This paper highlights recent developments in research on racism in the United States, and notes several conceptual issues of significance for the long-range planning work of those interested in reducing racism in America and particularly in Idaho. Growth in the number of minority researchers has resulted in increased attention toward racism as it affects other minority groups, and has led to the development of new theories or reinterpretations and to the greater sophistication of both theoretical development and empirical investigations. In addition, there is greater diversity to the definition of the word "racism". Some "constellations" of findings of recent empirical research on prejudice and discrimination include results on how prejudice is learned, class prejudice, racism and self-esteem, the impact of contact among diverse groups, additive multiculturalism, the nature of social experiences, and the role of schools. In addressing each of these subjects, the paper offers a general description of recent findings and in most cases quotations from key studies and theories. A final section considers the implications of these findings for education, business, and society in general. (Contains 101 references.) (JB)
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I. Research Review

A review of recent social science research on racism in the United States reveals some notable characteristics. Among the most significant are: 1) the increase in the number of theorists and investigators from minority communities; 2) a growing complexity and controversy over the focus of research, key conceptual issues and definitions, and the dynamics among major variables; 3) the breadth, depth and quality of empirical research; and 4) the growth in knowledge upon which to base policies or programs designed to prevent, reduce or remedy the effects of past racism. Each of these aspects merits further comment.

First, the growth in the number of minority researchers has had a number of consequences. One of these has been the increased attention devoted to racism as it affects Hispanic Americans, Asian Americans and Native Americans. While much of this recent work draws on earlier research into white-black relations, it has broadened investigations beyond a nearly exclusive focus on that issue. The result is both an increase in complexity of conceptual issues and controversy over key elements in the historical, cultural, social, economic, and political dynamics of relationships between the dominant white community and other minority communities. There is some general agreement currently among theorists or researchers regarding the patterns of similarity and dissimilarity in race relations. Racism in America appears to have some patterns in common between white Americans and members of key minority communities, for example, the basic dynamics of in-group/out-group processes. Yet there are also important differences in white attitudes and actions that reflect different and unique elements of the history and circumstances of each minority community. This controversy also tends to generate disagreement over the goals of race relations--such as integration and/or multiculturism--as well as the effectiveness of policies like desegregation and affirmative action, either in general or as they might affect a particular minority community.

Second, the growth in the numbers of researchers from minority communities has led to the development of new theories, or reinterpretations of older research perspectives, and to the sophistication of both theoretical development and empirical investigations. This growing knowledge draws also from researchers studying sexism and their contributions to our understanding that racism may have differing patterns and impacts on women in minority communities--a fact that has implications for any policy designed to remedy the effects of racism. One other feature of the increase in minority researchers is that the major research focus has shifted away from a concentration on the attitudes of individual white Americans, a primary focus of much earlier work done largely by white males. Now more attention is being devoted to the behavior of social, political, and economic systems, and even to the impact of...
white, Euro-centric culture in general. Recent empirical work also has demonstrated that there is no simple, clear and constant relationship between attitudes and behaviors in inter-racial relations. Investigators have begun to explore how behaviors--individual and institutional--can be modified, even if attitudes remain relatively unaffected. Moreover, numerous investigators, especially minority researchers, point to cultural dimensions that are permeated by an intrinsic, implicit racism that may consequently shape the actions of economic, political and social institutions and people within them. This dimension of racism--largely implicit, perhaps even unintentional--may be the most powerful form of racism because of the relative invisibility of its dynamics, the breadth and depth of its impact on minority communities, and the possibility that cultural racism may prove to be the most intractable to remedy by social policy.

Finally, the recent growth in the number of researchers from diverse ethnic communities--and their interaction with white researchers--has contributed both to the growing theoretical sophistication of research into racism in America and to the number and quality of empirical investigations. Field research by white researchers working in non-white communities has become more unwelcome and more difficult, especially on sensitive topics such as race relations. Here the increasing availability of investigators from diverse communities constitutes an important resource for expanding our current understanding. This fact also confirms the proposition, to be noted more below, that diversity--biological and social--provides both a quantitative and qualitative resource that is crucial for effective problem-solving and so adaptation and evolution by a species. Social diversity is essential for superior solutions whether on the individual micro-scale or on the macro-scale of society and its cultural, social, economic, and political institutions. Richness in perspectives and practices--while stimulating potential conflict and controversy--also promotes the greater cooperation that can result in a "superordinate wisdom" and "ways that work" by including all peoples.

Research into race relations in America raises a number of issues, some noted generally above, but one definitional element deserves more detailed attention here. Although this paper uses the term "racism," its use here refers to much more than the dictionary-derived idea that race is a primary determinant of human attributes and abilities and that racial differences produce a superiority of any particular race. Earlier definitions focus on attitude rather than behavior, and most researchers now would use a more inclusive concept. For example, one writer (Kaiz, 1976) defines racism as "the unequal treatment of individuals because of their membership in a particular group," while another (Taylor, 1984) terms it "the cumulative effects of individuals, institutions and cultures that result in the oppression of ethnic minorities." These writers, reviewing various definitions of racism, comment further:

Although prejudice and discrimination may often be components of racism, they need not be. Taylor's definition (above) focuses on social structures and processes and the manner in which they influence individual behavior rather than the reverse. Conceptually, separating the constructs of racism and prejudice
clarifies the fact that attitudes do not always lead to particular behaviors and that certain behaviors can have the same devastating effects, with or without an attitudinal component. This separation makes it easier for people to focus on the concept of institutional racism, where consequences are negative even though the intent may not be malevolent.

