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In our shrinking world, people everywhere have to face two kinds of long-range problems that spell disaster for humankind (and lots of other species, too) unless we manage somehow to face them: how to reorient ourselves, our societies and our cultures to become compatible with our planet’s limited resources, and how to change ourselves, our societies and our cultures so that we do not injure or destroy each other as we trip over each others’ toes. The two challenges are obviously interlinked. People who have learned how to resolve their conflicts with each other constructively can cooperate in “win-win” approaches to resource problems, whereas the longer we postpone facing the problem of managing our resources wisely and equitably, the greater the strain we can anticipate on interpersonal and intergroup relationships. Both sets of problems inherently involve considerations of justice, as we encounter them in a world increasingly split between Haves and Have Nots, powerful and powerless, within and between nations.

A major source of problems of getting along with one another is well captioned by the label US & THEM. On different scales, our nation, our ethnic group, our religion, our “kind of people”, our political party, our family and clique and club—US—are the centers around which our social worlds revolve, and by contrast it is easy for US to see the Others as THEM, the Bad Guys, threatening us or to be despised as a way of bolstering our sense of competence and virtue. Quite possibly our tendency to think and feel in terms of US & THEM arose early in human evolution, since it has adaptive consequences. It seems to be a human universal, and loyalty to the people we are closest to has always paid off. If US & THEM has an evolutionary, biological basis, it does not follow that we must resign ourselves to inevitable and brutal conflict. Human beings have continually adapted culturally and individually to manage potentially troublesome impulses: we are not the naive captives of our biology. In the more crowded and closely interconnected world of today, we are challenged to find new ways of getting beyond US & THEM thinking so as to avoid its harmful consequences, which can easily become fatal.

US & THEM thinking concerns US & THEM at all levels, from family and clique to nation or tribe, but the thinking is done by individuals, whether powerful leaders or common citizens, and it is done in the context of contemporary society and its history. On the world stage, religious and ethnic conflict are presently salient, though the potential for serious international conflict remains. In the United States, the preemptive immediate challenge is to accommodate with respect, justice, and good feeling to our diversity of national origin, ethnicity, religion, age, gender and sexual orientation etc., at a time when the previous “majority group” is at the point of becoming one of many minorities, a situation that fuels US & THEM thinking on the part of its members.
In this **US & THEM** Presenter’s Manual, Stephen Fabick provides a unique resource through which mental health professionals can help professional, school, and community groups become aware of their own unrecognized tendencies to think in terms of **US & THEM**, and to transcend them. It is based on psychological wisdom and years of experience in the development and use of exercises for this purpose. By giving such concrete and imaginative help to mental health professionals who are ready to take the lead in reeducating people for the diverse society that they now inhabit, Dr. Fabick and his colleagues have themselves made an outstanding contribution toward making our society a good one.

M. Brewster Smith  
Professor Emeritus of Psychology, University of California at Santa Cruz
Mission

“Ethnic cleansing”, 9-11, hate crimes. We are deluged with the horrors of intergroup prejudice and violence. The natural response to problems of such magnitude is to feel helpless and hopeless. Such “compassion fatigue” can lead to becoming blind to injustice and numb to other’s suffering.

But as psychologists we are in a position to address such problems. Our research has clarified the roots of prejudice, fear, hatred and exploitation. Psychologists have identified intergroup contact factors which escalate, and de-escalate prejudice and conflict. We have the skills to foster introspection about one’s attitudes, facilitate meaningful dialogue, promote empathic understanding, and handle resistance to change—all skills useful in large group conflict resolution. We can moderate conflict at various system levels, e.g. intrapsychic, interpersonal and organizational/community. Psychologists are central in the expanding new field of ethnopolitical conflict transformation.

The mission of the US & THEM program is to provide tools for intervention before intergroup prejudice and tensions erupt into violence. The three part US & THEM program is a proactive “ounce of conflict prevention”, not a “pound of cure”. Yet this program may be appropriate after violent conflict has ceased and both sides are ready to begin a process of reconciliation.

The US & THEM program is generic, i.e. applicable to an array of problems such as religious intolerance, racial tension, ethnic turmoil, community divisiveness and so on. Regardless of the particular dimension addressed, our goal is to build greater understanding and acceptance between diverse groups through empathy and psychological awareness.

If you have tried to do something and failed,
   You are vastly better off
Than if you had tried to do nothing
   And succeeded.
US & THEM: REDUCING THE RISK OF TERRORISM
Stephen D. Fabick, Ed.D.

“We must live together as brothers, or perish together as fools.”
Martin Luther King

As the world gets smaller with CNN, the Internet, and transportation advances, different cultural groups have more contact with each other. With this comes the opportunity for greater understanding, but also greater conflict. Our enhanced technology requires an enhanced psychology. Our world no longer has the luxury of easy answers such as blind tribal loyalty, ingroup aggrandizement, and outgroup dismissal and disdain.

In a more interdependent world, collaboration trumps competition in the long run, even for the powerful. Wise leaders of powerful groups realize the transitory nature of such power imbalance. And in a world in which terrorism is the seductive equalizer, the powerful have no other choice ultimately. The asymmetrical warfare of terrorism requires a reassessment of the ways to deal with such threats. Transformative thinking is needed in a world where survival depends more on cooperation than on competition.

