

University of San Diego

Digital USD

Dissertations

Theses and Dissertations

1994

Barriers to Community: The Development of an Instrument to Assess Components of Prejudice

Anita M. Rogers EdD
University of San Diego

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Digital USD Citation

Rogers, Anita M. EdD, "Barriers to Community: The Development of an Instrument to Assess Components of Prejudice" (1994). *Dissertations*. 597.

<https://digital.sandiego.edu/dissertations/597>

This Dissertation: Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Theses and Dissertations at Digital USD. It has been accepted for inclusion in Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital USD. For more information, please contact digital@sandiego.edu.

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY: THE DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT
TO ASSESS COMPONENTS OF PREJUDICE

by

Anita M. Rogers

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfillment
of the requirements for the degree of

Doctor of Education

University of San Diego

1994

Dissertation Committee

Dr. Susan Zgliczynski, Ph.D., Director

Dr. Jerome Ammer, Ph.D.

Dr. Judith Liu, Ph.D.

© MARCH 1994 ANITA MARIE ROGERS
ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

ABSTRACT

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY: DEVELOPMENT OF AN INSTRUMENT TO ASSESS COMPONENTS OF PREJUDICE

Contemporary theory and practice defines leadership as a collaborative effort, based in community, and purposefully guided by a mutual vision of freedom, justice and equality. Prejudice, as a preset of negative beliefs and behaviors toward a person or a group is a primary barrier to the transformational process of team-building and formation of community.

The purpose of this study was to contribute to the effectiveness of training and educational interventions through further understanding of the origins and aspects of prejudice which act as barriers to community. The Retroductive Triangulation process served as a guiding methodology for the development of a conceptual framework for prejudice and for an instrument which allowed that framework to be tested in a sample population. The seven stepped process involved a deductive phase (I) consisting of a review of the related theoretical and empirical literature, and an identification and analysis of themes. During the inductive phase (II), interviews were conducted with experts and practitioners in the content area. An analysis of the data yielded themes related to the concept. A conceptual framework (III) was created from an analysis and synthesis of measured and unmeasured dimensions which emerged. An assessment protocol (IV) focused on the unmeasured dimensions as the basis for the instrument development (V). The instrument was tested for psychometric properties (VI) in a diverse sample population from five local educational institutions. The four hundred and fifteen subjects were upper level

undergraduates, graduate students, and participants in executive training programs.

The results of the study supported an association of important aspects of contemporary prejudice with Western world views and values. These included competition, and a quest for power to bolster identity, evaluation of others by external and material standards, and a belief in the inevitability of hierarchical systems. The study highlighted also the American ambivalence between values of individualism and community. The implications of the study for interventions suggest that an emphasis be placed on the identification and examination of basic assumptions which guide individual behavior and the formation of organizational systems. The preliminary 30 item instrument may be further developed as a self assessment tool (VII) to be used in organizational interventions.

DEDICATION

To my children Lisa and Kevin Buckley

Who taught me tolerance.

And to my husband David P. Rogers

Who taught me love.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The development and completion of this project has been an experience of community in action and it is to that community that I wish to express my deep appreciation. My committee brought their unique talents to this endeavor and I wish to thank Dr. Susan Zgliczynski for her extraordinary inspiration, Dr. Judith Liu for her warm incisiveness, and Dr. Jerome Ammer for his kind wisdom and humor. My classmates were an unexpected source of support, encouragement and real help. This study could not have been completed without their assistance in providing access to subjects and test sites. The participants were exceptionally gracious, the interviewees who paved the way and the many students who completed the questionnaire. Their genuine interest and encouragement were buoyant forces and it was an honor to learn from them. I have had the good fortune to work with colleagues at the University of San Diego Career Services, who are also my friends. Mildred Brown, Barbara Burke, Liz Jacobs, Rebecca Jaurigue and Linda Scales have created the kind of workplace that is truly a gift. Most of all, I want to thank Dr David Rogers, who has been my mentor, my ally, my resonator, my husband and my friend on this heroic journey of doctoral studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT.	
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.	iii
CHAPTER 1	1
STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE.	1
Introduction	1
Purpose	6
Research Questions	10
Definition of Terms	10
Attitude	10
Belief	11
Discrimination.	11
Intervention	12
Prejudice	12
Retroduction.	12
Triangulation	13
Assumptions and Limitations	13
CHAPTER 2	17
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	17
Theoretical and Empirical Triangulation	17
Studies	17
Philosophy.	22

A conceptual analysis of prejudice	22
Critical Theory, Prejudice and Self Estrangement	23
Expanded Definitions	26
Feminist Theory	28
Domination, Subordination and the Ethic of Care	28
Organizational Development	30
Managing diversity	30
Education	33
Prejudice and Socio-Political Arrangements	35
Anti-democratic attitudes and the authoritarian personality.	36
Prejudice and Tolerance.	38
The Theory of Modern Racism	42
Comparison of Prejudice Reduction in High and Low Prejudiced People	45
Individual Differences.	48
Susceptibility	50
Synthesis of the Literature Related to Prejudice	56
Review of Empirical Measures	58
The California F Scale	58
The Dogmatism Scale.	59
The Public Opinion Questionnaire	60

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale	60
Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory	60
The Modern Racism Scale	61
The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale	62
Summary of Related Empirical Measures.	63
Initial Conceptual Framework	63
CHAPTER 3	67
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY	67
Qualitative Study	67
Interview Process for Data Collection	73
CHAPTER 4	81
CONCEPTUAL SCHEMA	81
ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL; INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT	81
Deductive and Inductive Retroductive Triangulation.	81
The Interviewees	81
Formation of Unmeasured Dimensions from the	
Theoretical and Qualitative Studies.	85
Formation of Concept Assessment Protocol	87
Theoretical Definitions	92
Assessment Protocol for Instrument Development	93
Instrument Development From Unmeasured Dimensions	95
Item Identification and Development	95

Scaling Format and Scoring Procedures	96
The Preliminary Instrument	96
CHAPTER FIVE	97
PSYCHOMETRIC EVALUATION: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS	
OF RELIABILITY AND VALIDITY TESTING.	97
Content Validity Determination.	97
Pilot Study.	99
Sample.	100
Procedure	102
Barriers to Community Instrument	103
Results.	103
Internal Consistency Reliability.	103
Factor Analysis	106
First Factor Analysis	107
Second Factor Analysis	108
Third Factor Analysis	108
Fourth Factor Analysis	110
Multidimensionality and Unidimensionality	115
Discriminant and Convergent Validity	117
Item Analysis of the Barriers to Community Instrument	121
Summary	125

CHAPTER 6	126
DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS.	126
Instrument Development	127
The Qualitative Study and the Theoretical and	
Empirical Triangulation.	127
Psychometric Testing	129
Meaning and Implications of the Findings	131
Summary of the Research.	135
Implications for Education and Training Interventions	135
Reflections on an Instrument Development Methodology as a Means	
for Exploring a Complex Human Construct	136
Conclusion	137
REFERENCES	139
APPENDICES	152
A. Summary of Theoretical Literature: Prejudice	152
B. Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects Consent. Part I	156
C. Thematic Interview Guide	159
D. Interviewee Consent Form	160
E. Content Validity Form	161
F. Items Listed by Dimensions.	162
G. Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects Consent. Part II.	168
H. Subjects Consent Form	169

I.	Demographic Profile	170
J.	Barriers to Community Instrument	171
K.	Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory	175
L.	Right Wing Authoritarian Scale.	178

LIST OF TABLES

2.1 Preliminary Salient Facets of Prejudice From Theoretical Review. 54

2.2 Verification of Salient Aspects of Prejudice Emerged From Theoretical Review
. 55

2.3 Emerged Dimensions of Prejudice from Empirical Review 65

2.4 Preliminary Conceptual Framework 66

3.1 Seven Phases Retroductive Triangulation Process 67

3.2 Demographic Characteristics of Interviewees. 72

4.1 Comparison of Unmeasured Dimensions from Theoretical review and
Qualitative Study 86

4.2 Reduction of Preliminary Dimensions from Interviews 90

4.3 Synthesis of Dimensions from Qualitative Study and Theoretical Review. . . 91

4.4 Assessment Protocol of Measured and Unmeasured Dimensions of Prejudice
. 94

5.1 Demographic Data 101

5.2 Reliability Analysis of the 58 Item Barriers to Community Scale 104

5.3 Correlation Coefficients of the Four Subscales of the 58 Item Barriers to
Community Instrument 105

5.4	Results of the Fourth and Final Factor Analysis of the 30 Item Barriers to Community Scale	111
5.5	Items and Loadings of the 30 Item Barriers to Community Scale	112
5.6	Reliability Analysis of the Reduced 30 -Item Two Dimensional Barriers to Community Scale	115
5.7	Correlations of the Four Subscales in the Original 58 Item Barriers to Community Scale..	116
5.8	Item Means and Skewness for the Reduced Barriers to Community Scale .	122

CHAPTER 1

STATEMENT OF THE ISSUE

Introduction

Broad self-knowledge and knowledge of others lead to an essential questioning of the underlying assumptions which support prejudice (Jung, 1957). The world is condensing upon itself, through the growth of population, the immediate access of any global part via transportation and communication, and the shifting boundaries and alliances effected by global politics. Each person is faced today with a neighbor, who yesterday was a stranger. The human species has presented itself with a momentous opportunity to make the quantum leap into global harmony and true spiritual evolution. To accomplish this leap we will require the never ending development of tolerance and openmindedness toward others. Humans have also created for themselves, a potential powder keg where increasing proximity creates increasing disturbance.

The United States represents the world's first and greatest experiment in its attempt to consciously make diversity and coexistence work. Yet, prejudice occupies the daily headlines, and it is prejudice which stands in the way of this great experiment. Prejudice is everywhere. According to Morrison (1992), prejudice is still the number one barrier to advancement in the business community. Prejudice is found at the very roots of day to day existence, in the culture. Adorno (1967) pointed out that culture in

the modern world has become an industry. Commercial entertainment, which is the working arm of the culture industry creates in its audience a state of uncritical receptivity. The audience absorbs what has been deemed important to that industry into the very core of its existence. This is an unconscious process. Patterns of beliefs and behaviors are absorbed unconsciously and acted upon unconsciously.

In the scientific world, objectivity, defined as a quality of perception undistorted by personal feelings or perceptions, has been considered the essential ingredient in the quest for truth. Harman (1988) has discussed the ill treatment perpetrated by scientists on other scientists whose theories or investigation did not conform with the prevailing paradigm. His explanation is unconscious protectiveness and ego involvement with one's own theory. He points out that objectivity is defined by assumptions about reality which remain unconscious. Nevertheless, the scientific model has become so exalted that it has been coopted into the organizational world and has led to the creation of the bureaucratic manager. MacIntyre (1984) has identified the manager as one of the three governing characters of the age. He defines character as the moral representative of a culture who legitimizes a way of life. The manager's beliefs and attitudes toward others is rooted in a mechanistic thesis about the predictability of human behavior and about appropriate ways to manipulate that behavior. Thus, science, the culture industry and business, three key facets of the modern world collude to create a cultural mentality in which the person becomes object, treated as an instrument to fulfill other ends.

There are limitations of awareness and understanding which culture imposes as

it is defined by the arts as well as the science of the modern world. Yet, those who are concerned participants in this world attempt to intervene in the workings of institutions and organizations, in interpersonal relationships in the hope of reducing prejudice. Whether it is called organizational development, cross-cultural training, or interdisciplinary studies, these interventions aim to reduce prejudice, increase tolerance, openness and ultimately effectiveness in co-existing productivity.

These interventions become problematic when they themselves foster the very prejudice they attempt to alleviate. Hammer (1985) has referred to unconscious bias in applications of Jungian psychological type theory in organizational interventions. These biases lead to increased stereotyping of various personality types. In education, Ellsworth (1989) found that such key assumptions of critical pedagogy as empowerment, student voice, and dialogue are repressive myths which increased Eurocentrism, racism, and sexism. According to Gardiner (1972), human relations training, or "sensitivity training", as it was presented in the 1960's and 1970's has not been effective as it is often perceived as a manipulative attempt to change attitudes and is too superficial, yet this type of training has re-emerged recently as cross-cultural or diversity training. The works of the cognitive theorists (e.g., Taifel and Turner, 1979) also point out the dangers of exaggerating through various and inappropriate interventions the importance of the differences among people.

There are distortions in the underlying assumptions upon which these interventions are based and in the perceptions and presentations of those who attempt them. How can these underlying assumptions, attitudes and beliefs be brought to

awareness? Is there an ideal state of being non-prejudiced and can it be identified?

These are the questions which guide this research.

Significance and Relevance to Leadership

Contemporary leadership scholars, (Morrison, 1992; Rost, 1991; Foster, 1989) have defined leadership as a collaborative process among members of the community in which power, control and vision are shared in the service of mutually enhancing change. Burns (1978) has identified the goals of this change as equality, justice and freedom. The process through which these goals are achieved is called transformational leadership. The concept "transformational" refers to the ability of those in the leadership role to understand and respond to the wants of followers, and translate them into needs, the wants of the followers being the end values of equality, justice and freedom. Ultimately, both parties in the process will move toward fulfilling their mutual quest of intended change. He names role-taking as essential to the process. Role-taking, which involves the ability to shift to another's frame of reference, demands an appreciation of the other's world, empathy for the other's ideas and intentions. Human beings are not divided into self contained compartments of the personal versus the political, but are a complex unity of both. In other words, the personal is political.

Bennis and Nanus (1985) identify the acquisition of self knowledge as one of the five essential ingredients of successful leadership. Self-knowledge leads to self-management and the management of self is critical in the leadership process. In order to truly have an understanding and appreciation of another's needs, aspirations and goals, both in their uniqueness and in dimensions of mutuality, it is necessary to first have

clarity about oneself, one's beliefs, attitudes and behaviors. It is necessary to understand the boundaries between oneself and others in order to be secure in one's selfhood. For leadership involves "committing a greater risk, exposure and intimacy that most of us emotionally yearn for, rhetorically defend, but in practice, shun" (Bennis and Nanus, 1985, p. 217). Gilligan (1982) noted that inclusion is a major theme in feminist research. In their critique of an exclusive emphasis on individualism, separateness and mechanistic instrumentalism which precludes intimacy and empathy, feminists have helped define leadership as a process necessarily residing in empathic communication and caring action.

Implicit in these definitions and discussions of leadership is the necessity of open communication and tolerance among participants in the leadership process to one another's ideas and intentions. It is hoped these attitudes of openness and tolerance can contribute ultimately to transformational change and the building of community where equality, justice and freedom prevail. The word community has become a popular term in everyday language whether reference is being made to a global community, a corporate community, a large or small community, a formal or informal community. Concerns about prejudice are equally dominant in the minds of those who live in the modern world, for it is prejudice which stands in the way of building community, which stands in the way of the leadership process and which stands in the way of transformational change.

Purpose

How to reduce prejudice and increase tolerance are major questions within our institutions and organizations. Many organizational development and change efforts are attempts to enhance interpersonal understanding and communication. The team-building programs using the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator (Hirsch, 1985) to identify personality styles are an example of these interventions. There are increasing numbers of programs in organizations focusing on racial, ethnic and cultural differences which are intended to heighten an awareness and an appreciation of diversity. One trainer captures the essence of these programs in the following statement: "This is a therapeutic process, a healing process. We have some things to unlearn about how we relate to people" (Mitchell, 1992, personal communication). These programs represent one of three levels of intervention, as described by Duckitt (1992) in a multi-level, causal framework for prejudice. Duckitt has suggested that change must be addressed at the level of social structure, social influence processes, and at the individual attitudes and susceptibility level. A substantial body of literature exists which suggests that prejudice is a generalized attitude, in part due to individual differences in proneness. The existing research has been plagued by conceptual and methodological problems. Specifically, there is a need for a psychometrically reliable and valid instrument to operationalize an individual differences approach to prejudice and give immediate feedback to the individual. Prejudice has been studied systematically since early in the century (Duckitt, 1992), and the various theoretical and experimental explorations have informed education and training. Despite progress in prejudice reduction, prejudice

persists, displaying itself not only in old fashioned bigotry, but in new and subtle forms of symbolic racism (McConahay and Hough, 1976), aversive racism (Gaertner and Dovidio, 1986) and modern racism (McConahay, 1986). There has been some evaluation of systems change, often semi-anecdotal reports of changes in worker satisfaction and productivity. Other than anecdotal reports however, there has not been a systematic effort to document change at an individual level in interpersonal acceptance and tolerance.

Dempster (1990) has identified the measurement of a problem as a key challenge in research and practice. Concepts must be clearly defined, operationalized and measured by a variety of methods. Included among these methods would be the development of a reliable instrument which can provide a framework for the collection of data and increased understanding of the concept. The purpose of this study is to expand the knowledge of a contextually complex, multi-faceted concept of prejudice and to develop an instrument which will measure its occurrence in individuals. It is not enough to hope that education and training will change attitudes, beliefs and behaviors which make up prejudice. These efforts to reduce prejudice must be assessed rigorously and must add self assessment to the feedback loop. There is little reported in the literature which addresses even indirectly the issue of assessment. There appear to be no systematic attempts to assess before and after levels of prejudice. Furthermore trainers, facilitators and leaders of interventions are not included in the assessment equation. Agents of intervention must be accountable for their own biases in this process. They are, as Jung (1957) noted, the makeweights who tip the scales in the

prejudice reduction process.

There are currently available a number of new instruments designed to identify beliefs, attitudes and behaviors which may be related to prejudice, the Global-Mindedness Scale (Hett, 1991), the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley and Meyers, 1992), and the Diversity Awareness Profile (Grote, 1991). Each of these scales identifies characteristics which in specific cross-cultural contexts facilitate adaptability. However, with the exception of the Global-Mindedness Scale, these newer instruments are atheoretical and lack adequate psychometric properties. There are numerous scales available which are designed to identify attitudes and levels of prejudice toward specific groups and content issues including the following: the Heterosexual Attitudes Toward Homosexuals (Hath Questionnaire, Larsen, Reed and Hoffman, 1980); the Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1986); the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA) (Altemeyer, 1981). There are also instruments which were created in the 1950's and 1960's, such as the California F Scale (Adorno et al., 1950) and the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960), from research on the authoritarian personality and the open and closed mind, respectively. These latter instruments, which are rooted in psychodynamic theory and emphasize the psychological aspects of old fashioned bigotry, may not be sensitive to the subtleties of modern prejudice. What the emphasis on psychopathology does not recognize is the universality of the varying forms and degrees of prejudice in the culture. What the emphasis on the intercultural does not recognize is that prejudice can and does occur in every day human to human interaction. This study will attempt to identify attitudes and beliefs that predispose an individual to resist or obstruct attempts to build

community around difference, whether those differences are of race, gender, ethnicity, or simply of personality style. An instrument will be developed out of the resulting construct that will attempt to identify and measure these attitudes and beliefs within the individual. The phrase "Barriers to Community" is intended to be synonymous with the word prejudice; that is, a set of subtle or overt attitudes, beliefs and behaviors that minimize other persons and their opportunities, and obstruct the formation of teams and harmonious community.

There is a need for an efficient and sensitive instrument developed and normed in the current linguistic, cultural and political climate that can assist in the accomplishment of these goals. The intent of the study is to construct a self assessment prejudice awareness tool. The two purposes of the instrument are (1) to lead to greater self-awareness of personal attitudes, and (2) to identify the constellation of attitudes and behaviors that will lead to prejudice and thus form Barriers to Community. The hope is that as individuals become increasingly aware of their own limitations toward openness, tolerance and resistance to team-building and community, they will challenge themselves to confront and deal with these tendencies in a positive manner. The goal is to produce a self assessment instrument that can be used in the context of organizational development and training efforts in a variety of settings. Such a tool will help link concept to experience and facilitate team-building efforts. It is hoped also that the instrument can be used to assist in the design of team-building programs. Specifically, the goal will be to support a multi-faceted approach addressing the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of personality. The instrument may be able to assist in

determining within individuals and groups the need for empathy training, cognitive skills development, communication skills. Finally, the goal is to assist in assessing the effectiveness of team-building training programs, with the instrument forming part of the evaluative component in determining whether change has occurred.

Research Questions

The researcher seeks to investigate the following questions:

- 1) What is prejudice?
- 2) What is the nature of prejudice that leads to Barriers To Community?
- 3) What research has been done on facets related to prejudice?
- 4) Have instruments been developed to measure concepts related to prejudice? If so, what attributes are assessed?
- 5) What variables does the literature suggest might be predictors of prejudice?
- 6) What attitudes, beliefs and behaviors do theorists and researchers who study the concept of prejudice associate with prejudicial behaviors and beliefs?
- 7) Can a valid and reliable instrument be constructed to identify aspects of prejudice that form Barriers to Community?
- 8) Does the instrument indicate subsets evolving out of this study?

Definition of Terms

In constructing a reliable and valid instrument the following terms will be used.

Attitude There have been several conceptual and methodological problems with the three-dimensional model of attitude, including possible independence among the three

components. A three-dimensional model assumes an interdependence among cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of a phenomenon. Nevertheless, the model has the potential to integrate several psychological concepts into one schema of prejudice, which is the intent of this study. Therefore this research will be guided by the definition of Kagan and Havemann (1968) who distinguish between an attitude and a belief. An attitude consists of an organized set of beliefs directed toward an object and consists of emotional, behavioral and cognitive components.

Belief is a view that is deeply assimilated into the cognitive structure and acquired through a socialization process but lacks the emotional component of an attitude.

Discrimination Lalonde and Cameron (1994) discuss the complex relationship between prejudice and discrimination. They refer to the Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) definition of discrimination in context as typical; that is, prejudice is defined as an attitude, while, discrimination is an unjustified and selectively negative behavior toward others.

Furthermore, Dovidio and Gaertner suggest that there may be causes of discrimination other than prejudice. Lalonde and Cameron build on this definition by proposing that individual prejudice is not a necessary precondition for discrimination. Discrimination can be institutional; that is, rooted in the entire social system. The foregoing discussion and definitions view prejudice and discrimination as two separate phenomena. This study will deviate from these views based on the following perspectives. Prejudice in this study is defined as an attitude. Attitude is defined as a set of beliefs, emotions and behaviors. Discrimination, in this definition is the behavioral dimension of prejudice. While discrimination may be institutional in source, this does not mean it exists in the

absence of prejudice. Institutional viewpoints which sanction unwarranted negative behaviors are prejudiced viewpoints. Individuals who subscribe to these viewpoints subscribe to prejudiced views. Therefore, while prejudice may exist without manifestations in external behavior, that is, in discrimination, this is highly unlikely.

Discrimination cannot exist without prejudice. To make such a claim is to abdicate the notion of personal responsibility for beliefs, behaviors and for contribution to the formation of societal and organizational systems.

Intervention refers to an intentional and structured attempt to effect change in the processes of a system, organizational or human.

Prejudice To define prejudice is to define a concept in process since the purpose of this study is in part to elucidate the definition. Duckitt (1992) has identified eleven different attempts at definition. Ten of the eleven have a cognitive component, characterized by words such as: irrational, unsubstantiated, prejudgment, misinformation. Ten of the eleven definitions have an affective component represented by words and phrases such as: an emotional attitude, a failure of human-heartedness, an emotionally charged attitude. Conceptual blurring occurs in the use of words such as "disposition" or hostility toward other groups, which do not explicitly state a behavioral dimension but could readily include one. A majority of the definitions identified have included such "blurred" concepts. The term as it is defined in this study refers to a set of unwarranted negative beliefs, attitudes and behaviors toward another person or group based on distorted information which predisposes one toward action.

Retroduction The process relies on both inductive and deductive reasoning whereby

incremental convergence of data gathered from a theoretical study (deductive) and a qualitative study (inductive) results in the emergence of theory. Theory arrived at in this way should avoid inherent flaws of a strictly qualitative or quantitative methodology.

Triangulation The strategy of triangulation involves the collection of data from varied sources and subsequent cross-validation (Guba, 1981).

Assumptions and Limitations

A key assumption of this study is that the components which constitute the complexity of the concept prejudice have been correctly identified and can be measured. There is evidence from past research (Adorno et al., 1950) that similar components have been identified and measured, for example superstition and stereotypy have been identified as characteristics of the authoritarian personality. A second assumption is that beliefs and behaviors which characterize prejudice can be modified through a variety of interventions currently in use, in educational and organizational settings, since one of the purposes of this study is to develop an instrument to assess the effectiveness of interventions aimed at the reduction of prejudice. Third, it will be assumed that subjects' answers will reflect their best effort to honestly express their attitudes.

The most important assumption of this research is prejudice is undesirable. There are arguments for and against a pejorative use of the term. The argument against a pejorative use of prejudice resides in the boundaries of rationality. Duckitt (1992), for example, poses the question, was it equally rational in the second world war for the Nazis to have antipathy for the Jews as the Jews for the Nazis? A second consideration against a pejorative use of the term is a methodological one. What has been

operationalized and measured is the degree of negativity of the intergroup attitude. What has not been measured is how much a prejudiced attitude is unwarranted, or inhuman, or unjust. The recent focus on the study of prejudice within the domain of cognitive psychology has shifted the concept of prejudice to evaluatively neutral ground. Prejudice is simply identified as a negative intergroup attitude, rooted in normal and universal human processes. Therefore prejudice, which is manifested by the majority of the population, is normative and normal.

Bagley (1979) rejected moral relativism and condemned prejudice and racism as morally wrong. Billig (1978) argued against the new sociology. Racism is condemned because it offends certain categorical imperatives of how human relationships should be ordered. Harding et al. (1969) proposed that prejudice is bad because it violates three ideal norms. The norm of rationality is violated because prejudice is rooted in insufficient evidence. The norm of justice is violated because prejudice implicitly inhibits equal treatment for all. Prejudice violates the norm of compassion by denying the basic humanity of others. This research will proceed on the assumption that prejudice is undesirable for the following reasons. While it may be argued that prejudice served an essential self preserving function historically, in an increasingly global community prejudice is no longer functionally appropriate. If humans were to operate on an "assumption of oneness," which Harman (1992) suggests is necessary for a sustainable society, then prejudice cannot be rational. Supporting this notion is a contemporary view of leadership rooted in egalitarian, democratic ideals and critical philosophy which guides this research. That nearly a century of intense study has been

devoted to the understanding and eradication of the phenomenon is an indication that prejudice is an issue toward which there is little neutrality.

An important limitation of the study is that the researcher is a female member of the white middle class, middle-aged population and is confined by the inherent biases of this membership. As a member of a privileged group from a country which pays little overt attention to issues of heterogeneity, a large portion of the adult life of the researcher was spent in naivete and experiential isolation from the issues under study. There are deficits and benefits inherent in this background. On the deficit side, there exists a lack of cumulative substantive knowledge of the issues, and on the benefit side, the absence also of personal, cultural and institutional prejudgments about particular groups. The researcher has experienced the oppression of privilege in that a certain place and power has been assumed, with the ensuing dependence leading to a lack of resilience and hesitancy to relinquish power. This has afforded an insider's view on the addiction to the benefits implicit in a western world view of competition, individualism, and material entrapment. As a woman growing further into middle-age, the researcher's life has spanned the shift from traditional to contemporary expectations and has shared in the confusion, uncertainty and anxiety experienced by those whose lives have bridged a gap. As a new arrival in a country where youth is a primary commodity, at a pivotal point in the personal transition from youth to middle-age, the researcher has experienced for the first time, invisibility, a loss of credibility and a loss of power. This experience has crystallized as figure, in a figure/ground gestalt, pain, sorrow, and disillusionment. While these experiences may enlarge a sense of empathy with others who suffer from

oppression, the researcher can never know the full implications of oppression for those who have suffered from birth.