Katz and Taylor comment further:

... Sears correctly notes, the term racism is more perjorative than some of its synonyms. Nevertheless, it has been in wide usage for at least fifteen years and appears to have more connotative power than other terms.

... He (Jones) notes there are three types of racism: individual, institutional and cultural. The definition of individual racism has a great deal of overlap with that of prejudice because it refers to individual attitudes. Jones argues that cultural racism is the most pernicious form and perhaps the hardest one to eradicate.

Reid... reviews a number of definitions of racism, including Chester's (1976), which refers to acts of institutional procedures which help create or perpetuate sets of advantages or privileges for whites and exclusions or deprivations for minority groups. In this definition, Chester included both individual discriminatory behavior and institutional racism. Reid points out that Chester added a proviso, namely, an ideology of explicit or implicit superiority or advantage of one racial group over another, plus the institutional power to implement that ideology in social operations. Thus, for Chester, racism is a combination of beliefs and behavior patterns, combined with the power to enact these beliefs. (Katz and Taylor, 1988, pp.6-7. All italics in the original, underline added for emphasis.)

II. Racism's Significance for America's Future

Given these definitions, "racism" clearly characterizes race relations in the United States, and within Idaho. It is demonstrated in national and state data that document pervasive and continuing inequalities in employment, income, housing, health, education, and other key resources between whites and racial minorities (See, for example: Richard Mabbutt, Hispanics in Idaho; Concerns and Challenges, 1990). This inequality and the consequent waste or underutilization of human capabilities has grave consequences for the society as a whole.

Robert Hormats, an investment banker and former State Department official writing on "The Roots of American Power" notes:

Among the world's large industrialized democracies the United States stands out for its racial and ethnic diversity--the size
of its minorities as a percentage or its overall population. Immigration has historically been a source of America's economic strength and dynamism. It has given this country a distinct economic advantage over others. Now this very diversity could become a source of political friction, social fragmentation and economic disarray unless the country can better educate, motivate and employ its growing population of blacks, Hispanics and new immigrants. American social performance and economic performance will increasingly be connected; if the country fails at the former, it is likely to fail at the latter.

Conventional wisdom correctly holds that its people are a nation's greatest resource. Like other resources, they can be underutilized. That is the case in America today. The difference between vigorous and weak economic growth for the United States in the 1990s will be its effectiveness in developing and mobilizing the skills and creativity of a far greater portion of its citizens.

If 15 percent of all the nation's factories or forests were destroyed in an earthquake or fire, the country would be in a state of crisis; yet for years the talents of roughly that portion of working age Americans have been wasted due to illiteracy, inadequate training or poor motivation--and this is treated with complacency.

The United States is in the midst of a dramatic demographic transformation. Hispanics, blacks and Asians together will account for more than half the growth in the U.S. labor force over the next decade. Almost nine million immigrants entered the United States during the 1980s, accounting for 40 percent of the nation's labor force growth, and the pace continues. Women of all racial groups and origins now account for over 60 percent of new work-force entrants.

At the same time, the number of working-age people in the United States will grow more slowly in the future than in the 1980s, as the 77 million baby boomers born between 1946 and 1964 are followed by a smaller number of labor-force entrants. Because the ratio of retirees to active workers will increase steadily, the productive output of new workers will have to increase significantly in coming years just to maintain current national living standards.

America has not done well at incorporating blacks and Hispanics into the work force or tapping their full productive potential. Yet significant increases in American growth in the 1990s--as well as a reduction in the size of the nation's economic underclass and improved social cohesion--will be difficult to achieve without higher levels of labor-force participation and productivity by men and women in both groups, many of whom are now on the economic sidelines. They, indeed all Americans, will have to perform knowledge- and technology-driven jobs to higher and higher standards in coming years. (Foreign Affairs, Summer, 1991, pp. 136-140.)
Not only do American minority communities constitute a sizeable segment of our society, but the richness imbedded in their cultural, racial, ethnic and other "communities of diversity" is a most valuable resource, for it provides an array of viewpoints and possible behaviors for a species. Diversity—a basic principle of natural systems design—is an essential element of ecological strength and resilience, for diversity enhances the problem-solving and survival capabilities of an individual, an institution, or a society at large. As the world rapidly becomes more interdependent, the ability to compete as a nation or a business is recognized by policy-makers, both public and private. Individuals, so the argument goes, must be productive in order to be competitive; and a productive work-force, utilizing the capabilities of all workers to the fullest, is essential to the nation's future economic and political well-being. While essentially true, this argument ignores a larger, more crucial truth: In the global village, characterized by ever growing interdependence—economic, political and social—the vital element is cooperative, rather than competitive, production.

Nowadays, production occurs in a larger context in which cooperation, rather than competition, is paramount. "Composite products," whether automobiles, bank services or arms limitation agreements, are the most important results of global problem-solving systems. Environmental, economic, political and social policy-making necessarily involve international or multi-national, as well as sub-national organizations and their citizens cooperating to create solutions that ensure human and planetary survival or even enhancement. Many such "composite organizations" are citizen initiated and directed and involve sub-national, national and multi-national organizations, both public and private. Survival of the "fittest" now requires that peoples and their many diverse institutions "fit" together—with one another and with the planet—to assure not only their mutual continuation, but to improve the living standard of the planet and its inhabitants. Diversity is essential now more than ever for superior solutions, whether at the individual, micro-scale, or on the macro-scale of societies and their economic, political and social institutions. Demographic and functional diversities are the key resource in the "noetic" or knowledge-based economy that characterizes today's "global village."