Such thinking starts on a personal level with the appreciation that the disenfranchised poor are no less important than others. And it continues with the realization that countries with the highest disparity in wealth have the greatest incidence of stress, violence, and crime (Albee, 2000). Such transformative vision then extends to the powerful fully understanding the sense of threat others can feel is posed by their greater power, the privileged having sensitivity to the envy fostered by their bounty, and appreciation of the resentment kindled by their higher status. Teddy Roosevelt recognized that those wielding a big stick must speak softly.

It has been argued that people in the majority may be no more prejudiced than those in the minority. But the disenfranchised cannot be oppressive or racist since such structural violence rests upon not just prejudice, but also on power. So because the powerful have more impact socially, economically, militarily and psychologically, so too do they have greater responsibility to exercise intergroup care and judgment.

Americans don’t have to look elsewhere to see the effects of oppression. The original purpose of slavery in America was to justify an economic advantage for the labor intensive industries of the South. Unlike slaves in some societies in which prisoners of war were enslaved, American slaves were dehumanized. The residue of this evil is apparent. Though black men constitute less than 6% of the general U.S. population, they account for 48% of the state prison population (Haney, C. & Zimbardo, P., 1998). And

2 The term “terrorism” is used in this chapter to refer to violence committed by non-state entities in contrast to “terror” which is used by those in power to maintain it.
gross economic disparity continues unabated between blacks and whites in America.

Though the majority of whites today are not personally responsible for this problem, i.e. are not racist, they benefit from such “white privilege” and thus are primarily responsible for fixing the problem (McIntosh, P., 1994). And because of their greater power, whites are more able to effect such change. This burden of American power, a form of modern day noblesse oblige, extends to international relations.

As Benjamin Barber points out in Jihad vs. McWorld (1996), many Muslims fear the encroachment of western culture, i.e. a cultural genocide. Westerners don’t need to apologize for everything about themselves, but need to be sensitive to the fears of Muslims. And the West may learn something from its adversaries that can’t be learned from its allies. The history of the loss of advantage by a dominant group suggests that for every loss there is a gain. As men in the West have lost some competitive edge at the office, they have gained in their enhanced role in parenting. What can the West learn?

Westerners’ greatest “ism” is not racism or nationalism, but materialism. Conversations center on consumption. Western men tend to discuss the acquisition of wealth, e.g. their investments and jobs, and Western women their consumption, e.g. shopping, restaurants, and vacations. The poor in the West shoot each other for jewelry and expensive athletic shoes. Perhaps what the West stands to gain the most from an attunement and responsiveness to the Muslim world is a personal and spiritual renewal. A sense of such an awakening was manifest in New York after the Trade Center attack. Martin Luther King, Jr. saw the connection between materialism and racism (Wallis, 1994, p. 136):

We must rapidly…shift from a “thing”-oriented society to a “person”-oriented society. When machines and computers, profit motives and property rights are considered more important than people, the giant triplets of racism, materialism and militarism are incapable of being conquered.

Relevance

Are psychological theory, research and practice relevant in the “War Against Terrorism”? We have seen that multinational military intervention has a place, as does the “dirty business” of intelligence gathering. Certainly, diplomacy plays an essential role in countering the risk of terrorism. But what about psychology? Some track II diplomacy (working with mid level leaders from large groups in protracted conflicts) relies directly upon psychological research and skills (Rouhana & Kelman, 1994; Lederach, 1995). Reich (1998, p. 279) concludes that psychological research has an important role in the understanding of terrorism:

Most important for psychological researchers is the need to remember that terrorism is a complicated, diverse, and multi-determined phenomenon that resists simple definition, undermines all efforts at objectivity, forces upon all researchers moral riddles of confounding complexity, and is as challenging
to our intellectual efforts to understand it as it is to our collective efforts to control it. It is an example and product of human interaction gone awry and is worth studying and understanding it in the human terms that befit it: as conflict, struggle, passion, drama, myth, history, reality, and, not least, psychology. However, in applying social science to the understanding of terrorism, we must be cautious, since terrorism is essentially a political phenomenon. We cannot easily extrapolate what is known about violent people in general to terrorists. Kellen, (cited in Reich, 1998, p. 49) states,

Most violent people are not terrorists. What characterizes terrorists is the political, or pseudo-political, component of their motivations, which ordinary violent people lack. Terrorists...have the comparatively rare personality combination of the intellectual (albeit usually not brilliant ones) and the physically violent person in the extreme.

Furthermore, psychologists should not pathologize terrorists’ personalities. Hoffman (1998, p. 158) stated, “Contrary to both popular belief and media depiction, most terrorism is neither crazed nor capricious.” Terrorists don’t voluntarily seek out psychological assessment or treatment. Even when social scientists have access to them after they have been captured, examination of the development of their radicalization is, by definition, post hoc. It is therefore processed through the filter of selective memory and self-justification, as well as intentional omission and deliberate distortion due to judicial contingencies and promotion of the particular political agenda of the terrorist. But, they do seek media attention and converts. So terrorists’ thinking has been examined in their writings and pronouncements. Overall, researchers (Jager, Schmidtchen & Sullwold, 1981) who have studied terrorist personalities have concluded that there is no terrorist personality per se. That is, the type of person drawn to and radicalized into a terrorist subculture is unique to the particular political and social context. A terrorist is further socialized and radicalized once within the terrorist group. The more insular the group from mainstream society, the greater the likelihood of its members developing idiosyncratic thinking over time.