The second limitation is related to the sample population selected for development of the items. While a sample will be chosen to reflect a broad and knowledgeable perspective on prejudice, that sample is impacted by availability and the choice of the researcher. In addition, the sample selected for testing the resulting instrument will have implications for generalizability. Interpretation of the results will be applicable only to that sample. Finally, this study has taken place in cultural, historical time and cannot completely identify, nor escape the biases inherent in that reality.

CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Theoretical and Empirical Triangulation

The first phase of the Retroductive Triangulation process involves a review of the theoretical and empirical literature related to prejudice and a triangulation of the data. Through a critical analysis of the theoretical literature, unmeasured facets of prejudice were identified. An analysis of existing instruments identified measured dimensions related to prejudice. In order to capture the essence of the construct, an extensive review of the literature was conducted across a number of disciplines, psychology, social psychology, sociology, philosophy, education, and business. A conceptual schema formulated from a consolidation of the major recurring themes formed the foundation for the development of the instrument "Barriers to Community."

Studies of Prejudice in the Twentieth Century

Duckitt (1992) identified social psychology as the primary host discipline and characterized both social psychology and the study of prejudice as predominantly North American phenomena. Myrdal (1944) explained why America self-selected as the heartland of prejudice studies when he identified the "American dilemma." In his view, that dilemma was characterized by the conflict between creed and deed, and the discrepancies between the espoused Christian value system and the reality of action grounded primarily in self-interest.

While their study explored the white majority experience, Bellah et al. (1985) echoed the paradoxical nature of the American way of life in their study that examined the personal costs exacted by a singular emphasis on individualism and urged a re-balancing toward civic values and community. Katz et al. (1986) identified an abiding tension which results from the unresolved dilemma of creed versus deed, and paradox of individualism and community. This tension tends to polarize and exacerbate interpersonal behaviors both positively and negatively. Overarching this conflicted, paradoxical reality is the extraordinary diversity of the American experiment. Within this societal complexity, a prominent American interest in the study of prejudice was catalyzed.

There have been a number of different approaches to the classification of prejudice study. Duckitt (1992) and Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) building on the work of Ashmore and Del Boca (1976) describe two basic levels in the study of prejudice: societal level sociological theories and individual level psychological theories. Simpson and Yinger (1985) provided a three part classification: cultural, group, and individual determinants. Allport (1954) identified six levels of analysis: historical, sociocultural, situational, personality, phenomenological, and stimulus/object. Duckitt (1992) undertook a dialectic approach to an historical analysis, explaining why theoretical shifts have occurred across the history of prejudice studies and how the various theories might complement each other. He identified a series of seven stages and shifts in the study of prejudice which emerged in response to historical circumstances. The modern study of prejudice began in the 1920's, when white supremacy and racial superiority were challenged. The problem

of race relations was reframed as a problem of white prejudice. During the 1930's and 1940's researchers used psychodynamic theory to explain the persistence of prejudice as the result of unconscious and universal processes such as defense mechanisms of projection, frustration, and scapegoating. These "aggressive" processes diffused intrapsychic tensions resulting from environmental stresses. Most notably, this approach explained the rise of Nazism and the spread of anti-Semitism.

The events of World War II catalyzed a number of studies which formed the foundation for most subsequent research related to prejudice. The horror engendered by the war caused researchers to shift from an emphasis on universal processes, to a search for a particular structure of personality. Adorno et al. (1950) examined prejudice psychoanalytically and concluded that prejudice was rooted in authoritarian child-rearing practices. The adult personality remained psychologically disempowered, maintaining equilibrium through the dynamic of authoritarian submission and displacement of aggression. Rokeach (1960) took a cognitive approach, examining how the individual processes information, attending to open and closed systems of belief which result in the open and closed mind respectively. Allport (1954) underlined the complexity of the phenomenon in a comprehensive examination of the psychological, historical and sociological roots of prejudice. Taking a behaviorist perspective, he concluded that prejudice in the individual is characterized by a threat orientation, moralism, need for definitions, externalization, and authoritarianism. A tolerant personality shows empathy, self insight and tolerance for ambiguity. Duckitt (1992) pointed out that the individual differences approach was acceptable at this time because it would relieve the average

individual from the threat of any responsibility and in the post war triumph of democracy, society itself was removed from scrutiny.

The individual differences approach could not explain the prejudice of whole societies such as the U.S. South and the socio-cultural emphasis emerged. This emphasis explained prejudice in two ways, as a norm transmitted by conformity (Westie, 1964) and by socialization (Proshansky, 1966). The expected positive results of integration did not occur. Issues of conflict, power and domination had not been included in the equation. Therefore, a second socio-cultural emphasis was needed, the study and resolution of intergroup conflicts of interest and social structural conditions.

The study of prejudice returned to the discipline of psychology with the growing recognition that prejudice was not disappearing but persisting in new, subtle forms such as symbolic racism. McConahay and Hough (1976) defined symbolic racism as "the expression in terms of abstract, ideological symbols and symbolic behaviors, the feeling that blacks are violating cherished values, or making illegitimate demands for changes in the racial status quo" (p.38). Duckitt (1992) and Dovidio and Gaertner (1986) acknowledged the work of Taifel and Turner (1979) as a major influence on what has become the cognitive approach to the study of prejudice. Using the minimal intergroup paradigm, Taifel and Turner explained:

The mere perception of belonging to two distinct groups — that is, social categorization per se, is sufficient to trigger intergroup discrimination favoring the in-group. In other words, the mere awareness of the presence of an outgroup is

sufficient to provoke intergroup competitive or discriminatory responses on the part of the in-group. (p.38)

This phenomenon is attributed to normal cognitive processes of categorization and subsequent study has been devoted to how this process of categorization translates into discrimination, stereotyping and prejudice. The cognitive approach suffers from an absence of investigation into the affective factors of prejudice and fails to account for individual differences in attitudes and beliefs.

Duckitt (1992) summarized his historical analysis with an integrative framework. He attributed causality to four interactive processes; (A) fundamental psychological phenomena that provide a state of basic human readiness for prejudice. These include displacement, belief similarity, projection, social categorization, and social identification; (B) social and intergroup dynamics such as realistic conflict, and social competition; (C) social transmission of prejudice, through conformity, pressure, socialization and; (D) individual differences rooted in authoritarianism, frustration, adjustment, dogmatism, intolerance of ambiguity, political ideology, and self-esteem.

The dialectic approach leads to the speculation that perhaps it is not just the study of prejudice, which is influenced by historical moments, but perhaps the nature of prejudice itself is influenced by the times. As this is the acknowledged age of information with the concomitant stresses of information overload, it may be that the human need to categorize and stereotype is a particularly prevalent aspect of prejudice today. A further review of the literature revealed discussions of prejudice and related topics of tolerance, oppression,

and moral development in the organizational, political, feminist, and philosophical literature.

Philosophy

A conceptual analysis of prejudice

Allport (1954) devoted several passages to a conceptual analysis of prejudice. He traced the evolution of the word prejudice through three stages. In the first stage, the Latin noun *praejudicium* meant precedent, a judgement based on previous decisions and experience. In the second stage, the English term came to mean a premature or hasty judgement made before appropriate examination of the facts. In the third, and present stage, the word is defined also by an emotional tone of favorableness or unfavorableness. Newman (1979) defined prejudice as errors of fact, of logic and of values. He pursued an exploration of the meaning of prejudice and acknowledged that in its essence, prejudice is a kind of prejudgement. He adds to the definition by pointing out that prejudice is an unwarranted attitude toward some person, which is in itself based on an attitude toward certain characteristics of the person. We tend to prejudge people who are different from us even when they do not belong to an identifiable group. He points out that ignorance or a lack of facts is not the only crucial component of prejudice. He is concerned also with why particular kinds of prejudgements are rooted in ignorance. In a hypothetical example, a bigot, defined here as someone obstinate in intolerance, was presented with the facts and rejected them as irrelevant in favor of the original data. Here was not mere ignorance of data, but a decision based in a values system that lacked the moral insight of a tolerant attitude.

It is important to distinguish between two levels of prejudice, prejudice based on empirical error, that is prejudgements about characteristics, and prejudice based on logical error, errors of inference, that is prejudgments about people. Identifying these differences is crucial in the treatment of prejudice. The problem of prejudice is not just a problem of facts, prejudice at the first level, it is also a problem of logic and values, prejudice at the second level. Therefore, education as an antidote must take the appropriate form. Direct personal experience often breeds more prejudice when it is not accompanied also by a study of personal logic and values.

Critical Theory, Prejudice and Self Estrangement

Newman asked why these errors of logic and values exist. Critical theory provides illumination in its attention to oppression and the concept of self estrangement. Critical theory as a contemporary philosophy is concerned with the emancipation of society and its members from oppression, so that all humans can be fully participant in the creation of their own world. A key to this emancipation is the recognition of human embeddedness (Fay, 1987).

Both as individuals and as groups, humans are embedded in a system of contingent relationships... a full realization of this human condition would lead to an ecological sense, a way of living in which people are deeply impressed with the interrelatedness of all things to each other and have the care and sensitivity which must be taken in dealing with any one member of a system because of reverberations of any part in all the other parts. (p. 195)

What must be overcome in order to accomplish this ecological sense of oneness, is self estrangement. Self estrangement theory proposes that what humans both value and fear is based on misunderstandings about themselves and what they need. Classical Greek thought identified the notion of self estrangement. However, the Greeks were content with the possibility of ever increasing self knowledge, for its own sake. Critical theory, rooted in the modern scientific, technological world, assumes that change in the human condition is possible through human endeavor. Critical theory assumes that humans are active in creating their own world. To dispel these misunderstandings, this false consciousness, which results from self estrangement, the fully active human must be characterized by qualities of intelligence, curiosity, a capacity for self reflectiveness, and willfulness. Intelligence, the tendency to alter one's beliefs based on new information implies openness and flexibility and is supported by curiosity, a desire to seek out and expand one's knowledge about the environment. A capacity for self reflectiveness implies self consciousness, the ability to stand outside oneself and self examination, the capacity to evaluate the rationality and coherence of one's beliefs and desires, given what is and what ought to be. Willfulness, provides the force to act on the basis of one's reflections. Critical theory acknowledges the power of resistance and education and proposes the conditions under which people may open themselves to the tasks of critique and change. Schatzmann (1971) spoke of R.D. Laing's insistence on an environment free of distorted communication which encouraged full expression of feelings and ideas in an atmosphere of mutual trust and collective decision making.

Freire (1972) urged the development of consciousness based on an exploitation of political, social and economic conditions. The consciousness raising groups of the women's movement create an environment where perceptions, feelings, and fears, can be made conscious, where inherent contradictions in the social structure can be explored.

While critical theory has been informed by Freud and the psychoanalytic theory, the two diverge in end goals. For Freud, the human was cured through conformity to the existing structure. For critical theory, it is the emphasis on consciousness raising and rebellion which provides the freedom from the oppression of false consciousness and the society it constructs (Marcuse 1972).

For Jung, self estrangement was a result of alienation from the shadow, the unconscious. Rather than claiming ownership of seemingly undesirable characteristics, humans disown them, projecting them onto external relationships. The nature and quality of external relationships often mirror what is internal (Pierce 1989). The enemy is necessary to define oneself and to define oneself as good. Conflict arises from the split created by two halves in opposition. This split has been fostered by an emphasis on "logos," the masculine principle, with little tolerance for ambiguity and paradox. Neumann (1973), characterized the old ethic as governed by a strong set of rules which were collective and which defined goodness by obedience. This led to a scapegoat psychology with the goal of victory over evil. Racial and ethnic prejudice are rooted in a need to cast the shadow outward, in a fighting mentality and in an inability to see the big picture. Changes for the oppressed and changes in the structure of society are resisted for if the enemy changes, so must we. This accounts for the tenacity of prejudiced attitudes.

To change the oppressive structures of society requires a venture into the new ethic.

"Responsibility for the group presupposes a personality which has become conscious of its shadow problem and which has come to grips with this problem with all the forces at its disposal. The individual must work through his own basic moral problem before he is in a position to play a responsible part in the collective. (p. 93)

The new ethic resides in the principle of eros, relatedness, which requires a convergence of self assertion and love. What is required is the willingness to accept the ambiguity of inner experience, the danger of the unknown. "It requires compassion to see the others point of view, and to see our weaknesses through the others' eyes and thus to learn and grow." (Martin Luther King, 1983). This results in a "rehumanizing" of the enemy and a reframing of the relationship from adversaries to partners (Pierce 1989).

Expanded Definitions

Kagan and Havemann (1968), whose definition of attitude guides this research, pointed out that it is the emotional component of an attitude with deeply unconscious roots which sets it apart from a belief and makes it particularly resistant to change. An attitude which disregards individual differences and categorizes all people of a certain group is called a stereotype. Attitudes are not necessarily based in real evidence or on logic. Prejudice is an attitude involving judgement about people based in stereotype and virtually uninfluenced by new information or experience. This definition of prejudice then, is congruent with the definition proposed by Allport (1964), which placed special importance on the emotional component. The definition is in support also of Newman's (1979) thesis that prejudice contains both errors in fact and in logic. Finally, this

definition addresses the concept of self estrangement proposed by the critical philosophers.

Lindzey (1985) reiterated the irrational and illogical aspects of prejudice, characterizing it as a belief based on false assumptions and inadequate data which remain unassailable because they contain an element of truth and they justify a certain pattern of living. Prejudice involves overgeneralization and distortion of reality, reinforced by cultural norms and the mass media. Papalia and Olds (1985), described prejudice as an attitude in which a person or issue is prejudged without unbiased consideration of all the evidence. They synthesize the prevailing theories about the roots of prejudice into three, the political, sociological, and psychological, to account for the development of prejudice in society. Firstly, there is competition over scarce resources and prejudice is developed against the competition (political). Secondly, prejudice is an attitude learned in the same way as other attitudes; that is, we are carefully taught (sociological). Thirdly, prejudice is a manifestation of a certain type of personality (psychological). They extend and elaborate an understanding of the complexities of the phenomenon beyond the issues of evidence and logic and begin to address the question that Newman (1979) raised, namely, why does this ignorance and faulty logic exist.

Morris (1973), added insight to the investigation in his discussion of stereotyping as an attempt to simplify the world by referring to general categories of behavior or personality. According to attribution theory, the individual judges other people's behaviors according to predetermined factors internal to the person and de-emphasize the

complexities of context and the effect of stimulus objects. One judges oneself in the opposite manner.

The scapegoat theory supports the political and sociological aspects of prejudice, and also relates prejudice to personality factors, that is a tendency to blame others for one's own sense of inadequacy and frustration, then displace the aggression onto an outgroup. Berkowitz (1969), names four factors which determine the group selected for scapegoating: safeness, visibility, strangeness, and prior dislike rooted in tradition. The target group must be weak enough to be non-threatening. They must possess certain characteristics which cause them to stand out from others and these characteristics must in some way be unacceptable to the ingroup. According to social learning theory, there must be some prior historical antagonism to allow for prejudicial attitudes to develop.

Feminist Theory

Domination, Subordination and the Ethic of Care

Feminist theory has been particularly concerned with issues of inequality, domination and subordination, and there can be no discussion of prejudice without taking them into account as manifestations of the phenomenon. Theorists have been vigilant in pointing out that power structures of society are the cause of aggression and we tend to disregard our own participation in the structure of power when we are the beneficiaries. Therefore, those who may have the most power to effect change may be most blinded to the problem. (Espin and Gawelek 1990). Miller (1986) has explored the human treatment of difference. The dominant group determines what is normal and legitimizes inequality. Conflict is the inevitable result of this inequality. Conflict, and any awareness of conflict

is rationalized, dodged and suppressed by the dominant group. The subordinate group is labelled by the dominant group as inferior and encouraged to act in ways pleasing to the dominant group, all the while, being excluded from the most highly valued activities of the society. This exploration supports the political and sociological explanation of the origins of prejudice.

Gilligan's (1982) research on moral development, supported by Harman's (1992) "assumption of oneness," and Fay's (1987) "ecological sense" identified a different kind of development, an ethic of care based on relationship, responsibility and connection. This morality is in contrast with the prevailing ethic of justice and rights based on separation and individualism. This distinction was described by Newman (1973) as the difference between "logos" and "eros". Gilligan contended that the origins of aggression are in the failure of connection.

Ellsworth (1989) supports the primacy of the ethic of connection and inclusion in her examination of the failure of critical pedagogy. She elucidates the layers of complexity in unravelling unconscious assumptions and biases. While there may be an illusion of student empowerment and dialogue created by the rhetoric of pedagogy, without an examination of the hierarchical structures inherent in schools, and without an honoring of the individual student experience, the authoritarian nature of the teacher student relationship remains untouched. The most effective means of finding commonality across difference takes the form of conversation which honestly acknowledges both a mutuality of interest and of limitations in connection.

Organizational Development

Managing diversity

Organizational life provides an important arena for the playing out of personal attitudes and cultural values. The organization both harbors prejudice and fosters the opportunity for its dissolution. It is in the organizational development literature that the implementation of theory to real life can be presented.

How to effectively manage diversity has become a major topic of concern in organizational development. Applications of the personality theory of Jung (1971) are the focus of a wide variety of organizational interventions. The intent is to identify the strengths of different personality styles with the ultimate goal of fostering an appreciation of individual differences. This understanding and appreciation is intended to contribute to more effective teamwork. While stereotypes are not inherent in the theory, stereotypes occur in some of its applications. Prejudice occurs at both a conscious level resulting in the favoring of some personality styles over others. Prejudice occurs also at an unconscious level and results in prescribing rather than describing personality characteristics (Hammer, 1985).

Solomon (1989) recognized that people have difficulty working with different styles, not just across cultural or racial lines, but also across personality style differences, for example, the creative versus the technical. She describes programs in a variety of corporate settings which aim to identify underlying assumptions which block diversity. These programs attempt to replace prejudgement with a recognition and understanding of

differences through a refocusing, away from interpretation of the observable, and toward descriptive accuracy of content.

Issues of prejudgement and prejudice are raised in collaborative, multi-national training programs. Problem-solving is facilitated by focusing on why each person approaches a problem from a different angle, minimizing the baggage of prejudgements and prejudice characterized by the mentality of "Do it my way", in favor of learning how to learn (Wittenberg-Cox, 1991). Thomas (1990) mentioned that, today's emphasis on non-hierarchical, flexible, collaborative management requires an increase in tolerance for individual difference. Watts (1987) commented that modified behavior does not necessarily require deep psychological change, but a corporate culture which will act as a modifier. The complexity of communication and the importance of learning new behaviors to effectively communicate across difference must be recognized and the fundamental role that willingness plays in the process. Gurevitch (1989), also highlighted the importance of relinquishing prejudgements in a discussion of the power of not understanding. He suggested that a necessary stage in a dialogue among conflicting partners is the following:

a deliberate not understanding to restore the other party's freedom to participate on an equal basis as free and independent in the dialogue. This replaces the usual stance in which the other is in actuality nothing more than a recipient of what has been appropriated as already understood from an egocentric/ethnocentric perspective, whereby one projects onto the other the identity of vicious enemy, inferior/superior race, or the other dark side of reason, truth and justice. (p. 162)

Prejudice does not emerge in a vacuum but according to Kenneth Chan (1987), it serves a function in the workplace. He created a mathematical model based in established psychological and sociological theory in which he demonstrated that discrimination in the workplace serves the economy particularly in times of economic recession. He argues that the problem of frustration and loss of self esteem which majority workers suffer when aspirations are blocked can be displaced onto minorities. This tactic avoids intrapsychic or in-group conflicts resulting in stable or even increased productivity.

Studies on the distribution of the various personality types in a number of different countries, Latin America, the United States, Great Britain, Korea, and Japan have revealed that the preferred style of managers and those in leadership positions is characterized by a pragmatic, conventional, authoritarian orientation, those same orientations which have been correlated with prejudice. Therefore, the expectations of management and leadership must be examined because inherent in these styles and expectations are the seeds of prejudice.

Much of the current literature in organizational development is concerned with the reduction of prejudice in order to more effectively manage an increasingly diverse workforce, all in the service of an optimum level of productivity. It appears from this review of the literature that much attention is being devoted to the recognition of unconscious individual and corporate assumptions as a first step toward eradication of prejudice. Whether an ethic of appreciation, empowerment and collaboration can coexist, not in the service of but simultaneously with the societal and corporate ethic of competition, productivity and success remains in question.

Education

An analysis of National Survey Data from 1956 to 1980, shows continuous increases in support for equal treatment or equal status for minority group members resulting from a shift in the overall cultural environment in America. Education is credited with having a constant positive effect on prejudice reduction. Evidence has shown also that the more educated have greater access to sources of correct information and that all groups of men, women, and various minority groups are equal in innate ability. Education can be broadly defined to address the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of prejudice. Pate (1988), reported that when students are able to identify with human emotions, dreams, fears, and problems, via the use of film, they begin to achieve a clear picture of the effects of prejudice. Students could empathize and this resulted in positive attitude change.

The cognitive approach involves assisting students to think at a more complex level, in order to avoid oversimplification and overgeneralization. Studies such as Handler's (1966) demonstrate that students trained when to differentiate between relevant and irrelevant characteristics of people display less prejudice than before training. Gardiner (1972), reinforced this finding in a study which gave students cognitive complexity training and reduced their level of prejudice.

If prejudice means prejudgement, to have formed an opinion without full and sufficient examination then thinking critically is the antithesis of prejudicial thinking. Thinking critically begins with a disposition to question the available evidence, and to suspend judgement until the available evidence is examined (Walsh, 1988). Walsh cited D'Angelo (1971), who described attitudes necessary to the development of critical

thinking. These attitudes include intellectual curiosity, objectivity, openmindedness, flexibility and respect. Johnson and Johnson (1975), addressed the behavioral dimension in their study of cooperative learning which increased retention, application and transfer of information, acceptance and appreciation of cultural ethnic, and individual differences, increased democratic values, positive attitudes toward self and school and a reduction in prejudice. Pate (1988) reported the prominent role of self esteem in the occurrence of prejudice with studies showing a high correlation between the two.

Stember (1961) examined also the impact of education on prejudice. He pointed out that phrasing and language are crucial in studies examining the occurrence of prejudice. When neutral terminology is used, the reported negative correlation between education and prejudice does not exist. The influence of education is more superficial than profound, reaching most strongly those aspects of prejudice that are least entrenched. He pointed out that the educated are less prejudiced in terms of legal or formal discrimination but they do not take strong positions against informal discrimination. Education seems to alter expressed attitudes rather than actual behavior.

While Stember's review has had a wide impact, it has been criticized on both methodological grounds and on its failure to address the significance of the relationship between education and prejudice. Specifically Stember cited survey findings using single or a few ad hoc measures, rather than reliable, valid scales to measure prejudice.

Jackman (1978) supported Stember's conclusions, but that study has been criticized on similar methodological grounds (Schuman and Bobo, 1988). Duckitt (1992) proposed that it is the nature of education which may be significantly related to prejudice. Only

liberal education which aimed at broadening both intellectual and experiential perspectives, rather than education aimed at perpetuating traditional /authoritarian norms will successfully contribute to prejudice reduction. The concept of cognitive sophistication (Glock et al., 1975) supports this notion. Cognitive sophistication includes a component called 'psychological capacity' which includes intelligence and a component called 'opportunity' which is related to the variety and breadth of social experience. Cognitive sophistication is purported to reduce prejudice in two ways. It reduces the readiness with which simplistic social categorizations are made and it may change attributions about group differences. Attempts have been made to assess cognitive sophistication through a variety of ad hoc indices, 'Interest in Intellectual Pursuits', (Glock et. al., 1975), a flexibility scale, (Gough, 1957), and agreement with simplistic view of human nature.

Prejudice and Socio-Political Arrangements

Prejudice appears to be related to social-political ideology. Favorable and unfavorable attitudes tend to cluster on the bi-polar liberal/conservative continuum. What is still in question is why prejudice and conservatism are associated. Several theories have been proposed to address the underlying organizing principle of conservatism. Wilson (1973) suggested an orientation to change reflecting a fear of uncertainty. This resulted in a fear of people who are different. Ray (1974) and McClosky (1958) identified the opposing liberal/conservative dichotomy as rooted in views on the nature of humans as good or bad.

Anti-democratic attitudes and the authoritarian personality

The theory of the Authoritarian personality and the subsequent research it generated has been one of the most influential attempts to understand the psychology of prejudice. Reconsideration of the theory has been prompted in the last decade by the question which Altemeyer (1981) posed: " Are there individual differences in the support of anti-democratic government actions which are general enough across situations that we ignore them at our scientific and social peril?" (p. 3).

There have been serious criticisms both of the theory of the Authoritarian personality and the construct of Authoritarianism as operationalized in the F Scale (Altemeyer, 1981). In a reexamination of the F Scale, Altemeyer concluded that only three of the nine constructs proposed by Adorno et. al. (1950) co-varied sufficiently to form a coherent, uni-dimensional construct. He defined the three attitudinal clusters as follows:

Authoritarian submission describes a high degree of submission to authorities who are perceived to be established and legitimate in the society in which one lives.

Authoritarian aggression is a general aggressiveness directed against various persons which is perceived to be sanctioned by established authority. Aggressiveness includes the disposition harm to someone, physical, psychological, financial or social. Conventionalism refers to a high degree of adherence to the social conventions perceived to be endorsed by society and its established authorities (Altemeyer, 1981, p. 148).

Altemeyer commented on the clinging to respectability as the essence of a morality rooted in the law, and hypothesized that this reflected fear of evil in the self. He commented also on the strength of the punitive impulses noting that authoritarians were not just inclined to dislike, but to hate and attack any target sanctioned by authority. Altemeyer questioned whether the hostility is primary, or the result of other attitudes. His account of the occurrence of authoritarianism was through social learning rather than psychoanalytic theory. That is, the attitudinal clusters were learned from others through direct contact and imitation rather than arising from instinctual forces and conflicts. Altemeyer conjectured that the substance of these learnings was fear of the world as a dangerous place and a sense of self righteousness and moral superiority.

Duckitt (1989) also questioned the underlying construct of authoritarianism and proposed an answer terms of social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). He suggested that authoritarianism was rooted in an intense identification with a group whose economic and social advantages are threatened by an outgroup. The demands of group cohesion were such that individual interests were subordinated to group norms and rules of conduct, unconditional obedience and loyalty, aggressive punitiveness and intolerance of non conformity prevailed. The conformity argument is flawed in several ways. Normative pressures can be easily evaded in natural settings. Moreland and Levine (1982) suggested that the conformity paradigm overemphasizes group impact on individuals and underestimates individual impact on group. Altemeyer (1981) also commented, "The mood of the people of the people can affect public officials and public policy" (p. 214). McConahay and Hough, (1976) Sears and Kinder, (1985) in their

account of 'modern racism' demonstrate that racial attitudes are deeply ingrained and not subject to change, because of the changing norms of society. Duckitt (1992) suggested rather than viewing conformity as a general determinant of prejudice levels, it may be significant in certain circumstances only. Similarly, authoritarianism, which Altemeyer (1988) believed involves a hypersensitivity to threat in individuals may be a more prominent aspect of prejudice in a society where perception of threat and conflict arise in intergroup relations.

Prejudice and Tolerance

Hochschild (1986), in her review of a study conducted by McClosky and Brill (1983), examined the related but opposite concept of tolerance. The question to be answered was why some people will protect the civil liberties of others and some people will not. Through a nationally implemented opinion survey, McClosky and Brill learned that community leaders and activists are more libertarian than the mass public. The most important explanation of this phenomenon is social learning; people close to power centers and/or politically active, learn and adopt the norms of a politically liberal society. Demographics play a role in the incidence of tolerance, the well educated, well off, are greater supporters of civil liberties. Their final explanation is psychological; people who are inflexible, conformist and low in self esteem are more intolerant.

