings about
homosexuality. It seems that tolerance is a major factor in the amount of prejudice an individual exhibits (Martin & Westie, 1969 pg. 247-254). This means that the less tolerant a person is, the greater the likelihood that the person will be prejudiced. Smith (1971) conducted research with 130 university undergraduates to investigate individuals whose negative attitudes toward homosexuals may contribute to the problem of homophobia. His results indicate that highly homophobic individuals are more status conscious, authoritarian and sexually rigid.

**Anti-Mexican-American Bias**

Chicanos have also been discriminated against in recent history (Larned & Muller, 1979 pg. 143-155). The reasons include an obvious language difference and the fact that the standard of living in Mexico is substantially below what an average American would consider acceptable (Averill, 1977). To the typical American, the Mexican lives in poverty, appears dirtier and works in jobs that require physical labor rather than office or clerical skills (Grebler, Moore & Guzman, 1970 pg. 205-215). West (1936) conducted a study in which elementary school children who were Spanish speaking were considered harder to teach by the instructors than were their more privileged Caucasian counterparts. It is hypothesized that these minority groups will be
agonistic toward each other and may show a significant amount of bias in our survey. Because of a "Latin" mystique there is a common belief among Latin peoples that, for a male, having multiple children is indicative of masculine virility and sexuality (Grebler, Moore & Guzman, 1970 pg. 364-366). It is also expected that many Mexican-Americans, especially males, will have anti-gay biases.
CHAPTER TWO
History of Research on Attitudes Toward Ethnic Groups

Bogardus (1925) was a pioneer in attitude research with his Social Distance Scale that measured the attitudes of the white majority towards a number of racial and national groups. He asked 248 subjects to rate 39 nationality and racial groups. European groups were looked upon more favorably whereas the dark-skinned people such as Mulattoes, Negroes and Turks were looked upon least favorably. Jews, Mexicans and Negroes ranked on the lower end of the scale.

In 1928, L. L. Thurstone measured the preference of students for different nationalities at the University of Chicago using the Bogardus technique (Thurstone & Chave, 1929). Once again, the Mexicans and Negroes fell at the lower end of the scale, while the Jews ranked just below the middle. This similarity in findings is noteworthy because Bogardus conducted his survey in California and Thurstone conducted his in Chicago, suggesting that these stereotypes are common in different places in the nation and that their stability across the country may be a good indicator of the "average American's" attitudes.

J. P. Guilford (1931 pg. 179-204) using the same general method as Bogardus and Thurstone, tested group
preferences among college students in Kansas, Illinois, Washington, Florida and Nebraska. Once again, Jews fell slightly below the middle of the list and Mexicans and Blacks were at the bottom. Despite differences in time, geographic location and methods utilized, the results were similar. Spoerl (1951 pg. 69-76) found the same pattern in her replication of Bogardus' study with college students. The ordering of the members of the various ethnic and national groups, with a few minor shifts, remained substantially constant. These results point to a pattern of group preferences that may have been typical of the average American at that time. Virtually no studies asking subjects to rank their racial preferences have been conducted since that time. Homosexuality was not among the groups these past researchers studied.

Katz and Braly (1935 pg. 175-193) were the first researchers to investigate "stereotypes" and how they influenced group prejudice. Two groups of Princeton students were told to rate 84 traits on a scale of 1 to 10 in order of preference. The ethnic groups were then ranked on the basis of their alleged traits. The findings indicated that these stereotypes were very consistent among and between groups and that prejudice in general is associated with stereotypes. The term "stereotype" has come into common usage with later studies in the early
When stereotypes were used to measure prejudice, there appeared to be a distinct difference of more tolerant feelings in the North versus less tolerant feelings in the South (Chase, 1940, pg. 367-378; Bayton, 1941 pg. 525-531).

Bayton (1941 pg. 525-531) asked 100 Negro college students to select adjectives that described typical white Americans as well as Jews and Blacks. The traits that were assigned regarding Negro characteristics were: superstitious, lazy, happy-go-lucky, very religious, ostentatious, loud, musical, ignorant, stupid, physically dirty and unreliable.

When the Negro students were asked to rate themselves, personally, the following traits were given: talkative, intelligent, happy-go-lucky, sportsmanlike, jovial, musical, sophisticated and generous. However, differences between the traits assigned to the "typical" Negro were very different from the traits the Black students assigned themselves. This suggests that propaganda, as seen in the media and literature, rather than personal contacts was more likely to influence stereotypes.

The characteristics most often assigned to Jews by
the Black students were: shrewd, sly, mercenary, grasping, industrious, persistent, intelligent, ambitious and loyal to family ties. The stereotypes of Jews shown by the Black students was very similar to the findings in the Katz and Braly (1935) study.

Levinson and Sanford (1944 pg. 339-370) investigated anti-Semitic attitudes in a sample of University of California students. Their scale measured "opinions" (defined as the subject's conception of Jews) and "attitudes" (defined as what the non-Jew should do with respect to the Jews). The students' attitudes appeared to be more favorable than their opinions, which seems to indicate that the students felt, but somehow resisted their anti-Semitism. Interestingly, the same students who felt Jews were more likely to be communists, also indicated that Jews were mostly capitalistic, either revealing the ambivalence felt about Jews or the ignorance of students regarding the understanding of the contradiction. It seems more likely that the students just assigned negative labels to Jews regardless of their internal contradiction.

Sappenfield (1942 pg. 173-197) revealed that Catholics were the most conservative and Jews the least on a test that measured the amount of tolerance for other groups. Wahrman (1981 pg. 151-154) administered the
Rokeach dogmatism scale to Jews and Christians and found that the degree of religious orthodoxy of the subjects' religious groups was not significantly related to their moral judgment; however, dogmatism was. Dogmatism explained the weak relationship between religious affiliation and moral judgment. This finding indicates that very religious people (no matter what their religion might be) are more rigid and less flexible than less religious people.

