THE EFFECTS OF PUBLIC POLICY IN HOUSING PROJECTS UPON INTERRacial ATTITUDES

By Morton Deutsch and Mary Evans Collins

There have been very few studies which have centered around changing prejudices. Not only have there been few such studies, but most of them have been limited to the investigation of influences (such as a college course, a motion picture, a visit to a Negro hospital) "which were probably relatively minor in relation to other influences in the subject's social milieu."

The often discouraging and inconclusive results of such investigations may well reflect the comparatively superficial nature of the influences being studied. The strength of the social and psychological barriers to democratic race relations as well as the pervasiveness of discrimination and prejudice suggests that a reduction in prejudices will require strong influences.

The social scientist is rarely in the position where he, himself, has the opportunity to create these influences. He has neither the political power nor the financial resources to produce of his own accord a major social experiment. Nevertheless, social "experiments" are going on all the time; or, perhaps more accurately, major attempts at producing social and psychological changes of one sort or another are a commonplace.

With the aid of scientific controls, the social scientist may occasionally be able to convert an attempt at social change into a social experiment. This is the purpose of our study. We wish to investigate the effects upon prejudice of what is perhaps one of the most important "social experiments" in the area of race relations—the establishment of publicly supported non-segregated interracial housing projects.

Unfortunately, as in most "social experiments," social scientists did not participate in the design of the "experiment." The problem we face, then, is to convert, ex post facto, a "social change" into a scientific "social experiment."

The Significance of Intercultural Housing. There are many reasons why residential segregation can be considered to be of central importance to intergroup relations in general. First of all, residential segregation brings with it, as a natural consequence, segregation in many other areas of living. If Negro and white people do not live near each other, "... they cannot—even if they otherwise would—associate with each other in the many activities founded on common neighborhood."

Segregated racial neighborhoods tend to bring with them segregation in schools, recreational centers, shopping districts, playgrounds, theaters, hospitals, leisure-time facilities, etc. Thus, one result of residential segregation is that prejudiced whites have little opportunity to see Negroes in social contexts which bring out the fundamental condition, human nature of Negroes and whites. They do not see the Negroes, for example, as school children missing homework, as

expectant mothers in their first pregnancy, or as tenants complaining about their landlords, or as breadwinners facing a contracting labor market.

Residential segregation, in yet another way, is of central importance. Next to employment discrimination, segregation is probably the most significant way by which Negroes, as a group, are disadvantaged. Residential segregation for Negroes in the North has always resulted in increased competition for a limited number of dwelling units, with the consequence that Negroes have invariably paid higher rentals for poorer accommodations. With limited incomes, high rentals have resulted in severe overcrowding and rapid physical deterioration. The economic and psychological burdens resulting from these housing conditions have contributed notably to a high incidence of delinquency, broken homes, emotional instability, and the general brutalization of life. These characteristics of Negro ghettos also tend to support the rationales for prejudice, helping to perpetuate the vicious circle which Myrdal and others have fully documented.

With a few exceptions and apart from run-down neighborhoods or areas in a process of racial transition, the only major instances of a break with the traditional practices of residential segregation in the United States have occurred in public housing. However, even in public housing the common pattern is complete segregation; Negroes and whites live in separate housing projects. But there are important exceptions. These exceptions and the variations among them, in effect, provide a natural social experiment which permits those engaged in carefully controlled research to gather valuable information about the conditions which affect interracial attitudes.

The Research Problem

To orient ourselves to the various factors which might influence race relations in public housing projects and to determine the social urgencies and vital issues, we interviewed officials with experience in interracial housing throughout the country. From our survey of expert opinion and from other social-science knowledge, it was apparent that one of the most crucial influences affecting race relations in housing communities is the occupancy pattern. To determine the impact of different occupancy patterns, we decided to do a comparative study of race relations in two types of housing projects: the integrated inter racial project (families are assigned to apartments without consideration of race) and the segregated bi-racial project (Negro and white families live in the same project but are assigned to different buildings or to different parts of the project).

We obtained the cooperation of two large housing authorities in neighboring cities, Newark and New York, which differ in policy with respect to the type of occupancy pattern in interracial public housing projects. In Newark, the projects, which house both Negro and white families, have a segregated occupancy pattern; in New York, the project is integrated. In each city two projects were selected for study. Realizing that the ratio of Negro to white families might be an important influence on race relations, we selected projects in the two cities that had approximately the same ratios. In one project in each of the two cities, there are about 70 Negro families to 30 white families; in the other project in Newark the ratio is 50-50, while the second project in New York has 60 white to every 40 Negro families.