Ferrar (1976) defined tolerance as a concept possessing three dimensions, (a) flexible, examined, attitudes which permit non categorical evaluation, (b) approval of a wide range of beliefs and practices, and, (c) allowance of a wide range of rights and privileges. The crucial question in examining the presence of tolerance in the individual

may well be: does he/she seek growing and changing procedures for testing ideas, or does he/she remain unreceptive to new issues, new information and individual variation displaying the characteristics of the closed mind (Rokeach 1960).

Martin and Westie (1964) also examined the relationship of prejudice and tolerance with regard to a number of variables. They found that tolerant subjects were significantly less nationalistic. They interpreted this to mean that tolerant persons were less ethnocentric, were not social reductionists with a need for rigid ingroup, outgroup categorization. Tolerant subjects were more accepting of ambiguity, both able and willing to individuate and particularize information. Tolerant subjects were less superstitious, that is, more rational and logical and less reliant on myth. On a threat-competition scale, tolerant subjects were more trusting, and compassionate, the prejudiced, more suspicious and competitive. On a religiosity scale, tolerants were more humanistic, the prejudiced more doctrinaire. While earnings were the same, tolerants had higher educational/occupational status and less sense of being economically deprived. Duckitt (1992) concluded that: "Social influences factors and individual susceptibility factors have different and complimentary roles in determining prejudice in individuals. In practice, the former will tend to determine the general mean level of prejudice in any particular social setting whereas the latter will account for much variation around mean." (p. 54) He pointed out the arguments for and against the notion of prejudice as a generalized attitude in the individual. Those who argue on behalf of generalizability point to the high correlation among scales measuring attitudes toward different minority groups. Those who argue against generalizability point to studies in the U.S. South

where antiblack subjects did not exhibit anti-Semitism (Ehrlich, 1973; Prothro, 1952). Duckitt (1992) proposed that the occurrence of prejudice in the individual be interpreted in a relative sense, relative to the prevailing normative attitude and rooted in susceptibility.

Studies in Cognitive/Motivational Psychology

Across a variety of surveys from NORC (National Opinion Research Center) eighty percent of White Americans consistently respond in a non prejudiced egalitarian way. Yet evidence exists for the persistence of negative feelings, ambivalence and bias rooted in cognitive and cultural factors. What may have changed is what people consider as socially desirable rather than racial attitudes themselves (Dovidio and Gaertner, 1988).

In a 1988 Harris poll, one third of Whites preferred to live in a neighborhood of mostly Whites. In 1983, sixty percent Whites did not personally approve of interracial marriage. The latest research confirms Katz's (1986) observation that Whites attitudes are ambivalent and complex. This is not to suggest that non-white attitudes are not also complex and ambivalent. Here is evidence of an inherent bias in the research community and in the researcher. A major portion of the research conducted during this period and reported in the traditional sources which were the focus of the literature reviewed for this study concentrates on the white population.

The focus in cognitive research is not on who is biased, the assumption is that everyone is biased, but on what situations will elicit the egalitarian attitude and reveal also the context also in which negative feelings will be diminished. Using a number of different techniques beyond the questionnaire, Dovidio et al., (1992) demonstrated both

the existence of aversive racism and its nature. The term aversive racism refers to an ambivalence resulting from conflict between feelings and beliefs associated with an egalitarian value system and unacknowledged or unconscious negative feelings and beliefs concerning blacks and other racially different groups. Aversive racists discriminate, but in subtle ways which do not threaten non-prejudiced self images. They concluded that in situations where socially appropriate behavior was clearly defined Whites behaved according to non-prejudiced self images and did not discriminate. Where appropriate action was not clearly defined and discriminatory action could be rationalized, Whites discriminated. "Aversive racists do not think minorities are inferior. They think Whites are superior. They do not endorse restrictions of rights for minority groups, but they do endorse the racial status quo." (p. 89). In other words whites demonstrate uni-dimensional conceptions of meritocracy focusing on their own superiority and concern with maintaining position. Whites show stronger bias toward higher status minorities who threaten to reverse traditional role relationships that favor Whites. Dovidio and Gaertner propose that these attitudes are rooted not in psychopathological processes but in normal processes. They outlined the chief factors which in their estimation accounted for the occurrence of prejudice. Cognitive processes that support racial prejudice have to do with how people process information, the need to categorize, the effects of categorization. Motivational factors involve satisfaction of basic needs such as the need for self esteem. Economic competition which threatens the dominant group status, what Wills (1981) called downward comparison can be explained through social identity theory (Tajfel and Turner, 1979). Social-cultural factors play a

significant role in explaining the roots of prejudice. Prejudice is a structural tradition perpetuated by cultural stereotypes (Karlins et al., 1969), mass media portrayals (Weigel et al., 1980) and institutional racism. Ambivalence and conflict result from the clash of attitudes rooted in these fundamental cognitive motivational processes and egalitarian attitudes involving higher order, more complex, abstract, social, moral principles.

The Theory of Modern Racism

The theory of modern racism (McConahay, 1981) addressed this conflict and the resulting discrepancy between the decline in racial responses in the NORC surveys (Taylor et al., 1978), the Harris polls (Newsweek, 1979), and voting polls, Sigelman and Welch (1984), and the continuing strong resistance to affirmative action programs. Racist feelings remain high but have been displaced from socially undesirable old fashioned beliefs to new beliefs where racism is not recognized. The tenets of modern racism can be summarized in the following way: racism is a thing of the past in that Blacks are now free to compete equally in the market place. However, they have pushed too hard and too fast through unfair tactics. They have been given preferential treatment which they don't deserve, and therefore the gains are undeserved. These beliefs are not recognized as racist. Only those old fashioned beliefs and stereotypes about black intelligence, honesty, support for segregation are recognized by modern racists as racist. McConahay identified 1965 as the pivotal historical moment in America, when the civil rights movement separated old fashioned racism from modern racism. He proposed that modern racism focuses on new issues arising from the civil rights movement. The theory proposes that the affective component of racial attitudes is acquired early in life and is

harder to change than the cognitive or conative (policy preference) components. The issues involve both racial and non racial philosophical aspects such as political conservatism and are therefore enormously complex. This complexity and the manner in which many social scientists and racists in defining racism has led to the belief that negative attitudes about contemporary social issues are not racist. McConahay conducted a set of three studies designed to test the hypothesis that whites recognize old-fashioned beliefs to be socially undesirable, but not modern racial beliefs. He contrasted items on a modern and an old fashioned racism scale. The modern racism scale had a lower perceived racism mean than the old fashioned scale. Many subjects involved in the testing argued that the scale did not measure racism. Nevertheless, the scale correlates with anti-Black voting, predicted interpersonal distance preferences and when race is an issue, with anti-Black feeling. Thus Whites do not recognize any beliefs, or actions other than old fashioned racism, as detrimental to Blacks.

Aversive racism and modern racism share basic assumptions about the conflicted and complex attitudes of whites. Both theories agree that there is a lack of awareness within this population about personal negative racial feelings. However, the theories were developed from a focus on different groups. Aversive racism is concerned with the behaviors of liberals, modern racism, with the behavior of conservatives. Thus the theories highlight subtle differences. The theory of aversive racism focuses on the embracing of egalitarian values, modern racism on the rejection of racist beliefs. Dovidio et al. (1992) examined prejudice toward Hispanics through application of a model of contemporary prejudice. Taking the position that prejudice is rooted in normal processes,

they assumed a commonality among attitudes toward different groups. Cognitive psychologists are interested in studying how subjective expectations filter perceptions. The notion of selective processing is based on the major assumption of cognitive psychology, that the amount of attention available to experience the world is finite. A fundamental strategy of selective processing is categorization, occurring on the basis of physical similarity, proximity, and shared fate. The concept of the self has a central place in terms of the ingroup/outgroup categorization. People process and retain information about ingroups and outgroups differently. They recall more detail for the ingroup, have a better recall of similarities between ingroup and the self and dissimilarities between the outgroup and the self. People create different explanations about behaviors. Positive behaviors and successful outcomes are attributed to stable characteristics of the ingroup. An organized cognitive structure results which filters perceptions and expectations based on social category membership and are called 'social schemata'. Stereotypes are an example of social schemata. Information that is more consistent with a stereotype is processed more efficiently and recalled more accurately. People seek out and prefer information about others that confirms their perceptions beyond conscious awareness (Fiske and Taylor, 1984).

Dovidio et al. (1992) confirmed predictions from the theory of aversive racism. In a review of the sparse experimental literature on Hispanics, they found that in a response latency study, non-Hispanic subjects had a more positive association with non Hispanic whites than with self identified Chicanos. Teachers praised non-Hispanics more often than Hispanics. In a different study, non-Hispanics responded more favorably to a

Hispanic manager when behaving in an Anglo style than in an Hispanic cultural style. The higher the status, the more bias will be expressed. When discrimination can be rationalized on the basis of behaviors not obviously connected with race or ethnicity, such as a poorer command of English, negative bias will occur. "People tend to make the data fit the schema." (p. 177) The evidence supports the notion that stereotypes are highly resistant to change.

Comparison of Prejudice Reduction in High and Low Prejudiced People

Devine (1991) commented on the resistance of stereotypes to change: "Efforts to defeat prejudice are likely to involve a great deal of internal conflict between consciously endorsed non prejudiced beliefs and lingering stereotypic thoughts and feelings." (p. 817). She proposed that prejudice like responses are automatically activated in the presence of members of the stereotyped group. Non prejudiced responses require the inhibition of the automatically activated negative responses and the conscious intentional activation of non prejudiced beliefs. Devine agreed with Dovidio that non prejudiced beliefs and prejudiced thoughts and feelings can co-exist. The change from prejudice to non prejudice is a process during which low prejudiced persons are especially vulnerable to conflicts between the two sets of beliefs. Drawing from Myrdal (1944) and Allport (1954), Devine (1991) explored the notion of compunction, the affective consequences associated with discrepancies between actual responses and personal standards. In studies which investigated discrepancies between how one should respond to stereotyped groups and how one would respond, the predicted psychological discomfort of guilt and self criticism occurred in low and moderately prejudiced subjects. Both high and low

prejudiced people indicated that society's standards were mixed. Low prejudiced people tried to behave according to consistent personal standards, whereas high prejudiced people had mixed standards defined according to context. These findings support in part, those of Dovidio in that if high prejudiced people were exposed to clear external standards they would behave in non prejudiced ways. Devine does go a step farther than Dovidio in separating out high from low prejudiced people. When asked what has prompted low prejudice people to consciously want to reduce prejudice, Devine (1992, personal communication) commented on her belief that empathy was at the root of such a decision. Those committed to changing their ways of responding must develop new beliefs. Automatically activated stereotypes can be avoided if individuals have the time and the cognitive capacity to bring new beliefs to mind. Overt non prejudiced responses require controlled inhibition of the automatically activated stereotype and a conscious deliberate activation of non prejudiced beliefs. Allport (1954) and Rokeach (1973) suggested that conflict between one's attitudes and responses and central aspects of self concept would constitute a threat to the self concept and would produce dissatisfaction with the self. Higgins (1981) argued for qualitatively distinct affects associated with distinct types of self inconsistency. Devine and Monteith (in press) conducted a study involving subjects identification of the discrepancy between should and would responses in situations evoking possible discriminating behavior. An important finding of the study was that subjects could identify the discrepancies. This appears to be inconsistent with Dovidio and McConahay's theories of aversive or modern racism which implies that once people chose a non prejudiced stance they exclude negative reactions from awareness.

However, while high prejudiced people experienced discomfort at the discrepancy, they externalized the affect, anger and irritation, especially toward members of the stereotyped group. Low prejudiced people experienced guilt and self criticism. Monteith and Devine (1992) concluded that high prejudiced subjects' personal standards are not well internalized and are derived from prevailing norms rather than personal moral standards. They experienced discrepancy related affect but externalized it rather than using it to self regulate. Devine suggested that even the highly prejudiced may have established internal standards based on their own standpoint (internalized) for behaviors. However, Monteith has been interested in examining the various response domains of feelings, thoughts and behaviors in various scenarios which differed reliably in their perceived acceptability and controllability. Low prejudiced subjects reported non prejudiced personal standards in all domains. The location of high prejudiced personal standards depended on the response domain. Compared to feeling and thought standards, they reported relatively non prejudiced standards only for overt controllable behavioral responses. Standards were not as non prejudiced, nor as well internalized as low prejudiced . Across all domains, high prejudiced show less internalized standards based on their own standpoint and negative feelings were directed outward. While negative affect may be used to stop the prejudice cycle in low prejudiced people, it may have the reverse effect on highly prejudiced, inducing a backlash with highly prejudiced blaming the victim. The recent work of Devine and Monteith as well as the modern racism theorists in the area of cognitive/motivational psychology has begun to redress the lack of attention to the affective components in studies associated with prejudice and specifically to provide the

possibility for unification of an individual differences approach and cognitive psychology.

Individual Differences

Rokeach (1973) suggested that confronting the discrepancies between egalitarian ideals and prejudiced standards in a supportive, non threatening environment would induce internalized non-prejudiced standards. Rokeach made two assumptions, that egalitarian standards are self defining and are more self defining than prejudiced attitudes. This approach could be effective when prejudiced attitudes serve an instrumental, costs and benefits function. If prejudice serves a symbolic function of protecting the self concept then resolving the inconsistency that Rokeach suggested would require deep self awareness and change.

Higgins (1981) distinguished among various states of self , the actual self, the ideal self or how one wishes to be, and the ought self which involves what one perceives as one's responsibility. He also distinguished between standpoints of self from which one can be evaluated based on a certain set of values, a personal standpoint and the standpoint of another. Higgins pointed out that people suffer greatly from discrepancies between actual self states and self guides, but they do not lower or change these self guides. He hypothesized that people with actual/ideal discrepancies had parental interactions which involved the absence of positive outcomes, parents who withdrew or abandoned in response to unwanted childhood behavior and parents who communicated their own sadness and discouragement. Those with actual/ought discrepancies had parental interactions that involved the presence of negative outcomes, parents who were controlling, intrusive, and communicated fear and dread. The notion that a discrepancy

between one's self concept and one's preferred potential self is associated with discomfort has been central to the literature on self esteem. Measures of actual/ideal discrepancy correlated highly with self esteem scale.

Self discrepancy theory has implications for individual differences in evaluating others. Self discrepancy theory could predict whether a judgement is positive or negative (depending on how high perceivers self guides are), and also what the perceiver's specific emotional response is likely to be. A target's behavior that was discrepant from a perceiver's ideal standards could cause the perceiver to feel dissatisfied or sad for the target. If the target's behavior was discrepant from the perceiver's ought standards the perceiver might be resentful or critical.

It was predicted that emotions arising from actual own/ought other discrepancies would be agitation related emotions. Because violation of prescribed duties and obligations are associated with sanctions, a person would be vulnerable to fear and would feel threatened. Analysis of these emotions have revealed them as associated with external agents from the standpoint of one or more others. The motivational nature of the discrepancy might be associated with feelings of resentment and resentment of anticipated pain inflicted by others. Actual own/ought own discrepancies elicit guilt and self contempt which may be expressed not as guilt directly but as worthlessness.

A discussion of individual susceptibility to prejudice presupposes the possibility that attitudes can be measured effectively and that the measurement of attitudes is of significance. Altemeyer (1981) contended that in general, attitudes predict behaviors. In support of his position, Herek (1987) proposed that attitudes people hold serve the

function of fulfilling certain needs, and in essence asks the question 'why' rather than 'what' or 'how'. Attitudes negative or positive which are based on past interactions serve what he called an experiential/schematic function . The attitude is part of a knowledge structure that organizes past experiences and provides guidelines for future evaluation. Attitudes can serve a defensive function forming part of a strategy for avoiding anxiety. Attitudes can serve a self expressive function, that is, as a vehicle for expressing important values. On the basis of this theoretical model, an attitude function inventory was developed for assessing attitude functions efficiently. Based on the results of his study, Herek proposed that these attitude functions remain stable across attitude effects and are related to personality characteristics. He suggested also that intergroup attitudes are likely to tap defensive, social expressive, and value expressive functions.

Susceptibility

In his discussion of individual susceptibility, Duckitt (1992) suggested the possibility that susceptibility toward prejudiced attitudes might be mediated by such influences as frustration, psychological adjustment and low self esteem. The research on the relationship of frustration to prejudice is inconclusive as the complexities of variables have been difficult to untangle and to date the research has been methodologically inadequate. The research on self esteem or 'generalized negative affect' presents a stronger link with prejudice. Bagley et al. (1979) acknowledged that a large amount of the variance in prejudice can be explained by cultural factors. Cultural factors with deep historical roots have influenced the development of stereotypes and symbols which are then built into existing structures and institutions and become institutionalized racism.

Prejudice as manifested by the majority of the population is normative and normal. However, Bagley proposed that personality variables are predictors of prejudiced attitudes beyond the norm. Of these, self esteem is pivotal. Individuals who are anxious , depressed, neurotic, or have poor self esteem tend to be more prejudiced. To a greater extent than the general population, they have chosen the cultural symbols of racism as a means of protecting their identity and their self worth.

Taifel (1969) suggested that intergroup relations cannot be understood on the basis of instinct and motivation but on the basis of cognitive aspects. The study of cognitive processes includes the processes of categorization , assimilation of information, the search for coherence and consistency. Bagley argued that prejudice influences perception: He summarized a multiple of factors involved in the aetiology and process of prejudiced attitudes including an environment of racial superiority, perceptual blindness, and distortion. The human need to have a sense of order about the world even at the expense of reality, the need to be valued by others and the need to compare favorably with other groups means the need for enhanced self esteem. Self esteem is increased by maximizing personal and social power over others. Ackerman and Jahoda (1950) in a psychoanalytic study determined that prejudice is ego defensive, involving projection, denial, displacement, and that social aggression is a defense against anxiety. The research on the Authoritarian personality as one who is anxious, punitive, status conscious, and addicted to an externalized set of values supports this view.

Erllich (1973) remarked that very little research had to that time dealt directly with the relationship of self attitudes and ethnic attitudes. All that had been done was

supportive of his theory of 'self congruity,' which states that an individual's attitude toward self will correlate with attitudes toward others.

Bagley et al. (1979) conducted a study with British school children using Coopersmith's (1967) Self Esteem Inventory. The study demonstrated that as self esteem increased, prejudice decreased, at least to normative levels in the population. They concluded that prejudice serves the function of increasing self esteem as a means of defending the ego and as a means of alleviating anxiety. While some argue that change must be institutional, Jahoda (1973) concluded that not understanding the motives of humans may lead to ineffective social measures. Ziller (1976) presented a hierarchy of potentially changeable characteristics from least to most amenable: attitudes, values and behaviors, roles, self concept. While self concept may be hardest to change, it is of highest priority in the consideration of attitude change. Changes in self esteem will lead to subsequent changes in the other characteristics.

A tabular summary of the authors, their work, and the particular dimensions of prejudice which they address can be found in Appendix A. Table 2.1 which follows provides a synthesis of themes associated with prejudice which emerged from the literature review. The literature review was examined for all words and word phrases of characteristics associated with prejudice. In a preliminary step, these words and phrases were listed in order of occurrence. The lists were re-examined and the words coded according to potentially subsuming concepts, that is, based on logical groupings. The coded words and phrases were synthesized and transcribed according to these dimensions. Eight categories subsumed a variety of personal cognitive, affective and behavioral

predispositions to prejudice and Barriers to Community. These eight dimensions were identified as: (a) self states, (b) control orientation, (c) political narrowness, (d) fragmentation, (e) cognitive passivity, (f) power differential, (g) entitlement, (h) hostility. Table 2.2 provides a verification summary of those identified themes according to author.

Table 2.1 Preliminary Salient Facets of Prejudice From Theoretical Review

Category	Definition	Dimensions
Self States	level of internal comfort and self acceptance.	Self esteem, Anxiety Frustration, Fear/threat orientation
Control Orientation	need for predictability and management of personal environment	Inflexibility, Unreceptivity, Fear of uncertainty, Closemindedness Concreteness Intolerance of Ambiguity Need for order Search for coherence and consistency
Fragmentation	Separation between conscious and unconscious functioning	Separatedness, Projection Displacement, Externalization Self estrangement, Denial
Cognitive Passivity	lack of cognitive agility, a lack of particularization	Absence of curiosity Absence of inquisitiveness Categorization, Generalization Cognitive oversimplification
Political Narrowness	Orientation favoring the status quo	Nationalistic, Doctrinaire, Conservative, Conformist, Authoritarian aggressiveness Authoritarian submission, Conventionalism
Power differential	attitudes and behaviors governed by socio-economic differences between individuals and groups	Downward comparison Competitiveness Economic Deprivation Domination, Discrimination Downward mobility, Individualism
Entitlement	belief that by virtue of a dominant position, one has guaranteed rights and privileges	Moralism/moral superiority Intolerance Self Righteousness Resentment
Hostility	Anger directed outward toward others	Judgementalness, Scapegoating "Humans as Bad" Blaming, Social Aggression

Table 2.2 Verification of Salient Aspects of Prejudice Emerged From Theoretical Review

<p><u>Self States</u> Bagley et al., 1979 Higgins, 1981 Duckitt, 1992 Hochschild, 1986 Dovidio, 1992 Pate, 1988 Chan, 1987 Jahoda, 1960</p> <p><u>Control</u> Neumann, 1973 Rokeach, 1960 Allport, 1954 Ferrar, 1976 Wilson, 1973 Taifel, 1970 Bagley, 1979</p> <p><u>Fragmentation</u> Allport, 1954 Bellah et al., 1985 Devine and Monteith, (in press) Fay, 1987 Gurevitch, 1989 Jahoda, 1960 Jung, 1957 Neumann, 1973</p> <p><u>Political Narrowness</u> Altemeyer, 1981 Duckitt, 1992 Martin and Westie, 1964 Wilson, 1973</p>	<p><u>Cognitive Passivity</u> Allport, 1954 Devine, 1992 Dovidio, 1992 Fay, 1987 Gardiner, 1972 Handler, 1966 Kagan and Havemann, 1968 Lindzey, 1985 Miller, 1986 Solomon, 1989 Walsh, 1988</p> <p><u>Power Differential</u> Bagley, 1979 Chan, 1987 Dovidio, 1992 Miller, 1986</p> <p><u>Entitlement</u> Allport, 1954 Altemeyer, 1981 Higgins, 1981 Newman, 1979</p> <p><u>Hostility</u> Altemeyer, 1981 Devine and Monteith, (in press) Bercowitz, 1969 McClosky, 1958 Ray, 1974</p>
--	---

Synthesis of the Literature Related to Prejudice

We are both solitary and social beings. We are connected and separate. This is the existential dilemma within which we live. This is the essential nature of the human condition. What may set us apart from other planetary species, what may make us unique, is our intellectual capacity, in particular, our capacity for self awareness. That self awareness allows us to see our individuality and our group membership. This very capacity which offers us the opportunity to participate consciously in our own evolution, may also be our downfall. That same capacity has allowed us to participate in our fragmentation, as individuals and as a species. We can select what we value in ourselves to remain conscious and displace and disown what we fear and abhor. We can construct a world both symbolic and real, in which each of us strives for a place of security and safety. We can convince ourselves that this ensures our immortality. We rely on the group for survival, yet we insist on our separate identities. Too often we keep our place at the expense of another. Our intellectual capacity allows us to define what is good and to define ourselves as good, while the "other" is bad and becomes the enemy. Prejudice is the result.

Prejudice is a prominent issue across all disciplines which concern themselves with the human condition. What has emerged from a review of the literature is that prejudice is embedded in contemporary culture and in certain predispositions of the individual personality. At a macro-level, it is the dynamic between the culture and the individual which fosters prejudice, while it is a dynamic also within the individual at a micro-level which breeds prejudice. Specifically, prejudice begins with a fear orientation,

rooted in deficient self esteem and anxiety, coupled with a sense of entitlement about one's needs and place in the world. This orientation leads to dispositions of control, fragmentation and cognitive distortions, ultimately leading to hostility and prejudiced behaviors.

Critical examination of the underlying structures of society and a critical self examination can lead to increased awareness in all dimensions of self and society and the possibility of conscious choice for tolerance and an ethic of care and connection. The vehicle for the accomplishment of this transformational shift is education in its broadest sense which will address the cognitive, affective and behavioral aspects of prejudice at societal, group and individual levels. Dovidio (1992) has called for decategorization and recategorization, namely, the provision of opportunity for individualizing persons in groups and restructuring boundaries to honor inclusion and a common group identity. Cooperative learning (Johnson and Johnson, 1989) is another form of decategorization, as are many sensitivity and human relations training programs. Working at an individual level, Bagley et al. (1979) demonstrated the power of therapeutic intervention and the connection between self esteem and prejudice. Altemeyer (1988a) described a number of personal level, non therapeutic strategies for reducing authoritarianism.

Harman (1992, personal communication) has suggested that in order to survive as a species, we must convert from an economy driven existence to a society dedicated to human development, dedicated to the concept of 'paidea', the Greek notion of human learning for its own sake. If the metaphor characterizing the personal and political world at the end of the second millenium has been 'fragmentation', then healing in the third

millennium calls for a new metaphor, that invoked by Harman 'an assumption of oneness'. An assumption of oneness calls us to reclaim and reintegrate our disowned selves, to reconnect with our species and our planet. If the metaphor is 'oneness' the manner is 'reframing,' from competition to collaboration, from individual to collective, from separation to connection, and from enemy to friend.

Review of Empirical Measures

There have been a number of instruments developed which relate to prejudice. Most of those instruments are culture, race, or content issue specific. With the exception of the Modern Racism Scale, the instruments included in this review were chosen because they are cultural general. They are: The California F Scale (Adorno et al. 1950), the Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach 1960), the Public Opinion Questionnaire (Edwards, 1941), the Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Budner, 1962), the and the Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley and Meyers, 1992), the Modern Racism Scale, (McConahay, 1986) and the Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA), Altemeyer, (1981).

The California F Scale Adorno et al. (1950) designed the F scale to measure general ethnic prejudice and pre-fascist tendencies. The theory of the authoritarian personality was developed and tested in California hence the title. The authors identified nine variables which constituted the authoritarian personality syndrome. The nine variables were (1) conventionalism, (2) authoritarian submission, (3) authoritarian aggression, (4) anti-intraception, (5) superstition and stereotypy, (6) power and toughness, (7) destructiveness and cynicism, (8) projectivity and, (9) sex. There are four variations of

the F scale containing from 30 to 38 Likert type items. Respondents indicate their degree of agreement or disagreement on a +3 to -3 Likert scale. A high positive score indicates a high degree of authoritarianism. Split half reliability ranged from .74 to .90. Form 78 of the F Scale correlated .53 with the Anti-Semitism Scale, .54 with the Ethnocentrism Scale, and .65 with the Pensacola Z Scale indicating a moderate association between prejudice, anti-democratic tendencies, and fascist authoritarian attitudes.

The Dogmatism Scale Rokeach (1960) designed the Dogmatism scale to measure an individual's degree of openness to new information, and the ability to integrate that information unencumbered by irrelevant internal or external influences. The scale was concerned not so much with the content of beliefs but the actual belief structure. The Dogmatism scale contains eight subscales: 1) isolation within and between belief and disbelief systems, 2) relative degrees of differentiation of belief and disbelief systems, 3) specific content of primitive beliefs, 4) formal content of the intermediate belief region, 5) belief in a cause, 6) interrelations among primitive, intermediate, and peripheral beliefs, 7) attitudes toward the past, present and knowing the future, and 8) belief in force as a way to revise the present, form the final three subscales. Respondents answered the questions on a six point Likert scale, indicating their agreement or disagreement on scoring range from +3 to -3. A high score indicated a high degree of dogmatism. Split half reliabilities for each of the five variations of the scale ranged between .70 and .91. Extensive validity studies were done. Correlations with the F scale (Authoritarian) using six different sample groups were between .54 and .77. Similarly, the scale was correlated with the Ethnocentrism Scale and results ranged from .31 to .53.