Allport (1954) conducted a survey on attitudes of various groups toward Blacks and discovered that Catholics led the list in anti-Black bias. He found that Jews as a group and other persons lacking religious affiliation were markedly free from prejudice. Although the Jews were the most frequent victims of prejudice, Allport's study found Jews to be the least biased (Allport, 1954).

All these stereotypes about these minority groups have existed for many years. Only recently have Blacks insisted on being called Black as opposed to Negro, and homosexuals have insisted on being called gay (Galloway, 1983, pg. 19-34). Mexican-Americans have also coined a new term for themselves: Chicano (West & Macklin, 1979, pg.4). With the civil rights movement in the decades since World War II, for the first time it has it been unpopular to
have biases (or at least to speak openly about having prejudices) and probably for this reason attitude testing on racial bias has been severely curtailed. Since admitting prejudical opinions is considered unAmerican, we can no longer ask the same questions, nor are subjects as ready to expose their biases. For example, Bettelheim (1950), in an interview designed to measure racial and religious bias asked questions such as, "Are there any organizations or groups of people whom you feel might be harmful to the country unless they are curbed? What do you think should be done about the Jews in this country? Should Jews be prevented from intermarriage?"

Since World War II, a shift has taken place among American Whites from blatant forms of discrimination to more subtle forms of racism (Crosby, Bromley, & Saxe, 1980 pg. 546-553). In 1950, people responded without feeling the need to censor their responses. Today, in 1987, 30 to 40 years after these original experiments were done, these questions are no longer useful in ascertaining just who is prejudiced. Since it is no longer fashionable to voice these negative opinions, obvious questions such as the above used by Bettelheim can no longer be used. More subtle means of measuring prejudice must be employed if researchers are to be able to determine the nature and extent of current prejudices. Although there has been some
research on prejudice since World War II, it has not been framed in the same way as earlier, it is not always written by Whites and it is often published in different journals.
CHAPTER 3
Judging Offensiveness as a Method of Uncovering Prejudice and Self-Hate

Previous studies have attempted to show the effect of syllogisms on logical reasoning (Morgan & Morton, 1944, Lefford, 1946, Thistlethwaite, 1950). Syllogisms utilizing ethnically offensive material have been used, and the resulting disruptions in ability to solve the syllogisms tend to demonstrate prejudicial attitudes in the subjects who take the tests of logical reasoning (Thistlethwaite, 1950 pg. 442-458).

Such studies have served to show that prejudice is not logical. Tsukashima (1983 pg. 217-231) believes that a high level of prejudice may simply be a deficiency in reasoning. Blacks are moving up the educational ladder yet still retain their anti-Semitic prejudices. Therefore the problem, as he sees it, is not one of education, but rather a deficit in reasoning and thus is inherent in the individual's basic personality pattern. Consequently, the solving of logical syllogisms may serve to uncover overt as well as covert prejudice.

An example of this type of reasoning is as follows:
Given: All A's are B's. (Major Premise)
    All B's are C's. (Minor Premise)
Therefore: All A's are C's. (Conclusion)

Inserting prejudicial or inflammatory material into the neutral form of the syllogism is likely to emotionally involve the member of the race, religion, or sexual orientation mentioned, and thus disrupt his/her ability to judge the validity of the syllogism's conclusion (Thistlethwaite, 1950 pg. 442-458).

An example about Jews, using the same structure as the above syllogism is as follows:

Given: All Jews are stingy.
All stingy people have emotional disorders.

Therefore: All Jews have emotional disorders.

This syllogism is valid. The subject who states that this syllogism is invalid is likely influenced by the content of the syllogism rather than the structure of the argument alone.

Method

Based on an idea and rationale suggested by Benjamin Mehlman, Professor of Psychology at California State University, Northridge, a double attitude inventory blank of four separate scales representing each of the four minority groups was composed to measure offensiveness. The syllogisms were designed to be comprehensible yet irritating enough to become offensive. That is, parallel
scales of syllogisms, each containing potentially offensive material, were presented to members of each minority group for ratings of offensiveness. Subjects were asked to judge the offensiveness of the materials in all scales.

Briefly, the steps followed in constructing the Offensiveness Scale were as follows:

(1) Wherever possible, items were adapted from attitude scales already standardized.

(2) Additional items were made of statements that were expressions of hatred or personal opinion that it was believed could evoke diverse responses. As far as possible, statements of fact were avoided. Suggestions for types of statements were obtained from books and informal remarks of persons of varying points of view (as suggested by Likert, 1932) in an attempt to include a wide range of stimuli related to life situations to which the subject must respond.

(3) An attempt was made to evoke polarized responses to statements, with extreme agreement at one end of the scale and disagreement at the other. The final inventory consisted of four groups of syllogisms, half of them favorable and half of them unfavorable for each of the four minority groups.

(4) The complete inventory included 80 items, 20
relating to Jews, 20 relating to Mexicans-Americans 20 relating to Blacks, and 20 relating to homosexuals.

(5) Subjects were asked to judge the offensiveness of each syllogism on a 7 point scale. Half the terms for each group were positive statements, half negative statements, with high ratings indicating judgements of offensiveness (sensitivity to prejudice to the minority group). Scores were totalled for each subject, following the scoring method established by Likert (1932) then recoded by the computer so that the syllogisms were all unidirectional. The subjects were asked (a) first, to rate each syllogism on how offensive it is to the minority group they belong to, (b) second, to look at each syllogism as if they were a member of that particular group involved, and to respond the way he or she thinks that particular minority group would respond. The first scoring is called the Personal Rating (A) scale, and the second the "as if " (B) scale.