Of course, other factors in addition to
the ratio of Negro to white families may influence race relations. Fortunately the projects we were comparing are similar in many relevant respects: they all are low-income projects containing families who had to meet similar eligibility requirements in order to move in; they were all built at about the same time, just before World War II, the neighborhoods surrounding the various projects are much alike—all of them are predominantly Negro neighborhoods, and one of the projects in each city is located in a neighborhood that is considerably deteriorated and characterized by much delinquency; the staffs in each of the four projects include both Negro and white personnel; the project managers have all had considerable experience in interracial public housing projects; etc. The projects differ somewhat, as one would expect, e.g., one New York project is larger and the other smaller than the corresponding projects with similar racial ratios in Newark. Also, it should be indicated that population differences exist that act to enhance some of the results reported below. However, statistical analysis reveals that these population differences are by no means sufficient to explain away the differences we attribute to the effects of occupancy pattern.

The data for this study were collected primarily through systematic interviewing of white housewives. The home is, after all, largely the domain of the woman. She spends more time in it than anyone else; she is, by and large, the initiator of activities and contacts that develop directly out of the home. Whether or not she “wears the pants in the family,” she is the key person in activities centered around the place of residence.

The funds at our disposal made it unfeasible to interview both Negro and white housewives in equal proportion.

We decided to interview more white housewives as a result of our conviction that prejudiced interracial attitudes are more socially crucial among whites than among Negroes, since the practices of segregation and discrimination are enforced by the white and not by the Negro segment of the population.

We interviewed approximately 100 white and 25 Negro housewives in each of the four projects. In addition, a total of 24 Negro and white adolescent boys and girls were interviewed in one project in each of the two cities. The interviewees were selected by a random procedure.

THE INTERVIEW

The interview was long and intensive; on the average, it lasted about one and a quarter hours. Some interviews ran over two hours. In the course of the interview, data were obtained about five major areas:

1. The Attitudes of the Housewife toward Living in the Project: What she liked most and least about the project; her feelings about public housing, the neighborhood, the apartment, etc.; the anticipations she had before moving into the project; her future plans; and her feeling toward people in the project.

2. Attitudes toward Negroes: A series of questions attempted to uncover the attitudes of the housewife toward Negroes, her feelings about them, her “knowledge” and beliefs about them, and her feelings about living in an interracial project.

3. The Amount and Intimacy of Contact with Other Women in the Project: Questions were asked about neighborly contacts (such as visiting, shopping together, minding children, going to movies together), friendships, how one gets to know people, etc. Information was obtained about the types of contacts with Negro women.

4. The Social Support for Attitudes: The housewife was asked, for example, to tell her relatives, friends, people in the project, management staff, etc., who would react to her being friendly with Negro people.

5. The Characteristics of the Housewife: A miscellaneous assortment of questions was asked about the housewife: her age, number of children, her activities, her education, her religion, her interests, etc., to obtain information about the comparability of the populations in the projects we were studying.

The interview, for the most part, encouraged the respondent to answer freely in her own words rather than restricting her to “yes” or “no” answers. Interviewing was done in the respondent’s home.

RESEARCH RESULTS

In an ex post facto experiment such as we are here reporting, there is always need to be cautious in making causal inferences. One must inevitably face the critical question, “Which came first?” That is, did the attitudinal differences between the housewives in the integrated interracial and the segregated bi-racial projects exist prior to their residence in public housing and perhaps cause them to move into the one or the other type project? Or did the differences in attitudes result from their living in the different types of projects? In the book from which this article is adapted and condensed considerable indirect evidence is brought to bear upon these questions. This evidence, for which we do not have space here, leads us to believe that the differences primarily reflect the effects of the different occupancy patterns. The evidence is of several sorts: (1) an examination of the socio-psychological situation of prospective tenants; (2) an examination of refusal rates and voluntary move-outs; (3) an examination of the housewives’ prior interracial experiences; (4) the reports of the housewives about their prior attitudes; (5) comparison of housewives who did or did not know about the nature of the occupancy pattern before they made their applications; (6) a comparison of housewives in the different projects who were equated for education, religion, and political beliefs. All these types of evidence give credence to the interpretation that the occupancy pattern had causal efficacy.