The Public Opinion Questionnaire Edwards (1941) designed the twenty-six item Likert type scale to measure fascist attitudes. Respondents indicated agreement or disagreement on a five point Likert scale. High scores suggested fascist attitudes. Split half reliability of .84 was reported. Content validity was determined by five judges.

The Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale Intolerance of ambiguity is defined as the tendency to view the complex, the unknown as a source of threat. Budner (1962) classified responses to threat into four categories which formed the subscales of his instrument. The four categories are phenomenological submission and denial and operative behavioral submission and denial. The 16 item scale is in a 6 point Likert format, with respondents indicating strong agreement to disagreement. For scoring purposes, 7 was assigned to answers indicating strong agreement and 1 to strong disagreement. Scores were then summed across all items. A reliability of .85 computed by Cronbach's alpha formula was reported. There was no significant correlation with Edward's Social Desirability Scale. Correlation studies with three other tolerance of ambiguity scales yielded results of .50, .36, and .54, all at the .05 level of significance.

Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory Kelley and Meyers (1992) developed the inventory as a training tool to help increase awareness in cross-cultural effectiveness. The inventory consists of fifty items distributed among four dimensions: emotional resilience, flexibility/openness, perceptual acuity, and personal autonomy. The reported standardized alpha for the total scale is .90, meaning the scale demonstrates strong internal consistency among the items.

The Modern Racism Scale (McConahay, 1976) based the scale on the theory of modern racism and was developed to measure attitudes in a changed climate and structure of public opinion. Developed as an alternative to the old fashioned racism scale, which was plagued by issues of social desirability, it was intended to measure the cognitive component of racial attitudes. The tenets of modern racism have been discussed in the review of the literature. McConahay has applied his theory to voting, policy preferences, hiring behaviors. In the selection of items for the scale, those which correlated best with anti-Black voting behavior for example were those which expressed moral outrage rooted in abstract principles of justice and diffuse negative feelings, not personal experience or threat. Items using "code" concepts or symbols for blacks, correlated with voting behaviors, hence the term symbolic racism. The 14 item Likert type scale contains a six point response continuum ranging from strongly agree to strongly disagree. Measures of test-retest reliability range from .72 to .93 across a number of samples. Alpha coefficients range from .75 to .86. To examine the validity, the modern racism scale was correlated with voting behaviors, opposition to busing. Correlations ranged from .511 to .391. The scale also correlated with other measures including a .383 correlation with anti-black feeling as measured by the Feeling Thermometer (Campbell, 1971). The strongest evidence for construct validity was collected in an experimental study which examined hiring preferences for black and white candidates with identical credentials. In ambiguous contexts, more prejudiced subjects showed greater ambivalence and inconsistency in behavior than low prejudiced subjects, adding confirmation to the ambivalence hypothesis of modern racism.

The Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale (RWA) as a revised version of the F scale was developed by Altemeyer for two reasons. He rejected the psychoanalytic theory underlying the instrument and he identified a series of methodological inadequacies in the published research, particularly around the issue of reliability. His revision also identified three of the original categories which co-varied sufficiently to form the construct authoritarianism: authoritarian aggression, authoritarian submission, and conventionality. The 24 item scale has undergone constant revision and updating from 1973 to 1987. Respondents indicate their agreement or disagreement on a 6 point Likert type scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree. There are two interesting points to note about the RWA scale. The RWA scores appear to be sensitive to changing political climates and have documented changes in levels of authoritarianism in teenage populations in the United States and European countries. Since glasnost and perestroika, the RWA scale has been used successfully to document Russian authoritarianism. Thus the RWA scale is relevant in cross cultural research. Reliabilities between .77 and .95 have been reported. Convergent validity has been reported also as the result of a study in which a variety of scales including Rokeach's D scale, Wilson and Patterson's (1968) Conservatism Scale were administered to a sample of 956 respondents. In a study using a modification of Milgram's (1974) obedience paradigm, the RWA scale, correlated (.44) with persistence of "shocking" the other. Those who score high on the RWA scale also demonstrated higher levels of obedience when they continued to administer electric shocks to others in an experimental situation beyond the supposed safety level when they were instructed to do so by those in charge of the experiment.

Summary of Related Empirical Measures

The concern of this research is to access attitudinal components which predispose the individual to manifest Barriers to Community. While there are several instruments which address components which may form a part of the complex phenomenon of prejudice, there is no single instrument which captures the concept in its entirety or is devoted solely to measuring prejudice. In addition, many of the instruments are dated, both in content and phrasing and could not sustain credibility in the current sophisticated environment. Table 2.3 summarizes the empirical instruments and their measured dimensions. Similar to the process used in the examination of the theoretical review, information from the empirical review was examined and synthesized into logical groupings. It appears that various instruments actually address different logical orders, that is, some identify surface attitudes, (Modern Racism Scale), others address psychological processes, (California F Scale, Dogmatism Scale, Intolerance of Ambiguity scale), and still others identify basic personality orientations (Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory).

Initial Conceptual Framework

The Retroductive Triangulation process of instrument development dictates that the final step in the first phase of the process consists of a synthesis of measured and unmeasured aspects of prejudice elicited from the literature review. This conceptual synthesis provides preliminary guidance for the Barriers to Community Scale. Table 2.4 demonstrates this synthesis. Creating a conceptual framework involves the identification of overlaps which have emerged from the theoretical review and dimensions which have already been measured. The schema is thus simplified and the unmeasured dimensions

highlighted as the basis for the development of the new instrument. It can be seen in Table 2.4 that two identified themes from the theoretical review appear to be measured dimensions. Cognitive passivity, defined as a tendency to categorization, and cognitive simplification are subsumed by the measured dimension, cognitive fluidity addressed in the Dogmatism Scale and the Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale. Political narrowness, which was defined as an orientation favoring the status quo and included conventionalism and conservatism, was incorporated into the measured dimension of anti-democratic attitudes addressed in the California F Scale, the Public Opinion Questionnaire, and the RWA Scale. The remaining unmeasured dimensions were self states, control, fragmentation, power differential, entitlement, and hostility which formed the theoretical underpinnings to the development of the Barriers to Community Scale.

Table 2.3 Emerged Dimensions of Prejudice from Empirical Review

Dimensions	Instrument/Reference
A. Cognitive Fluidity -dichotomous thinking -belief inconsistencies -narrowing -stereotyping -fear of the unknown	Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) Intolerance of Ambiguity Scale (Budner, 1960)
B. Self Perceptions -aloneness, isolation -helplessness -inadequacy -internal conflict -righteousness -anti-intraception	Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) California F Scale (Adorno et al. 1950)
C. Anti-Democratic Attitudes -authoritarian aggression -authoritarian submission -conventionality -fascist ideology	California F Scale (Adorno et al. 1950) RWA Scale (Altemeyer, 1981) Public Opinion Questionnaire (Edwards, 1941)
D. Relational Orientation -intolerance -flexibility/openness -empathy	Dogmatism Scale (Rokeach, 1960) Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (Kelley and Meyers, 1992)
E. Socio-Economic Attitudes	Modern Racism Scale McConahay, 1976)

Table 2.4 Preliminary Conceptual Framework

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY	
MEASURED DIMENSIONS DIMENSIONS	UNMEASURED
Cognitive fluidity	Self States
Self Perceptions	Control
Anti-Democratic Attitudes	Fragmentation
Relational Orientation	Power Differential
Socio-Economic Attitudes	Entitlement
	Hostility

CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

Qualitative Study

The review of the literature did not reveal the existence of an instrument designed to measure prejudice predictors. Therefore, this research was designed to (a) identify key variables which are associated with prejudice, and (b) to use those factors as the construct for designing a valid and reliable prejudice indicator. The Retroductive Triangulation Process (Quayhagen and Quayhagen, 1988) method of instrument design which was used to design and test the construct for the prejudice instrument integrates both qualitative and quantitative approaches to research. This process involves both generation of a hypothesis and testing. This is achieved by (a) a recognition of the essence of the retroductive methodology, (b) a reliance on inductive and deductive reasoning, and (c) triangulation of the resulting evidence. There are seven phases to the Retroductive Triangulation Process. These include "Deductive and Inductive approaches, protocol formation, conceptual schema revision, instrument formatting, testing for psychometric properties and revision for further testing". (p. 45). Table 3.1 outlines these phases.

Table 3.1 Seven Phases Retroductive Triangulation Process

I.	Deductive Phase	Review of related theoretical and empirical literature. Analysis and identification of themes.
II.	Inductive Phase	Qualitative interviews with experts. Content analysis of data and emergence of themes related to concept.
III.	Conceptual Schema	Identification and synthesis of measured and unmeasured dimensions related to concept.
IV.	Assessment Protocol	Measured and unmeasured dimensions charted. Focus on unmeasured dimensions for instrument development. Measured dimensions retained as criterion variables.
V.	Instrument Formulation	Item identification, instrument formatting, scaling, and content validity established.
VI.	Psychometric Testing	Establishment of internal consistency reliability, (Cronbach alpha); factorial validity, convergent and divergent validity.
VII.	Reformulation and Retesting	

Phase one, the deductive phase, required a review of the literature in a number of related disciplines to identify unmeasured facets of prejudice. Phase one included also a review of existing empirical measures. The theoretical review across the disciplines of philosophy, social psychology, political science, education, feminist scholarship and business, revealed themes which contributed to an understanding of the prejudice construct. Themes were identified also from the measured dimensions of constructs

related to prejudice. Both the unmeasured themes and measured themes were outlined and converged into a preliminary conceptual framework in accordance with the model created by Dempster (1990).

Phase two, the inductive phase of the Retroductive Triangulation Process (Quayhagen and Quayhagen, 1988) consisted of a qualitative study in which sixteen persons identified as experts in the area of prejudice reduction and team-building were interviewed. According to Quayhagen and Quayhagen (1988) the purpose of the qualitative study is to "obtain ecologically valid meanings of the concept" (p. 45) to ensure that understanding of the concept is grounded in contemporary thought and language.

Glaser and Strauss (1967) refer to the development and operationalizing of theory which emerges from data as grounded theory. The terms qualitative study and naturalistic inquiry are used interchangeably. Guba and Lincoln (1982) refer to naturalistic inquiry as an "alternate paradigm to the positivistic which is essentially analytic, reductionist, empiricist, associationist, reactivist, nomological, and monistic... This posture is inconsistent with the characteristics of many social/behavioral phenomena" (p. 23).

Merriam (1988) offered additional support to the Guba and Lincoln rationale:

"Naturalistic inquiry, which focuses meaning in context requires a data collection instrument sensitive to underlying meaning when gathering and interpreting data.

Humans are suited for this task and best when using methods that make use of human and sensibilities such as interviewing, observing and analyzing" (p. 3).

Merriam recommended non-probabilistic sampling, purposive (Chein, 1981) or purposeful (Patton, 1980); that is, selecting those who are most knowledgeable, when the purpose of the study is expansive, to discover, to gain insight, to elaborate on phenomena.

The interviewing process and analysis was guided by a phenomenological approach that attempted to capture the personal structure and meaning to interviewees of the concept prejudice, beyond simply informed opinion.

Approval to conduct the qualitative study was acquired from the University of San Diego Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects (see Appendix B) to recruit and interview a sample group. Selection of the sample was guided by issues of generalizability of data and focused expertise. Guba and Lincoln (1982) suggested that "generalizability relies on thick description and that generalization should be regarded nevertheless only as a working hypothesis to be tested again in the next encounter (Guba, 1978, p. 70). Merriam (1988) addressed the necessity of focused expertise: "One needs to select a sample from which one can learn the most" (p. 48).

Access to initial interviewees came through campus resources. To enhance generalizability there was a specific attempt to locate those who possessed theoretical and practical expertise in the areas of prejudice and prejudice reduction in organizational settings. The University of San Diego was in the midst of a major effort to institutionalize diversity to the campus during the time this project was conducted. Theoretical expertise was defined as scholarly work and publication in the area. Practical expertise meant involvement in the development and delivery of prejudice reduction and team-building programs. As much can be learned from how the interviewees mediated

these issues in their own lives, as from what they said about the issues themselves. To understand the nature and motivations of that group of people who are responsible in the organizational world for prejudice reduction, is to provide insight into what the various interventions in the organizational community hope to accomplish. Should their mission be accomplished, those people who dwell in the organizational world will have been touched, changed in some degree by their role models, those who intervene.

Subsequent interviewees were identified through a network selection process, "Each successive participant or group is named by a preceding group or individual" (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984, p. 79). Within the parameters of theoretical and practical expertise, a demographic mix of age, background, race, ethnicity and setting were selected. Thus, theoretical and practical expertise combined with a lived dedication to understanding issues of prejudice and prejudice reduction were the criteria for selection. Sixteen persons were interviewed from a wide variety of racial and ethnic backgrounds in a number of locations across the United States. They ranged in age from twenty-eight to fifty-five. In all cases, the initial request for an interview was made by telephone. In situations where a telephone interview subsequently took place, a consent form was mailed out and returned to the researcher. All conversations both over the telephone and face to face were audio-taped. Table 3.2 outlines the demographic data of the participants. All were United States citizens.

Table 3.2 Demographic Characteristics of Interviewees

Category	#Subjects	Category	#Subjects
Total number of persons interviewed	16	Born outside the U.S	5
<u>Sex</u>		<u>Age</u>	
Male	7	25-29	1
Female	9	30-34	4
		35-39	3
		40-44	2
		45-49	4
		50-54	1
		55-59	1
<u>Career</u>		<u>Sector</u>	
Diversity Trainer	9	Business	9
Educator	3	Non-Profit	3
Student	1	Education	7
Manager/Director	9	Government	1
<u>Ethnic Origin</u>			
African American	5	Phillipine American	1
Japanese American	1	Italian American	1
Russian Jewish American	1	Cuban	1
Puerto Rican	2	Anglo American	4
<u>Years of Involvement In Prejudice Reduction</u>			
0-5	3		
6-10	5		
11-15	4		
15 and over	4		

Interview Process for Data Collection

Dexter (1970) described interviews as conversations with a focus and a purpose.

The purpose of these interviews was to gain an enhanced understanding of the construct prejudice. Given that both Hett (1991) and Dempster (1990) had successfully implemented the Retroductive Triangulation process for similar purposes, the interview schedule, known as a thematic interview guide, served as a prototype for this research. Relying on the rather common sense outline provided by Waltz, Strickland, and Lenz (1991) the draft of questions reflected what is important to know about the concept, and the specifics of the construct in need of elucidation. Patton's (1980) scheme provided a useful guide to the formulation of the questions. Knowledge questions and opinion/value questions attempt to learn what the respondent knows factually and thinks about the issue. The questions which follow are examples from the thematic guide: "What does the word prejudice mean to you? What are the attitudes and beliefs you would expect from someone who is prejudiced? Experience/behavior questions and sensory questions look for descriptions of behaviors, actions, which respondents may see, hear, notice. Examples from the thematic interview guide follow: What kinds of behaviors would you expect from someone who is prejudiced? How does prejudice within the individual interfere with team-building and create Barriers to Community? Feeling questions look for emotional responses from respondents. Do you consider yourself to be prejudiced or non-prejudiced? How do you feel we can reduce prejudice? Background/demographic questions attempt to identify similarities and differences among respondents and the general population. Strauss et al. (1981) list four categories of questions which provided

organization not only in the initial schedule, but also during the interview process. These are (1) Hypothetical or 'what if' questions, for example: "what if we could identify and measure the variables associated with prejudice in a given situation?", (2) Devil's advocate questions such as: "What beliefs and behaviors are the opposite of prejudice?", (3) The ideal position question: "What does someone look like who is relatively free of prejudice?", (4) The interpretative question: "How would you say your own experience led you to this work?"

The interview format itself was semi-structured, guided by the list of questions in which the exact wording and order of presentation varied in response to the individual situation. The quality of the relationship between the researcher and respondent was characteristic of what Massarik (1981) called a depth interview in which the interviewer and respondent are peers. The latter stages of the process in which personal background, philosophy and work of the respondents was explored, were phenomenal in that both the interviewer and interviewee were engaged in mutual search for understanding and universal meaning.

Analysis of Content of Interviews

The interview analysis was analogous to cross-case analysis described by Merriam (1988). Each interview was treated as a case in "a qualitative inductive multi-case study which seeks to build abstractions across cases" (p. 154). Glaser and Strauss (1967) pointed out that "comparing as many differences and similarities in the data as possible tends to force the analyst to generate categories, their properties, and their interrelations as he or she tries to understand the data" (p. 55). Glaser and Strauss (1967) in their

discussion of grounded theory, advocated the "method of constant comparison" that required constant reassessment of the data set as additional information is collected, analyzed and included in the categorizing process.

The outline provided by Waltz et al. (1991) was used as a framework for the analysis of the interview content. This systematic procedure was considered appropriate for use with recorded information, where the content, not process of communication is the subject of scrutiny. The procedural steps relevant to this study are as follows (1) Define the domain to be examined, (2) Identify the characteristics or concepts to be measured, (3) Select the unit of analysis, 4) Develop a sampling strategy, (5) Develop a categorization scheme, (6) Perform the analysis.

The domain was predetermined by the research methodology, namely, the qualitative aspect of the Retroductive Triangulation process, which consisted of all the transcribed data from the sixteen interviews. The content of the interviews formed the basis for the construction of the instrument. The research proposal, the intended audience, and the research questions, such as: "What are the beliefs, attitudes and behaviors of someone who is prejudiced?", determined the concepts to be identified and measured. Additionally, guidance was obtained from aspects of prejudice identified from the theoretical and empirical review. The unit of analysis selected were words and word phrases. This choice was informed by the advice of Lincoln and Guba (1985) and Merriam (1988) who suggested that those units must have two characteristics. They must be heuristic, that is, relevant and illuminating to the purposes of the researcher, and, they must be the smallest piece of information that can stand alone without additional

information other than the larger context. Waltz et al. (1991) recommend examination of the interviews in their entirety when the content analysis represents the inductive component in theory building. Each audiotaped interview was transcribed and analyzed in order to derive categories which formed the components of the construct prejudice. The process involved both induction and deduction and, in this way, connected the theoretical with the qualitative data. Themes which emerged from the theoretical review provided initial guidance. Waltz et al. (1991) assert that "categories for a given characteristic must be exhaustive and mutually exclusive and the criteria for assigning content to a category must be clear and explicit" (p. 304). The categorization was accomplished through the "constant comparison method" suggested by Glaser and Strauss (1967) and operationalized by Lincoln and Guba (1985). Each interview was examined and each 'unit of meaning' related to prejudice was recorded on an index card. For cross referencing purposes, the assigned number of the interview was recorded on the back of the card. As cards accumulated, each was examined and compared for similarities and differences in properties related to aspects of prejudice and to each other. Responses to questions from the thematic interview guide provided focus and a framework for clustering. The question: "What does prejudice mean to you?" elicited responses such as: "You prejudge someone based on certain characteristics you find negative." "An expectation of negative behaviors and attitudes". "Judgements are made not on the basis of any personality characteristics, but on the basis of an individual's membership in a group." When asked what beliefs and behaviors seem to be the opposite of prejudice, interviewees said: "a commitment to work on incorporating new information," "Listening

without interpreting," "a willingness to acknowledge one's own imperfections and humanness," "an understanding that you can't anticipate who a person is by name, or color, or accent."

Each card was read, and sorted into an assigned category based on similar verbalizations and tacit grounds. Memo writing and the creation of rules suggested by Lincoln and Guba (1985) assisted in the categorization process. On the back of each card, the researcher documented thoughts on the preliminary properties of a statement, the relationship of the statement to other statements, both similar and different, and to the concept prejudice. When a sizeable number of cards had clustered into one category, first attempts were made to capture the 'essence' of the cluster in the "writing of a rule." Each card was reviewed to justify its inclusion and as the study progressed, subsequent cards were examined in view of the rule. When all the cards were exhausted, the categories themselves were examined for internal homogeneity and external overlapping.

At the outset of the categorization process, there were twenty-nine categories. Subsequently, twelve preliminary dimensions emerged: self awareness, personal fragility, categorization/generalization, power, assumption of oneness, conventionality, fear, intolerance of ambiguity, exclusion/disconnection, collaboration/connection, spirituality, curiosity. The preliminary dimensions associated with prejudice emerged from the interviews as follows with supporting quotations from the interviewees.

Self Awareness: Knowledge of self and motivations

"Must be grounded in self, know self", "A lack of self reflection, you're not doing any of your personal growth work", "Need to develop self awareness of my motivation, my intention".

Personal Fragility: Insecurity and a lack of trust in self

"Starts off with people feeling insecure of their own places"; "Starts off with where they are feeling threatened"; "What allows me to work on my prejudice is being comfortable with who I am"; "Trust, belief in my own reality".

Categorization/Generalization: A passive cognitive style, failure to use critical thinking

"Use information to judge before finding out if information applies to all"; "Must deal with the individual straight up, not based on my experiences as a child"; "We are always categorizing. We're taught to label and categorize".

Power: Quest for dominance over others

"Emphasis on competition, individual success along those lines"; "Whole thing is about power possession"; "Another motivation is the need to develop an inferior/superior relationship with others".

Assumption of oneness: An understanding of the interconnectedness of humans

"Appeal to self interest. Must help people to see their connection to others is productive for them"; "A sincere belief that discontinuing racist practices benefits everyone"; "A sense of expectation about the world in general, a sense of unity".

Conventionality: Rule bound attitudes and behaviors

"Groups and group mentality has an enormous amount to do with prejudice because it reinforces"; "Rebellion allows people to break out of whatever the rule was"; "To buy into conventional ways, I would have destroyed myself, my creativity"; "Get control by setting up a series of rules".

Fear: Lack of trust in environment

"When I think about racism, I think about our fear of loss of power"; "A lot of prejudice is based on fear"; "Opposite of prejudice - it would be openness and a lack of fear".

Intolerance of Ambiguity: Insistence on absolutes

"Their world is right or wrong"; "Must be willing to live with ambiguity"; "To tolerate not knowing what the right answer is".

Exclusion/Disconnection: Limiting interpersonal experience

"Closing myself off from a variety of experiences"; "People limit their experiences interpersonally"; "Set up a series of rules, make the rules exclusive".

Collaboration/Connection: Co-operative behavior

"Create opportunities for diverse people to work together"; "Creating a common agenda"
"A willingness to compromise".

Spirituality: Belief in a guiding and transcendent purpose beyond the personal

"A sense of the spiritual, a belief in a higher good allows people to be more tolerant";
"The sense of doing something, or having something beyond oneself to live for"; "People who have a larger sense, a sense of continuity, take risks".

Curiosity: Inquisitiveness and interest in others

"A willingness to share and ask questions"; "Take the time to get to know a person on a lot of different levels"; "Prejudice means to suspend one's ability to understand the uniqueness about individual human beings"; "Just by knowing the group identification of an individual, you are no longer interested in the individual".

Self awareness and personal fragility referred to internal and individual states.

While fear may be related to personal fragility, it was a theme that occurred so frequently in the interviews, it seemed to warrant a separate category at this stage. In addition, the topic of fear was most often discussed with reference to the external world rather than in the context of an internal state. The dimensions of categorization/generalization, intolerance of ambiguity and curiosity seemed related to cognitive or perceptual agility. The dimensions of power and conventionality seemed to be concerned with the need for control and together with exclusion/disconnection. Collaboration/connection reflected an experiential agility and openness which could at this stage be associated with perceptual agility, or form the opposite pole to exclusion/disconnection. A third possibility might be group collaboration/connection with an assumption of spirituality and an assumption of oneness, all of which seemed to tap into having a larger sense of interconnectedness.

The categories which emerged from the qualitative study provided ecological grounding to the instrument development process. That is, they framed the real world data which subsequently would be synthesized with the theoretical data to form a final conceptual framework for the instrument Barriers to Community. In addition, the categories and the verifying quotes would form the substance for the items themselves.

CHAPTER 4

CONCEPTUAL SCHEMA

ASSESSMENT PROTOCOL; INSTRUMENT DEVELOPMENT

A guiding conceptual framework for instrument development was created from the preliminary dimensions which emerged in the deductive and inductive phases of the retroductive Triangulation process. Theoretical definitions for the components of this conceptual schema of prejudice were formulated. An assessment protocol consisting of measured and unmeasured dimensions provided additional concrete guidance to the instrument development.

Deductive and Inductive Retroductive Triangulation

The dimensions which emerged from the analysis and the categorization of data from the theoretical review provided initial guidance for both conducting and analyzing of the qualitative component. In keeping with the phenomenological framework of the qualitative study as much was learned from how the interviewees mediated the issues under investigation within their own lives as from what they said about the issues themselves. The interviewees themselves gave the data and the project a "lived quality."

The Interviewees

The origins of a philosophical and vocational devotion to the understanding and elimination of prejudice in early background and experience became apparent as the

interviews unfolded. The thirty year old head of west coast training for an international prejudice awareness and reduction organization, was an Italian American. She had been raised with a Catholic father and a Jewish mother. Her parents had been active in the community; she herself had grown up around different groups and orientations, was fluent in Spanish, was widely travelled and had always done work involving multicultural issues. She said: "What allows me to work on my prejudice is being comfortable with who I am, not being threatened into feeling I have to change simply by coming into contact with others." A professor of Leadership at a west coast university, with a focus on feminist scholarship described her life long commitment to increasing her own self awareness in her interactions with others. Strongly influenced by her mother's viewpoint and challenge, which was: "always trying to understand what experiences the other person had had," she grew up within an open and verbal family, and a most important learning experience was adapting to life in a multi-racial student house during her own doctoral studies.

The local director of a prejudice reduction organization described his up-bringing as one which discouraged the dishonoring of differences through sanctions. Candid about his own adult struggles to arrive at an acceptance of certain groups, he said: "The more I come into contact with members of this community who are very much like me except for one aspect, the easier it is to recognize their humanity."

The head of multi-cultural training in an organizational effectiveness unit of a government agency described her work as a: "Significant way to make a difference". Growing up in a family which had a strong value of community service, where faith and

self reflection came early, she described herself as "pretty cleaned up on the prejudice of first impressions and am finding the more insidious stuff now moving into the more subtle ways that I could deceive myself if I wanted."

The director of multi-cultural training for a large banking institution grew up in Puerto Rico and experienced prejudice. "If you have kinky hair that is not as good as...I grew up with that and that is very personal." An avid reader with Spanish as a first language, she described herself primarily as a teacher whose quest for awareness is "a gift from the universe". Colliding with the world of prejudice awareness and prejudice reduction, she realized she already had the skills. She was merely given the script.

The director of training for a community based service organization who grew up with a twin brother in a Muslim country, went to school in a Hindu country, experienced first religious and then gender prejudices. The discrepancy between the way she and her brother were treated caused her to question and ultimately rebel. Guided by friends who met with parental disapproval, and by books which "I sort of lucked into time after time such a Victor Frankl's 'Man's Search For Meaning'", she developed a philosophical framework that "the sense of doing something or having something beyond oneself to live for makes a difference. Meaning comes from doing something worthwhile in the face of an absurd universe. With a belief in people rather than a god, the journey is more important than the end."