It is assumed that this test measures prejudice covertly, assuming the degree of offensiveness in the scales is roughly equivalent. If the subject is completely unbiased, he or she will rate the material as approximately equally offensive for each of the four groups. For example, if a syllogism concludes "Therefore:
All Blacks are lazy" and the subject rates that as a 7 (very offensive), when he or she comes to a similar statement about Chicanos, the unbiased subject should rate that item the same way as he rated the item concerning himself/herself. If a subject indicates that a statement ending with "All Blacks are lazy" is a 7 (very offensive) and rates another statement such as "All Chicanos are lazy" as a 4 (moderately offensive) then this person exhibits a differential sensitivity to offensive statements. Consistency is the key to this test, as a subject will not be considered prejudiced if he or she consistently rates these statements similarly throughout the test. It is only when the subject fluctuates and has high discrepancy scores judging the offensiveness for different groups that prejudice can be inferred. Judging materials as less offensive when they deal with his/her own group suggests some ethnic self-hate.

Though the person may have heard these terms before and may have erected a set of defenses against the offensiveness of the material, the very presence of defenses implies threat. Though Jews among themselves may call themselves by derogatory terms, and gay men among other gay men may refer to themselves as "faggots", and many Blacks call each other "nigger" when among other Blacks, the same statements coming from an out-group
Demographic data were collected, and the Rosenberg Self-Esteem scale was administered. There are ten items on this inventory, which were rated by the subjects according to the following scale: 1 = Strongly Agree, 2 = Agree, 3 = Disagree, and 4 = Strongly Disagree. The items deal with a general favorable or unfavorable global self-attitude and has been used as a popular instrument for measuring self-esteem. These scores were also coded by the computer in a unidirectional fashion, so that the higher the score on the scale, the lower the self-esteem of the subject. The scale only takes a few minutes to administer, has a 2 week test-retest reliability of .85, and has a scalability of .72 (Rosenberg, 1965).

Establishing Reliability

The total Offensiveness scale was administered to 126 subjects and scored separately using an alpha reliability coefficient for the items of the entire scale. The alpha coefficient formula was applied to obtain the coefficient of reliability for the total battery (r = .88).

Administering the Offensiveness Scale

The offensiveness scale was self-administering. The
experimenter was always available for immediate answering of any questions that might be raised in the minds of the subjects by their exposure to statements on the inventory. Subjects did not receive any preliminary explanation or guidance other than that specified in the instructions to the inventory.

Debriefing

A written debriefing sheet was given to each subject at the end of the experiment and any questions that could not be answered during the inventory were answered. (Please see Appendix 5).

Subjects and Biodata

The subjects used in the present study were volunteers among college students at a medium-sized Southern California university, members of a reform Jewish temple, and members of the Gay Pride organization, for a total of 42 Jews, 35 Blacks, 19 Mexicans and 30 homosexual men. Sixteen of the Jewish subjects were male and 26 female. Nine of the Blacks were male and 26 were female. There were 9 Chicano males and 10 Chicano females, and all the the gays (N=30) were male. The total study utilized 64 women and 62 men. See Table 1.
Table 1

Number of Subjects in Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Mex-Amer</th>
<th>Black</th>
<th>Jewish</th>
<th>Gay</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The educational levels of the fathers of the subjects were as follows: the fathers of the gays and Jews appeared to have the highest amount of education—about 52% of all the Jews stated that their father had graduated from college at the Bachelor's level or higher, and 56% of the gays made that claim, while only 20% of the Blacks and 21% of the Chicanos stated that their father had graduated from college. $F(3, 122) = 7.231, \ p < .05$. A post hoc Newman-Keuls test showed significant differences ($p < .05$) between Blacks and gays, Jews and Chicanos, and Jews and Blacks. (See Table 2 and Appendix A.10).

For the subjects' activity within their own group, (that is, how active the subject was within his/her own minority group), differences were again observed. Only 2.4% of all the Jews and 6.7% of the gays stated that they were very active within their ethnic group while 14.3% of the Blacks and 15.8% of the Mexican-Americans said they were very active, $F(3, 122) = 2.977, \ p < .05$. A post hoc Newman-Keuls test showed the Jews and Blacks to be significantly different from each other at the .05 level (see Table 3 and Appendix A.11).

The analysis of variance of the subjects'
Table 2

Cross Tabulation of Father's Educational Level by Subject's Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>MEX-AMER</th>
<th>GAY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>col %</td>
<td>tot %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EDUCATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME HIGH SCHOOL</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HIGH SCHOOL GRAD</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>48.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>19.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>34.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME COLLEGE</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLLEGE GRAD</td>
<td>41.9</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>24.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FINISH GRAD SCHO</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>26.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ANSWER</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 3