The superordinate value of cooperation in global productive processes highlights the absolutely crucial importance of developing every person's capabilities and utilizing them to the maximum extent possible. Actualization of every person's capacities is imperative for our future planetary well-being. Macro and micro-scale policies--economic, social, political and cultural—that promote that goal are essential. Policies or practices that deny or restrict such opportunity for any person thereby simultaneously deprive all others to some degree of the well-being that could have resulted from the best contribution of all. No longer are there winners and losers; in today's global context there are only winners or losers.

If diversity is the "difference that makes the difference," then global, national and state/local policy makers must meet the challenge of demographic, economic, social, cultural and political integration, most broadly defined. Integration, as a social policy in the past has generally meant, either formally or
in practice, that minority groups should be assimilated or acculturated; that is, they should be absorbed or become basically homogenized— as implied in the "melting pot" metaphor. A more inclusive definition of integration holds that each social group should maintain its essential distinctiveness while being able to cooperate with other groups to undertake an even richer, more complex enterprise. A metaphor now used with greater appropriateness is that of a "tossed salad"— in this image, each element retains its distinctiveness while contributing to a richer whole.

The notion of synergy—the concept that the whole is greater than the sum of its parts—is a related and relevant idea for it suggests that the coming together of distinctive parts makes possible a more complex and richer capability in the resulting whole. Integration as a "union of uniqueness" is the appropriate social goal. This is the essence of what some theorists term additive multiculturalism (see Triandis' comments on Lambert's idea in Katz and Taylor, 1988). This idea, at its best, involves minority cultures retaining their distinctive features, while also developing their capabilities for effective— e.g., mutually powerful and appreciative— interactions with the non-dominating majority society. This concept, as presented here, requires the majority society to forego, at a minimum, economic, political and socio-cultural domanative attitudes and behaviors, and more positively, to learn the ways of minority communities and interact effectively with other peoples on the basis of authentic equality. This perspective goes beyond tolerance, for it emphasizes appreciation and application of the folkways of others. It does not mean, however, appropriation of others' ways— e.g., whites trying to adopt Native American religious practices— but co-participating on mutually agreeable terms. This approach to integration means that one group does not gain what the other loses, but that both (or all) gain in awareness, appreciation, and potential for effective action.

III. Research Findings

The foregoing discussion on recent trends in research on American race relations and their future significance has focused briefly on the increase in minority practitioners and the evolving theoretical and empirical sophistication of research work. The growing complexity of work in this field also creates controversy over the state of our knowledge about racism and its causes and consequences. And this raises additional issues about policies for remediying the effects of past discrimination, for reducing current practices of racism or preventing future prejudice, especially in the context of national and global developments. While recent research leaves investigators less sure about some previous assumptions, and less certain about the positive impact of some remedial solutions, there is a growing knowledge about racism that such complexity and controversy should not obscure. From this expanding knowledge base, some generalizations about what could or does work (or does not) are possible. These lead in turn to some inferences about policy actions that could be undertaken with a reasonable certainty of improvements for individuals, organizations, and the emerging global society.
Recent works: Daniel Bar-Tal, et. al., Stereotyping and Prejudice: Changing Conceptions (1989), Phyllis A. Katz and Dalmas A. Taylor's Eliminating Racism: Profiles in Controversy (1988), James Lynch, Prejudice Reduction and the Schools (1987), and John F. Dovidio and Samuel L. Gaertner's, Prejudice, Discrimination, and Racism: Historical Trends and Contemporary Approaches (1986) mention many of the theoretical developments and recent research findings in the area of racism in the United States (and Europe). Many of these also include quite specific suggestions for policies, programs, and practices that could be undertaken and provide lengthy references and bibliographies for those desiring more detailed information on the points summarized below. Of special interest, also, is the work of Dr. Glenn S. Pate, Associate Professor of Education, College of Education, University of Arizona, who has written several articles that summarize recent research in prejudice reduction. For the purpose of this project, he has made available to the Idaho Human Rights Commission a 1989 draft of a book-length work in progress on research into reducing prejudice. The following section draws from these major sources, as well as many specific research articles reviewed. Since this paper's purpose is to highlight the implications of recent research for policy actions the IHRC Commission might consider, the focus is on the pattern of findings rather than an assessment of any particular study. The possible implications of these findings for future development of policies, programs or projects or other actions by the Commission or other state and local organizations, public and private, are noted in a final section.

1. **Prejudice is learned very early.** Gender, race, class and cultural biases are acquired from early infancy through early adolescence. These prejudices may be "set" or "softened" by key individual experiences (positive and negative), or in family, peer group or socio-economic settings, and can be changed, but only with difficulty, in later years. [For example, see: Derman-Sparks, et al. and their cited sources, Morland and Suthers (1980), Morland (1963).]

2. **Class prejudice may be as strong, though more subtle, than racial prejudice.** Cultural aspects of class prejudice may be even stronger because these are the invisible contexts from which social "cognitions" are derived. Anthropologist Ruth Benedict notes: "The eye never sees the lens through which it looks." Some research on social cognition and behavior suggests that prejudice may result more from favoring in-group members, rather than from rejecting out-group persons. Together, these findings lead to a range of actions, that focus on institutional remedies such as national or state or local programs that guarantee real jobs to every person capable of work. Opportunity to contribute valued work, e.g., rebuilding the public infrastructure, restoring the natural environment, or serving the young, the elderly, the ill, etc. and receive income builds self esteem--which is itself a prerequisite for positive interracial contact. Other institutional strategies focus on increasing access to: health care, education, housing, etc.; the principle underlying all such approaches
incorporates the twin elements of economic earnings and enhanced self-esteem for "under-class" communities and their members. [See: Schaefer (1986), Pate (1981), Glock, et al. (1975), Cohen (1973), Trager and Yarrow (1952).]