A professor of Women's Studies at another west coast university was born in Cuba, lived through the revolution where social justice put at stake her life, her lifestyle, and the way she had grown up. She said: "It was very hard to believe that in order to enhance

social justice, I had to let go of all that." Subsequently travelling and living in Panama and Costa Rica, where she participated in trying to create social justice, she said: "What was going on there was not affecting me in the same way, because, after all, I had lost my country; I could pretty much live anywhere." Witnessing the confusion of events and interpretations in Latin America challenged and shifted her own perceptions about the nature of truth and reality. She remains guided by a sense of mission originating in childhood: "To do the right the thing, to do what needs to be done even if it costs me my life."

The national director of training for a prejudice reduction organization which provides programs for business, education, and government was bussed to all white schools as a child. He developed some success strategies within that framework of co-existence, but in college was challenged by people of his own culture about associations he may have had with whites. In describing the evolution of his own racial identity, he said: "Some tough decisions get made as to how to deal with the majority culture. The choices are typically to either make a decision to stay within your own first culture or to branch out. Choosing to be an integrationist relies on an ethnic of inclusion." Speaking about his involvement in the work of prejudice reduction, he concluded: "One, I have the skills, but secondly, if I am going to try to make the world I live in better for me and if I am going to champion some of these issues, I don't have a choice."

Included also in a sample of interviewees were a senior psychologist in a university counseling center, the director if an Equal Opportunity program in an educational institution, the head of multi-cultural programs in a Silicon Valley computer industry, a

director of a human resources department at a university, a diversity trainer who provides programs nationally, and an educator in private business who provides programs focused on empowerment and cultural awareness primarily for youth. Common among all interviewees was an early exposure to issues of prejudice and an awareness and sensitivity to social injustice and the resulting pain. Whether as victim or as bystander, that awareness was catalyzed by inner questioning and curiosity, or outer promptings. Most interviewees volunteered that they had always been avid readers, especially about other people. The quest for self awareness has continued throughout their lives. That self awareness has allowed them to place themselves within a social context and to take responsibility in the whole. All are guided, driven even, by a desire to make a difference and by a sense of meaning derived from participating in something greater than themselves. Finally, the interviewees were marked by a singular courage, the courage to challenge, the courage to rebel, the courage to live with ambiguity.

Formation of Unmeasured Dimensions from the Theoretical and Qualitative Studies

Before Phase Three of the instrument development process could be implemented that is, development of the conceptual schema could be implemented, a comparison of the unmeasured dimensions from the qualitative study and the theoretical review was necessary. The dimensions which emerged from the qualitative interviews gave ecological validity to the theoretical dimensions from the literature review. Twelve preliminary categories were identified from the interviews. They were (a) self awareness, (b) power, (c) personal fragility, (d) assumption of oneness, (e) intolerance of ambiguity, (f) exclusion/disconnection, (g) fear, (h) categorization/generalization, (i) spirituality, (j)

curiosity, (k) collaboration/connection, (l) conventionality. Table 4.1 shows a comparison among the unmeasured dimensions from the qualitative study and the theoretical review. Eight preliminary categories emerged from the theoretical review. Two of the dimensions, political narrowness and cognitive passivity were accounted for in the empirical review. Table 4.1 provides a comparative view of the remaining dimensions from the two studies.

Table 4.1 Comparison of Unmeasured Dimensions from Theoretical review and Qualitative Study

12 Dimensions from Qualitative Study	6 Dimensions from Theoretical Review
Self Awareness	Self States
Personal Fragility	Fragmentation
Intolerance of Ambiguity	Control Orientation
Categorization/Generalization	Power Differential
Curiosity	Entitlement
Exclusion/Disconnection	Hostility
Power	
Fear	
Collaboration/Connection	
Assumption of Oneness	
Spirituality	
Conventionality	

Formation of Concept Assessment Protocol

Phase Three of the Retroductive Triangulation process, a conceptual schema revision was a preliminary stage to the actual instrument development. The data from the qualitative study was examined together with the research from the theoretical and empirical reviews with the purpose of developing a final conceptual framework. Waltz, Strickland, and Lenz (1991) define a concept as the name of an idea that symbolizes an aspect of reality and which serves as a building block for the development of a theory about that reality. A conceptual framework includes a number of concepts which guide the theory development. Specifically, the categories which were identified from the interview data were compared with themes which emerged from the theoretical reviews. Ritualistic behavior seemed to incorporate the preliminary dimensions of Self Awareness and Personal Fragility which emerged from the qualitative data and incorporated Self States and Fragmentation from the theoretical review. This category represented attitudes and actions resulting from alienation from self, a lack of self awareness, and rooted in fear. Experiential Rigidity included Intolerance of Ambiguity, Categorization, Generalization, identified in the qualitative study and Control orientation which emerged in the theoretical review. Perceptual Agility reflects the opposing pole of rigidity and included the dimensions of curiosity. Exclusion did not emerge as a stand alone category in the literature review. Exclusion was often portrayed in discussions of Power and Hostility, not as specific day to day subtle behaviors. Disentitlement absorbed categories of Power, Righteousness, Disconnection in the qualitative study, and Power Differential, Entitlement, Hostility in the theoretical review. Willing Connectedness incorporated the

notion of collaboration/connection which emerged from the qualitative review as a category reflecting behaviors and attitudes the opposite of prejudice. Egocentric Cynicism refers to those dimensions of prejudice which reflect the opposite of spirituality and an assumption of oneness, that is self absorption and concern with the immediate and tangible. Table 4.2 displays these categories and characteristics.

To enhance validity and reliability of the analysis and synthesis of data, outside content experts were enlisted at each stage to examine the emerging dimensions. Two experts reviewed the qualitative data independently, deriving similar categories as the researcher. Their comments and suggestions were incorporated into the on-going refinement process. The researcher returned to selected interviewees for subsequent brief interviews to clarify and expand the meaning of key statements such as: "I intended to do what is morally right, because it was right."

While the Retroductive Triangulation process has outlined the sequence of instrument development as moving from constructed categories to concept development to item formulation, this researcher has digressed from the approach. Preliminary categories were determined. Items were written based on the content of the categories. The categories were then re-examined in the light of the written items for coherence, homogeneity, and exclusiveness of categories. In this way, tighter, more crystallized categories were derived. In addition, some of the content of the discussion around prejudice in the interviews concerned positive characteristics of the non-prejudiced which resulted in initial categories framed in the positive, in keeping with the focus of the

instrument, Barriers to Community, these categories were reframed as much as possible in the negative to preserve consistency and continuity of focus.

The final categories to emerge were Self Integration which incorporated self awareness and personal fragility in the qualitative study and self states from the theoretical review. Self-states had consolidated anxiety, frustration, fear, insecurity and low self esteem. Self-integration seemed to capture more clearly and succinctly the meaning and undercurrents of ritualistic behavior, Experiential Agility encompassed intolerance of ambiguity, categorization, generalization, and the positive pole of curiosity from the qualitative study. The dimension of cognitive passivity from the theoretical review had included absence of curiosity, absence of inquisitiveness, categorization, generalization, oversimplification. Due to the many overlaps, cognitive passivity was subsumed under experiential agility and the interim category, Perceptual Agility, Quest for Power absorbed power, and righteousness, disconnection, fear and the behaviors of exclusion. The category Transcendence synthesized collaboration, connection, assumption of oneness and spirituality from the qualitative study.

Table 4.3 presents this synthesis.

Table 4.2 Reduction of Preliminary Dimensions from Interviews

Ritualistic Behavior

"Lack of self reflection"; "Your are not doing your own personal work"; "Abdicating responsibility for hurting another because I didn't intend it"; "People feeling insecure of their own places"; "People who are as hard on themselves as they are on other people" "It's a lens that doesn't allow them to be open-minded even about themselves".

Willing Connectedness

"Listening without interpreting"; "People crossing lines to talk, to ask questions"; "A willingness to engage"; "Trying to really understand what my words mean to me"; "Working through conflict"

Experiential Rigidity

"Having negative expectations"; "Blind to anything that doesn't fit their construct" "A smug knowingness rather than a curiosity"; "We hear what we are taught to listen for" "Your competence gets based on your look"; "Can't have prejudice without stereotyping"

Exclusion

"A feeling of standoffishness"; "Avoidance"; "Just not hearing someone's voice as well"; "Don't date anyone who isn't a Christian"; "Not being addressed"

Perceptual Agility

"In getting more information, you can appreciate more hopefully."; "Again, the interest, did it expand?"; "A willingness to tolerate that sense of not knowing"

Disentitlement

"Less favorable assignments in the workplace"; "Oppressed people deserve their plight" "Rationalize bad behaviors"; "The more I oppress people and enjoy the benefits, the less I'll be willing to change"; "This is what the whole thing is about, power possession"; "A feeling of superiority"; "Fear of loss"; "When one person looks at another person as lesser in value"

Egocentric Cynicism

"Are we molding society? Are we helping it to grow?"; "People without a sense of things beyond can't take the risk"; "People who hold onto their prejudices have a sense the world stop with them.

Table 4.3 Synthesis of Dimensions from Qualitative Study and Theoretical Review

Preliminary Dimensions from Qualitative study	Theoretical Dimensions	First Synthesis	Final Synthesis
Self Awareness Personal Fragility	Self States Fragmentation	Ritualistic Behavior	Self Integration
Intolerance of Ambiguity	Control Orientation	Experiential Rigidity	
Categorization Generalization Curiosity		Perceptual Agility	Experiential Agility
Exclusion Power Disconnection	Power Differential Entitlement Hostility	Exclusion Disentitlement	Quest for Power
Assumption of Oneness Spirituality Collaboration Connection		Willing Connectedness Egocentric Cynicism	Transcendence

Theoretical Definitions

According to Waltz et al. (1991) the first step in operationalizing a concept is the development of a theoretical definition. This process involves analysis of concepts already generated and further conceptualization. To derive a preliminary definition of prejudice the elements which emerged from the theoretical review and the qualitative study were analyzed and subsequently synthesized into a dynamic explanation of the construct prejudice.

Prejudice is defined as a negative set of beliefs and behaviors toward another person or group, based on distorted and insufficient information. A person experiencing a readiness for prejudice lacks a coherent and confident sense of self, demonstrates a lack of self reflection and belief in self-improvement. This results in self alienation. Internal fragmentation prohibits the connection with the larger whole and leads to fear, a rigid, self protective stance, and disentitlement of others.

The dimensions which form the construct prejudice are the following:

Self Integration involves self reflection and an appreciation of self improvement; a sense of security about place in the world; humility and an ability to accept criticism.

Quest for Power arises from a belief in scarcity; fear and threat are compensated by an acquired superiority; privilege is maintained through oppression and the exercise of power; this stance is bolstered by an attitude of self righteousness, rationalization and avoidance behaviors.

Experiential Agility refers to an open perceptual lens; an attitude of curiosity leads to a quest for information; exposure to others and critical thinking leads to perception shifts, appreciation of differences and inclusive behaviors.

Transcendence reflects an understanding of the unity of all humans, a belief that human interconnectedness is productive; involves having a sense of things beyond oneself to live for and a belief in service and abundance.

Assessment Protocol for Instrument Development

Phase Four of the Retroductive Triangulation Process involved the development of an assessment protocol, a chart depicting both the measured dimensions of concepts related to prejudice which were identified in the empirical review and the unmeasured dimensions, elicited from the theoretical review and qualitative study. The assessment protocol identifies eight characteristics of the existing instruments: name, author, number of items, subscales, measured dimensions, reliability, and validity and is shown in Table 4.4.

Table 4.4 Assessment Protocol of Measured and Unmeasured Dimensions of Prejudice

Dimensions	Instrument/Reference	Items/type	Reliability	Validity
I. <u>Measured</u>				
A. Authoritarianism Anti-Democratic attitudes	California F Scale Adorno et al. 1950	30/38 Likert	Split half .74-.90	Convergent
B. Open and closed belief systems	Dogmatism Scale Rokeach, 1960	66 Likert	Split half .71-.91	Construct Convergent
C. Fascist attitudes	Public Opinion Questionnaire Edwards, 1941	26 likert	Split half	Content
D. Fear of unknown	Intolerance of Ambiguity Budner, 1962	16 Likert	Cronbach Alpha	Convergent
E. Intercultural Adaptability	Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory Kelley and Meyers 1987	50 Likert	Cronbach Alpha	Face
F. Covert Racism	Modern Racism Scale McConahay, 1976	14 Likert	Test-retest .72-.93 Cronbach Alpha .75-.86	Construct
G. Authoritarianism	Right Wing Authoritarianism Scale Altemeyer, 1973	24 Likert	Cronbach Alpha .77-.95	Convergent
II. <u>Unmeasured Dimensions</u>				
Self Integration				
Quest for Power				
Experiential Agility				
Transcendence				

Instrument Development From Unmeasured Dimensions

Item Identification and Development

Phase Five of the instrument development process involved item development and instrument formatting including scaling and scoring procedures. The theoretical definitions which captured the essence of the conceptual schema formulated from the theoretical/qualitative synthesis were used as guidelines. This ensured that each item did reflect an aspect of the definition. Words and word phrases from the interviews and the theoretical review were recorded on cards. These formed the content for each item. A preliminary pool of one hundred and seventy three items was developed. As the theoretical definitions were revised, the number of items was reduced to eighty in an iterative process. For example, the theoretical definition of Quest for Power included a belief in scarcity. Comments from experts linked the belief that there is not enough to go around with the need for power to gather and protect goods and position. In this way, an item in the Quest for Power was developed: "The truth is there isn't enough wealth to go around in this world." Using Corcoran and Fisher's (1987) framework of definitions for behavior and sentiment which Dempster (1990) elaborated upon, items were developed to reflect not just overt, but covert behaviors such as feeling or thinking, sentiments and beliefs. An attempt was made to balance negatively and positively worded items to avoid response set bias.

At this stage, the instrument under development was critiqued by two of the original interviewees for preliminary face and content validity. The instrument was then administered to a Doctoral assessment class in the first pilot study. Eleven instruments

were returned to the researcher with comments on content, structure, redundancy, and relevance. After incorporating these comments the number of items was reduced to 78, with 15 items in the Self Integration subscale, 29 in Experiential Agility, 18 in Quest for Power, and 15 in Transcendence.

Scaling Format and Scoring Procedures

A summated, self report, Likert type format was used. Waltz et al. (1991) recommend the format for psychometric and practical reasons. Such an instrument is easy to construct and administer. It tends to have good reliability and better validity than other formats. Each item has approximately equal value and the instrument is easy to score. Nunnally (1978) suggested that reliability is increased by increasing the number of scale steps with five or six steps considered appropriate to a scale of fifteen to twenty items. To avoid possible overuse of a neutral category, the scale was designed with a numerical intensity rating of: strongly disagree (1); mostly disagree (2); slightly disagree (3); slightly agree (4) mostly agree (5); completely agree (6).

The Preliminary Instrument

The preliminary instrument Barriers to Community was developed through the retroductive triangulation process. The summated, self report, Likert type instrument consisted of seventy-eight items divided among four tentatively identified dimensions of prejudice. Higher scores on the instrument were meant to indicate increased susceptibility to prejudice. The next step involved assessing the instrument for content validity by a panel of experts in instrument design and prejudice reduction and team-building.

CHAPTER FIVE
PSYCHOMETRIC EVALUATION: ANALYSIS AND RESULTS OF RELIABILITY
AND VALIDITY TESTING

Phase Six in the instrument development process involved the establishment of psychometric properties for the scale "Barriers to Community." This multi-staged sequence included in the following order: a) the examination of content validity and the determination of the content validity index (CVI) as outlined by Waltz, Strickland, and Lenz (1991); b) the establishment of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach Alpha); c) factorial validity through exploratory factor analysis, (Dixon 1986; Nunnally 1978); and (d) convergent and discriminant validity (Nunnally, 1978; Waltz, Strickland, and Lenz, 1991).

Content Validity Determination

Content validity was examined through the process described by Waltz, Strickland and Lenz (1991). The content validity process allows a panel considered to be experts in the content area to examine how adequately each item in a particular subscale represents the theoretical definition to which it has been assigned. The panel of experts assesses also, how adequately, the item links with the theoretical definition of the overall construct. The Content Validity Index (CVI) is the coefficient of agreement among the panel of experts as to the rating of the adequacy of each item.

Five content expert judges were asked to examine the "Barriers to Community" instrument. Four were doctoral level faculty members at the University of San Diego, from

the disciplines of Education, Social Psychology, Psychology and Nursing. These panel members were chosen for their specific expertise in both academic and applied knowledge in the areas of prejudice. One member was involved in special education; another was a key figure in the in the assessment and evaluation of diversity efforts on the campus. A third member was co-author of a recently published textbook on issues of prejudice and diversity. The fourth member of the panel was a feminist scholar. The fifth member of the panel was a diversity consultant and trainer in the community. Each panel member was given a copy of the Barriers to Community instrument which included 78 items. The items were assigned to their relevant subdimensions. Each subdimension was prefaced by a theoretical definition and quotations from the qualitative study. The panel was asked to rate the degree of congruence of each item to the theoretical definition on a four point rating scale, ranging from (4) completely valid, to (1) completely invalid. (See appendix E)

Waltz et al. (1991) suggest that items which are rated a three or a four by the judges should be retained. "The CVI is defined as the proportion of items given a rating of quite/very relevant" (Waltz et al., 1991, p. 173). Following this definition, the CVI for the Self Integration scale was .92, .94 for Experiential Agility, .98 for Quest for Power, and .95 for Transcendence. The CVI for the total scale was .94. The researcher calculated the mean ratings for each item and any item which fell below a rating of 3.5 was deleted. While this was a more rigorous threshold than that suggested by Waltz et al. (1991) the process was seen as an opportunity to systematically reduce the lengthy instrument to a more manageable 50 to 60 items for administration and testing. Therefore, 5 items were deleted from the Self Integration scale, 8 from Experiential Agility, 2 from Quest for Power, and 5 from

Transcendence. Judges commented also on redundancy, social desirability factors, other possible interpretations of individual items, and placement in alternative subscales. An instrument containing 58 questions remained.

Pilot Study

The questionnaire was administered to twenty-seven Master of Business Administration students at San Diego State University. While this was a sample of convenience, it was intended to reflect the larger sample that would represent the target audience. The instrument was meant to be a self assessment tool for a variety of adults, particularly those in leadership, managerial and supervisory capacities including trainers and change agents. An assumption was made that in most current organizational structures these groups potentially set the tone for the organizational community as a whole and potentially possessed the most influence in making change. Participants commented on the timing, clarity of directions and the questions themselves. One student suggested that it would be helpful to preface the administration of the instrument with a comment instructing participants to personalize in answering the questions. She said that it took her several questions to understand that they must be answered from a subjective position. There were comments about specific questions, but no consistent feedback that necessitated substantial revision. The researcher had prepared a brief explanation of the instrument and the construct under investigation which was delivered after completion of the instrument. This presentation elicited philosophical discussion around the meaning of self integration, (self confidence versus self centeredness), the nature of power, moral and ethical issues associated with the quest for power, the role and meaning of transcendence and general discussion of societal values and world view.

Many participants commented on the thought provoking nature of the questionnaire. The researcher was unprepared for the strong words of support, respect and encouragement from the participants for two reasons. The literature reporting studies on the Modern Racism Scale described resistance and even hostility when the instrument was administered. Secondly, in the first pilot study of the Barriers to Community instrument, which was conducted in a doctoral assessment class, some subjects reported that some of the questions provoked strong feelings of discomfort.

Sample

The intent of the project was to develop an instrument which would be effective in assessing the occurrence of prejudice as a barrier to community in a variety of workplace settings. Subjects were recruited from a total of twelve different sites in a variety of educational settings in San Diego, including two community colleges and the three major universities. The defining parameter for the population sought was experience in the workplace or potential/imminent experience in a managerial/leadership role. Table 5.1 summarizes the demographic variables.

Table 5.1 Demographic Data

SEX	Frequency	Percent
Male	222	53.6
Female	192	46.4
AGE		
Less than 18	1	.3
18-22	115	34.2
23-27	120	35.0
28-32	43	12.7
33-37	23	6.3
38-42	20	5.4
43-47	11	2.5
48-52	5	1.5
50 and over	2	.7
Missing cases 76		
MARITAL STATUS		
Single	288	69.6
Married	93	22.5
Divorced	11	2.7
Separated	3	.7
Co-habiting	19	4.6
EDUCATIONAL LEVEL		
High School	33	8.0
Voc/Tech.	11	2.7
Undergraduate	262	63.4
Postgraduate	107	25.9
NUMBER OF YEARS IN WORK FORCE		
0-5	177	42.7
6-10	139	33.5
11-15	57	13.7
16-20	18	4.3
21 and over	21	5.1

Table 5.1 continued
Demographic Data

CURRENT EMPLOYMENT STATUS	Frequency	Percentage
Not employed	113	27.5
Employed Fulltime	173	41.7
Employed Parttime	127	30.8
ETHNICITY		
African American	14	3.4
Native American	-	
Asian/Pacific Islander	32	7.7
Mexican American	18	4.3
Filipino	17	4.1
Latino/Other Hispanic	20	4.8
White	293	70.6
Other	18	4.3

With the exception of a community college personal growth class, all subjects were recruited from master's level business or education classes, specialized training classes for managers and executives, and upper level undergraduates in business schools. A total of four hundred and fifteen subjects took the Barriers to Community questionnaire.

Procedure

Consent was obtained from the University of San Diego Committee on the Protection of Human Subjects through an expedited review, to conduct the second half of the instrument development process, the psychometric testing. (See Appendix G). Consent had already been obtained from the committee in a separate expedited review, to conduct the first half of the study, the qualitative interviews.

Access to classroom sites was gained through instructors known through personal and committee contacts. With the exception of one site, the researcher personally introduced the

instrument, requested voluntary participation and assured anonymity and confidentiality. Subjects were asked to complete a brief demographic sheet and the "Barriers to Community" questionnaire. (See Appendix J) Once the final questionnaire was completed, the researcher debriefed the group using a brief presentation developed for the pilot study. In one instance, the researcher returned to the class at a later date to provide a classroom interpretation of a personality instrument (MBTI), as an expression of appreciation to the participants and the instructor.

Barriers to Community Instrument

The first draft of the Barriers to Community instrument was a 58 item, theoretically multi-dimensional questionnaire designed to measure attitudes associated with prejudice in subjects in a variety of settings. Four dimensions had emerged in the instrument development process: a) Self Integration (10 items); b) Experiential Agility (22 items); c) Quest for Power (17 items); and, d) Transcendence (9 items). Twenty-four reverse scored items, hypothesized to reflect attitudes in opposition to prejudice, were distributed throughout the questionnaire. Scaling format and scoring were a six step Likert type summated structure, ranging from strongly disagree (6) to strongly agree (1), with a possible response range of 58 to 348. Higher scores indicated higher levels of attitudes associated with prejudice and barriers to community.

Results

Internal Consistency Reliability

A measure of reliability is a measurement of the consistency of scores and reliability is the underlying concept in computing the error of measurement of a single score (Anastasi,

1988). While there are several types of reliability, the form appropriate to this study was internal consistency reliability (Waltz et al., 1991) or inter-item consistency reliability (Anastasi 1988), which is based on a single administration of a single form of a cognitive measure. Waltz et al. (1991) suggested the alpha coefficient as the preferred statistical method for measuring reliability. Anastasi (1988) refers to the coefficient alpha (Cronbach) as a generalized formula derived for use in measures with multiple scored items. A desirable reliability coefficient should approach 1.00 and usually falls at least above .80. Internal consistency reliability was established for the total scale and for each of the four subscales.

Table 5.2 Reliability Analysis of the 58 Item Barriers to Community Scale

Subscale	#Items	Standardized Item Alpha	Corrected Inter-item Correlation range
Self Integration	10	.47	-.15 - .26
Experiential Agility	22	.74	-.19 - .54
Quest for Power	17	.84	-.05 - .58
Transcendence	9	.62	-.06 - .51
TOTAL TOOL	58	.87	-.19 - .58

As can be seen from table 5.2, the standardized item alpha or Cronbach alpha for the total instrument was in the acceptable range of .87 for an instrument under development, as were two of the subscales, Experiential Agility .74 and Quest for Power .84. the standardized item alphas for the Self Integration and Transcendence subscales were below

the acceptable minimum of .70 suggested by Nunnally (1978) for an instrument under development. The minimum inter-item correlations on the four scales were also below the acceptable minimum of .20 to .25 suggested by Nunnally (1978). Therefore further reliability analysis was required. The corrected inter-item correlation for each item was examined and those items with values exceeding .35 were flagged and retained, resulting in a reduced scale of 40 items. The Self Integration subscale contained four items, Experiential Agility retained thirteen items, Quest for Power had sixteen items and Transcendence, seven items.

It was decided to incorporate the four remaining items of the subscale into Experiential Agility because of the high correlation between the Self Integration and Experiential Agility subscales as shown in Table 5.3, the low alpha level for Self Integration and the low number of items remaining.

Table 5.3 Correlation Coefficients of the Four Subscales of the 58 Item Barriers to Community Instrument

	Self Integration	Experiential Agility	Quest for Power	Transcendence
Self Integration	1.00	0.70	0.32	
Experiential Agility	0.71	1.00	0.39	0.19
Quest for Power	0.32	0.39	1.00	0.45
Transcendence	0.10	0.19	0.45	1.00

A reliability analysis was performed on the reduced instrument. This analysis yielded a standardized alpha of .88 for the whole scale. The Experiential agility scale showed a standardized alpha of .75, with a mean inter-item correlation of .13. The Quest for Power

scale had a standardized alpha of .83 and a mean inter-item correlation of .23. The Transcendence subscale demonstrated a standardized alpha of .66 and a mean inter-item correlation of .20. While the Transcendence subscale did not achieve the required minimum coefficient alpha of .70 for a scale under development, it was retained temporarily in order to examine the performance of the items in a factor analysis.

Factor Analysis

According to Nunnally (1978), Dixon (1986), and Waltz, Strickland and Lenz (1991), factor analysis refers to a variety of methods for collecting, understanding and interpreting a number of variables including a collection of mathematical procedures for deciding which variables belong in which groups. As a grouping technique, factor analysis serves as a data reduction process by clustering a large number of variables into smaller factors and then deciding which items collectively best represent the meaning of the factor. Therefore, factor analysis is a useful tool in the instrument development process, and in the construction and validation of theory which the instrument in question has been designed to explore.

The Barriers to Community instrument fulfilled the necessary requirements to proceed to an examination of construct validity through factor analysis. The instrument demonstrated sufficient reliability, contained more than twenty variables and a multiple response format which Nunnally (1978) deemed appropriate for analysis through principle component (PC) factor analysis with orthogonal varimax rotation. This procedure positions the factors in such a way that the meaning that they can be more readily interpreted, and maximizes the variance on fewer factors. The sample of 415 subjects exceeded the five subjects per item recommended by Nunnally (1978) and Dixon (1986)

First Factor Analysis

Several important elements of the factor analysis procedure were noted in each factor analysis, eigen values, factor loadings, factorial complexity, and conceptual interpretability. The first factor analysis in this exploratory process allowed the program (SPSSX) to determine the number of factors present rather than specifying the number of factors expected. Using Dixon's (1986) criterion of retaining those eigen values of 1.00 and above, eleven factors emerged accounting for 56% of the variance. Dixon suggested the range of acceptable factor loadings to lay between .30 and .40, that is, the correlation of the individual item with the factor. A loading of .35 was established as the acceptable minimum loading for this analysis. All but one item loaded onto at least one factor at .35 level or above. Item six: "I find it almost impossible to take criticism" failed to meet the criterion.