Researchers have identified some personality patterns, however. For example, left-wing terrorists are typically more educated, more middle class, and less indiscriminately violent compared to right wing terrorists. Religious terrorists tend to be more violent than secular terrorists given the formers’ tendency to see the targeted group as infidels. “Holy terrorists” justify more extreme forms of violence by seeing it as retribution for the non-believers’ immorality, i.e. a “divine duty” (Hoffman, 1995).

Paraphrasing several authors Reich (1988, p. 27) writes that terrorists have been described as action-oriented, aggressive, stimulus-hungry and excitement seeking. Particularly striking is their reliance upon the defenses of externalization and splitting. They exhibit a suspension of rational and empathic thinking in a compartmentalized way about their cause and the humanity of target outgroup individuals. And though there is some support for psychological motivations such as abusive and neglectful relationships with parents playing some role in vengeance toward authority figures, (Jager,
Schmidtchen & Sullwold, 1981), there are no control group studies. And, as previously mentioned, each situation needs to be examined given the multiplicity of variables across societies in which terrorism has manifested. Overall, cultural and political factors may weigh more heavily in the development of a terrorist than individual personality.

Given the commonly reported tendency of terrorists to externalize blame to the target group, split good and bad into ‘us’ and “them” respectively, to justify their actions, and to dehumanize ‘them’, it makes sense to draw upon the body of research which has addressed such intergroup tendencies, i.e. prejudice and intergroup conflict studies. Since terrorism is one of the most extreme manifestations of prejudice and conflict which minority group members can perpetrate, it is reasonable to apply such research in our efforts to delineate new paradigms for the research. It also stands to reason that applied programs in intergroup and conflict reduction are relevant in the nascent psychosocial field of terrorism risk reduction.

There is a wealth of research and applied programs in the related areas of conflict resolution (Deutsch & Coleman, 2000) and prejudice reduction (Oskamp, 2000). Much work in social psychology as been done on why individuals identify with a certain group, -- their reference group -- and counter-identify with another (Tajfel & Turner, 1979) and (Turner, 1985). Such work is relevant in understanding issues of terrorist development and recruitment as well as the support that such individuals receive socially, economically, and politically within their communities.

Research has clarified the conditions under which intergroup prejudice (Oskamp, 2000), and conflict (Fisher, R. & Keashly, L., 1991) escalate and aspects of this should apply to the intensification of terrorist threat. Even some work on the identification of types of individuals prone to bifurcation of good in their own racial or ethnic group and bad in targeted outgroups (Duckitt, 1992) may help our understanding of people drawn to terrorist action. Such identification might be useful in terms of discriminative profiling for security purposes. Most importantly, the work done in the areas of prejudice reduction and conflict resolution should help inform program development in terrorism risk reduction. As Crenshaw (cited in Hoffman, 1998, p. 247) wrote, “It is difficult to understand terrorism without psychological theory, because explaining terrorism must begin with analyzing the intentions of the terrorist actor and the emotional reactions of audiences.”

Focus

This article will review the role of social identity (Tajfel, 1981), intergroup contact (Allport, 1954), competition (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood, Sherif & Campbell, 1988), individual psychodynamics (Volkan, 1988), power (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999), and social cognition (Bandura, 1998), in prejudice and conflict, and by extension terrorism. Then a program developed to moderate group prejudice and conflict -- US & THEM: Moderating Group Conflict -- will be described in detail.
Theory

Social Identity theories assume that group members have a basic need for a positive social identity and that conflict between groups arises from the inevitable comparisons between them. Group identity consists of a variety of dimensions, e.g. religion, geography and class. Minorities have trouble achieving favorable social comparisons -- and therefore positive feelings about themselves -- because of their typically inferior social and economic status.

Tajfel (1981) identifies three ways minorities group members handle such a problem. If the social system is seen as legitimate and stable, and there are no clear ways to alter the system, such as in a feudal, slavery, or caste system, they acquiesce. In such societies, minority group members usually have internalized the majority group’s justification for their lower status to some degree. This lowered self-regard helps maintain the status quo. If the status quo is perceived as illegitimate or unstable by the minority group, the system will be threatened. It is at this stage that states may turn to oppression and terror to preserve their faltering hold on power.

Social, political, and economic changes lead to minority group members challenging the assumptions of their society about their inferior status. Education, industrialization, urbanization, democratization, capitalism, and mass communication foster comparisons based upon individual merit, not group membership. Such changes sow the seeds of group conflict as the aspirations of the disenfranchised rise. If the majority-minority status is seen as unstable, i.e. the intergroup walls are more permeable, most minority group members will try to assimilate into the majority.

Taylor and McKirnan (1984) suggest that the majority tends to accept highly qualified members of the minority because such assimilation contributes to the stability of the society. Other minority members may be pacified with the expectation that they will move up too if they try hard enough. However, if the system is perceived as not only unstable but also illegitimate, minority group members will move to change their inferior status. Some highly qualified members of the minority are not accepted by the majority or choose not to try. Additionally, some less well qualified minority members believe that assimilation will not be possible. Then the highly qualified, non-assimilated minority group members begin to raise the consciousness of their group. Self-hate is replaced with pride. They may redefine their group’s identity, e.g. “Black is beautiful”. The minority leaders ascribe responsibility for their lower social status to discrimination and oppression by the majority, not minority inadequacy. Such consciousness-raising is followed by collective action. The minority begins to struggle against what it now sees as social injustice. The emergence of a charismatic leader is common. Such charismatic leaders may be regressive like bin Laden, while others are transformative like Gandhi.