Cross Tabulation of Subject's Activity
Within Their Own Group by Subject's Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>MEX-AMER</th>
<th>GAY</th>
<th>ROW</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>count</td>
<td>row %</td>
<td>col %</td>
<td>tot %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACTIVITY LEVEL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY ACTIVE</td>
<td>1 5 3 2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.1 45.5 27.3 18.2</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.4 14.3 15.8 6.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>.8 4.0 2.4 1.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 9 3 7 26</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMEWHAT ACTIVE</td>
<td>26.9 34.6 11.5 26.9</td>
<td></td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16.7 25.7 15.8 23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.6 7.1 2.4 5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12 15 5 8 40</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOME TIMES ACTIVE</td>
<td>30.0 37.5 12.5 20.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>28.6 42.9 26.3 26.7</td>
<td></td>
<td>9.5 11.9 4.0 6.3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14 3 4 6 27</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LITTLE ACTIVITY</td>
<td>51.9 11.1 14.8 22.2</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33.3 8.6 21.1 20.0</td>
<td></td>
<td>11.1 2.4 3.2 4.8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 3 4 7 22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NO ACTIVITY</td>
<td>36.4 13.6 18.2 31.8</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19.0 8.6 21.1 23.3</td>
<td></td>
<td>6.3 2.4 3.2 5.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>42 35 19 30 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>27.8</td>
<td>15.1</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
significant, $F(3,122) = 4.318, p < .05$. A post hoc Newman-Keuls test found the Blacks to be the most different of all the minority groups, i.e., Blacks appeared to identify with their own minority group more so than the other groups did. Only 3.6% of the gays found being gay vital to their sense of self. Approximately 7 percent of Jews said that being Jewish was vital, while 79.6% of Blacks and 83.3% of Chicanos said their ethnicity was important. Not a single Black listed "not important", "very infrequently" or "infrequently", on their identification with their own group, suggesting a close alliance to their own group. Although Jews listed "frequently" (26.8%) to their identification with their own group, a full one third also listed "little activity" within their own group. This seems to indicate that while Jews tend to identify fairly closely to their own group, their actual activity level within their own group was down (see Table 4)

For subject's self-esteem, as measured by the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (1965), no significant differences were observed.
### Table 4

**Cross Tabulation of Subject's Identification With Their Own Group by Subject's Ethnicity**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ETHNICITY</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>JEWISH</th>
<th>BLACK</th>
<th>MEX-AMER</th>
<th>GAY</th>
<th>ROW %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>IDENTIFICATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOT IMPORTANT</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY INFREQ</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INFREQ</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOMETIMES</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.1</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FREQUENTLY</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>44.1</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VERY FREQ</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>16.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VITAL</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLUMN</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>14.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Scoring the Offensiveness Scale**

On the offensiveness scale used in the present investigation, responses indicating the maximum degree of offensiveness were assigned the value of 7. The other extreme was assigned the value of 1, indicating that the subject thought the syllogism was inoffensive; a 4 indicates an irritation with the statement. Each minority group, then, received from each subject five mean scores: one on the Black scale, one on the Chicano scale, one on the Jewish scale, one on the gay scale and one on the Total scale.

A measure of self-hate is also involved here (Lewin, 1941). If a subject consistently rates an item dealing with his own minority group as being less offensive than similar items that apply to persons who are not in his minority group, and this pattern is consistent throughout the test, we can say that that particular person appears to be self-hating.

If this pattern is consistent throughout the minority group being tested, we can say that the group in general appears to be self-hating. It is our hypothesis that the Jews in our sample will be significantly more self-hating than any other minority group being tested based on data presented in the Klein (1978) study: (A) it is hypothesized Jews will rate offensive items toward Jews as
not offensive, but when it comes to a similar statement about other minority groups, the Jews will consider them more offensive than like statements about Jews. On the basis of data presented in the Sappenfield (1942) study, we also hypothesized that Jews will be more tolerant towards homosexuals than the rest of the minority groups will be.

(B) It is hypothesized that some groups will show differences in the way they respond to the individual minority groups, as evidenced in the Rosenfield (1982) study.

(C) It is hypothesized that subjects who score high on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale will tend to evidence less prejudice than subjects who score low on this measure.
CHAPTER FOUR

Results

A one-way between subjects repeated measures multivariate analysis of variance was performed on the eight dependent variables; MEXA, MEXB, JEWA, JEWB, BLACKA, BLACKB, GAYA and GAYB. Independent variables were the subject's minority group, either Mexican-American (Chicano), Black, Jewish or gay.

SPSS MANOVA was used for the analyses. Order of entry of IVs were Mexican-American, Jewish, Black, Gay. The total number of subjects was 126. Results of evaluation of assumptions of normality, homogeneity of variance matrices, linearity and multicollinearity were satisfactory.

Personal Ratings (A Scale)

For the MANOVA, on the personal ratings (A statements) only, the main effect of the subject's ethnicity was not statistically significant. However the main effect for the type of scale (Mexican-American, Jewish, Black and Gay) was significant, using the Wilks' criterion, $F(3, 122), p < .05$. The subjects found the Jewish and Gay Scales to be the most offensive overall. There was also a significant positive interaction between ethnicity and type of scale, $F(3, 122) = 11.890, p < .05$ (see Table 5).
Table 5

Means of Scores for Personal Ratings on the Four Offensiveness Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Mexican-American Scale</th>
<th>Black Scale</th>
<th>Jewish Scale</th>
<th>Gay Scale</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mex-Amer</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.14</td>
<td>3.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.99</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>3.69</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.35</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>3.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3.78</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>3.49</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.90</td>
<td>3.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A priori contrasts of the data provided additional information. On the Jewish A scale, a significant difference was found between the way the Jews rated the statements vs. how the rest of the subject's rated the same items, \( F (3, 122) = 11.870, \ p < .05 \). This means that the Jews rated the Jewish Scale to be significantly less offensive than any other group did.

On the Gay scale, there was a significant contrast between ethnicity and type for the Mexican subjects, \( F (3, 122) = 17.383, \ p < .05 \). The Mexican subjects consistently rated the syllogisms about gays to be the most offensive.

"As if" (B) Scale

A second MANOVA was performed on the "as if" (B) statements. Use of the Wilks' criterion on the combined DVs was statistically significant for the main effects, for ethnicity of target, \( F (3, 122) = 4.20 \ p < .05 \) and type of statement, Wilks' = .67186, \( F (3, 122), p < .05 \). There was no statistically significant interaction. A priori contrasts of the "as if" (B) statements were as follows: On the Mexican-American Scale,
Table 6
A Priori Contrasts of Personal Ratings on the Four Offensiveness Scales

1. On the Jewish Scale, the Jewish subjects were different from all the groups taken in combination. For example, the Jews responded differently on the Jewish Scale from the combination of the Mexican-American, Black and Gay subjects. The mean for the Jews on the Jewish Scale is 3.35, and the mean for the others (taken in combination) is 3.84.