Upon examination of the results, it became apparent that only eight factors contained loadings of .35 or above. Factor I contained twenty-four items, reflecting a combination of all three dimensions of the subscales Experiential Agility, Quest for Power and Transcendence. This factor was tentatively renamed Insularity. Factor II contained five items which appeared to represent one of the twelve preliminary dimensions from the qualitative study Power/Quest for Dominance. Factor III contained one question: "We cannot protect ourselves without protecting others." and was named according to one of the original twelve dimensions, Assumption of Oneness. Factor IV also contained one item: "I've been told I'm pretty stubborn when it comes to changing my mind about anything" and was named Cognitive Rigidity. Factor V, with three items was represented the dimension

Curiosity, Factor VI with two items reflected Willing Connectedness. Factors VIII and X contained one item each, reflecting Personal Fragility and Humility respectively.

Therefore while the first factor analysis demonstrated that virtually all items achieved acceptable loadings, the scale failed to meet the criteria of factorial simplicity and interpretability suggested by Zeller and Carmines (1980). Four factors containing one item each did not meet the minimum of three items per factor established by Nunnally (1978). Why factor VII, IX, and XI contained no significant loadings remained unclear.

Second Factor Analysis

Before further deletions were undertaken, a second factor analysis was performed using a three factor approach, with the intent to explore the modified hypothetical structure of three subscales which had emerged from the reliability analysis. This resulted in three eigen values over 1.00 explaining 31.8% of the variance. Only twenty-three items achieved the necessary loading of .35 on a single factor, with factor I containing 17 items, factor II, five items, and factor III, one item.

Returning to the results of the first factor analysis, item 6 which failed to meet the minimum leading of .35 was deleted. In addition, those factors containing only one item were deleted. Factor III, item 35: "We cannot protect ourselves without protecting others", had a similar counterpart in Factor I. Similarly the one item factor IV was deleted. Factors VIII and X, tentatively called Personal Fragility and Humility were deleted. A scale of 35 items remained.

Third Factor Analysis

A third factor analysis yielded eight factors with eight eigen values accounting for 52.7% of the variance. All but three items loaded onto the first factor at .35 level and above. Two items, 43 and 48 loaded exclusively onto factor II. Three items, 34, 45, 50 loaded onto Factor II at a higher level than on factor I. Item 16 loaded onto factor IV. Items 17, 28, 32 loaded onto factors 6,7,8 respectively, at higher levels than onto Factor I. Thus, in this third factor analysis considerable overlap of items and factors was observed, demonstrating factorial complexity and conceptual blurring.

Factor IV, containing item 16 was deleted: "It takes time to know a person at many different levels." The intent of the item was represented in factor I by two items: "Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another", and "I am curious about the differences in people." These items were intended to capture a willingness to acknowledge and explore the complexities of people. Item 28 in factor VII was deleted. "If I have some doubts about a person or a group, I try to get more information before I conclude anything." Item 19 in Factor I: "I am always interested in the chance to correct or refine my ideas about someone by talking with them," seemed to capture sufficiently the notion of openness and willingness to communicate.

In spite of the double loadings, items 32, 33, 34 were retained as they singularly represented: a) a scarcity mentality; b) an attitude of superiority; and, c) a competitive approach to human relationship. Item 43 was retained, as it addressed an attitude of entitlement, item 45 a belief in hierarchy, and, item 56, a sense of righteousness. It was noted that item 48, which had loaded onto factor VI in the first factor analysis was now

located in Factor II. Item 10 did not achieve the .35 criterion on any factor and it was deleted.

In examining the 32 item scale to determine domains of meaning, it appeared that the instrument now reflected two major categories of the original four which were hypothesized, Experiential Agility and Quest for Power. Therefore the items were intuitively reordered according to the two dimensions and a reliability analysis was performed. A standardized alpha of .86 was achieved for the whole scale, .75 for the subscale Experiential Agility and .81 for the subscale Quest for Power. Items 2 and 4 did not meet the corrected inter-item correlation total criterion of .35 and were deleted.

Fourth Factor Analysis

A fourth factor analysis was performed on the 30 item scale yielding six eigen values over 1.00 accounting for 49.1% of the variance. Four items loaded onto factor II, all other items loaded onto factor I beyond the requisite .35 level. Table 5.4 demonstrates these results.

Table 5.4 Results of the Fourth and Final Factor Analysis of the 30 Item Barriers to Community Scale

Factor	Eigenvalue	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Item	Loading
Experiential Agility	6.5	21.7	21.7	56	.62
				44	.60
				31	.57
				49	.56
				38	.56
				40	.55
				57	.55
				30	.54
				26	.52
				39	.51
				51	.50
				33	.49
				58	.48
				54	.46
				18	.45
				55	.44
				53	.43
				17	.41
				23	.41
				34	.40
32	.40				
9	.37				
15	.37				
37	.37				
24	.36				
19	.35				
Quest for Power	2.9	9.8	31.5	43	.58
				48	.49
				50	.45
				45	.39

Table 5.5 Items and Loadings of the 30 Item Barriers to Community Scale

Factor I Experiential Agility		
Number	Loading	Item
56	.62	I measure a person's success by what they've achieved in money and position.
44	.60	If certain groups get knocked around a bit, it is mostly because they've had it coming.
31	.57	When I meet new people I try to size them up to see how I may be better than them.
49	.56	I think the best way to handle being around people who are really different from me is to be a little stand-offish.
38	.56	Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another.*
40	.55	I find it hard to accept some minority groups as equals.
57	.55	It's important to me that we are all helping to make the world a better place.*
30	.54	I have very little time for people who don't basically see things the same way as I do.
26	.52	The ways in which people are different can benefit all of us.*
39	.51	I am curious about the differences among people.*
51	.50	It upsets me to see our cultural and racial heritage get blurry through too much intermarriage.
33	.49	I get a lot of satisfaction in proving I am right and someone wrong.
58	.48	I believe in people.*

Table 5.5 continued
 Items and Loadings of the 30 Item Barriers to Community Scale

Factor I Experiential Agility		
Number	Loading	Item
54	.46	Having power is a way to get and keep what you want.
18	.45	I don't see the need to have a lot of experience with different kinds of people.
55	.44	If everyone were alike, we wouldn't have the problems we have in this country.
53	.43	I am bothered by certain groups feeling they have a right to what I've earned.
17	.41	I consider myself hard-headed when it comes to ideas and people.
23	.41	I can usually tell what people are going to be like just looking at them.
34	.40	When I compare myself with others I am proud that I've accomplished more than most.
32	.40	The truth is there isn't enough wealth to go around in this world.
9	.37	I have learned to catch my biased thoughts.*
15	.37	My beliefs are not open to questioning.
37	.37	After working with different people, I find I take on new ways of doing things.*
24	.36	If we don't care for all people, we will all suffer.*
19	.35	I am always interested in the chance to correct or refine my ideas about someone by talking with them.*

Table 5.5 continued

Factor II Quest for Power		
Number	Loading	Item
43	.58	I've worked hard and that gives me the right to society's rewards.
48	.49	I've worked hard to make it and I see no reason why othes shouldn't do the same.
50	.45	Those who don't make a contribution to society don't deserve the rewards.
45	.39	There is always going to be a top dog and a bottom dog.

* Reverse score

Before a final reliability analysis was performed on the reduced 30 - item scale, the whole instrument was reassessed for meaning. For the purposes of exploration several items were moved to the scale Quest for Power as they continued to represent in the mind of the researcher the original parameters of the Quest for Power definition: "Involves a belief in scarcity; fear and threat compensated by an acquired sense of superiority; privilege is maintained through the exercise of power and oppression, bolstered by self righteousness, rationalization, avoidance behavior." The subscale now contained items 31, 32, 33, 34, 40, 43, 44, 45, 48, 49, 50, 53, 54, 56. Table 5.6 presents the results of this analysis.

Table 5.6 Reliability Analysis of the Reduced 30 -Item Two Dimensional Barriers to Community Scale

Subscale	#Items	Standardized Item Alpha	Corrected Inter-Item Correlation Range
Experiential Agility	16	.80	.25 - .60
Quest for Power	14	.81	.31 - .53
TOTAL TOOL	30	.87	.25 - .60

The final version of the Barriers to Community scale met most of the preliminary psychometric requirements for an instrument under development. All of the items loaded onto a one of two factors at .35 or above. With the exception of one item, which had an corrected inter-item correlation total of .25, the range was above the .30 minimum suggested by Nunnally (1978). The results of the factor analysis left a lack of clarity about the dimensionality of the instrument and the sources of variance in the instrument.

Multidimensionality and Unidimensionality

According to Nunnally (1978), low correlations among subscales of .40 and below indicate that an instrument is multidimensional, that is, each subscale represents a separate and distinct component of the construct. Correlations of .70 and above suggest a unidimensional instrument. Moderate correlations between .50 and .60 indicate distinguishable, but interdependent facets of the construct. Table 5.7 demonstrates the correlations among the four hypothesized subscales of the original 58 item instrument.

Table 5.7 Correlations of the Four Subscales in the Original 58 Item Barriers to Community Scale.

	Self Integration	Experiential Agility	Quest for Power	Transcendence
Self Integration	1.00	.70	.32	.09
Experiential Agility	.70	1.00	.39	.19
Quest for Power	.32	.39	1.00	.45
Transcendence	.09	.19	.45	1.0

Table 5.7 displays the inconsistency of relationship among the four hypothesized subscales in the original instrument. With the exception of the .70 correlation of the Self Integration subscale with Experiential Agility indicating conceptual and empirical blurring between the two subscales, all other correlations suggested a range of interpretations. The .39 correlation between the Agility and Power subscales indicated distinctly separate but related aspects of the construct under investigation, as did the .45 correlation between the Power and Transcendence subscales. The correlation of .09 between the subscales Self Integration and Transcendence showed these subscales to have no relationship with each other, leading to the conclusion that these scales did not belong in the same tool. As the preliminary analyses were conducted it was apparent that the Self Integration scale performed poorly in all ways and ultimately only one item of the original fifteen remained in the final scale.

Following the final reliability and factor analysis, the instrument having been reduced to 30 items and the subscales to two, a calculation of the Pearson Product Moment Correlation showed a moderate correlation of .57 between the subscales Experiential Agility and Quest for Power, suggesting that while the subscales are related, they are making individual and coherent contribution to the whole instrument. While the reliability analysis of a two dimensional instrument demonstrated acceptable results, the final factor analysis did not support a 14 item Quest for Power subscale. As was shown in table 5.4 only 4 items loaded onto factor II at acceptable levels.

Discriminant and Convergent Validity

Convergent and discriminant validity were explored through the correlation of the Barriers to Community Instrument with two other scales, one which measured a construct considered to be similar and one, measuring a different construct. Waltz, Strickland, and Lenz (1991) refer to the correlation of different constructs which employ similar types of rating scales as the hetero-trait mono-method approach. The method was used to explore convergent and discriminant validity through the correlation of the Barriers to Community Instrument with the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI), Kelley and Meyers (1992) for discriminant validity, and the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale (RWA), Altemeyer (1981) for convergent validity.

The Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory was purchased locally from the authors. The researcher had hypothesized that an important aspect of prejudice within the individual would be a lack of openness, a cognitive and experiential rigidity in relationship to unknown others. Consequently, it was conjectured that an instrument which was reported to measure

flexibility, curiosity and openness should represent an opposite construct to that hypothesized in the Barriers to Community scale. Permission to use the Right Wing Authoritarian questionnaire was granted by the author Robert Altemeyer. The RWA scale is a measure which has shown psychometric stability across a number of populations and has been correlated with a variety of prejudice measures. In a series of studies, which examined the early work of Adorno et al. (1950) on authoritarianism and fascist ideology, Altemeyer distilled three "attitudinal clusters" which demonstrated stability. The covarying clusters of authoritarian submission, authoritarian aggression, and conventionalism described individual tendencies to conform to the norms of society, to submit to the perceived legitimacy of authority, and to display aggressiveness against persons when it is perceived to be sanctioned by authority. The sanctioned targets for aggression are "deviants" from societal norms, unconventional persons and minority groups. Thus, Altemeyer (1988a) presented a theoretical explanation for the relationship of prejudice and authoritarianism.

Both scales to assess discriminant and convergent validity were administered to different portions of the sample, the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale to one hundred subjects and the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory to fifty subjects.

Anastasi (1988) suggested that correlations between tools should be in the moderate range (.40 - .70), which would indicate related but separate constructs. Both correlations fell short of that range. A negative but not significant correlation (-.32) was established between Barriers to Community and the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory. There appeared to be no relationship (.07) between Barriers to Community and the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale. The Right Wing Authoritarian Scale and the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory

showed a $-.29$ correlation. The reliability of the two instruments was examined within the sample population. Reliability for the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory was adequate at $.82$, but somewhat below the reliability reported by the authors of $.90$. The reliability of the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale ($.70$) was inadequate for the purposes of this study and below the reported range of $.77$ to $.95$. T tests were conducted to determine any significant differences between the subsamples and the whole. None were found. The low correlation of the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory and Barriers to Community Scale may be explained by a sample size too small to lend significance. A more obvious speculation may be that the hypothesized relationship between the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory and Barriers to Community does not exist, that the instruments are based on unrelated constructs. A third possible interpretation may be related to the absence of construct validity studies on the Cross Cultural Adaptability Inventory. The instrument may not be measuring a coherent construct. A fourth possible interpretation may be that the Barriers to Community questionnaire does not represent an identifiable construct. The Right Wing Authoritarian scale was examined more closely in an attempt to understand its failure to achieve adequate reliability within the sample population. The statistics for each item were reviewed in which the mean score, kurtosis, and skewness were noted. A number of questions failed to discriminate among subjects: "A woman's place is wherever she wants it to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and to social conventions belong strictly in the past." The response to this item was unanimously anti-authoritarian. Other items showed indifference in the responses, that is, no skewness and high kurtosis, a clustering around the

mean. "It's one thing to question and doubt someone during an election campaign, but once a man becomes a leader of our country, we owe him our greatest support and loyalty."

Some questions showed high polarization on the side of right wing authoritarianism. "The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down on deviant groups and trouble makers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order." It should be noted that the sample population in which the Barriers to Community study was conducted, was not the traditional, undergraduate sample used in many similar studies. All participants were upper level undergraduates, graduate level students, participants in executive level training programs and other specialized training programs such as Total Quality Management. Altemeyer (1988a) commented that as students reached the end of an undergraduate degree, levels of authoritarianism decreased. The results of the reliability and item analysis showed that within this population, the RWA scale demonstrated internal inconsistency.

In reflecting on the meaning of the responses, it may be conjectured that the population has achieved a high level of awareness, sophistication and liberality concerning women's issues, issues of religious and sexual identity. However, items which demonstrated high RWA responses, showed a population valuing patriotism, concerned with crime and inclined to a punitive stance in its treatment. "Capital punishment should not be abolished." "National anthems, flags, and glorification of one's country should all be de-emphasized to promote the brotherhood of all men." (Reverse Score). It may also be hypothesized that with crime and external forces perceived as primary threats, other issues such as differences in religion, sexuality, and gender are perceived as less threatening.

While the establishment of convergent and discriminant validity with the selected tools proved elusive, it is noteworthy that in the debriefings following the administration of the questionnaire, participants spontaneously volunteered the comment that the questionnaire appeared to be addressing prejudice. While this certainly supports the face validity of the instrument, the obvious nature of some of the questions ensures also that responses would have been impacted by issues of social desirability.

Item Analysis of the Barriers to Community Instrument

Further exploration of the possible influence of demographic variables in response to the instrument seemed premature in view of the inconclusive results of the validity study. It was decided, therefore to conduct a further examination of the individual items, item means and skewness in order to further understand how the population as a whole responded to the instrument and to cast further light on the underlying meaning of the instrument. The scale was expanded and the steps weighted for this analysis in order to increase the extremes and achieve greater clarity. Step 6 in the scale was assigned a value of 9, step 5 became a 7, steps 4 and 3 were weighed equally at 5, step 2 was assigned a value of 3 and step 1 retained a value of 1. Table 5.8 demonstrates the means and skewness using the modified steps.

Table 5.8 Item Means and Skewness for the Reduced Barriers to Community Scale

# Item	Mean	Skewness
48 I've worked hard to make it and I see no reason why others should not work as hard.	7.7	-.305
45 There is always going to be a top dog and a bottom dog.	7.3	-.260
34 When I compare myself with others I am proud that I've accomplished more than most.	6.6	-.241
50 Those who don't make a contribution to society don't deserve the rewards.	6.5	-.010
53 I am bothered by certain groups feeling they have a right to what I've earned.	6.0	-.156
54 Having power is a way to get and keep what you want.	6.0	-.131
33 I get a lot of satisfaction in proving I am right and someone is wrong	5.3	-.035
17 I consider myself hard-headed when it when it comes to ideas and people	5.2	-.099
32 The truth is there isn't enough wealth wealth to go around in this world.	5.0	.261
24 If we don't care for all people, we will we will all suffer.	4.4	-.430
49 I think the best way to handle people who are really different from me is to be a little stand-offish.	4.2	-.053
56 I measure a person's success by what they have achieved in money and position.	4.0	.428

Table 5.8 continued

Item	Mean	Skewness
30 I have very little time for people who for people who don't basically see things the same way as I do.	3.9	.242
31 When I meet new people I try to size them up to see how I might be better.	3.7	-.317
19 I am always interested in the chance to correct or refine my ideas about someone by talking with them.	3.7	.383
55 If everyone were alike we wouldn't have the problems we have in this country.	3.5	.914
44 If certain groups get knocked around a bit its mostly because they've had it coming.	3.1	.657
40 I find it hard to accept some minority groups as equals.	3.1	.995
38 Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another.	3.1	.790
58 I believe in people.	3.0	1.012
51 It upsets me to see our cultural and racial heritage get blurry through too much intermarriage.	2.9	1.158
39 I am curious about the differences among people.	2.8	.584
57 It's important to me that we are all helping to make the world a better place.	2.8	.729

Table 5.8 continued

Item	Mean	Skewness
26 The ways in which people are different can benefit all of us.	2.7	.851
18 I don't see the need to have a lot of experience with different kinds of people.	2.6	1.234

Higher means on this expanded scale indicate responses in the direction of prejudice, lower means indicate less prejudice. There was slightly more skewness in a positive direction, a result which Waltz et al. (1991) would suggest indicates slightly lower scores over all (less prejudice). When individual means were examined this finding was supported. Items such as: "I believe in people" and "Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another" had lower means, as did items such as: "I find it hard to accept some minority groups as equals." There were fewer items with elevated means (more prejudice) and these items seemed to reflect attitudes of economic self protection: "I have worked hard to make it and I see no reason why others should not work as hard." "Those who don't make a contribution to society don't deserve the rewards." Belief in the inevitability of domination/subordination relationship: "There will always be a top dog and a bottom dog" would support also a belief in the inevitability of societal oppression. A competitive attitude was reflected in the high mean response to the item "When I compare myself to others I am proud that I have accomplished more than most." A belief in power as means to personal satisfaction seemed supported by the high mean response to the item: "Having power is a way to get and keep what you want." These items were all located in the original subscale Quest for Power. Items which referred blatantly to prejudiced attitudes such as: If certain

groups get knocked around a bit, it's mostly because they've had it coming" may have achieved lower scores because of the social desirability issue. Similarly, politically correct responses may have been given to such items as "It's important that we are all helping to make the world a better place. When items tap into the fundamental American values of economic competitiveness, entitlement and acquisition of power there is a strong mean response.

In attempting to conceptualize the whole scale from another vantage point, there appeared to emerge a theme of "insularity," that is, a self protective stance versus an expansive one. The items were reviewed also by a psychometrist, who suggested that the instrument appeared to be assessing a personality characteristic related to "defensiveness", and a sociologist familiar with the study, who perceived that the instrument was addressing self esteem/self confidence issues.

Summary

The initial results of the reliability analysis of the instrument Barriers to Community proved satisfactory. The results of the validity studies, the convergent and discriminant validity studies in particular, were unsatisfactory. Therefore, it is not yet possible to state conclusively the nature of the construct Barriers to Community. It may be that the instrument is not an attitude scale, but more closely related to a values scale, or a worldview scale, and therefore the choice of attitude measures for the convergent/discriminant studies would have been inappropriate. The possible relationship of the Barriers to Community instrument to values and worldview will be discussed in the concluding chapter of this study.

CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS, RECOMMENDATIONS

"By working up a rage against you, I am defending everything that is unique about me. It is a matter of self preservation." (Berman, 1994, p.61) Inherent in these words is the paradox highlighted by Hoare (1991, p.45) : "Identity...carries the seeds of prejudice."

While the quotations above depict the current state of reality, contemporary leadership theory and rhetoric defines itself as a collaborative effort, based in community, purposefully guided by a mutual vision of a better world for all. In an effort to explore the interface between reality and vision, prejudice and leadership, the instrument Barriers to Community was developed through the Retroductive Triangulation process. The process allowed for an exploration of the construct prejudice with the intent to contribute further to the understanding of the phenomenon in society. Through a synthesis of the theoretical, empirical, and experiential knowledge obtained from an extensive review of the literature and a qualitative study, a framework was developed upon which an instrument was built. A 30 item tool was the result. While the framework informed the theoretical understanding of prejudice, the instrument was meant to assess the occurrence of the identified aspects of prejudice in a given group. The ultimate purpose of the Barriers to Community project was to examine the implications of the findings for educational and training interventions. Therefore the discussion which follows will address two separate and related facets of the

study: a) methodological issues and the instrument development process; and, b) meaning and implications of the findings.

Instrument Development

The analysis of the 30 item Barriers to Community instrument demonstrated psychometric properties mixed in strength and clarity. While the overall instrument showed good reliability and subdimension reliabilities and some construct validity through factor analysis, the results of the convergent and discriminant validity study were unsatisfactory. Therefore, it is impossible to state conclusively that the Barriers to Community scale does indeed identify and measure aspects of prejudice. A re-examination of the components of the study is warranted.

The Qualitative Study and the Theoretical and Empirical Triangulation

Every attempt was made to design and implement a rigorous qualitative study. Indeed, a diverse sample population was interviewed, diverse in age, occupation, race, ethnicity and location with a commonality in terms of expert knowledge and practice. The tape recorded interviews were documented verbatim and analyzed, and data saturation was reached, that is, information and themes became redundant. There may however, be an inherent methodological flaw. In interviewing "experts," access is gained to their theoretical and experiential knowledge. What is accessed also, is their worldview and an individual disposition to self integration and transcendence. While, the lack of a transcendent orientation (Myers et al., 1991) and an integrated self identity (Hoare, 1991) are associated also with the occurrence of prejudice in the literature, the operational dilemma of formulating effective items in these categories proved daunting in this study. Items based in authentic

verbalizations of those who not only espouse but attempt to live in a self integrated, transcendent fashion whether they be "experts" or theoreticians, were not able to elicit consistent responses from the test population. The implications of these results are twofold. First, the concepts self integration and transcendence must be examined and re-defined more carefully. None of the items in the self integration dimension survived psychometric testing. Equally important and elusive is the task of effectively inquiring into levels of self awareness, security, and extrinsic versus intrinsic motivations without the contaminating factor of social desirability, of a population who may not be fully conversant within themselves of these issues. While several items in the transcendent dimension did survive how influenced the responses were by the social desirability factor is uncertain as items in the transcendent category reflect aspects of the espoused morality of American society.

Recommendation #1 suggests a re-examination and a redefinition of the concepts self integration and transcendence and a rewording of more items in a negative direction.

Dempster (1991) commented on the lack of qualitative research related to the concept autonomy in practice which she investigated. The same might be said about prejudice. Much of the current literature is devoted to theoretical discussion and analysis of the research which is experimental in nature. No research was encountered in the area of prejudice which used a qualitative, emergent approach such as the one used in this study. However, the parameters of discovery were also limited in this study by the methodological framework. The sample of experts was recruited. Research questions were pre-determined. The thematic interview guide, see (Appendix C), a series of questions designed to ensure consistency among the interviews was constructed in advance. Therefore, the "qualitative" component

was governed to a great extent by pre-existing knowledge and cannot be said to be truly emergent.

Recommendation #2 involves an expansion and modification of the qualitative component of this process.

An ethnographic approach to the study of prejudice would bring the researcher into contact not only with those who fight prejudice but also with those who have been identified as living it. Out of this expanded ecological base clearer behavioral parameters could be established resulting in a scale similar to that developed by Hett (1991) to assess Globalmindedness.

Recommendation #3 includes the development of a separate behavioral scale to assess prejudice. Behaviors are most accessible to change. They are visible and lend themselves to documentation and confrontation. Behaviors are the access point of attitudes and beliefs. They are the problematic interface among people. It is through behaviors that prejudice becomes discrimination.

Psychometric Testing

The results of the content validity study demonstrated a CVI of .94 for the whole scale and a range of .92 to .98 for the subdimensions, reducing the scale from 78 to 58 items. The comments from the five judges in a variety of disciplines focused primarily on the self integration and transcendence subscales, identifying conceptual overlaps, alternative interpretations of items, and the possible relationship of items to phenomena other than prejudice. It is noteworthy that two judges who had agreed originally to examine the scale found themselves unable to complete the task due to a philosophical stance which opposed

the study of prejudice in a quantitative manner. They were subsequently replaced with two alternate judges.

The instrument was piloted on twenty-seven business graduate students from a local university. After minor procedural revisions, it was administered to four hundred and fifteen subjects in twelve separate educational and training settings in the San Diego area.

The initial reliability study showed good overall reliability (Cronbach Alpha) of .86 exceeding the minimum of .70 suggested by Nunnally (1978) for a tool under development. The subscales Self Integration and Transcendence failed to meet this criteria and many items were deleted at this stage. The standardized item alpha, after further deletion of items through factor analysis was .87.

The results of the four successive factor analyses did not support a strongly multi-dimensional instrument with the exception of four items, all others loaded onto the first factor at the assigned minimum value of .35 and above. Nevertheless, upon re-examination of the items, two of the four proposed dimensions Experiential Agility and Quest for Power had remained intact. The items were reorganized subsequently to reflect a theoretically two dimensional tool, submitted to a correlational analysis which yielded a moderate correlation of .57 between the two subscales. The final result was a 30 item instrument.

The results of the discriminant and convergent validity study proved inconclusive and, potentially most enriching. While various alternative explanations were proposed in the results section, it appears that the resulting instrument may be related to a scale of values or a world view scale. The researcher struggled with the conceptual blurring and definition of the concept "attitude" from the inception of the study. The intent of the study was to identify

underlying predispositions in the individual which might be associated with prejudice and its manifestations. Though controversial, the attempt was to create a "cultural general" instrument in that there would be no mention of specific groups, the belief being that the underlying predispositions leading to prejudice, regardless of the target group would be the same. Yet inherent in the definition of attitude and attitude scales are target groups. The Right Wing Authoritarian Scale, an attitudinal scale was chosen to assess convergent validity. The lack of correlation may be explained on two counts. The Barriers to Community Scale and the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale examine different levels (orders) of identity formation. In Allport's (1950) scheme, philosophical assumptions, world view and values represent more fundamental levels of identity than attitudes. Even if the Right Wing Authoritarian Scale had demonstrated acceptable reliability in the sample population, it now appears that the scales are addressing different constructs.

Prejudice is a complex phenomenon. The correlation of high authoritarianism with prejudice does not mean that all prejudice is associated with authoritarianism. Therefore, **Recommendation #4 suggests a fuller investigation into empirical instruments designed to address values and world view and subsequent re-testing of the instrument for convergent and divergent validity.**

Meaning and Implications of the Findings

The relevant research questions which framed this research will form the context for the discussion of the theoretical and practical implications of the findings.

Question #1 What is prejudice ?