The central aim of such proposals is to reduce the obvious (or most odious) class distinctions that contribute to negative interracial stereotyping or "attributive" projections by whites. Some research suggests "positive" actions by in-group members are "attributed" to the individual person, while "negative" actions are attributed to the setting; the reverse holds for perceptions about out-group members—that is, "positive" actions are attributed to the setting, while "negative" actions are assumed to be intrinsic to the person. Therefore, if institutional strategies can reduce or eliminate obvious extremes in access to or use of societal resources—economic, political, social and cultural—between the white majority and minority communities, then the social setting may provide fewer perceptual clues to establish "out-group," i.e., "different from me/us" distinctions. If class-based "differences" are reduced, the negative attribution "of differentness" to members of minority communities may thereby be decreased as well. [See, for example: Comments by Hewstone and Bar-Tal in Bar-Tal, et al. (1989); and those by Triandis and Jones in Katz and Taylor (1988).]

"White awareness training," developed by Judy Katz at the University of Oklahoma, also may be a useful resource in revealing and challenging both class and racial prejudices in institutional and individual settings. Such training involves "white on white" situations in which white participants—led by a trained facilitator—focus systematically on the ways that white dominance of America's cultural, economic, social, and political institutions produces unequal access to opportunities and, thus, to rewards. (Katz, 1978) This training is emotionally demanding and its effects are so far untested. But a "white awareness" program may have potential for Idaho because the state is 90% white and many residents wonder "what or where is the prejudice problem?" White awareness training emphasizes whites working with white, because the "heart" of the race problem lies, in this view, with the dominant white, Euro-centric culture and its economic, social, political and cultural institutions.

A caution is noted, however, that other research also indicates that training directly focused on "race relations" is probably less effective than learning about race through more indirect social or educational settings (Pate 1988). Further, when participants feel coerced or manipulated, such training can be counter-productive, increasing prejudice instead. However, for white Idahoans who might volunteer for these "white awareness" workshops, there is evidence suggesting that such training, featuring: white role modeling—e.g., white trainers "owning" their racism—and the engagement of cognitive, affective and behavioral dimensions of learning, and with an emphasis on what white individuals, or white decision makers can do now, might be effective.

Such training could be an element in a larger training/learning program that focuses first on "Diversity: The Difference that Makes a Difference." As people grow in their awareness of the value of diversity—it's not just the "right"
thing, it's also the "bright" way--there may come the opportunity to explore what perceptions and practices get in the way of whites working effectively in multicultural situations. White awareness training can help identify advantages whites currently enjoy, but also draw attention to the ways whites simultaneously disadvantage themselves with respect to local/regional, national or global settings and how they can restrict or expand performance capabilities that are most valuable in the context of the "global village."

3. **People with strong self-concepts and positive self-esteem usually rank low in racial prejudice.** Dr. Pate (1981) holds that the single most effective things schools could do to reduce racial prejudice would be to improve students' self-concepts. Social policies that reduce inequalities of access to societal resources or rewards for adults and children reduce elitism and foster improved self esteem. Moreover, recent research on cooperative learning projects--so-called jigsaw experiences--or other cooperative learning practices generally documents dramatic improvements in student academic performance, self-esteem and valuation or appreciation of other learners. [See: Selections by Aronson and Gonzalez in Katz and Taylor (1988) and Slavin (1983).]

The promise of cooperative learning systems, compared to the current standard practices centered around competition among individual students, is profound. Cooperative learning experiments document the clear superiority of academic and social outcomes for participants and groups (Slavin 1983). These findings reinforce the points made earlier about the positive values of diversity if managed for cooperative and mutual gain. These policy reforms are synergistic and mutually reinforcing: diversity--> creativity--> productive performance--> self-esteem--> positive feed-forward for enhanced future cycles. This synergistic relationship can be promoted in any stage, and is positively reinforcing; it is one of the best examples of a "virtuous circle." (See also 4 and 5 below.)

4. "Contact" among people from diverse backgrounds is essential in reducing prejudice--and perhaps discrimination--but only if certain favorable conditions exist. Recent research identifies these necessary, though not always sufficient conditions as:

- participation is voluntary, and respected civic leaders or public officials support and/or model desired behaviors;
- opportunity exists to know participants as individuals rather than representatives;
- participants are about equal in social, economic status;
- participants share key interests, goals, norms or functional attributes, e.g., occupation, age, etc.;
- circumstances feature cooperative, rather than competitive group processes, focused on outcomes or rewards and valued by all participants;
• participants experience success, with personal and group goals/rewards achieved on a win-win basis.

In the absence of these conditions, social contact can reinforce prejudice, so a premium is placed on ensuring as many of these conditions as possible are present (Pate, 1981).