Getting to Know Each Other. As our knowledge about the development of prejudice has increased, it has become more and more evident that prejudice rarely originates in personal experiences with the members of a minority group. We know that many people who are extremely prejudiced against Negroes or Jews have never known a Negro or a Jew. Further, we know that the nature of prejudice is such that it results in a reduction of intimate, equal-status contacts with the objects of prejudice. Prejudices combine with social custom to prevent the bigot from having the types of experiences, with Negro people, for example, which would destroy his prejudices. Hence, the main source of information about Negroes comes to be the “experiences,” beliefs, and feelings of other prejudiced members of his own group. As a consequence, members of the prejudiced group, through contact with each other, tend mutually to confirm and support one another’s prejudices. A vicious circle or a “socially shared autism” is established whereby, without personal experience with members of a minority group, contact with the prevailing attitude toward them provides the “experience” to support a prejudice.


d* Essentially the same questions were asked of the Negro housewives but, of course, we asked them about white people.

d# Gardner Murphy has originated the term “socially shared autism” to refer to phenomena such as those in which members of a social group develop considerable confidence in their belief about something with which they no longer have contact, as a consequence of their mutual reinforcement of each other’s beliefs. See his Personality: A Biosocial Approach to Origin and Structure (Harper & Bros., 1947).
TABLE 1

PERCENTAGES OF HOUSEWIVES INDICATING THEIR MOST LIKELY CONTACTS WITH NEGRO PEOPLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Meeting place</th>
<th>Integrated interracial projects</th>
<th>Segregated bi-racial projects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Koaltown *</td>
<td>Sacktown *</td>
<td>Bakerville *</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases †</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-39</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 or over</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total cases</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The project names are pseudonyms.
† Only the people who responded "yes" or "uncertain" to the question of getting to know Negro people are included. The percentage figures add up to more than 100 because many people named more than one place.

Perhaps the first problem that faces the person who wishes to change the attitudes of a prejudiced individual is that of breaking through this vicious circle so as to bring to bear upon the bigoted the experiences necessary to a change in attitudes. Something must be done to "prevent" the prejudiced person from selectively avoiding the experiences which might disrupt his prejudices. One method of accomplishing this objective would be to "compel" him to get to know Negro people in equal-status contacts of a sufficiently intimate and extended nature to resist perceptual or memorial distortion. This latter qualification must be inserted because we know that attitudes tend to select and distort experiences so as to maintain themselves. However, persistent, intense experiences that are repeated are likely to survive attitudinal distortion, if only because of the individual's need to accept the reality of his own senses and experiences.7

One of the basic hypotheses of the study is that the greater physical and functional proximity of Negro and white families in the integrated interracial projects will result in more frequent and intimate contacts between Negroes and whites in these projects as contrasted with the segregated bi-racial projects. Let us consult the data.

In the interview, we asked the housewife to indicate whether she thought that a person who moved into the project would be "likely to get to know any colored people in the project." The differences in responses of the housewives in the two types of projects are striking. More than 95 percent of the women in each of the two integrated projects assert that a person will get to know some Negro people in the project; the few dissenters voice the opinion that "it depends upon you." In contrast, only a minority (30 percent in one and 21 percent in the other) of the housewives in the segregated bi-racial projects feel that there is any chance of getting to know Negro people; the majority are quite convinced that no such likelihood exists.

Clearly, then, the opportunity to get to know Negro people is considerably greater in the integrated than in the segregated project. Table 1 helps to explain why there is such a striking difference in this respect between the two types of projects. The most frequently mentioned places of contact with Negro people for white residents in the integrated projects are the buildings in which they live, laundry facilities located 0 or near their buildings, or outside on benches. (People in the projects, for the most part, during the warm season customarily sit on benches located near their buildings.) It seems evident that the major source of Negro-white contact—contacts that arise from living in the same building—is not available to residents of a segregated bi-racial project.

Several of our questions in the interview of the housewives had the purpose of finding how intimate the contacts were with Negro women in the two types of projects. Only 3 percent of the housewives in each of the two segregated projects report "knowing any Negro people in the project pretty well—well enough to call them by their first names"; in contrast 77 percent of the housewives in one and 49 percent in the other integrated project report having at least this degree of intimacy. The tenants were also asked to tell us the five people in the project they know best. Table 2 indicates the percentage of persons "known best" who are Negro. None of the women in the segregated projects include Negro people among those they know best in the project. In contrast, 27 percent of the women in Koaltown and 62 percent in Sacktown indicate that at least one of the women they know best is Negro.