2. Also on the Jewish Scale, the Mexican-American subjects were significantly different from all the groups taken in combination. The mean for the Mexican-American subjects is 4.00, and the mean for the others (taken in combination) is 3.62.

3. On the Gay Scale, the Mexican-Americans were different from all the groups taken in combination, for example, the Mexican-Americans were different on the Gay Scale from the combination of the Blacks, Jews and Gays. The mean for the Mexican-Americans on the Gay Scale is 4.14, and the mean for the others (taken in combination) is 3.81.

Note: All a priori contrasts are statistically significant, p < .05.
a priori contrasts showed a significant difference between the way the Blacks answered the items, $F(3, 122) = 5.62$, $p < .05$. The Blacks did not find the Mexican-American syllogisms to be offensive to the same degree as the other syllogisms.

On the Jewish B scale, there was a significant difference between the way the gays answered the items vs. the rest of the subjects did, $F(3, 122) = 4.619$, $p < .05$. The gay subjects rated the items about Jews as more offensive than the items concerning the other minority groups.

On the Gay B scale, a significant difference between the way the gays answered the items vs. the way everyone else answered the items was found, $F(3, 122) = 6.23$, $p < .05$. The gays also found the syllogisms about gays to be more offensive than the other syllogisms. In examining the relationship between the other ethnic groups and type of scale, no statistically significant relationship was found (see Tables 7 and 8).
### Table 7

Means of Scores for Ratings "as if" the Subject was a Member of the Minority Group in Question on the Four Offensiveness Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject's Ethnic Group</th>
<th>Mexican-American Scale</th>
<th>Black Scale</th>
<th>Jewish Scale</th>
<th>Gay Scale</th>
<th>Total Scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mex-Amer</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>2.55</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>2.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jewish</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gay</td>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>3.19</td>
<td>3.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2.70</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>2.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 8

A Priori Contrasts for Ratings "as if" the Subject was a Member of the Minority Group in Question on the Four Offensiveness Scales

1. The Mexican-Americans rated the Mexican-American Scale as being significantly less offensive than the other scales (taken in combination).

The mean for the Mexican-Americans on the Mexican-American Scale was 2.61, and the mean for the others (taken in combination) is 3.02.

2. On the Mexican-American Scale, the Mexican-American subjects rated their own scale as being significantly less offensive than the other groups (taken in combination).

The mean for the Mexican-American subjects is 2.61, and the mean for the rest of the subjects (taken in combination) was 2.73.

3. On the Jewish Scale, the Gay subjects rated the statements as significantly more offensive than the other groups (taken in combination).

The mean for the Gay subjects was 3.14, and the mean for the rest of the subjects (taken in combination) was 2.99.

4. On the Gay Scale, the Gay subjects rated the statements as significantly more offensive than the other groups
The mean for the Gay subjects was 3.19, and the mean for the rest of the subjects (taken in combination) was 2.83.

Note: All a priori contrasts are statistically significant at the .05 level.
The analysis of variance on ethnic self-esteem scores, as rated on the Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale by ethnic groups, did not turn out to be statistically significant. The hypothesis that self-esteem would be negatively correlated with low ratings of offensiveness could not be empirically tested.
CHAPTER FIVE
Discussion and Conclusion

Past research has shown evidence indicating that lower self-esteem and prejudice may be dependent upon personality factors such as, authoritarianism, dogmatism, intolerance and sexual rigidity (Rokeach 1960). Previous research has focused on the degree and number of social and psychological variables thought to affect specific types of prejudice (Bettelheim, 1950; Allport, 1954).

The results of the present study have provided some support for the main hypothesis that the Jewish subjects would rate items concerning themselves as less offensive than similar items about other minority groups.

Although there was no significant difference between ratings of offensiveness on the personal ratings (A statements), that is, how offensive the statements appeared to the individual himself or herself, there was a significant difference on responses to the "as if" (B statements). The subjects responded differently when asked to rate items as if they were someone else.

The total pool of subjects, including the Jews, rated the Jewish "as if" (B) statements items as being more offensive than the Black, Chicano or gay statements. Although the Jewish "as if" (B) scale showed the highest amount of offensiveness over subjects generally, the Jews
themselves rated the Jewish "as if" (B) scale to be less offensive than the other three scales. This seems to indicate that the Jews simply do not find negative statements about their own minority group as offensive as statements about other groups. Because of the non-significant differences among the groups in ratings of self-esteem and the non-significant differences on the personal rating (A) statements, interpretation of the differential Jewish response as self-hatred appears dubious, particularly as the more rigorous test of self-hatred, lower ratings of Jews by Jews on the Jewish personal ratings (A) scale, did not prove statistically significant.

On the Jewish personal ratings (A) scale, there was a significant difference in the way the Mexican-American subjects responded to the statements. The Chicanos found the Jewish items to be more offensive than did members of other groups (\(\bar{x}=4.00\)).

It is puzzling why this occurred. If this is true, than their unfamiliarity with the Jewish culture and customs may create disbelief when they are presented with the negative Jewish stereotypes. One possible explanation is that Chicanos, coming from a culture where there are few Jews physically present, and as less assimilated members
of U. S. society, have heard fewer negative street comments about Jews.

The hypothesis that Jews would be more tolerant towards homosexuals than the other minority groups was not born out, as there was no significant difference between the way the Jews rated the Gay statements vs. the way the other groups rated the Gay statements on either the personal rating (A) scale or the "as if" (B) scale.