A working definition of prejudice, seen in chapter four was created from a synthesis of the theoretical and qualitative data. If the instrument resulting from this study is taken as a reflection of the construct under investigation prejudice is a set of negative beliefs and behaviors toward others held by those with an insular orientation in which the evaluative measure for inclusion is based in the Western world view of human worthiness.

Question #2 What is the nature of prejudice that leads to Barriers to Community?

Prejudice by its nature is an exclusionary orientation which defines those who do not demonstrate adequately core western values of successful competition and productivity, as unworthy of full participation in society.

Question #3 What research has been done on facets related to prejudice .

Question #5 What variables does the literature suggest might be predictors of prejudice?

Question #6 What beliefs and behaviors do theorists and practitioners who study and work with the concept prejudice associate with prejudicial beliefs and behaviors?

Myrdal (1944) framed the American dilemma as the conflict between espoused values and values in action. Bellah et al.(1985) lamented the loss of community to the spirit of individualism and contemporary prejudice researchers have identified the tension which results from conflict between egalitarian values and deeply rooted racist beliefs. Duality and paradox are the themes which unite these realities. Duality and paradox are visible in the "Barriers to Community" questionnaire. Items which addressed fundamental values of individualism, competition, and superiority elicited strong responses in the direction hypothetically associated with prejudice. Those items which addressed communitarian

values of co-operation and care elicited responses which grouped in a non-prejudiced direction.

The current research in order to understand and resolve such dilemmas poses the fundamental question about prejudice to be one of causation. Research points to a distinction between personal and collective orientations to prejudice which is paralleled in the functional analyses of the origins of prejudice. Some forms of prejudice are an expression of personal needs, motivations, or experience, while others are expressions of collective identity. (Brewer, 1994). Snyder and Miene (1994) proposed that prejudice and discrimination serve a variety of functions. The ego-defensive function, rooted in a psychodynamic perspective, suggests that prejudice which involves the derogation of others through downward social comparison bolsters self esteem. Inherent in the judgement of the socially or economically disenfranchised is a belief in their innate deficiency, a deficiency not shared by the judge and who therefore escapes a similar peril. A structural function proposes that prejudice is an expression of underlying value systems, for example, the Protestant ethic, as explored in the theory of Symbolic or Modern Racism. (McConahay, 1986). These expressions of values help foster and solidify values as defining features of personal identities. The function of detachment which allows the prejudiced to detach themselves from their targets is especially evident in situations of intergroup socio-economic disequilibrium. "Detachment allows members to justify inequitable relationships if people can be seen somehow as deserving their misfortune, the need for individual or collective action is eliminated" (Snyder and Miene, 1994, p. 48). The causation inquiry asks if structures determine the nature of the

evaluation of others, or do structures simply provide the vehicle through which underlying psychological forces are played out.

The Barriers to Community project suggests that all three functions may be at play, that dichotomies and dilemmas exist simultaneously one with the other, and not in a linear, causal fashion, but in a dynamic, dialectic relationship.

Recommendation # 5 would be to attempt to assess levels of self esteem independently of the Barriers to Community instrument through existing means or the development of new ones and compare the results with responses to Barriers to Community.

Recommendation #6 suggests an examination of the detachment function in experimental situations.

A partitioned understanding of prejudice would claim that interventions must differ depending on whether personal or group based perceptions are targeted. The Barriers to Community project suggests that personal and group perceptions are interdependent. Therefore, an integrated intervention approach would be most effective.

Myers (1984, 1988) provides a meta-level understanding of the roots and dynamics of prejudice in her discussion of the Western world view. She describes this worldview as a "sub-optimal" faulty conceptual system which is oppressive to all who participate in it. The essence of this world view is the Cartesian split of mind from matter. According to Harman (1992) the scientific/economic world order is the result of this split in which sources of self worth and power become externalized capturing both victim and victimizer in the all encompassing web of oppression. "Individuals with sub-optimal socialization turn outside themselves for meaning, peace, and value. This orientation sets them up to search for

someone better than them... An extrinsic orientation and the need to be better than, is the basis for all society's 'isms'." (Myers, 1988, p. 561)

Although Rokeach, Ball Rokeach (1989) and Sampson (1989) concurred in their findings that values priorities among Americans show a shift toward greater individualism and autonomy, the values confrontation technique of Rokeach (1973) in which value discrepancies in the individual are confronted, has shown some success in promoting behavior which demonstrates community concern. (Ball Rokeach et al., 1984)

Summary of the Research

Current theory and research approaches the study of prejudice as a multi-faceted phenomenon with multi-causal roots in personal and group domains. The concept of world view, as a complex of guiding assumptions, beliefs, and values provides an integrating framework for understanding prejudice as a dynamic interplay among forces requiring an integrated intervention approach. It is within this context that the Barriers to Community instrument may prove its usefulness.

Implications for Education and Training Interventions

The Barriers to Community instrument was intended to serve as a self assessment tool for those participating in prejudice reduction and team-building training programs in a variety of organizational settings. It was especially intended for use by those who had developed a level of self awareness and who were serving or would potentially serve in supervisory, managerial and leadership capacities. The instrument appears to access not only values, beliefs and behaviors characterizing the sub-optimal economically based Western world view which is becoming the world order, but also the optimal world view, which

recognizes human interconnectedness and interdependence. The debriefing sessions following the initial testing demonstrated the instrument as an effective catalyst for self exploration and examination of value systems.

Recommendation #7 proposes that the Barriers to Community questionnaire be examined, adapted, and retested for application in the Rokeach values confrontation technique to explore and highlight values discrepancies inherent in responses to the instrument.

Reflections on an Instrument Development Methodology as a Means for Exploring a Complex Human Construct

Questions have been raised in the literature about the appropriateness and effectiveness of using conscious self report measures in the assessment of prejudice. This methodology may fail to capture the multi-directional relationships among affect, cognition and experience. Issues of neutral mood, issues of social desirability, levels of self awareness and absence of consequences all play roles in confounding the meanings and interpretations of questionnaire results. Silverman (1974) reported that responses can differ dramatically when behavioral consequences are attached, and, underlined the importance of moving beyond a reliance on cost free questionnaire measures of proscribed prejudice.

During the Barriers to Community study, it occurred to the researcher that there existed within the project an inherent paradox. To attempt to distill, to quantify and to categorize elements of a complex human phenomenon was to perpetuate the very roots of the phenomenon under study. If causality is located in a fragmenting, scientific paradigm, then inquiry into human phenomena must take this into account. The Retroductive Triangulation

process, in its reliance on qualitative as well as quantitative methodology does honor the human focus of the project. The resulting questionnaire must be used with care, not with an emphasis on measurement, but as a catalyst to exploration and self assessment and as one aspect in an integration intervention approach.

Conclusion

Those who lament the loss of community spirit to the zeitgeist of individualism, materialism, and human dissonance may need to reconsider their despair. The human species may be participating in an evolutionary project of vast dimension. It may be that what appeared to be community may have been an infancy stage of unconscious merging in the service of basic needs. Humans may now be in a collective adolescence, with a focus on separation, differentiation and self awareness. It may only be through this developmental process that humans can emerge into a third age of self aware integration into community. Jung proposed that the first half of life was devoted to establishing the self in the external world, while the second half was devoted to the development of spirituality, and the inner world. An integrated intervention approach to building community would assist in developing interiority, would assist in identifying sources of intrinsic worth, uniqueness, and purpose. Such an approach would identify world view, not "the other," as the source of insecurity, fragmented self development, feelings of vulnerability and fear. Such an approach would assist in seeing "the other," not as threat, but in his or her differences, as a reflection of those parts of ourselves which have been lost or disowned. Interaction, collaboration and mutual learning with "the other" can

assist in reintegrating or forming anew that which was lost or never was: the whole person.

Adorno (1950) named the culture industry as the most effective instrument in perpetuating a mechanistic mentality. Yet within the most powerful arm of this industry, there is hope. In March 1994, four of the five motion pictures nominated for this industry's most important honor, have concerned themselves entirely with issues of oppression, racial, ethnic, gender and sexual oppression and with human rights, human dignity and human courage. Those involved in any capacity in prejudice reduction and building community are engaged in a therapeutic process. Their charge is healing the split. "Never doubt that a small group of thoughtful, committed citizens can change the world. Indeed, it is the only thing that ever has." (Margaret Mead)

REFERENCES

- Ackermann, N., & Jahoda, M. (1950). Anti-Semitism and emotional disorder. New York: Harper.
- Adorno, T. (1967). Prisms. London: Neville Spearman.
- Adorno, T. Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). The authoritarian personality. New York: Harper.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Cambridge: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, R. (1988a). Enemies of freedom: understanding right wing authoritarianism. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Altemeyer, R. (1981). Right wing authoritarianism. Winnipeg: University of Manitoba Press.
- Anastasi, A. (1988). Psychological testing. New York: Macmillan.
- Ashmore, R., & DelBoca, F. (1976). Psychological approaches to understanding intergroup conflict. In P. Katz (Ed.) Towards the elimination of racism. (pp. 73-123). New York: Pergamon.
- Bagley, C., Verma, G., Mallick, K., & Young, L. (1979). Personality, self esteem and prejudice. Westmead, England: Saxon House.
- Ball-Rokeach, S. J., Rokeach, M., & Grube, J. W. (1984). The great American values test. Psychology, 18 34-41.
- Barnard, W. A., & Benn, M. S. (1987). Belief congruence and prejudice reduction in an interracial contact setting. The Journal of Social Psychology, 128(1), 125-134.
- Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). Habits of the heart. New York: Harper and Row.

- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). Leaders. New York: Harper and Row.
- Berger, E. (1952). The relation between expressed acceptance of self and expressed acceptance of others. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology. 47. 778-782.
- Berkowitz, L. (1969). Roots of aggression: A re-examination of the frustration-aggression hypothesis. New York: Atherton Press.
- Berman, J. (1994). The other and almost the same. (pp. 61-71). The New Yorker. February 28.
- Brewer, M.B. (1994). The social psychology of prejudice: Getting it all together. In P. Zanna and J. M. Olson. The psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium, volume 7. (pp. 315-329). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Billig, M. (1985). Prejudice, categorization, and particularization: from a perceptual to a rhetorical approach. European Journal of Social Psychology. 15, 79-103.
- Billig, M. (1978). Fascists: A social psychological view of the National Front. London: Academic.
- Brigham, J. C. (1972). Racial stereotypes: Measurement variables and the stereotype attitude relationship. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 2(1) 63-76.
- Budner, S., (1962). Intolerance of ambiguity as a personality variable. Journal of Personality. 30 29-50.
- Burns, J. (1978). Leadership. New York: Harper and Row.
- Campbell, A. (1971). White attitudes toward black people. Ann Arbor: Institute for Social Research.

- Chan, K. S. (1987). The production effect of discrimination: A conceptual investigation. Journal of Economic Behavior and Organization. 8, 307-314.
- Chein, I. (1981). Appendix: An introduction to sampling. In L. H. Kidder. (Ed.) Sellitz, Wrightsman and Cook's research methods in social relations. (4th ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.
- Coopersmith, S. (1967). The antecedents of self-esteem. San Francisco: W.H. Freeman.
- Corcoran, K., and Fischer, J. (1987). Measures for clinical practice: A sourcebook. New York: The Free Press.
- D'Angelo, E. (1971). The teaching of critical thinking Amsterdam: B. R. Gruner.
- Dempster, J. (1990). Autonomy in practice: Conceptualization, construction and psychometric evaluation of an empirical instrument. (Doctoral dissertation, University of San Diego, 1990). Dissertation Abstracts International, 51, 3320B.
- Devine, P. G., & Monteith, M. J. (in press). The role of discrepancy associated affect in prejudice reduction. In D. M. Mackie & D. L. Hamilton. (Eds.) Affect, cognition and stereotyping: interactive processes in intergroup perception. Orlando: Academic Press.
- Devine, P. G., Monteith, M. J., Zuwerink, J. R., & Elliot, A.J. (1991). Prejudice with and without compunction. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 60, 817-830.
- Devine, P. G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic controlled components. Journal of Applied Personality and Social Psychology. 56(1), 5-18.
- Dexter, L. A. (1970). Elite and specialized interviewing. Evanston ILL: Northwestern University.

- Dixon, J. (1986). Grouping techniques. In B. H. Munro, M. A. Visintainer, & E. B. Page. (Eds.) Statistical methods for health care research. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott.
- Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., Anastasio, P. A., & Santioso, R. (1992). Cognitive and motivational bases of bias. In S. B. Knouse, P. Rosenfeld, A. L. Culbertson (Eds.) Hispanics in the workplace. Newbury Park: London.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). The social psychology of prejudice. Praeger: New York.
- Duckitt, J. (1991). Prejudice and racism. In D. Foste and J. Louw-Potgieter (Eds.) Social Psychology in South Africa. (pp. 171-203). Isando, South Africa: Lexicon.
- Duckitt, J. (1989). Authoritarianism and group identification: A new view of an old construct. Political Psychology, 10, 63--84
- Edwards, A. L. (1941). Unlabelled fascist attitudes. Journal of Abnormal Social Psychology 36, 575-582.
- Ellsworth, E. (1989). Why doesn't this feel empowering? Working through the repressive myths of critical pedagogy. Harvard Educational Review. 59(3), 297-324.
- Erlich, H. J. (1973). The social psychology of prejudice. New York: Wiley.
- Espin, O. M. & Gawelek, M. A. (1990) Women's diversity: Ethnicity, race, and gender in theories of feminist psychology. In M. Ballou and L. Brown (Eds.) Theories of personality and psychopathology: Feminist reappraisals. New York: Guilford Press.
- Fay, B. (1987). Critical social science. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.
- Ferrar, J. W. (1976). The dimensions of tolerance. Pacific Sociological Review 19(1) 63-81.
- Fiske, S. T. & Taylor, S. E. (1984). Social cognition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Foster, W. (1986). Paradigms and promises. Buffalo: Prometheus.

- Freire, P. (1972). Pedagogy of the oppressed. New York: Herder and Herder.
- Gaertner, S. L. & Dovidio, J. F. (1986). The Aversive form of racism. In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner. (Eds.) Prejudice, discrimination and racism. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gardiner, G. (1972). Complexity training and prejudice reduction. Journal of Applied Social Psychology. 2(4), 326-342.
- Gilligan, C. (1982). In a different voice. Cambridge: Harvard University Press.
- Glaser, B. G. & Strauss, A. L. (1967) The Discovery of grounded theory. Chicago: Aldine.
- Glock, C., Wuthnow, R., Piliavin, J., & Spencer, M. (1975). Adolescent prejudice. New York: Harper and Row.
- Goetz, J. P. & Lecompte, M. D. (1984). Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Gough, H. G. (1957). California psychological inventory manual. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Grote, K. (1991). The Diversity awareness profile. San Diego: Pfeiffer and Company.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y. S. (1982). Epistemological and methodological bases of naturalistic inquiry. In G. F. Madeus, M. Scriven, & D. L. Stufflebeam (Eds.) Evaluation Models. Boston: Kluwer-Nijhoff.
- Guba, E. G. & Lincoln, Y.S. (1981). Effective evaluation. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Guba, E. G. (1978). Toward a methodology of naturalistic inquiry in educational evaluation. CSE Monograph Series in Evaluation. No. 8 Los Angeles: University of California, Los Angeles: Center for the Study of Evaluation.

- Gurevitch, Z. D. (1989). The power of not understanding: The meeting of conflicting identities. Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 25(2), 161-173.
- Hammer, A. L. (1985). Typing or stereotyping? Unconscious bias in applications of psychological type. Journal of Psychological Type, 10, 14-19.
- Harman, W. (1988). Global mind change. Indianapolis: Knowledge Systems.
- Handler, J. M. (1966). An attempt to change kindergarten children's attitudes of prejudice toward the Negro. Ed.D. Dissertation: Columbia University.
- Harding, J., Proshansky, H., Kutner, B., & Chein, I. (1969). Prejudice and ethnic relations. In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson (Eds.), The Handbook of Social Psychology, 5 (pp. 1-76). Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Held, D. (1980). Introduction to critical theory. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Herek, G. M. (1987). Can functions be measured? A new perspective on the functional approach to attitudes. Social Psychology Quarterly, 50(4), 285-303.
- Hett, E. J. (1991) The development of an instrument to measure global-mindedness. (Doctoral Dissertation, University of San Diego, 1991).
- Higgins, E. T. (1987). Self discrepancy theory: A theory relating self and affect. Psychological Review, 94. 319-340
- Hirsch, S. K. (1985). Using the Myers-Briggs Type indicator in organizations. Palo Alto: Consulting Psychologists Press.
- Hoare, C. H. (1991). Psychosocial identity development and cultural others. Journal of Counseling and Development 70, 45-53.

- Hochschild, J. L. (1986). Dimensions of liberal self satisfaction: Civil liberties, liberal theory, and elite mass differences. Ethics, 96(2), 386-399.
- Jackman, M. R. (1978) General and applied tolerance: Does education increase commitment to racial integration? American Journal of Political Science,22, 302-324.
- Jahoda, M. (1975). The roots of prejudice. New Community, 4, 179-187.
- Johnson, D. and Johnson, R. (1989). Cooperation and competition: Theory and research. Edina, Minnesota: Interaction Book Company.
- Johnson, D., & Johnson, R. (1975). Learning together and alone. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Jung, C. G. (1971). Psychological types. Bollingen Series XX. The Collected Works of C. G. Jung, 6. Princeton: Princeton University Press.
- Jung, C. G. (1957). The undiscovered self. (R.F.C. Hull, Trans.). New York: Penguin.
- Kagan, J., & Havemann, E. (1968). Psychology: An introduction. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Jovanovitch.
- Karlins, M. Coffman, T. L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13(5).
- Katz, I., Wackenhut, J., & Hass, R. G. (1986). Racial ambivalence, value duality and behavior In J. F. Dovidio & S. L. Gaertner (Eds.). Prejudice, discrimination and racism. Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- Kelley, C. and Meyers, J. E. (1992). Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory. Instrument and manual distributed by Human Relations Consultants, La Jolla, CA.

- King, C. S. (Ed.) (1983). The words of Martin Luther King, Jr. New York: Newmarket Press.
- Larsen, K. S., Elder, R., Bader, M., & Dougard, C. (1980) Authoritarianism and attitudes toward AIDS victims. Journal of Social Psychology, 130(1), 77-80.
- Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985), Naturalistic inquiry. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Lindzey, G., (Ed.) (1985). Handbook of social psychology. New York: Alfred Knopf.
- MacIntyre, A. (1984). After virtue. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press.
- Marcuse, H. (1969). Eros and civilization. London: Sphere Books.
- Massarik, F. (1981). The interviewing process re-examined. In P. Reason & J. Rowan (Eds.), Human inquiry: A sourcebook of new paradigm research. New York: John Wiley.
- McClosky, H., & Brill, A. (1983). Dimensions of tolerance: What Americans believe about civil liberties. New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McClosky, H. (1958). Conservatism and personality. American Political Science Review, 52, 27-45.
- McConahay, J. B. (1986). Modern racism, ambivalence and the modern racism scale. In J. F. Dovidio, and S. L. Gaertner (Eds.), Prejudice, discrimination and racism Orlando, FL: Academic Press.
- McConahay, J. B., Hardee, B. B., & Batts, V. (1981). Has racism declined in America? Journal of Conflict Resolution, 25, 563-579.
- McConahay, J. B., & Hough, J. C., Jr. (1976). Symbolic racism. Journal of Social Issues, 32, 23-45.

- Merriam, S. B. (1988). Case study research in education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Milgram, S. (1974). Obedience to authority. New York: Harper and Row.
- Miller, J. B. (1986). Toward a new psychology of women. (3rd ed.). Boston: Beacon Press.
- Monteith, M. J., Devine, P. G., & Zuwerink, J. R. (1992). Stereotypes and prejudice: Replacing the old with the new. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.) Social Cognition: Contributions to classic issues in social psychology. New York: Springer-Verlay.
- Moreland, R.L & Levine, J. M. (1982). Socialization in small groups: Temporal changes in individual-group relations. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology, 2, pp. 137-192. New York: Academic.
- Morris, C. G. (1982) Psychology: An introduction. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Morrison, A. M. (1992). The new leaders. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Myers, L. J. (1984). The psychology of knowledge: The importance of worldview. The New England Journal of Black Studies. 4, pp. 1-12.
- Myers, L.J. (1988). Understanding an Afrocentric worldview: Introduction to an optimal psychology. Dubuque, IA: Kendall/Hunt.
- Myers, L. J., Speight, S. L., Highlen, P. S., Cox, C. I., Reynolds, A. L., Adams, E. M. & Hanley, C. P. (1991). Identity development and worldview: Toward an optimum conceptualization. Journal of Counseling and Development, 70, 54-63.
- Myrdal, G. (1944). An American dilemma: The Negro problem and modern democracy. New York: Random House.
- Neumann, E. (1973). Depth psychology and a new ethic. New York: Harper Torchbooks.

- Newman, J. (1979). Prejudice as prejudgement. Ethics, 90, 47-57.
- Newsweek, February 26, 1979.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Papalia, D. E., & Olds, S. W. (1985). Psychology. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Pate, G. S. (1988). Research on reducing prejudice. Social Education, 52(4) 287-289.
- Patton, M. Q. (1990). Qualitative and evaluation research methods. Newbury Park: Sage.
- Pierce, R. (1989, November). Conflict and peacemaking: Implications for individuation.
Address to The friends of Jung, San Diego, CA.
- Prothro, E. T. (1952). Ethnocentrism and anti-Negro attitudes in the deep south. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47, 105-108.
- Quayhagen, M. P. & Quayhagen, M. (1988) Retroductive triangulation: A method for instrument development. (Abstract). The Measurement of Clinical and Education Nursing Outcomes Conference, 45.
- Ray, J. J. (1974). Introduction. In J. J. Ray. (Ed.), Conservatism as heresy. Sydney: ANZ Book Co.
- Rokeach, M., & Ball-Rokeach, S. J. (1989). Stability and change in American value priorities: 1968-1981. American Psychologist, 44(5), 775-784.
- Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. New York: Free Press.
- Rokeach, M. (1960). The open and closed mind. New York: Basic Books.
- Rost, J.C. (1991). Leadership for the twenty-first century. New York: Praeger.
- Sampson, E. E. (1989). The challenge of social change for psychology. American Psychologist, 44(6), 914-921.

- Schatzman, M. (1971). *Madness and morals*. In R. Boyers & R. Orrill (Eds.), R. D. Laing and anti-psychiatry. New York: Harper and Row.
- Schuman, H., & Bobo, L. (1988). Survey based experiments in white racial attitudes toward residential integration. American Journal of Sociology, 94, 273-299.
- Sears, D. O. & Kinder, D. R. (1985). Whites' opposition to busing: On conceptualizing and operationalizing "group conflict." Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48, 1141-1147.
- Silverman, B. I. (1974). Consequences, racial discrimination and the principle of belief congruence. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 29, 497-508.
- Simpson, G. E., & Yinger, J. M. (1985). Racial and cultural minorities: An analysis of prejudice and discrimination. (5th ed.), New York: Plenum.
- Sigelman, L. & Welch, S. (1984). Race, gender and opinion toward black and female presidential candidates. Public opinion quarterly, 48, 467-475.
- Snyder, M. & Miene, P. (1994). On the functions of stereotypes and prejudice.. In M.P. Zanna & J. M. Olson . (Eds.). The social psychology of prejudice: The Ontario symposium, 7, 33-54. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Solomon, C. (1989). The corporate response to work force diversity. Personnel Journal, 43-53.
- Stember, C. (1961). Education and attitude change. New York: New York Institute of Human Relations Press.
- Strauss, A., Schatzman, L., Bucher, R., & Sabshin, M. (1981). Psychiatric ideologies and institutions. (2nd ed.), New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

- Taifel, H., & Turner, J. C. (1979). An integrated theory of intergroup conflict. In W. Austin & S. Worchel (Eds.), The social psychology of intergroup relations, pp. 33-47, Monterey: CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Taifel, H. (1970). Experiments in intergroup discrimination. Scientific American, 223, 96-102.
- Taifel, H. (1969). Cognitive aspects of prejudice. Journal of Social Issues, 25, 79-97
- Taylor, D. G., Sheatsley, P. B., & Greeley, A.M. (1978). Attitudes toward racial integration. Scientific American. 238, 42-49..
- Thomas, R. R. (1990). From affirmative action to affirming diversity. Harvard Business Review, 107-117.
- Walsh, D. (1988). Critical thinking to reduce prejudice. Social Education, 52(4), 280-282.
- Waltz, C. F., Strickland, O. L., & Lenz, E. R. (1991). Measurement in nursing research. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.
- Watts, P. (1987). Bias busting: diversity training in the workplace. Management Review, 51-54.
- Weigel, R. H., Loomis, J. W. & Soja, M. J. (1980). Race relations on prime time television. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 888.
- Westie, F. R. (1964). Race and ethnic relations. In R. E. L. Faris, (Ed.), Handbook of Modern Sociology, pp. 576-618. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Wills, T. A. (1981). Downward comparison principles. Social Psychology Bulletin, 90, 255-257.
- Wilson, G. D. (Ed.) (1973). The Psychology of conservatism. New York: Academic

Wilson, G. D., & Patterson, J. R. (1968). A new measure of conservatism. British Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology, 7, 264-269.

Wittenberg-Cox, A. (1991) Delivering global leaders. International Management. 52-55.

Zeller, R. A., & Carmines, E. G. (1980). Measurement in the social sciences. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Ziller, R. (1976). A helical theory of personal change. In R. Haire (Ed.) Personality. Oxford: Blackwell.