Regardless, the initial response of the majority group is to portray the divisions between their groups as illegitimate or obsolete. But if such attempts fail, the conflict continues, and possibly escalates. If it escalates, the majority may resort to violence and suppression, or it may decide to negotiate to create a mutually acceptable situation. An
implication of this research is that to reduce the risk of terrorism, powerful democracies need not only to be seen as militarily and politically strong, but also legitimate.

One of the most researched theories of intergroup conflict and prejudice is the Contact Hypothesis (Allport, 1954). That research shows that a lessening of intergroup conflict and prejudice occurs under the following conditions: equal status between the groups in the situation; common goals; personal contact (the opportunity to get to know outgroup members as individuals); and support for such contact by each group’s authority figures. Such conditions optimize the opportunity for interdependence and empathy development. The Contact Hypothesis, and its more recent additions, has been supported by many studies (Pettigrew, 1998).

Intergroup contact under the wrong conditions deleteriously affects relationships. The size of the minority in comparison to the majority, the density of the minority population in a certain area, and the opportunities for superficial (and potentially, competitive) contact between the groups are variables that increase conflict. These factors can increase the sense of threat experienced by the majority. Forbes (1997), a political scientist, emphasized the negative influence of contact between groups when their larger communities are not supportive of such contact, are in conflict, and are disproportionate in size. So he simply extended the scope of the Contact Hypothesis research to larger constituencies.

A variant of the Contact Hypothesis is the Realistic Group Conflict Theory of Sherif (1966). It postulates that intergroup hostility arises from real or perceived competition caused by conflicting goals. The conflict is fueled by the zero-sum nature of the competition, i.e. desired resources are finite, or at least viewed as such. So members of each group believe that gains achieved by members of the outgroup will result in fewer resources for themselves.

Also, Sherif & Sherif (1953) noted that one’s reference group and their membership group may be different. For example, an individual may belong to a minority group but aspire to and identify with the majority group. Such individuals are typically seen by their membership group as social climbers, disloyal, and mistrusted.

Vamik Volkan (1988) has been the most important psychologist in the formulation of the psychoanalytic approach to intergroup conflict. He described the following stages of the development of self and other images from infancy. First, infants begin to differentiate themselves from the outside world and other people. Simultaneously, they begin forming rudimentary images of others and themselves. However, they cannot connect both pleasure and pain with the same person, e.g. their mothers sometimes feeding them and other times not responding). So they form images of the other that are either all good or all bad. Normally, infants begin to meld these opposing images of others and themselves in the second year. However, some images remain unintegrated or primitive, i.e. all bad or good. Later, some of those unintegrated images of self and caretakers are idealized as all good, or devalued as all bad. Then children project those idealized or disparaged
images onto certain people. This is done to preserve a sense of internal goodness, safety and power in the self, one’s family and group.

Volkan uses the term suitable targets of externalization (STEs) to describe people and objects which are the reservoirs of such images. STEs are culturally determined and include symbols, cuisine, attire, religious icons, and also individuals and groups of people. People experienced as friends, allies, and heroes are positive STEs, enemies are negative STEs.

Volkan & Iitkowitz (1994) describe each member of a group as having an individual identity which is like a garment protecting the individual from threats. But each person in an ethnic, religious, or national group also has a group identity that is like a large tent. Group members aren’t preoccupied with the group identification unless they experience it as no longer protecting them. At such times, shoring up the ‘tent’ takes precedence over individual identity needs.

The group identity tent is woven with shared rituals, symbols, leaders, and myths. Chosen glories, mythologized and idealized collective achievements and victories are important in defining “us” versus “them”. Even more powerful are chosen traumas which are mythologized losses, injustices, and humiliations suffered by the group. Finally, borders, both physical and psychological, clarify the distinction between ingroup and others (Volkan, 1992).

Minorities are common STEs for the psychic discards of the dominant group. So minority group members may be discriminated against because of a mixture of real attributes, but also projected negative qualities of the majority. Unfortunately, more vulnerable minority group members may absorb such characteristics, leading to lowered self-regard.

Another psychoanalytic perspective is offered by Pearlman (2002) who spoke of terrorism as a pathogenic response to suffering that is not redressed, a perversion of the search for justice which has been thwarted, and a securing of the need for equality and freedom at any cost. The infliction of humiliation, powerlessness, and terror onto the powerful is experienced as expiation and victory by terrorists. By making the powerful helpless, equality is achieved. But a preferable solution is to achieve equality the other way, by empowering the helpless. “The Intifada seemed to turn Palestinians from victims to masters of their fate” (Andoni, 1997, p. 36). For many, especially men, the feeling of impotence is often intolerable. They would rather be bad. Pearlman cited the study of suicide bombers by Ann Marie Oliver and Paul Steinberg of the Center for Middle Eastern Studies at Harvard. They describe such suicide missions as a preemptive strike. Rather than let the enemy kill them, they kill themselves to deprive the enemy and attain control over the inevitable. Volkan has described suicide bombers as “preferring to die physically rather than psychologically.”

Bertrand Russell (1938) wrote, “The fundamental concept in social science is power, in the same sense in which energy is the fundamental concept in physics”. The asymmetry
of power between groups can foster subjugation and oppression. But reprisals by the repressed are not uncommon, terrorism among them. A prolonged sense of powerlessness can have dire consequences (Sashkin, 1984) and result in irrationality and violence (Kanter, 1977).