Similar differences obtain in "neighboring" activities, such as visiting back and forth; helping one another out, for example, with shopping or taking care of the children or when somebody is sick; informal club activities, such as "card" clubs, sewing or ironing clubs; and going out together, such as going to the movies, shopping together, or going "downtown" together. Only a very small percentage (1 percent and 4 percent) of white housewives in the segregated projects engage in any such activities with Negro women; in the integrated projects many of the white women (39 percent and 72 percent in the two projects, respectively) engage
in such activities with their Negro
neighbors.

To sum up, the data we have presented
so far have demonstrated that the likeli-
hood of white tenants getting to know
Negro people and of having intimate
social relationships with them is con-
siderably less in the segregated than in
the integrated projects. Our interviews
with Negro housewives and with children
of both races give the same results.

Further, when we compare people in the
two types of projects of the same religion
or of similar educational backgrounds, or
with similar political attitudes (or people
who are similar in all three respects—
religion, education, and political atti-
itudes) it is still strikingly clear that the
occupancy pattern markedly affects in-
terracial contact. . . . The integrated proj-
et is, thus, considerably more success-
ful in stimulating unprejudiced behavior
toward Negroes among the white people
in the project. Many more white people
in the integrated than in the segregated
projects violate, in actual behavior, the
social prejudices and social customs
which have the consequence of prevent-
ing intimate, equal-status contacts be-
tween Negroes and whites. In effect,
living in the integrated projects produces
a behavioral change with respect to race
relations for many of the white people.

Social Standards for Behavior with
People of the Other Race. A housing
project may be seen as composed of many
informal groups organized around various
types of goals. These groups are intric-
ately connected through the overlapping
memberships of individuals within each
group. Within this complex network it
is likely that group standards or social
norms will develop with regard to issues
which are collectively important to the
interconnected groups. In a society where
prejudice is commonplace and where in-
terracial association is a possibility, race
relations will be such an issue. It is our
hypothesis that the social norms in the
integrated projects will be more favorable
to friendly interracial relations than will
the corresponding social norms in the
segregated projects.

There are several reasons for advancing
the foregoing hypothesis. First of all, it
has long been recognized that people tend
to behave as they are expected to behave.
The expectations of others in a social
situation, particularly if these others are
important to the individual, help to de-
fine what is the appropriate behavior.
There is little doubt that a public housing
authority looms importantly in the life of
residents in public housing projects, since
it controls their only means of obtaining
decent housing at a low rental.

Thus, to the people who live in the pro-
jects, the action of a housing authority
in establishing a policy of integration or
of segregation is not likely to be without
significance. Further, the policy of in-
tegration or segregation is an "official"
decision implicitly carrying public sanc-
tion, and as such it may set up standards
for what one "should" or "should not"
do. The policy of segregation as seen
in applying the notion that Negroes
and whites should be kept apart; the
policy of integration, that race should
not be a criterion for distinguishing among
renters.

In addition to the direct psychological
impact of official policy decision in shap-
ing social norms, the policy decision has
indirect effects upon social norms through
the physical environment that it creates
for race relations. In the previous sec-
tion, we have seen how interracial contact
is promoted or hindered by the physical
nature of the occupancy pattern. The
differences in interracial behavior result-
ing from the different occupancy pat-
terns are likely to have consequences for
the social norms which emerge in the
projects. Thus, a housewife in the in-
tegrated projects is more likely to have
friendly relations with Negroes, as well as
to see other housewives as having similar
relations. These differences combined
with the inclination to rationalize one's own
behavior (to rationalize the status quo)
and with the tendency to conform to and
accept as "right" the behavior of one's
peers would work in the direction of pro-
ducing more favorable social norms in the
integrated projects. Another factor work-
ing in the same direction would be the
comparatively greater number of coopera-
tive relationships between Negroes and
whites in the integrated projects.

Several questions were designed to
determine whether and to what extent
the decision with respect to occupancy
pattern by a public authority and the fact
of occupancy pattern do establish a
standard for interracial conduct. Such a
standard, we felt, would be reflected in
the housewife's description of how the "other
people in the project would react if she
were friendly with Negro people" and
her answer to questions about whether it
would influence her reputation
in the project if she had much to do with
the colored people.