Not supported was the hypothesis that self-esteem and low ratings of offensiveness would show a significant correlation. In general, all of these subjects appeared to have approximately equal and high self-esteem.

It appears that the Chicanos found the Jewish statements, as well as the Gay statements above average in offensiveness (4.00) and (4.14). They show a higher amount of sensitivity for these groups than to their own group or to the Black group. It is possible that the Mexican-American culture is, in general, less tolerant of homosexuals. Possibly intensifying their reaction were several statements about gays concerning death and disease (i.e., "Therefore: some gays have AIDS"). An attempt was made to create syllogisms that were reasonably equivalent in offensiveness. However, it may be that the recent stereotype of a gay person having AIDS, and its horrible consequence of death, may have caused several of the
subjects to believe that being a member of the gay minority entails many more risks of rejection, separation and death than does being a member of the Black, Jewish or Mexican minority.

The lack of significant results supporting several of the hypotheses examined in this study, most notably, the relationship between self-esteem and self-hate, leads to several possible interpretations. First, significant differences may exist, which the present investigation may have missed due to flaws in the design, methodology or selection of subjects. Second, differences may exist which are too small to be significant with this small sample. Third, there may not be any actual relationship between self-esteem, self-hate and prejudice.

Also, all of the subjects were volunteers, and had to openly expose their ethnicity or sexual preference. Subjects who did not want to state their minority background were not part of this study. This pressure was especially important for the gay sample since the gay subjects all admitted openly to being gay. As with any gay population, the only way the researcher could know an individual's sexual preference is by asking, and then assuming an honest response. Only those who admitted homosexuality were included in the study. This researcher
knows of no feasible way to survey gay people who do not openly admit to their homosexuality. This is one of the inherent flaws in studying homosexual groups (Morin & Garfinkle 1978).

Further, most of the students were undergraduates taking an introductory course in psychology at California State University, Northridge. Most of the students were under 30 and came from upper middle class homes. They were all volunteers. This self-selection factor may severely influence the type of responses the researcher obtained.

In addition, this university is mostly comprised of students who do not live on campus, thus further narrowing the selection of subjects to those who live within the immediate surrounding area in Southern California. Because of this limited geographic area, there may be a question regarding the generalizability of the results of this study. Perhaps the results would be different if this study was carried out in the South or the Midwest.

Another possible explanation for the differences found among the various scales may be the subject's unwillingness to disclose information which could label himself/herself as prejudiced. Although the word "prejudice" was not mentioned during the instructions to the subjects or in the debriefing, several subjects did ask the author, after the survey was completed, whether
the study was measured feelings about the different minority groups. This fear of being labelled may have been intensified by the fact that the subjects were instructed to give their name and address as part of the research. It may have been the case that an individual who might respond otherwise as extreme on the scale changed his/her written answer to a more socially acceptable response when asked to identify himself/herself.

Suggestions for Further Research

(1) Before any conclusions can be made with any degree of certainty on the basis of the results on the Offensiveness Scale, the investigation should be repeated with larger and more representative sampling. A suggested procedure is to inventory the attitudes of junior high and high school students, as well as adults who are no longer involved in the educational system, for the purpose of establishing age norms. It is commonly believed that people become more prejudiced as they grow older (Bettelheim, 1950). However, there are no objective data to support these beliefs.

(2) Before any such replication is attempted, it seems wise to examine the syllogisms in further detail for a more thorough check of the equivalency of the items. If it is true that the gay syllogisms are significantly
different from the other syllogisms, future research should be able to acknowledge these differences and replace the inappropriate syllogisms. Nonequivalency of the items may be a major confounding factor in interpreting the results of this study.

(3) This type of research should be carried out in different cities with different populations, as the local political climate could be a significant factor in determining prejudice. For example, Los Angeles may have a fairly liberal population with respect to tolerance. Perhaps the results would have been different if this same study was carried out in the South.
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APPENDICES
Facesheet

A.1

All information is strictly confidential. Please answer all questions. Thank you for contributing to psychological research.

Name ____________________________
Address ____________________________
City ____________________________

Have you had a course in logic? _____

What kind of car do you drive? ____________________________

Please circle your father's highest educational level:
1. some high school 2. high school graduate 3. some college 4. college graduate 5. finished graduate school

Sex: Male____Female____

Are you: (check more than one if applicable)
    _____Jewish ______Mexican (Mexican-American, Chicano)
    _____Caucasian ______Gay
    _____Black ______Protestant
    _____Catholic
    _____Asian (Asian-American)
    _____Other (please indicate_____________________

Please indicate your degree of identification with your ethnic group on a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating that you rarely think of your ethnic identity, that it's basically unimportant to you, and a 7 indicating a strong identification with that group and would list it as the most important clue to your identity. A four would indicate that you sometimes identify with your group.

1. Not at all important 5. Frequently
2. Very Infrequently 6. Very frequently
3. Infrequently 7. Vital
4. Sometimes
How active are you in your ethnic community? Please rate yourself on the following 5 point scale.

1. Very active.
2. Somewhat active.
3. Sometimes active, sometimes not active.
4. I have little to do with my ethnic community.
5. I have nothing to do with my ethnic community.
Directions for Offensiveness Scale

Instructions:

A question has arisen regarding the offensiveness of some materials we wish to use in a study of reasoning ability using university students as our subjects and involving a number of different ethnic groups.

We are concerned about this matter and would greatly appreciate your help.

In this connection, would you rate the following items as to their degree of offensiveness to
  a) you personally
  b) the group or groups involved in the particular item

Rate each item on the following scale:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highly Offensive</th>
<th>Moderately Offensive</th>
<th>Not Offensive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7 6 5 4 3 2 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We also ask that you complete the attached brief data sheet.

When you have finished with both items, please place them in the stamped, self-addressed envelope and return them to us.