Social Dominance Theory (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) focuses on how group based hierarchies in society determine disproportionate access to power, wealth, and status, whereas subordinate groups suffer greater disenfranchisement, poverty, discrimination, and imprisonment. Social hierarchies are structured by age and gender generally. Depending upon the society, other dimensions for such stratification include; race, ethnicity, caste, clan, religion, class, nation, and many others factors important in a given society.

Coleman (2000) clarifies how power does not have to be a negative factor in group relations. He sees problems stemming from misconceptions about power such as the concept that there is only a fixed amount of power between groups, that power only flows in one direction (usually from the more powerful to the less), and that power means “power over” not “power with”.

However, as demonstrated in the classic Stanford Prison study (Haney, Banks & Zimbardo, 1973) power can easily corrupt. As religion has been labeled the opiate of the masses, so too could power be seen as the “opiate of the elite”. Kipnis (1976) described how those having power acquire a “taste for power”, an inflated esteem and a devaluing of the less powerful. Fiske (1993) and Mindell (1995) described the insensitivity to the less powerful fostered by the possession of power.

Social learning theorist, Albert Bandura, and others have addressed the perceptual and cognitive distortions which foster violence, including terrorism. He wrote (Bandura, 1998, p.163),

“From a psychological standpoint, third-party violence directed at innocent people is a much more horrific undertaking than political violence in which particular political figures are targeted. …to slaughter in cold blood innocent women and children in buses, in department stores, and in airports requires more powerful psychological machinations of moral disengagement.”

Conscious justification of violence allows a person to commit acts normally outside their moral code. A psychologically healthy soldier may take pride in his ability to kill the enemy if he believes that he is fighting a just war. The terrorist may think that more people will suffer, especially his people, if he doesn’t sacrifice the lives of innocents from the oppressive group. The unconscious mechanism of ingroup-outgroup bias (also known as the ultimate attribution error) facilitates such justifications. It refers to the tendency to imbue our own group members with greater value than the outgroup.

Another means of what Bandura calls the moral disengagement of the terrorist relies upon euphemistic labeling. Terrorists describe themselves as “freedom fighters” and
refer to “hostages” as “spies”, while America sanitizes killing with terms like “collateral damage”, “neutralizing” and “surgical strikes”. This is another example of ingroup-outgroup labeling bias, i.e. our “dissemination of information” is the outgroup’s “spreading propaganda”, and our “disinformation” is their “lies”.

Another example of this ‘us’ vs. ‘them’ bias is the finding that people rate aggressive actions of the other as more violent than they do when a member of their own group is the instigator (Duncan, 1976). Similarly, ingroup-outgroup bias leads to an overemphasis on personality for ingroup member’s virtuous behavior and overemphasis on the context as the explanation for reprehensible behavior by someone in the ingroup. The opposite attribution emphases are true in judging behavior of someone in the outgroup (Taylor & Jaggi, 1974). So terrorists can minimize their slayings as the only defensive weapon at their disposal against an oppressive, intractable regime. Counter terrorists can judge their retaliation as restrained compared to the carnage of the terrorists.

Another way one will relax self-sanction is through the displacement of responsibility. Milgram (Helm & Morelli, 1979) found that 65% of students would administer shock to an experimental subject until the student believed that the subject had passed out or died under certain conditions, e.g. anonymity between student and subject, gradual increases in ‘voltage”, and the direction of an authority figure who would “take responsibility for the consequences”. Likewise, acts such as suicidal bombings and hostage taking normally proscribed by Islam, receive endorsement through circuitous justifications by Shi’te clerics (Kramer, 1998). Bandura (1998) points out that the most reliable terrorists are those who are bound by a sense of duty to their superiors while relinquishing personal responsibility for the suffering they inflict.

Dehumanization is another psychological tool in the suspension of self-monitoring. It’s easier to kill a “Jap” or a “gook” than a person. “It requires conducive social conditions rather than monstrous people to produce heinous deeds” (Bandura, 1998, p.182). Empathizing with the other is the opposite of dehumanization. If one of the terrorists piloting the hijacked planes on September 11 empathized with his potential victims and their loved ones, he could not have completed his mission. Likewise, terrorism is less likely to be an attractive option to a disenfranchised or oppressed people who feel the humanizing effect of support from the larger world.

The attribution of blame is “another expedient that can serve self-exonerative purposes; one’s own violent conduct can then be viewed as compelled by forcible provocation” (Bandura, 1998, p.184). The cycle of violence escalates as terrorists and governments each focus on the latest assault of the other without appreciating the provocative nature of their own violence.

The previously mentioned Milgram studies on obedience, underscore the process of what Bandura terms “gradual moral disengagement”. Terrorists get socialized into more and more extreme attitudes and modes of violence over time. Sprinzak (1998) writes about the radicalization of the Weatherman. Their opposition to particular social policies grew
into increasing estrangement from the society and violent confrontations with police, and eventually they turned to terrorism in an effort to destroy the system.