Regarding inter-racial “contact,” James M. Jones, psychologist at the University of Delaware, comments:

The primary assumption of cultural racism is that our way is the best way; the majority rules, and tradition prevails. The antidote to this approach is the implementation of the principles of diversity, which recognize the biological idea that diversity promotes adaptability and increases genetic fitness and evolutionary success. The requirements for making positive strides in this area include:

1. Identifying the characteristics and capabilities of ethnic groups that derive from their evolution in and adaptation to the cultural context of discrimination and disadvantage. It is clear that the resourcefulness, inventiveness, and improvisation attendant on achieving in this society contribute to a resilience that may be instructive of wider range of human capabilities.
2. Learning how these characteristics may make a positive contribution to the attainment of the goals we generally share.
3. Providing interactional settings in which these majority and minority viewpoints and approaches can co-occur, so as to learn more about possibilities than a one-dimensional approach permits.
4. Conceiving participation patterns and valuations of them that do not stigmatize the minority relative to the majority contribution. (In Katz and Taylor, 1988, p. 132.)

These findings have wide application in diverse business, political, community and educational settings. “Diversity by Design” may be an important element in organizing all societal interactions in the future; indeed, this effort may be the next frontier in human relationships.

5. A commitment to “additive multiculturalism” would incorporate into the design of all social systems—especially learning systems and their educational content—approaches that value the totality of beliefs—and behaviors—of people from diverse backgrounds. Harry Triandis, psychologist at the University of Illinois, comments specifically on multiculturalism in education:

A good education also means an education that is adjusted to the needs of the minority as well as to the majority groups. Castañada, James, and Robbins (1974) outlined some of the ways in which schools must change to provide the best learning
environments for Latin-background, black, and Native American children. Castañeda, for instance, pointed out that teachers frequently punish behaviors that are learned in the child's home, thus making the school environment noxious. The Spanish-American emphasis on family, the personalization of interpersonal relations, the clear-cut sex-role differentiation, and so on create a particular way of thinking, feeling, and learning. A teacher who is not aware of these cultural influences can easily lose contact with a child. For example, the teaching of a Spanish-background child may be improved if the teacher sits close to the child, touches a lot, hugs, smiles, uses older children to teach younger children, involves the children in group activities, sends work to the child's home so the parents can get involved, arranges for Mexican foods to be cooked in class, teaches Spanish songs to all children, and so on. Similarly, if monocultural American children understood why native Americans have values stressing harmony with nature rather than its conquest, a present rather than a future time orientation, giving one's money away rather than saving it, respect for age rather than emphasis on youth, such children would broaden their perspective. The dominant American culture will profit from the inclusion of such conceptions in its repertoire of values: Harmony with nature is much more conducive to the respect that ecology imposes on technology in the post-industrial era; respect for old age may be much more functional in a nation where the majority is old, as it will be soon; a present orientation may be more realistic in a society that can no longer afford to grow rapidly because of energy and resource limitations; and so on. The majority culture can be enriched by considering the viewpoints of the several minority cultures that exist in America rather than trying to force these minorities to adopt a monocultural, impoverished, provincial viewpoint that may, in the long run, reduce creativity and the chances of effective adjustment in a fast-changing world.

Such goals are equally viable for minority and majority members provided we respect each other's cultural identity. We must not ask blacks to become culturally white. We must not ask them to lose their identity. Integration in the form of becoming like us implies by definition that their culture is inferior. Rather, what we want is to find more common superordinate goals and methods of interdependence that give self-respect to all. We need to be creative if we are to discover such methods. (In Katz and Taylor, 1988, p. 43.)

Recent research does provide such information, especially for Hispanic learners. The work of Elliot Aronson, University of California, Santa Cruz, and Alex Gonzalez, California State University, Fresno, focus on cooperative education and its specific relevance for learners from Hispanic backgrounds. Their findings provide further support both for the value cooperative education approach and its relevance as an element in designing learning systems that are culture-sensitive and build on cultural strengths of students from diverse
backgrounds. Given Idaho's growing Hispanic population and the challenge facing the state's education system, their work merits fuller consideration. They report:

We believe that the jigsaw technique may be of special benefit to Mexican-American children because of the special dynamics that exist within the typical Mexican-American family. Unlike families in mainstream American culture, Mexican-American socialization stresses mutual dependence, cooperation, and achievement for the group rather than individual achievement (Ramirez & Castañeda, 1974). In addition, Hispanic children are taught very early about mutual respect, support for family members, and the importance of status (Diaz-Guerrero, 1975).

Let us first look at cooperation. Since 1971, Spencer Kagan and his colleagues have been conducting research with Mexican, Mexican-American, and Anglo-American children aimed at identifying the social motives of these groups. He has used a paradigm that has children select from different alternatives (ranging from cooperative to competitive) on a choice card. Specifically, the children have a choice of assigning themselves and another child various numbers of trinkets. The absolute and relative amounts they give themselves and the other child over a series of trials yield a measure of cooperation or competition.

Not surprisingly, Kagan's findings indicate that Anglo-Americans are highly competitive. Indeed, their competitiveness exceeds absolute self-interest: they prefer a smaller, absolute outcome for themselves as long as they end up with more than the other child. In contrast, children of Mexican descent show a clear preference for equity, altruism, and cooperation. Moreover, the stronger the cultural bond, the more cooperative the individuals. For example, rural Mexican children are more cooperative than urban Mexican-Americans (Kagan, 1971; Kagan & Madsen, 1972). In addition, Knight and Kagan (1977) found that such prosocial behavior decreased for Mexican-Americans for each succeeding generation, a finding suggesting a trend toward the assimilation of values of the dominant cultural group.