We appreciate your early attention to this matter.

If you would like a copy of this study when it is published, please supply the data called for below, and we will try to send a copy to you.

I would like a copy of the published report, when this is available:

______yes______no

Name: ________________________
Address: _____________________
Answer Sheet

Please mark your answer sheet with the numbers 1-7.
You personally (A), the group involved in the particular item (B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>A</th>
<th>B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>46</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
<td>47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td>48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td>54</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td>55</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td>57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td></td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td>61</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td>66</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td></td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td></td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
<td>70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td>71</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td>72</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td>73</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
<td>74</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td>76</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td>78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
<td>79</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Thank you for participation.

This study is a possible preliminary for a future study dealing with reasoning and cognition, particularly as these relate to how people feel about themselves.

We are interested in, among other things, what facilitates and what inhibits the ability to reason logically, validly and dispassionately.

No worthwhile studies can be done without the cooperation of many different people. We greatly appreciate your time and effort.

If you have any special questions, the Experimenter, Karen Schneider, will be pleased to answer them.
1. Given: No kind people are cruel. All Chicanos are kind people. 
   Therefore: No Chicanos are cruel.

2. Given: All Jews are hungry for money. All business men are Jews. 
   Therefore: All business men are hungry for money.

3. Given: No gays are out of control. All people who are out of control molest children. 
   Therefore: No gays molest children.

4. Given: All people with chips on their shoulders need psychotherapy. All Mexicans need psychotherapy. 
   Therefore: All Mexicans have chips on their shoulders.

5. Given: Criminals frequently join gangs. Mexican men are criminals. 
   Therefore: Mexican men frequently join gangs.

6. Given: If gay people would stop having homosexual sex, then they would be healthy. Gay people will not stop having homosexual sex. 
   Therefore: Gays are not healthy.

7. Given: No Black people are rapists. All rapists are criminals. 
   Therefore: No Black people are criminals.

8. Given: All Mexicans dance great tribal dances. All people who dance great tribal dances have a rich heritage. 
   Therefore: All Mexicans have a rich heritage.

9. Given: If Blacks had a great deal of money, they would be wealthy land owners. Blacks do not have a great deal of money. 
   Therefore: Blacks are not wealthy land owners.

10. Given: Mental patients are wimps. Homosexuals are mental patients. 
    Therefore: Homosexuals are wimps.

11. Given: Black women who have many children are out of control sexually. All Black women are out of control sexually. 
    Therefore: Black women have many children.
12. Given: All Blacks are animals. All animals are cherished by God. Therefore: All Blacks are cherished by God.

13. Given: If Jews own all the gold in Fort Knox, then they would not be stingy. Jews do not own all the gold in Fort Knox. Therefore: Jews are not stingy.

14. Given: All greasy people need a bath. Some Mexicans need a bath. Therefore: Some Mexicans are greasy.

15. Given: No one who lives in Beverly Hills is poor. All poor people are Black. Therefore: No one who lives in Beverly Hills is Black.

16. Given: All Jews are men. All men must work hard for a living. Therefore: All Jews must work hard for a living.

17. Given: All Jews have large noses. Gary Fineman is a Jew. Therefore: Gary Fineman has a large nose.

18. Given: Some Jews are really cheap. Some Israelites are really cheap. Therefore: Some Israelites are Jews.

19. Given: All criminals have not been socialized properly. Gay people are criminals. Therefore: If people are gay, then they haven't been socialized properly.

20. Given: Weak-willed people should be institutionalized. All homosexuals should be institutionalized. Therefore: All homosexuals are weak-willed.

21. Given: All gays go into visionary trances. All people who go into visionary trances are artistic. Therefore: All gays are artistic.

22. Given: If Blacks are extremely retarded, they should be placed in mental institutions. Blacks are not extremely retarded. Therefore: Blacks should not be placed in mental institutions.

23. Given: All Mexicans are corporate attorneys. All corporate attorneys are men of good business sense. Therefore: All Mexicans are men with good business sense.
24. Given: Lesbians who are exclusive with their lovers have no children. All Lesbians are exclusive with their lovers. Therefore: Lesbians have no children.

25. Given: No Chicanos are hurtful people. All hurtful people molest their children. Therefore: No Chicanos molest their children.

26. Given: No clean people carry the AIDS virus. All Lesbian women are clean people. Therefore: No Lesbian women carry the AIDS virus.

27. Given: All bums are lazy. All Black people are bums. Therefore: All Black people are lazy.

28. Given: No Jews are allowed at the Valley Country Club. Everyone who goes to the Valley Country Club are charitable and kind. Therefore: No Jews are charitable and kind.

29. Given: All married men are overly domineering. Mexican men are married. Therefore: Mexican men are overly domineering.

30. Given: All people who have AIDS have sinned. Some gays have sinned. Therefore: Some gays have AIDS.

31. Given: Some Mexicans are not conscientious workers. All hard-working people are conscientious. Therefore: Some Mexicans are not hard-working.

32. Given: All good students spend a lot of time studying. Some Blacks spend a lot of time studying. Therefore: Blacks are good students.

33. Given: No Jews have low IQ's. All people with low IQ's are stupid. Therefore: No Jews are stupid.

34. Given: All gays love art. All people who love art are sensitive. Therefore: All gays are sensitive people.

35. Given: If Jews own all business corporations, then most Jews are wealthy. Most Jews do not own all business
corporations. Therefore: Most Jews are not wealthy.

36. Given: All Mexican women who don't use birth control have many children. All Mexican women do not use birth control. Therefore: All Mexican women have many children.

37. Given: Retarded people are mentally incompetent. Blacks are retarded. Therefore: Blacks are mentally incompetent.

38. Given: All people who play sports very well should join a sports team. Black people should join a sports team. Therefore: Black people can play sports very well.