One group’s defense is often experienced by members of the enemy group as an assault. Mistrust and defensiveness lead to caution and control, which can evoke a defensive and hostile reaction, which is then viewed as proof of the initial view. Unchecked, such self-fulfilling prophecies (Merton, 1952) tend to spiral into greater levels of hostility and violence.
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Chapter Two

US & THEM: Moderating Group Conflict Program
Overview

Need: Within each of us, to some degree, lies the need to split good and bad, that is to externalize unacceptable aspects of ourselves onto others. Likewise, within each group, there is some tendency to attribute disowned aspects of the group to other groups. Historically, this tendency has been adaptive; yet as our world shrinks due to technological advances, a new approach is required. As nuclear risk remains and terrorist threats grow, we need to adapt. The change in our technology demands a change in our psychology.

Description: The US & THEM program is designed to highlight the dynamics common to prejudice and conflict along many dimensions, for example race, class, culture, nationality, religion, and ethnicity. Furthermore, education about these common dynamics in the workshop relies upon a balance of teaching basic concepts, experiential learning through structured activities, and post-workshop dialogue and action.

US & THEM refers to the polarization of two or more groups. Such divisiveness is fueled by an exaggerated sense of one’s own group as special and good. Accordingly, other groups are devalued and feared.

The universal tendency to identify with our group and counter-identify with other groups has to do with issues of identity, comfort and survival. Group boundaries exist to give cohesiveness to groups and to exclude disavowed parts of group members. They tend to provide order and prevent fusion within a large, chaotic world. Group identity tends to confer some sense of belonging, goodness, and worth.

US & THEM thinking is magnified at times of intergroup conflict of interests, such as intensified economic competition, religious conflict or territorial dispute. And though we realize that prejudice and conflict have important historical, economic, and political causes, we focus on how such tensions are fueled psychologically--and how we can moderate them.

Participant Characteristics

Representation. The groups involved in the program should be representative of the major groups involved in the conflict in the region. Efforts need to be made to involve all such ethnic, religious, racial, or national groups. Uninvolved groups may be motivated to derail progress between the involved groups, especially if they feel uninvited in the first place.
Age. Although on several occasions, the program has been modified for children (shorter duration, simplification of concepts and language, etc.), participants should be adolescents or adults. A children’s program may be developed in the future.

Openness. Openness is another important participant characteristic. The majority of participants in past Programs have involved participants already predisposed to peaceful conflict reduction. However, optimal Program impact occurs with participants in the midrange of prejudice toward ‘them’ in the particular conflict. The program is not likely to succeed with the most prejudiced members of the community. And obviously, terrorists and their active supporters cannot be reached by such programs.

Influence. Ideally, we try to involve community leaders. The involvement of such people has the greatest post-program impact upon their communities.

Conflict Intensity. We usually envision the program being implemented before violent conflict. However, we appreciate the cyclical nature of conflict, as well as the need for interventions during intractable conflicts. So there is a role for the program after cessation of hostilities since it may help prevent another round of active conflict. However, the more intense the conflict, the less likely disputants will be willing and free to become involved. Doing so could run the risk of their larger constituencies’ seeing them as weak or disloyal, and mistrusting or ostracizing them. Therefore, the best time for Program is when intergroup tension is at a moderate level. In terms of Fisher and Keashly’s (1991) model of conflict escalation -- discussion, polarization, segregation, and destruction -- the program could be implemented in all but the fourth phase, though the endorsement of community leaders is essential in the segregation phase.

US & THEM Program Format

Phase One: The US & THEM: Moderating Group Conflict workshop is the first phase of the three phase program. The workshop is designed to be experiential, so brief talks by the presenter(s) are followed by more lengthy participant exercises. Each didactic segment covers an aspect of US & THEM dynamics: “WHAT do we mean by US & THEM?”; “WHY does US & THEM thinking occur?”; “HOW does US & THEM thinking develop in children?”; “WHEN does US & THEM thinking escalate?”; “WHO is prone to exaggerated US & THEM thinking”; “The problem with extreme US & THEM thinking”; and “Resolving extreme US & THEM thinking”. Masters for overhead transparencies are provided for each segment of the sample talk.

The experiential activities are the core of the workshop. The exercises are sequenced to facilitate learning objectives in the following order: 1) self-awareness; 2) other-awareness; and 3) a bridge between the diverse groups participating in each workshop. Exercises are categorized by their learning objectives, i.e. self-awareness, other-awareness, creation of a bridge between groups, and in some cases, a combination of two of those objectives.
Phase Two: The second phase of the Program occurs after the workshop. It entails formation of dialogue groups (based upon the Study Circles format). Groups have the following characteristics:

- They are comprised of eight to twelve people who meet regularly over a period of weeks or months to continue to engage in dialogue. The composition of the group is balanced along the dimension of interest, e.g. race, ethnicity, religion, and so forth.

- A dialogue is facilitated by a mutually respected person from each of the participant groups. The facilitators do not act as experts, but serve the group by keeping the discussion focused, helping the group consider a variety of views, and asking difficult questions.

- The format of the dialogue can be based upon the most relevant discussion guide from the Study Circles Institute.

- The Dialogue Group progresses from a session on personal experience (how does the issue affect me?) to sessions providing a broader perspective (what are others saying about the issue?) to a session on action (what can we do about the issue here?).

Phase Three: The next phase of the program, Joint Community Action, flows from the second. It involves a collaborative project developed and implemented by workshop participants from the diverse groups. Community action can be either a response to group conflicts or a coordinated effort to strengthen intergroup understanding before problems erupt. Projects could involve efforts to reduce neighborhood violence, joint social gatherings, collaborative political action, and so forth. Sample projects are described and relevant resources are provided in the Participant Booklet to facilitate that process.