These behavioral differences between Anglo-Americans and Mexican-Americans are also reflected in measures of motivation. Thus, Ramirez and Price-Williams (1976a,b) compared Mexican-American and Anglo-American fourth-graders on need for affiliation and need for achievement and found that Anglos scored higher on need for achievement, whereas Mexican-Americans scored higher on need for affiliation. Kagan and his colleagues (Sanders, Scholz, & Kagan, 1976) found similar results with fifth- and sixth-graders.

When viewed as a whole, these results indicate strongly that the typical American classroom puts Mexican-American students in a terribly disadvantageous position. Not only must many Hispanic children struggle linguistically (as in the case of Carlos), but they are also expected to perform in a manner that goes against the grain of
their family socialization and cultural tradition. Thus, the jigsaw technique is especially important for Mexican-Americans because it provides them with a situation in which, for a few hours a week, they can use to their advantage their higher need for cooperation and affiliation.

In a recent study, Wong-Fillmore and McLaughlin (1985), compared Chinese- and Spanish-speaking children in their ability to learn English as a second language. Consistent with the findings reported above, these investigators found that Hispanic children profited much more than Chinese children from the opportunity to interact with peers who spoke English well; Chinese children profited more from learning directly from the teacher. This finding provides us with additional encouragement in our belief that the jigsaw method is an ideal strategy for aiding underachieving linguistic minorities.

One must use great sensitivity in applying this method. For example, we noted earlier that "status" is an important value in Hispanic socialization. We can speculate that one way of losing status is to be the only member of a group who is having difficulty with the English language. In our early experiments with jigsaw, we noticed that several of our Mexican-American students seemed inordinately anxious. With hindsight, we now realize that these students were weak in English and were in groups where they were the only Mexican-American members. We speculated that this anxiety might have been reduced if the Mexican-American children had been in a situation in which it was not embarrassing to be more articulate in Spanish than in English. Thus, Geffner (1978), working in a situation in which both the residential and the school population was approximately 50% Spanish-speaking, found that Mexican-American children showed no such anxiety—and showed the kinds of gains in self-esteem, academic performance, and prosocial behavior that we had come to expect. These results were subsequently confirmed by Gonzalez (1979), who systematically varied the proportion of Anglos and Hispanics in his jigsaw groups and found that the positive effects of the jigsaw method were most pronounced when the group consisted of equal numbers of Hispanics and Anglos. He also found that Mexican-American students shifted their locus of control from external toward internal as the proportion of their membership in the group approached parity...

Our results offer substantial evidence supporting the value of the jigsaw method in raising self-esteem and academic performance, in reducing intergroup enmity, and in increasing the attractiveness of school. We have also shown why this structure is particularly beneficial to underachieving linguistic minorities, such as Mexican-Americans. Moreover, we hasten to add that the jigsaw technique is merely one of several cooperative strategies developed more-or-less independently by Robert Slavin and his colleagues at Johns Hopkins, Stuart Cook and his colleagues at the
University of Colorado, David Johnson and his colleagues at the University of Minnesota, Shlomo Sharan and his colleagues in Israel, and others. Although each of these techniques has its own unique flavor and its own special advantages and disadvantages, they all essentially involve a far higher degree of student interdependence than in the traditional classroom. And all produce results similar to those discussed here.

It should be clear that we are not suggesting that jigsaw learning or any other cooperative method constitutes the solution to our interethnic problems. What we have shown is that highly desirable results occur when children spend at least a portion of their time in the pursuit of common goals. These effects are in accordance with predictions made by social scientists in their testimony favoring desegregating schools over 30 years ago.

It is also worth emphasizing the fact that the jigsaw method has proved effective even when it is used for as little as 20% of a child's time in the classroom. Moreover, it has been shown that cooperative techniques have produced beneficial results even when accompanied by competitive activities (Slavin, 1980). Thus, the data does not support either attempting to eliminate classroom competition or interfering with individually guided education. Cooperative learning can and does co-exist easily with almost any other method used by teachers in the classroom. (In Katz and Taylor, 1988, pp. 311-312.)

Again, the implications of these findings present a major challenge to policy makers in communities, in business, in government and in education. The task of building "diversity by design" in all our economic, social, political and cultural interactions is formidable, yet it is imperative and holds the greatest hope for building on the best potentials of all people.

6. All social experiences--formal or informal--incorporate cognitive (information-beliefs), affective (feelings), conative (purpose) and behavioral dimensions. While these dimensions are interrelated, their pattern of relationship is not clear or certain. Attitudes and information may shape behavior; behaviors, especially those conforming to the situational setting, may affect attitudes, or the relationship may be multi-directional. While cognitive learning--information about racial groups and dynamics--can be useful, it is seldom sufficient. Most research focuses on students, and in limited settings of short duration. It does appear, however, that affective-empathetic engagement of learners and the presence of positive role models--especially people modeling desirable attitude and behavior changes--are especially important in learning situations. (Pate, 1981)

Dr. Glenn Pate has compiled an extensive list of the advantages and disadvantages of various learning formats and a variety of learning media that can guide the design and implementation of educational programs.
(unpublished manuscript, 1989). Two important caveats are noted here: 1) learning situations designed to get participants to change a specific attitude or behavior or to believe they should think, feel or act differently are generally transparent to participants. They see through the situation and tend to resist, perhaps feeling they are being judged and manipulated, if not coerced; 2) lecture formats are usually so passive that participative learning is minimized; learners are not deeply engaged in a positive way, and such settings are usually not highly productive.