APPENDICES

Appendix A. Summary of Theoretical Literature: Prejudice

<u>Reference and Definition</u>	<u>Identified Dimensions</u>
Wackenhut and Hass (1986) Bellah et al. (1985) Myrdal (1944) part of the American dilemma	individualism vs. community interpersonal tension
Adorno et al. (1950) intrapsychic dynamics	authoritarianism, displacement
Rokeach (1960) information processing	open and closed systems of belief
Allport (1954) individual differences, behavioral perspective tolerance	threat orientation, moralism, need for definitions, externalization, authoritarianism empathy, self insight, tolerance for ambiguity.
Westie (1964) Proshansky (1966) a socio-cultural phenomena	conformity, socialization, conflict, power, domination
McConahay and Hough (1976) maintaining socio-economic status quo	symbolic racism
Taifel and Turner (1969) a cognitive process	Categorization, discrimination, stereotyping, competition
Duckitt (1992) a dialectic among psychological processes, intergroup dynamics, social transmission, individual differences	Displacement, belief similarity, projection, social categorization, conflict, competition, conformity, authoritarianism, frustration, intolerance of ambiguity, self esteem, political ideology.
Newman (1979) errors of fact, logic and values	prejudgement, stubbornness Self estrangement, fear, misunderstanding, human embeddedness
Fay (1987) humans create their own world interrelatedness of all things fully active human	care, sensitivity, ecological sense
Marcuse (1972) Freire (1972) freedom from oppression	rebellion, consciousness raising

<u>Reference and Definition</u>	<u>Identified Dimensions</u>
<p>Jung (in Pierce, 1989) Neumann (1973) alienation from the unconscious</p> <p> emphasis on logos</p> <p> principle of eros</p>	<p>projection</p> <p>conformity, obedience, scapegoating, displacement, hostility, narrowmindedness</p> <p>self assertion, love, relatedness, tolerance of ambiguity, compassion</p>
<p>Kagan and Havemann (1968) an attitude</p>	<p>irrational judgement, categorization, stereotyping, stubborn</p>
<p>Lindzey, (1985) a belief based in false assumptions and inadequate data</p>	<p>overgeneralization, cultural norms</p>
<p>Papalia and Olds (1985) an attitude</p>	<p>competition, conformity</p>
<p>Morris (1973) attempt to simplify the world</p>	<p>generalization, categorization</p>
<p>Berkowitz (1969) displacement of aggression</p>	<p>scapegoating</p>
<p>Espin and Gawelek (1990) participation in the structure of power</p>	<p>aggression</p>
<p>Miller (1986) Human treatment of difference</p>	<p>inequality, domination, oppression</p>
<p>Gilligan (1982) ethic of care</p>	<p>Relationship, responsibility, connection</p>
<p>Ellsworth (1989) hierarchical relationships</p>	<p>inclusion, connection</p>

<u>Reference and Definitions</u>	<u>Identified Dimensions</u>
Solomon (1989) identifying underlying assumptions	Descriptive accuracy
Wittenberg-Cox (1991) learning to learn	inquisitiveness
Thomas (1990) tolerance of individual difference	flexibility, egalitarianism, collaboration
Watts (1987) corporate culture as behavior modifier	Learning, communication, willingness
Gurevitch (1989) the power of not understanding	Dialogue, equal participation
Chan (1987) discrimination in the workplace	displacement, frustration, self esteem
Pate (1988) Positive attitude change	Empathy
Handler (1966) Gardiner (1972) prejudice reduction	critical thinking
D'Angelo (1971) Development of critical thinking	curiosity, objectivity, openmindedness, flexibility, respect
Johnson and Johnson (1975) Pate (1988) co-operative learning	appreciation of difference, democratic values, self esteem
Duckitt (1992) liberal education	Broadened intellectual and experiential perspectives

<u>Reference and Definitions</u>	<u>Identified Dimensions</u>
Glock (1975) cognitive sophistication	interest in intellectual pursuits, flexibility
Wilson (1973) orientation to change	conservatism, fear of uncertainty, fear of difference
Altemeyer (1981) authoritarianism	self righteousness, authoritarianism, fear of the world as a dangerous place.
McClosky and Brill (1983) intolerance	inflexibility, conformity, low self esteem
Ferrari (1976) tolerance	flexibility, critical thinking, acceptance, openness
Martin and Westie (1964) tolerance	tolerance of ambiguity, critical thinking, rationality, trust, compassion
Dovidio et al. (1992) aversive racism	categorization, self esteem, economic threat
Devine (1991) internal conflict, automatic activation controlled inhibition	stereotyping, externalization, empathy, compunction, cognitive capacity, guilt, self criticism
Bagley et al. (1979) generalized negative affect protection of identity and self worth	depression, anxiety, need for order need for personal and social power
Jahoda (1950) ego defense	projection, denial, displacement social aggression, self congruity
Erlich (1973) correlation of self and ethnic attitudes	

Appendix C. Thematic Interview Guide

- * What does the word prejudice mean to you?
- * What are some of the attitudes and beliefs you would expect from someone who is prejudiced?
- * What kinds of behaviors would you expect from someone who is prejudiced?
- * How does prejudice within the individual interfere with team-building and create barriers to community?
- * How does someone become less prejudiced?
- * What changes would you expect to see in someone who had participated in team-building and prejudice reduction programs?
- * What beliefs and behaviors seem to be the opposite of prejudice?
- * Do you consider your self to be prejudiced or unprejudiced? What experiences and beliefs have contributed to your current attitudes?
- * How do you feel we can reduce prejudice and barriers to community in our organizations?

Appendix D. Interviewee Consent Form

CONSENT FORM

I have been asked to participate in an interview related to my expertise in the areas of prejudice reduction and team-building as part of a study conducted by Anita Buckley Rogers, M.E.D. I understand the purpose of the study will be to develop a questionnaire which will identify components of prejudice which create barriers to the formation of community endeavors.

I am aware that the interview will take approximately one to one and one half hours. Other than minor fatigue, participation in this study should not involve any risks or discomfort. This study may serve as an opportunity to reflect on my knowledge and experience and affirm my expertise in these areas. The findings will provide valuable information for leadership study and practice, team-building and prejudice reduction efforts.

My participation in this study is entirely voluntary. I understand I may request that the tape recorder be turned off at any time so that I can speak "off the record". If I wish I can suspend the interview or withdraw from participating in the study at any time. I understand that all interview data will be kept confidential. Audiotapes will be destroyed after they are transcribed and interviews will be coded so names will never be used in reporting the data and anonymity will be preserved.

I understand what is expected of me and all my questions have been answered. If other questions or concerns arise, I may call Anita Buckley Rogers at (619) 260-4654, or 278-0938.

There are no other agreements, written or verbal, related to this study beyond that expressed on this consent form. I will receive a copy of this consent form.

I, the undersigned, understand the above explanations and consent to voluntarily participate in this research.

(Participant's Signature)

(Date/Time)

(Researcher's Signature)

(Date/Time)

Appendix E. Content Validity Form

ITEM CONTENT VALIDITY

Barriers to Community

Thank you for agreeing to serve as a content validity judge to assess items developed to measure components of prejudice as "Barriers to Community."

The instrument is being developed to gain further understanding of attitudes, beliefs and behaviors associated with prejudice which form barriers to community. It is hoped that the tool will be used for self assessment by people in organizations who are participating in team-building, diversity awareness, and prejudice reduction programs. The format for scaling will be a Likert type format with scoring of 4-completely agree, 3-agree, 2-disagree, 1-completely disagree.

The instrument development process involved an thorough review of the literature on prejudice and sixteen interviews with experts in prejudice reduction. Expertise was defined as extensive theoretical and experiential knowledge of prejudice and prejudice reduction. Four dimensions of prejudice emerged from these interviews which were supported by the literature: self integration, experiential agility, quest for power, transcendence.

Prejudice as a barrier to community is defined as a negative set of attitudes, beliefs and behaviors toward another person or group based on distorted or insufficient information. A person experiencing a readiness for prejudice lacks self reflection, a sense of belonging and a belief in self improvement. Internal fragmentation prohibits a sense of connection with humanity, leading to fear, a rigid self protective stance, and disentanglement of other.

A pool of items including attitudes and behaviors has been developed for each of the four dimensions which emerged from the interviews.

A definition of each dimension and quotations from the interviews are placed at the beginning of each scale for that dimension. These definitions and quotations should provide guidance in determining if the item seems a valid measure of that dimension.

Please rate each item for its validity in measuring the specific dimension of prejudice.

(Reverse) means the item should reflect the opposite of that dimension.

Check the box next to each item which best indicates its validity. The choice ranges from 4-completely valid to 1-completely invalid.

Any additional comments and suggestions you wish to write will be greatly appreciated.

Thank you very much for your time, attention and care.
Please proceed to the next page and begin:

Appendix F. Items Listed by Dimensions

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY

	4	3	2	1
<p>Self Integration: involves self reflection and an appreciation of self improvement; a sense of security about identity and place in the world; humility and an ability to accept criticism.</p> <p>"Must be grounded in self, know self." "Need to develop self awareness of my motivation, my intention." "A lack of self reflection, you're not doing any of your personal growth work." "What allows me to work on my prejudice is being comfortable with who I am." Trust, belief in my own reality.</p>				
	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
1. I am as hard on myself as I am on others.(Reverse)				
2. I rarely feel secure in my life.(Reverse)				
3. I have noticed that when I feel good about myself, I feel good about others.				
4. I don't like to spend too much time thinking about why I do things. (Reverse)				
5. I am willing to admit when I don't know the truth.				
6. When I fail, I usually can trace those failures back to external causes.(Reverse)				
7. I believe that love is earned. (Reverse)				
8. I find it almost impossible to take criticism.(Reverse)				
9. I'm afraid if I spend too much time with people who are different from me, I'll have to change. (Reverse)				
10. I usually ignore the feelings of others when I am accomplishing an important task. (Reverse)				
11. I am not responsible for hurting someone else's feelings if I didn't intend it. (Reverse)				
12. I have learned to catch my biased thoughts.				
13. I believe people are loveable apart from what they can give and do.				
14. Becoming self aware is a valuable lifelong task.				
15. In my interactions with people, I am on the lookout for subtle things I do which put barriers between us.				

<p><u>Experiential Agility</u>: an open perceptual lens; an attitude of curiosity leads to a quest for information; exposure and critical thinking leads to perception shifting, appreciation of differences and inclusive behaviors.</p> <p>"In getting more information, you can appreciate more, hopefully." "Again, the interest, did it expand?" "A willingness to engage". "People crossing lines to talk, ask questions." "A willingness to tolerate a sense of not knowing".</p>				
	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely valid
16. I generally approach new people or situations expecting the worst. (Reverse)				
17. Sometimes in talking with people I learn we have two different interpretations of the same thing.				
18. My first impressions of people are usually pretty accurate. (Reverse)				
19. My beliefs are not open to questioning. (Reverse)				
20. It takes time to know a person on many different levels.				
21. I consider myself hard-headed when it comes to ideas and people. (Reverse)				
22. I was taught to be suspicious of anyone who was very different. (Reverse)				
23. I am always interested in the chance to correct or refine my ideas about someone by talking with them.				
24. People ought to take a stand, listen, and then be willing to shift their stand.				
25. I find it difficult to understand most people with accents. (Reverse)				
26. I've been told I am pretty stubborn when it comes to changing my mind about anything. (Reverse)				
27. The more quickly I can figure out where people belong, the better I feel. (Reverse)				
28. I grew up being open and curious about others.				
29. I am comfortable working toward a solution even without knowing if there is one right answer.				
30. Because people are so complex, it takes a long time to get to know them.				
31. Most people fall into a few predictable patterns. (Reverse)				
32. As a youngster, my openness to people allowed me to see them as real and human.				

	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
33. If I have some doubts about a person or a group of people, I try to get more information before I conclude anything.				
34. I can usually tell what people are going to be like just looking at them. (Reverse)				
35. I don't see the need to have a lot of experience with different kinds of people. (Reverse)				
36. My first impressions of people are usually pretty accurate. (Reverse)				
37. In dealing with people, it's almost impossible to generalize from one situation to the next.				
38. We need to question the standards of promotion in our organizations when minorities consistently can't make the grade.				
39. I try to understand what someone else is trying to say before I agree or disagree.				
40. I try to understand what someone else is trying to say before I agree or disagree.				
41. I have very little time for people who don't basically see things the same way as I do. (Reverse)				
42. The best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the similar to my own. (Reverse)				
43. After working with different people, I find I take on new ways of doing things.				
44. Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another.				
45. I am curious about the differences among people.				

<p><u>Quest for Power</u>: involves a belief in scarcity; fear and threat compensated by an acquired sense of superiority; privilege is maintained through the exercise of power and oppression, bolstered by self righteousness, rationalization, avoidance behavior</p> <p>"Whole thing is about power possession". "Emphasis on competition, individual success along those lines." "When I think about racism, I think about our fear of loss of power." "People limit their experiences interpersonally." "Another motivation is the need to develop an inferior/superior relationship with others."</p>				
	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
46. When I meet someone new, I try to size him or her up to see how I am better.				
47. The truth is there isn't enough wealth to go around in this world.				
48. I find it hard to accept some minority groups as equals.				
49. I've worked hard and that gives me a right to rewards.				
50. I get a lot of satisfaction in proving I am right and someone else is wrong.				
51. When I compare myself with others, I am proud that I've accomplished more than most.				
52. If certain groups get knocked around a bit, it mostly because they've had it coming.				
53. There is always going to be a top dog and a bottom dog.				
54. I would advise my children to stick to their own kind when dating.				
55. I have worked hard to make it and I see no reason why others shouldn't work as hard.				
56. I think the best way to handle being around people who are really different from me is to be a little stand-offish.				
57. Those who don't make a contribution to society don't deserve the rewards.				
58. It upsets me to see our cultural and racial heritage get blurry through too much intermarriage.				
59. I am bothered by certain groups feeling they have a right to what I've earned.				
60. Having power is a way to get and keep what you want.				

	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
61. If everyone were alike, we wouldn't have the problems we have in this country.				
62. I measure a person's success by what they've achieved in money and position.				
63. I think ethnic jokes are funny because they capture the essence of people's cultural quirks.				
<p>Transcendence: a sense of unity with all humans; a belief that human interconnectedness is productive; having a sense of things beyond oneself to live for; a belief in service and abundance.</p> <p>"A sense of expectation about the world in general, a sense of unity." "Appeal to self interest. Must help people to see their connection to others is productive for them." "People who have a larger sense, a sense of continuity, take risks." "The sense of doing something or having something beyond oneself to live for". "A sincere belief that discontinuing racist practices benefits everyone."</p>				
	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
64. We can only rely on ourselves. (Reverse)				
65. It's important to me that we are all helping to make the world a better place.				
66. We cannot protect ourselves without protecting others.				
67. I believe in people.				
68. I grew up with a strong value of community service.				
69. We only go around once and my main purpose is getting the most I can from the world. (Reverse)				
70. I ask myself from time to time, what am I contributing to the world around me?				
71. The ways in which people are different can benefit all of us.				
72. I see life as a process without hard and fast rules.				
73. Because I have a sense of things that go beyond me, I am more able to take risks.				
74. If we don't care for all people, we will all suffer.				
75. Knowing I am making a positive difference in peoples' lives is important to me.				

	completely valid	valid	invalid	completely invalid
76. The world we live in is a lonesome place. (Reverse)				
77. Most people don't give a damn about others.				
78. Human nature being what it is there will always be war and conflict. (Reverse)				

Appendix H. Subjects Consent Form

University of San Diego

CONSENT TO ACT AS A RESEARCH SUBJECT

Anita Buckley Rogers, M.ED., is conducting a research study to find out more about the important components of my perceptions of others and my relationship with them.

If I agree to participate in the study, I will be asked to complete a demographic data sheet and four questionnaires which will take approximately 45 minutes.

I understand that I may not benefit from the study personally, but the new knowledge gained will help the investigator with further regarding interpersonal perception. Participation in this study should not involve any added risks or discomforts to me except for possible fatigue or minor psychological distress.

Anita Buckley Rogers had explained this study to me and answered my questions. If I have other questions or research-related problems, I may reach Anita Buckley Rogers at either 260-4654 or 278-0938.

Participation in this research is entirely voluntary. I may refuse to participate or withdraw at any time without jeopardy.

Research records will be kept completely confidential. My identity will not be disclosed without my written consent required by law. I further understand that to preserve anonymity only group data will be analyzed. There are no other agreements, written or verbal, related to this study beyond that expressed on this consent form.

Signature of Subject

Date

Location

Signature of Principle Researcher

Date

Appendix I. Demographic Profile

DEMOGRAPHIC PROFILE

Some information on your background and experience is required in order to analyzed the data on this survey. Please remember that your anonymity and confidentiality is maintained at all times, in that your name is not included in this profile and the information you provide will be included in group data only.

1. **SEX;** _____ Male _____ Female
2. **AGE:**
3. **MARITAL STATUS:** _____ Single'
 _____ Married
 _____ Divorced
 _____ Separated
 _____ Co-habiting
4. **HIGHEST LEVEL OF EDUCATION
 COMPLETED:** ----High School
 ----Vocational/Technical Training
 ____Undergraduate Degree 1--2--3--4
 ____Post-graduate --1--2--3--4 and over
5. **NUMBER OF YEARS IN THE WORK FORCE:**
 ____ 0-5
 ____ 6-10
 ____ 11-15
 ____ 16-20
 ____ 21 and over
6. **CURRENTLY EMPLOYED:** _____ Yes _____ No PARTTIME _____ FULLTIME _____
7. **TYPE OF ORGANIZATION:** _____
8. **OCCUPATION** _____
9. **HOW WOULD YOU DESCRIBE YOURSELF:** _____ African American
 _____ Native American/
 American Indian
 _____ Asian American/
 Pacific Islander
 _____ Chicano/Mexican
 American
 _____ Filipino
 _____ Latino/other
 Hispanic
 _____ White
 _____ Other

BARRIERS TO COMMUNITY

This is a survey of some of your attitudes and perceptions. There are no right or wrong answers to these statements. The best answer is the one you feel to be true for you. Please put a checkmark in the box which most closely represents your view on the statement.

	6	5	4	3	2	1
	disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly
1. I rarely feel secure in my life.						
2. I have noticed that when I feel good about myself, I feel good about others.						
3. I don't like to spend too much time thinking about why I do things.						
4. I am willing to admit when I don't know the truth.						
5. When I fail, I usually can trace those failures back to external causes.						
6. I find it almost impossible to take criticism.						
7. I'm afraid if I spend too much time with people who are different from me, I'll have to change.						
8. I am comfortable working toward a solution even without knowing if there is one right answer.						
9. I have learned to catch my biased thoughts.						
10. Becoming self aware is a valuable lifelong task.						
11. In my interactions with people, I am on the look-out for subtle things I do which put barriers between us.						
12. Most people fall into a few predictable patterns.						
13. Sometimes in talking with people I learn we have two different interpretations of the same thing.						
14. My first impressions of people are usually pretty accurate.						
15. My beliefs are not open to questioning.						

	disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly
16. It takes time to know a person on many different levels						
17. I consider myself hard-headed when it comes to ideas and people.						
18. I don't see the need to have a lot of experience with different kinds of people.						
19. I am always interested in the chance to correct or refine my ideas about someone by talking with them.						
20. People ought to take a stand, listen, and then be willing to shift their stand.						
21. I grew up being open and curious about others.						
22. I've been told I am pretty stubborn when it comes to changing my mind about anything.						
23. I can usually tell what people are going to be like just looking at them.						
24. If we don't care for all people, we will all suffer.						
25. Because people are so complex, it takes a long time to get to know them.						
26. The ways in which people are different can benefit all of us.						
27. We need to question our standards of promotion in our organizations when minorities consistently can't make the grade.						
28. If I have some doubts about a person or a group of people, I try to get more information before I conclude anything.						
29. I try to understand what someone else is trying to say before I agree or disagree.						
30. I have very little time for people who don't basically see things the same way as I do.						
31. When I meet new people I try to size them up to see how I may be better than them.						

	disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly
32. The truth is there isn't enough wealth to go around in this world.						
33. I get a lot of satisfaction in proving I am right and someone is wrong.						
34. When I compare myself with others I am proud that I've accomplished more than most.						
35. We cannot protect ourselves without protecting others.						
36. The best way to live is to pick friends and associates whose tastes and beliefs are the similar to my own.						
37. After working with different people, I find I take on new ways of doing things.						
38. Everyone should have a chance to learn about one another.						
39. I am curious about the differences among people.						
40. I find it hard to accept some minority groups as equals.						
41. We can only rely on ourselves.						
42. Knowing I am making a positive difference in peoples' lives is important to me.						
43. I've worked hard and that gives me a right to society's rewards.						
44. If certain groups get knocked around a bit, it is mostly they've had it coming.						
45. There is always going to be a top dog and a bottom dog.						
46. Because I have a sense of things that go beyond me, I am more able to take risks.						
47. I would advise my children to stick to their own kind when dating.						
48. I have worked hard to make it and I see no reason why others shouldn't work as hard.						

	disagree strongly	disagree somewhat	disagree slightly	agree slightly	agree somewhat	agree strongly
49. I think the best way to handle being around people who are really different from me is to be a little stand-offish.						
50. Those who don't make a contribution to society don't deserve the rewards.						
51. It upsets me to see our cultural and racial heritage get blurry through too much intermarriage.						
52. We only go around once and my main purpose is getting the most I can from the world.						
53. I am bothered by certain groups feeling they have a right to what I've earned.						
54. Having power is a way to get and keep what you want.						
55. If everyone were alike, we wouldn't have the problems we have in this country.						
56. I measure a person's success by what they've achieved in money and position.						
57. It's important to me that we are all helping to make the world a better place.						
58. I believe in people.						

Appendix K. Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory

The CROSS-CULTURAL ADAPTABILITY INVENTORY

Dr. Colleen Kelley and Dr. Judith Meyers

This inventory is designed to help you assess your ability to adapt to other cultures. Answer each item as it relates to you. Please respond to each item by circling your answer in the box on the *CCAI Scoring Sheet* containing the corresponding item number. For example, if you think that an item is true about you, circle the "T" in that item's answer box. Do not worry about being consistent. Some items may seem to be similar. Simply answer each item as it best describes you.

1. I have ways to deal with the stresses of new situations.
2. I believe that I could live a fulfilling life in another culture.
3. I try to understand people's thoughts and feelings when I talk to them.
4. I feel confident in my ability to cope with life, no matter where I am.
5. I can enjoy relating to all kinds of people.
6. I believe that I can accomplish what I set out to do, even in unfamiliar settings.
7. I can laugh at myself when I make a cultural faux pas (mistake).
8. I like being with all kinds of people.
9. I have a realistic perception of how others see me.
10. When I am working with people of a different cultural background, it is important to me to receive their approval.
11. I like a number of people who don't share my particular interests.
12. All people, of whatever race, are equally valuable.
13. I like to try new things.
14. If I had to adapt to a slower pace of life, I would become impatient.
15. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.
16. If I had to hire several job candidates from a background different from my own, I feel confident that I could make a good judgment.
17. If my ideas conflicted with those of others who are different from me, I would follow my ideas rather than theirs.
18. I could live anywhere and enjoy life.
19. Impressing people different from me is more important than being myself with them.
20. I can perceive how people are feeling, even if they are different from me.
21. I make friends easily.
22. When I am around people who are different from me, I feel lonely.
23. I don't enjoy trying new foods.

24. I believe that all cultures have something worthwhile to offer.
25. I feel free to maintain my personal values, even among those who do not share them.
26. Even if I failed in a new living situation, I could still like myself.
27. I am not good at understanding people when they are different from me.
28. I pay attention to how people's cultural differences affect their perceptions of me.
29. I like new experiences.
30. I enjoy spending time alone, even in unfamiliar surroundings.
31. I rarely get discouraged, even when I work with people who are very different from me.
32. People who know me would describe me as a person who is intolerant of others' differences.
33. I consider the impact my actions have on others.
34. It is difficult for me to approach unfamiliar situations with a positive attitude.
35. I prefer to decide from my own values, even when those around me have different values.
36. I can cope well with whatever difficult feelings I might experience in a new culture.
37. When I meet people who are different from me, I tend to feel judgmental about their differences.
38. When I am with people who are different from me, I interpret their behavior in the context of their culture.
39. I can function in situations where things are not clear.
40. When I meet people who are different from me, I am interested in learning more about them.
41. My personal value system is based on my own beliefs, not on conformity to other people's standards.
42. I trust my ability to communicate accurately in new situations.
43. I enjoy talking with people who think differently than I think.
44. When I am in a new or strange environment, I keep an open mind.
45. I can accept my imperfections, regardless of how others view them.
46. I am the kind of person who gives people who are different from me the benefit of the doubt.
47. I expect that others will respect me, regardless of their cultural background.
48. I can live with the stress of encountering new circumstances or people.
49. When I meet people who are different from me, I expect to like them.
50. In talking with people from other cultures, I pay attention to body language.

Copyright 1992 by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers. All rights reserved.
Reproduced for this report with permission from Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers. Not for further reproduction without permission.



COLLEEN KELLEY
HUMAN RELATIONS
CONSULTANT

April 19, 1994

Amita Rogers
5247 Mt. Alifan Drive
San Diego, CA 92111

Dear Ms. Rogers:

With regard to the inclusion of *The Cross-Cultural Adaptability Inventory (CCAI)* in your dissertation, the *Inventory* (fifty inventory items) and the scoring key (not the *Scoring Sheet* itself) may be included in an addendum to your report, along with this letter, with the following notation at the bottom of the listing of the inventory items::

© Copyright 1992 by Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers. All rights reserved.
Reproduced for this report with permission from Colleen Kelley and Judith Meyers. Not for further reproduction without permission.

Sincerely,

Colleen Kelley

Appendix L. Right Wing Authoritarian Scale

RWA Scale

This survey is part of an investigation of general public opinion concerning a variety of social issues. You will probably find you agree with some of the statements, and disagree with others, to varying extents. Please indicate your reaction to each of the statements by circling the appropriate box according to the following scale:

-3 Disagree strongly
-2 Disagree somewhat
-1 Disagree slightly

+1 Agree slightly
+2 Agree somewhat
+3 Agree Strongly

1. People should pay less attention to the Bible and the other old traditional forms of religious guidance, and instead develop their own personal standards of what is moral and immoral.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

2. It is wonderful that young people today have greater freedom protest against things they don't like and "do their own thing".

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

3. Women should always remember the promise they make in the marriage ceremony to obey their husbands.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

4. Our customs and national heritage are the things that have made us great, and certain people should be made to show greater respect for them.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

5. Capital punishment should be completely abolished.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

6. National anthems, flags, and glorification of one's country should all be de-emphasized to promote the brotherhood of people.

-3	-2	-1	+1	+2	+3
-----	-----	-----	-----	-----	-----

-3 Disagree strongly
 -2 Disagree somewhat
 -1 Disagree slightly

+1 Agree slightly
 +2 Agree somewhat
 +3 Agree Strongly

7. The facts on crime, sexual immorality, and the recent public disorders all show we have to crack down harder on deviant groups and troublemakers if we are going to save our moral standards and preserve law and order.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
8. A lot of society's rules regarding modesty and sexual behavior are just customs which are not necessarily any better or holier than those which other peoples follow.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
9. Our prisons are a shocking disgrace. Criminals are unfortunate people who deserve much better care, instead of so much punishment.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
10. Obedience and respect for authority are the most important virtues children should learn.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
11. Organizations like the army and the priesthood have a pretty unhealthy effect upon men because they require strict obedience of commands from supervisors.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
12. One good way to teach certain people right from wrong is to give them a good stiff punishment when they get out of line.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
13. Youngsters should be taught to refuse to fight in a war unless they themselves agree the war is just and necessary.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |
14. It may be considered old-fashioned by some, but having a decent, respectable appearance is still the mark of a gentleman and especially, a lady.
- | | | | | | |
|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| -3 | -2 | -1 | +1 | +2 | +3 |
| ---- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- | ----- |

-3 Disagree strongly
 -2 Disagree somewhat
 -1 Disagree slightly

+1 Agree slightly
 +2 Agree somewhat
 +3 Agree strongly

15. In these troubled times laws have to be enforced without mercy, especially when dealing with agitators and revolutionaries who are stirring things.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

16. Atheists and others who have rebelled against the established religions are no doubt every bit as good and virtuous as those who attend church regularly.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

17. Young people sometimes get rebellious ideas, but as they grow up they ought to get over them and settle down.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

18. Rules about being "well-mannered" and respectable are chains from the past that we should question very thoroughly before accepting.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

19. The courts are right in being easy on drug offender. Punishment would not do any good in cases like theses.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

20. If a child starts becoming a little too unconventional, his parents should see to it that he/she returns to the normal ways expected by society.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

21. Being kind to loafers or criminals will only encourage them to take advantage of your weakness, so it's best to use a firm, tough hand when dealing with them.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

22. A "woman's place" should be wherever she wants it to be. The days when women are submissive to their husbands and social conventions belong to strictly to the past.
 -3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

-3 Disagree strongly
 -2 Disagree somewhat
 -1 Disagree slightly

+1 Agree slightly
 +2 Agree somewhat
 +3 Agree strongly

23. Homosexuals are just as good and virtuous as anybody else,
 and there is nothing wrong with being one.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

24. It's one thing to question and doubt someone during an
 election campaign, but once a man becomes the leader of our
 country we owe him our greatest support and loyalty.

-3 -2 -1 +1 +2 +3

 SCORING KEY: Reverse score items: 2,5,6,8,9,11,13,16,18,19,22,23

SCORING: * Range of scores 24 - 144
 * Sum all responses
 * Higher scores indicate higher authoritarianism