Presenter’s Manual and Participant Booklet: The Presenter’s Manual includes relevant research and materials for workshop presentations, such as a sample talk, originals for overhead projector transparencies, many participant exercises, sample agendas for various length workshops, ideas for opening and closing presentations, audio-visual resources, bibliography, and typeset brochure with space for the presenter’s name and contact information.

The Manual also includes the original copy of the Participant Booklet which includes basic workshop material, guidelines for forming dialogue groups after the workshop, ideas for joint community projects, and lists of resources, e.g. organizations, publications, and videos.

Group Process Considerations
Attention is paid to the dynamics necessary to optimize prejudice and conflict reduction as identified by the previously mentioned Conflict Hypothesis research.

- Fostering the equality of participating group members by: counterbalancing pre-workshop contact with group representatives; seating arrangements in the workshop; balancing the number of participants from involved groups; striving for approximately equal status of participants; and presenters who are not from participating groups. Presenters model respect for all participants, as well as for healthy diversity.

- Facilitating participants’ common goals, e.g. the superordinate goal of the reduction of intergroup misunderstanding and tension. Encouraging participants to engage in a collaborative process to achieve such outcome goals, e.g. introspection of their own attitudes, education about the other group members’ experiences to enhance empathy with them, and exercises and follow-up activities designed to create greater connection with participants from the other group(s). Group interdependence is highlighted and valued.

- Establishing a forum for participants to get to know ‘them’ as individuals through the exploration of common interests, experiences, and aspirations (recategorization and cross-categorization; socialization opportunities; and structured dialogue and exercises designed to increase participants’ empathic understanding of “them”).

- Gaining the endorsement of participating group’s community leaders. In some communities, it is not advisable to implement the program until tensions decline. If resources permit, holding the program outside the region may provide the psychological space and security conducive to open participation.

Purpose:

To help participants understand and moderate their intergroup prejudice and conflict.

Objectives:

Knowledge

- Greater awareness of the origins of one’s own images of “them” and a reduction of distorted perceptions of “them.”

- Increased knowledge of the outgroup participants’ history, beliefs, values, culture, perceptions of the “us”, experience of the conflict, and aspirations.

- Appreciation of the mutual influence between the groups (and the more powerful group’s exertion of greater influence).
• Greater sensitivity in dominant group members of the benefits of privilege they have taken for granted and sensitivity to feelings of the disadvantaged group members.

• Increased knowledge of why and how leaders and the media influence intergroup attitudes and conflict.

• Understanding the power of primary identification, but also the possibility of cross categorization with members of “them” on other dimensions.

• Increased awareness of collaborative processes and possibilities between participating groups.

Attitudes:

• Realization that group pride does not rely upon downward comparisons to other groups.

• Humanizing “them”, manifested by greater empathy and respect for “them.”

• Increased appreciation of intergroup diversity.

• Increased appreciation of intergroup interdependence.

• Movement toward forgiving “them.”

• Ability to envision a more constructive common future.

• Understanding that peace requires conscious, courageous, ongoing action.

Skills:

• Greater introspection ability in order to more non-defensively and fully see one’s own distorted images, stereotypes, and prejudging of “them.”

• The ability to talk directly, openly, and constructively to “them” about one’s views and feelings about “us”, the conflict, and “them.”

• The ability to accurately and empathically listen to “them” talk about their views and feelings toward their group, the conflict, and “us”.

• The skill to speak up effectively when someone from the either group expresses a demeaning or inaccurate representation of either group.
• Enhanced coalition-building skills with the participating groups.

Actions:

• Intentional and collaborative interaction with “them” during the program.

• Continuation of such cross group interaction after the program.

• Encouraging greater understanding of “them” within one’s group.

Sponsoring Organization:

Psychologists for Social Responsibility (PsySR) is a U.S.-based, non-profit, international network of psychologists who draw upon the research, knowledge, and practice of psychology to promote durable peace at community, national and international levels. With members in 47 states of the USA and 39 other countries, PsySR is building a cross-cultural network to facilitate communication about the complex and multi-disciplinary problems of fostering cultures of peace.

The US & THEM: Moderating Group Conflict program, originally titled US & THEM: The Challenge of Diversity, was developed by members of the Michigan Chapter of PsySR. The program was adopted by the national organization in 1994. Over the past decade, US & THEM programs have been conducted for a wide variety of groups. Programs have focused on problems ranging from international ethnic conflict to racial tension in Detroit.
Chapter Three

How to use the US & THEM Manual

Purpose
The US & THEM program is designed to highlight the dynamics common to differences along many dimensions, e.g. race, class, culture, nationality, gender, etc. Such differences often become the focal point of group conflict. Participants increase their awareness of these common dynamics through a combination of learning about basic group conflict concepts and experiential learning through structured activities in the US & THEM workshop. Post-workshop dialogue groups and collaborative action reinforce this awareness.

US & THEM workshop agendas should follow this sequence:

- Facilitation of greater self-awareness along the dimension addressed, e.g. religion or ethnicity.
- Facilitation of greater insight into others along this dimension.
- Facilitation of a bridge between/among these different groups in and after the workshop.

Format
This manual includes visual materials to help you in your presentation, such as a lecture outline and related cartoons. They follow the section titled US & THEM Overheads on page . Those pages should be copied onto overhead transparencies on a copy machine for use with an overhead projector. An abbreviated copy of a lecture is provided as an example to help you with your talk. The Reference list at the end of that lecture can also aid you in giving talks. Finally, weaving your own experiences into your presentation will help you to feel more ownership and comfort in your talk, and increase audience interest.