7. The role of schools, public and private, and at all levels, is crucial. Researcher James Lynch asserts: "There are few certainties in the field (prejudice reduction), except that unless the school educates to counter prejudice and discrimination it is inevitably reinforcing those attitudes and behaviours. It cannot remain neutral." (p. 40)

Lynch's work on prejudice reduction and the schools is based on both American and Continental experience in multicultural education. His work is comprehensive and detailed, and very much deserving of further study by policy-makers, educators and parents concerned about bias and the schools. His recent work, Prejudice Reduction and the Schools (1987), provides a philosophical rationale for multicultural education and reviews recent literature on prejudice acquisition and reduction. He also outlines whole school policies for combating prejudice, proposes a curriculum strategy for prejudice reduction, explores teaching approaches and reviews resources for teaching to reduce prejudice.

Lynch defines prejudice reduction as a "deliberate and systematic process, which aims by means of coherent, rational, democratic and sustained educational and broader social strategies, policies and practices, at enabling individuals and groups to re-orient their values, attitudes, actions and behaviour, in such a way that predispositions to prejudice and discrimination are reduced, amended or eradicated." (p. 40)

In discussing prejudice reduction and the schools he notes:

Banks (1982) has suggested that institutional reform needs to address the whole school and all of its major components, including norms, power relationships, verbal interactions, culture, curriculum, teaching/learning strategies, extra-curricular activities and attitudes towards language. He argues that the latent or hidden values may have a more cogent impact on students even than the overt curriculum, pointing to the way in which the negative values of the larger society are often reinforced and perpetuated by the school. Katz (1987) highlights the need to regard racial prejudice as a white problem and to produce strategies to focus on the majority—a dimension of prejudice reduction which had been influential in the United Kingdom and is the basis of many race awareness training (RAT) programmes (Twitchin and Demuth, 1985) . . .
In his work Banks (1981;1984) identifies and clarifies underlying principles which must be addressed if education for prejudice reduction is to be successfully implemented. These include the following:

- holistic strategies which include the total school environment;
- permeation of the purposes, values and attitudes of multiculturalism into every facet of the school's functioning, including examinations;
- measures that are comprehensive in scope and sequence;
- multi-disciplinary approaches and multi-directional purposes;
- mutual and multiple acculturation of pupil and teacher by each other in a process of cultural reciprocity;
- positive multiethnic interactions with significant others;
- staff composition reflective of ethnic pluralism;
- pedagogical strategies addressing decision-making and social-actioning capacities and competences;
- curricula strengthening the intercultural competence of pupils;
- potent involvement of, and use of, local community resources, including languages.

It goes without saying that an overall holistic strategy will include more than assessment strategies for pupils. The evaluation of programmes, teacher and institutions, the strategy as a whole, has to be seen within the context of the development of not only community and national, but also global, multicultural competences.

In spite of the disparate, unconnected and normally non-continuous nature of the work reviewed... important principles emerge from it. These are not firm conclusions, but provisional 'guiding lights' in a field where there is much rhetoric but still all too little illumination. Such work, it seems to me, affords useful benchmarks to institutions and schools who themselves are embarking on the long and difficult road of planning, implementing and evaluating the strategies of prejudice reduction which arise from the cultural biography of their own institution, community and societal context.

The upshot of this brief excursion into the writing concerned with prejudice acquisition and reduction can be no more that a series of tentative and provisional reflections, identifying possible guiding principles for the establishment of policies of multicultural education by teachers in schools. I would summarise these briefly as follows:

- Staff development, starting from where teachers are now and including their study of their own practice, is an indispensable starter;
- Teachers need to consider what we know about prejudice as a base to extend their frame of reference for their professional judgements;
Inclusive, comprehensive, systematic, continuous and holistic school approaches are likely to be most effective; multidimensional and interdisciplinary pedagogical approaches are necessary, including interconnected and coherent phases of reinforcement, addressing, wherever possible, higher levels of mental functioning; pedagogical initiatives need to be reflective of the cultural, racial and linguistic biography of the school and society; strategies need to be true to the underlying ethical principles which may be derived either from philosophical speculation or from international agreements and covenants and national legislation; within a democratic society the initiatives must rest on democratic principles of non-coercion and persuasion, backed up by agreed instrumental regulations; prejudice reduction must address both cognitive and affective dimensions, if it is to come to terms with the intellectual and emotional dimensions of prejudice and influence behaviour; positive ethnic interactions with 'significant others' as part of a process of multiple and mutual acculturation of both staff and pupils, will need to be on a co-operative, equal, voluntary and satisfying basis; by conceptual and political coalitions prejudice reduction must become an integral part of the curriculum rather than a 'tissue-rejected' graft; holistic strategies must involve all aspects of the school's functioning, including its assessment and evaluation approaches; social actioning within a democratic society will be part of basic education and development of prejudice reduction; prejudice reduction will need to take account of the economic, community and social context, but it cannot be delayed until they change; the community has to be recognized as something broader than local or national and, thus, issues of human and civil rights beyond the borders of the nation state, including international agreements, covenants and conventions, offer clarification and definition of basic ethical principles essential to effective and fair judgements and decisions. (Lynch, 1987, pp. 49-50.)

IV. Implications for Action by the IHRC and other Concerned Organizations

General Action: The Commission and other Idaho organizations might consider the definitions of key concepts as they are currently being used by researchers, and use this information consciously in any educational efforts by the Commission with policy-makers and the public. An awareness of cultural
and institutional racism, as well as individual racism, is essential for Idahoans to understand fully the nature of racism in the state and the nation.