39. Given: All Jews are stingy. All stingy people have emotional disorders. Therefore: All Jews have emotional disorders.

40. Given: All charitable people are generous. No Jews are charitable people. Therefore: No Jews are generous.

41. Given: College professors are not incompetent. Some Black people are college professors. Therefore: Black people are not incompetent.

42. Given: All the people who live in the Fairfax area are Jewish. All Jewish people are clannish. Therefore: All the people who live in the Fairfax area are clannish.

43. Given: No gay people are pre-school teachers. All pre-school teachers are boring. Therefore: No gay people are boring.

44. Given: Some homosexuals are not happy. All people who are mentally healthy are happy. Therefore: Some homosexuals are not mentally healthy.

45. Given: All Jewish businessmen are college graduates. Some devious and shrewd men are college graduates. Therefore: Some devious and shrewd people are Jewish businessmen.

46. Given: All fighters are masculine. Every Lesbian is a fighter.
Therefore: Every Lesbian looks masculine.

47. Given: Clowns are slaphappy. Some Black people are clowns. Therefore: Black people are slaphappy.

48. Given: If gay men participate in "safe sex", then they would be clean. Gay men do not participate in "safe sex". Therefore: Gay men are not clean.

49. Given: All religious Jews go to temple. Orthodox rabbis go to temple. Therefore: Some orthodox rabbis are religious Jews.


51. Given: All Mexican women spend a great deal of time in the kitchen. All people who spend a great deal of time in the kitchen cook very well. Therefore: All Mexican women cook very well.

52. Given: All Blacks have bushy Afros. All people who have bushy Afros are unclean. Therefore: All Blacks are unclean.

53. Given: Jews who wear yalmulkas are religious zealots. Some Jews wear yalmulkas. Therefore: Some Jews are religious zealots.

54. Given: All Jewish men are passive. All passive people are wimpy. Therefore: All Jewish men are wimpy.

55. Given: If Mexican men would go to the doctor regularly, then they would be healthy. Mexican men do not go to the doctor regularly. Therefore: Mexican men are not healthy.

56. Given: All gays have had psychotic episodes. All people who have had psychotic episodes are extremely creative. Therefore: All gays are extremely creative.

57. Given: Black people have had slavery in their ancestor's background. Some professional athletes have had slavery in their ancestor's background. Therefore: Some professional athletes are Black.
58. Given: No priests are cruel. All priests are Black. Therefore: No Black people are cruel.

59. Given: Mexican men are very sexy. All sexy people are good looking. Therefore: Mexican men are good looking.

60. Given: All farmers are hard-working. Blacks are hard-working. Therefore: Blacks are good farmers.

61. Given: All Blacks used to originate from tribes in Africa. All people from tribes in Africa have special healing powers. Therefore: All Blacks have special healing powers.

62. Given: All factory workers are lazy. All Mexicans are factory workers. Therefore: All Mexicans are lazy.

63. Given: No happy people are devious or shrewd. All Mexicans are happy people. Therefore: No Mexicans are devious or shrewd.

64. Given: Blacks are not shrewd. All criminals are shrewd. Therefore: Blacks are not criminals.

65. Given: Some ruthless people are dangerous. Some Blacks are dangerous. Therefore: Some Blacks are ruthless people.

66. Given: People in the garment industry are hard-working. Jews work in the garment industry. Therefore: Jews are hard-working people.

67. Given: No Playboy bunnies are Jewish. All of Hugh Hefner's girls are Playboy bunnies. Therefore: None of Hugh Hefner's girls are Jewish.

68. Given: Some Jews are not lecherous. All child molesters are lecherous. Therefore: Some Jews are not child molesters.

69. Given: Some people who are not diseased think they may be sick. No gay people think they might be sick. Therefore: Some gay people are not diseased.
70. Given: All Blacks have a lot of endurance. All persons who have a lot of endurance are natural athletes. Therefore: All Blacks are natural athletes.

71. Given: All Jews are conniving. No honest people are conniving. Therefore: Honest people are not Jews.

72. Given: All ignorant people are uneducated. All Mexicans are uneducated. Therefore: All Mexicans are ignorant people.

73. Given: All Mexicans are good at sports. Some professional boxers are good at sports. Therefore: Some professional boxers are Mexican.

74. Given: All Mexicans are poor. All poor people do not live in a ghetto. Therefore: All Mexicans do not live in a ghetto.

75. Given: No alcoholics should come out of the closet just to be humiliated. All gay people are alcoholics. Therefore: No gay people should come out of the closet just to be humiliated.

76. Given: All gay people are interested in their rights. Some professional athletes are interested in their rights. Therefore: Some professional athletes are gay.

77. Given: All homosexuals are concerned individuals. All concerned individuals have deep insight. Therefore: All homosexuals have deep insight.

78. Given: If Mexicans would work very hard, then they would be wealthy. Mexicans do not work very hard. Therefore: Mexicans are not wealthy.

79. Given: All strange people have emotional problems. All gays have emotional problems. Therefore: All gays are strange.

80. Given: All janitors are uneducated. No Mexican women are uneducated. Therefore: Some Mexican women are not janitors.
Table 9  
Oneway Analysis of Variance of Father's Educational Level by Subject's Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>52.0632</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>17.3544</td>
<td>7.231</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>292.7940</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>2.400</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>344.8571</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of Variation</td>
<td>SS</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>MS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>p</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>12.3324</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.1108</td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>.0343</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>168.4692</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>1.3809</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>180.8016</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 11

Oneway Analysis of Variance of Subject's Identification With Their Own Group by Subject's Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>SS</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>41.6584</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.8861</td>
<td>4.318</td>
<td>.0062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>392.3416</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>3.2159</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>434.0000</td>
<td>125</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>