The evidence strongly indicates that
the housewife in the integrated project
expects more approval than disapproval
from others in the project if she is friendly
with the Negro people. She thinks it
is better rather than not better for her to
have much to do with the colored
people. In contrast, the housewife in
the segregated project expects to be
socially ostracized by the other white
women if she is friendly with the Negro
people, and asserts that it is better not
to have much to do with them. Thus,
one woman in a segregated project said:
"They'd think you're crazy if you had a
colored woman visit you in your home.
They'd stare at you and there'd be a
lot of talk." Another said, "I used to be
good friends with a colored woman who
worked with me at the factory before I
moved here. She lives in the other side of
the project but I never have her over to
my side of the project—it just isn't done.
Occasionally, I go over and visit her."

Perhaps the most striking evidence as
to the effects of occupancy pattern in
creating guides for behavior comes from
interviews with the children. The children
in Bakerville (a segregated project) go to
unsegregated elementary schools, where
Negro and white children mix freely.
As a consequence of meeting in the
schools, they all have at least speaking
acquaintances with members of the other
race. Many of them play games together
and belong to the same clubs. Yet no
single instance among the children in-
terviewed in Bakerville do they engage
in such activities with children of the
other race in the project. The children in
Bakerville implicitly understand that
different standards with respect to inter-
racial association exist in the school and
in the housing project. In contrast, the
children in Sacktown (an integrated
project) play together at the project as
well as in the school, visiting in each
other's homes freely.

Some examples will illustrate the
effects of social norms on children in
Bakerville (a segregated bi-racial proj-
ector):

One twelve-year-old white girl stated
that she had made friends with a Negro
girl at camp and she thought the girl
was very nice. The girl lived in the
project, but they never saw each other.

A Negro girl who feels that she is
friendly with a number of white children
stated, "I play with them at school and
we go to the movies with them. In the
project, I have nothing to do with them."

Thus, it is clear that the occupancy
pattern brings along with it a frame of
reference which helps to establish expec-
tations and values with respect to race
relations within the project. Since this
frame of reference is shared by other
housewives with whom one is interacting,
it can be said that a consequence of mov-
ing into one or another project is that the
housewife becomes exposed to one rather
than another social norm with respect to
being friendly with the Negro people in
the project. It is apparent that the social
norm that one is exposed to as a result of
moving into an integrated project is more likely to favor friendly interracial association than the norm of the segregated project; the latter is more likely to favor avoidance (with the more or less inevitable connotation in American society that interracial association brings the idea that it is socially degrading).

The fact that the tenants in the various projects are exposed to "shared frames of reference," as Newcomb calls them, as well as "their isolated individual experiences," is matter of some significance. Levin and Grabbe have pointed out that "only by anchoring his own conduct in something as large, substantial, and superindividual as the culture of the group can the individual stabilize his new beliefs sufficiently to keep them immune from day-by-day fluctuations of moods and influences to which he, as an individual, is subject." This is why attempts to change significant social attitudes must be directed not only at the individual but also at the social institutions and social norms which determine the individual's values and which help to induce the goals for which he strives.

The Effects upon Interracial Attitudes. So far, the results have indicated that the integrated occupancy pattern creates more opportunities for close contact with members of the other race, an atmosphere more favorable to friendly interracial association, and friendlier interracial relations.

Let us now make the assumption that the tenants who moved into the two types of projects had, like most people of similar education and circumstance, rather prejudiced attitudes toward Negroes. If this were the case, one would expect many of the tenants in the integrated projects through their experiences and relationships with Negro neighbors, to shift their attitudes in a more favorable direction; few of the tenants in the segregated projects could be expected to change. That is to say, we hypothesize that the differences between the two types of projects with respect to interracial contacts and social norms which have already been indicated would result in attitudinal differences between the residents in the two types of projects. These attitudinal differences would be most directly reflected in attitudes toward the Negro people in the project; they might be generalized somewhat to include Negro people in general, and perhaps might even extend to other minority groups.

In our data we have many different indicators of attitudes toward the Negro people in the project; some of the measures of interracial association and interracial contact may be considered. All give the same results: the attitudes of the housewives in the integrated projects are considerably less prejudiced than those of the women in the segregated bi-racial projects. Almost three times as many women in the segregated projects (36 percent and 31 percent as compared with 13 percent and 10 percent) in describing the Negro people spontaneously use words like "aggressive," "dangerous," "trouble-makers." There are approximately two housewives who want to be friendly to every one who wishes to avoid contact with Negroes in the integrated projects; in the segregated developments, there is approximately only one who wishes to be friendly to every one who wishes to avoid relationships.