The Commission might consider explicitly advocating "additive multiculturalism" as a goal of state policy and explore specific practices that could maintain or support such a policy, especially in public education or business and employment settings. Moreover, the Commission might establish this policy preference on the grounds that diversity is a performance enhancer producing not only greater competitiveness, but greater cooperativeness, which is even more essential to global well-being. Diversity is the difference that makes a positive difference; it is not just the "right thing," but the "bright way" of doing things. This point is more fundamental than it may appear at first glance. For the Commission to support diversity only for its role in business or national competitiveness is to also reinforce an "us against them" competitive mentality that ultimately fosters a negative approach to competition in the global village. In championing diversity because it unleashes the full creativity and productivity of all people, for the benefit of the planet and its people, the Commission promotes even now the national and global cooperation that looms as so crucial in the 21st century.

Regarding Education and Children: The IHRC and others might consider developing a clearing house of resources on bias reduction and early childhood education. The file developed for this project includes a number of references, bibliographies, and resource lists for parents and educators; preliminary information suggests that there is no institution or individual in Idaho that has developed or maintains such a comprehensive information resource.

◊ The IHRC might consider developing staff capability in this area: a person(s) who could maintain such a resource inventory, undertake research as appropriate, and develop an advocacy plan that shares this information with a network of providers of early childhood care. Important providers include: parents (and their associations); day-care providers; kindergarten and early childhood development programs, e.g., Head Start, Child Development Centers, private schools, etc.; educators, psychologists, health care providers and other professionals concerned with early childhood development; educators of teachers, especially at Idaho's colleges and universities, for there appears not to be any faculty person who currently maintains an active specialization in this field.

◊ The IHRC might also consider facilitating or developing itself conferences, symposia, training workshops, etc. focused on the topic of prejudice acquisition/reduction in children and thereby increasing awareness in educators, and serving as a catalyst for other institutional change strategies, especially those focused on education.

◊ The IHRC, as part of these other activities, should develop and maintain information on prejudice reduction efforts that focus on school systems as a whole, and provide that information to parents, educators, or public policy makers as requested or appropriate.
Regarding Class and Racial Bias Advocacy and Training: The IHRC might consider developing staff capability for monitoring advocacy of public policy(ies) that affect class-based access to resources in the state or nation. The ability to analyze policies, present or proposed, for their "class contempt" properties, and so their potential for adding to racial stereotyping or attributions, is generally lacking in nearly every public institution in Idaho. For the IHRC to develop such a competency and provide that advocacy could be a useful, if not always understood and appreciated role.

◊ The IHRC might consider making a formal commitment to "multiculturalism" as the most desirable pattern of integration, and develop a strong, functional justification for diversity along the lines noted in the previous section. One element of that activity could be developing a white awareness training program that would be available upon request. This could be controversial for some, but it could become a valuable resource for this state, especially as Idaho business people expand their interactions with the international business community.

Regarding Business and Learning Settings: The IHRC might consider focusing advocacy efforts on education and business settings where there are "niches" receptive to training or experiments in excellence through cooperative diversity. This capability entails having a staff resource who can work with communities, businesses, schools, or other public agencies to highlight these research findings and their application to practical problems facing Idaho citizens. Conferences, demonstration or pilot projects, workshops, training and technical assistance consultancies and other resources might be useful tools. One focus might be advocacy centered around school reform issues in Idaho because these activities are current and might benefit from the available research data. Advocacy efforts around "excellence through cooperative diversity" might produce the greatest gains in prejudice reduction, even though the "learning" is indirect, this approach could have more positive impact on the people of the state than any other single action strategy proposed here.

◊ The IHRC might consider developing the staff resource to share these findings and develop programs that "design in" these conditions. This resource role might assist a broad range of Idaho communities, organizations and groups to develop awareness of the factors important to positive interracial contact, and to incorporate these elements into any activity, especially in educational settings and work places, where interracial contact is possible. This role is complementary to the roles outlined previously and reinforces other recommended actions.

◊ The IHRC might consider developing, maintaining and disseminating a resource file on information about educational processes and content that value positively the cultural beliefs and practices of people from diverse communities. Such a resource might be made available to business
people, educators and policy makers as requested, or as circumstances make appropriate.

The IHRC might consider maintaining a resource inventory about bias reduction in learning settings and develop information programs, packets or other resources, to be available to all educators, whether in government, business, education or civic organizations. This proposal would be an element of other recommendations made in this paper, but it emphasizes the application of research findings to both the Commission's activities and those of other human rights advocacy organizations, or other interested groups. Many current opportunities for the Commission or its staff to engage the public or policymakers stem from invitations to make presentations to groups. Careful attention to the design and delivery of such presentations could ensure the most effective "learning" possible in a given set of circumstances.

Conclusion

These lists of specific recommendations for institutional action and those available throughout the sources cited or reviewed for this paper could be used as models for adaptation not only by schools, but by any and all organizations, for organizations are themselves "learning systems." To further develop organizations through "diversity design" principles is as critical as it will be challenging; this initiative belongs to every citizen and every policy maker who yearns to pioneer a more positive future for all people.

This paper has highlighted recent developments in research on racism in America, and has noted several conceptual issues of significance for the long-range planning work of those interested in reducing racism in America. In addition, the paper has identified some "constellations" of findings of recent empirical research into prejudice and discrimination. The richness of these findings attest to the strength and value of diversity: among investigators and practitioners, among various theoretical perspectives and research practices, and among the various actual or potential applications of such knowledge. The Idaho Human Rights Commission commitment to undertake such a study and publish the results shares the gift of diversity, making superior knowledge available to improve the quality of life for all Idahoans.
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