We also obtained many different indicators about attitudes toward Negro people in general: reactions to social-distance questions, acceptance of stereotypes about Negroes, interviewer ratings, reports of the housewives about their own attitudinal change, etc. Again, all provide the same result. The attitudes of the
My doctor is colored... my dentist is colored. He’s a surgeon and he’s wonderful.”

In contrast with the above, the following remarks express typical findings in the segregated projects: “I don’t have anything to do with the colored people... they don’t bother me... I don’t mingle with them. I guess I don’t like them because they’re colored... the Bible says, ‘God created them equal’... so I guess they’re equal, but I don’t like them. I don’t like living so close to them. I think they ought to be in separate projects. Let them live their lives and let us live ours... My ideas haven’t changed any since I’ve lived here... They’re colored and I’m white. They don’t like us and we don’t like them.”

**Conclusions**

Our results provide considerable evidence to discredit a notion that has characterized much of social-science thinking in the field of race relations: the notion originating with William S. Sumner that “states cannot change folkways.” The implication of our study is that official policy, executed without equivocation, can result in large changes in behavior and attitudes despite initial resistance to that policy. Thus, it is clear from our data that, although most of the white housewives in the integrated projects we studied did not, upon moving into the projects, like the idea of living in the same buildings with Negro families (and certainly the community as a whole did not favor it), a considerable change has taken place in their beliefs and feelings as well as in their behavior. It is evident that from the point of view of reducing prejudice and of creating harmonious democratic intergroup relations, the net gain resulting from the integrated projects is considerable; from the same point of view, the gain created by the segregated bi-racial projects is slight.

Further, our results are consistent with the growing body of evidence about the effects of equal-status contacts, under certain conditions, upon prejudiced attitudes. Studies by Allport and Kramer, and by Brophy, by the Information and Education Division of the U.S. War Department, and by Mackenzie, among others, all support the notion that prejudices are likely to be diminished when prejudiced persons are brought into situations which compel contacts between them and the objects of prejudice, provided:

(a) the behavior of the objects of prejudice is such as not to conform with the beliefs of the prejudiced. That is, the Negroes with whom the prejudiced person has contact are not “lazy,” “ignorant,” “delinquent,” etc.

(b) that the intimacy and amount of contact with objects of prejudice not conforming to the stereotypes of the prejudiced are such as to result in experiences which are sufficiently compelling to resist marked perceptual and memory distortion.

(c) that the contact takes place under conditions which make the nonconforming behavior seem relevant to the basis on which the objects of prejudice are grouped together. Thus, if a Negro attendant is seen to be clean and honest, there may be little effect on stereotypes if the perception of cleanliness and honesty is connected primarily with the requirements of the situation, with the classification of the individual as an attendant rather than as a Negro or Negro attendant.\(^{11,13}\)

(d) that the prejudiced person has values or is exposed to social influences (e.g., democratic values or the social influences emanating from a policy of an official, public body) which would strongly conflict with the unbusted retention of unreasoned prejudices.

In addition, if the contact situation is such that it encourages the development of new sentiments to replace prejudiced sentiments either as a result of the experience of cooperative activity with the objects of prejudice or as a result of the internalization of the social norms of an unprejudiced group, the reduction of prejudiced sentiments will be much facilitated.

**ETHNIC TOLERANCE: A FUNCTION OF SOCIAL AND PERSONAL CONTROL**

By Bruno Bettelheim and Morris Janowitz

In this study of ethnic intolerance\(^1\) we attempt to throw light on the principles of group hostility in general and on ethnic hostility as a special subtype.

The four main hypotheses that the research sought to test were based on sociological theory and dynamic psychology. They were: (1) hostility toward out-groups is a function of the hostile individual’s feeling that he has suffered deprivations in the past; (2) such hostility toward out-groups is a function of the hostile individual’s anxiety in anticipation of future tasks; (3) the individual blames out-groups for his failure at mastery and projects undesirable characteristics denied in himself upon members of the out-group because of inadequate personal and social controls which favor irrational discharge and evasion rather than rational action; (4) ethnic intolerance can be viewed in terms of the individual’s position within the social structure either statically or dynamically.

It was assumed that ethnic intolerance was related more to the individual’s dynamic movement within the structure of society than to his position at a particular moment. No claim is made that these hypotheses are universally applicable, but they seemed useful in understanding hostility in modern industrialized communities.

A major premise of the study was that persons who believe they have undergone deprivations are disposed to ethnic intol...