Each workshop can be customized based upon the allotted time and needs of the participants. The exercises chosen for the workshop should be geared to the dimension addressed, such as ethnicity. The workshop should first focus on facilitating greater awareness of self (US), then insight into the other (THEM), and then a connection (bridge) between the different groups. To help you choose appropriate exercises for each workshop, they are categorized according to dimension of emphasis in the Table of Contents, e.g. (US), (bridge), etc.

A sample agenda is shown on the next page to help illustrate the design of a workshop. The exercises selected are sequenced in terms of facilitating self-awareness of racial attitudes, learning about the other group(s), and then establishing a bridge between/among the different racial groups participating. Workshops, and therefore agendas, may be quite different in terms of duration, participant composition and degree of intergroup tension.
Sample Agenda
One Day High School Workshop to reduce Racial Conflict

8:30 a.m. Welcome, Introductions and Opening Remarks

8:45 a.m. **US & THEM** mini-lecture (“What do we mean by **US & THEM**?” and “Why does **US & THEM** thinking occur?”)

9:00 a.m. Students complete, score and process the Diversity Quotient

9:45 a.m. **US & THEM** mini-lecture (“How does **US & THEM** thinking develop?” and “When does **US & THEM** thinking escalate?”)

10:00 a.m. *Stretch Break*

10:10 a.m. Attitudes Exercise

11:10 a.m. **US & THEM** mini-lecture (“Who is prone to exaggerated **US & THEM** thinking?”)

11:25 a.m. Relationship Exercise

12:10 p.m. Lunch

1:00 p.m. Guided Fantasy Exercise

1:30 p.m. **US & THEM** mini-lecture (“Resolving exaggerated **US & THEM** thinking”)

1:45 p.m. Role Reversal Exercise

2:15 p.m. *Stretch Break*

2:25 p.m. Coalition Building Exercise

3:30 p.m. Closing Remarks (summary and follow-up ideas), Reflection

3:45 p.m. Workshop Evaluations
Planning a Presentation

Before the presentation

1. Talk with the liaison(s) from your audience group to determine their needs and expectations. Inform them about your presentation, and adapt it according to audience needs. For example, if you will be speaking to a Youth Center group with gang trouble you will use different examples and exercises than for a PTO battling over a homosexuality curriculum.

2. Determine the audience’s tasks, e.g. promotion, the set up of the room (e.g. are the chairs moveable? Separated by tables which could inhibit a sense of audience connection?), audio visual equipment, refreshments, name tags, etc.

3. Balance the kind and amount of pre-workshop contact with participating group representatives, especially if there is significant tension between the groups.

For the Presentation

1. Bring necessary materials, e.g. a photocopies of the Participant Booklet at the back of this Manual for each audience member, newsprint, markers, masking tape, pencils, and anything needed for planned exercises.

2. Arrive early enough to coordinate last minute details with audience group liaison(s) and presentation team, test equipment, room set up and possibly signs directing people to the presentation.

Delivery Tips

Practice ahead. If using a co-facilitator, provide feedback to each other.

Start and stop workshop segments on time. If you have a co-presenter, serve as each other’s time managers.

Interact with participants during the mini-lectures, e.g. asking them questions such as “Why do we think in **US & THEM** terms?”

Shift the focus from a participant who is disruptive or monopolizes.

Mix up mini-lectures with exercises, with the latter longer.
Materials Checklist

____  Pencils
____  Markers
____  Masking Tape
____  Transparencies (prepared and blank)
____  Transparency Pen
____  Overhead Projector
____  Extension Cord
____  Screen
____  Table (for overhead projector, facilitator’s materials and handouts)

____  Handout Materials
   ____  One **US & THEM Participant Booklet** per audience member
         (Copied from the Master Booklet at the end of this Manual)
   ____  Brochures
   ____  Other, i.e.___________________

____  Exercise Materials

____  Name tags

____  **US & THEM** Presenter’s Manual

____  **US & THEM** Direction Signs *with meeting room written inside the Arrow*
      (Next two pages)
   ____  Other, i.e.___________________

*(Copy this page and check materials needed for your presentation.)*
US & THEM
Moderating Group Conflict
US & THEM
Moderating
Group Conflict
US and THEM: Moderating Group Conflict
Stephen D. Fabick, Ed.D

**WHAT** do we mean by **US & THEM**?
(Overhead #1)

**US & THEM** refers to the polarization of two or more groups. It can be along cultural, organizational, racial, ethnic, religious lines and so on. Such divisiveness is fueled by an exaggerated sense of one’s own group as special and good. Accordingly, other groups are devalued and feared (Overhead #2). Though, categorizing others as *like oneself and part of one’s group* is natural, the phrase **US & THEM** as it is used in this workshop, implies the extreme and potentially damaging sense of the **US** as better than **THEM**. (Overhead #3)

Devaluing other groups can be reflected in attitudes such as *misunderstanding, bias, prejudice and dehumanization*, as well as *actions* such as *avoidance, discrimination, war and genocide*. (Overhead #4) The more extreme **US & THEM** attitudes and actions are typically seen only in times of serious conflict when people feel highly threatened.

In confronting extreme **US & THEM** thinking (and, by extension, action), we are not saying, that all other groups are to be trusted at all times. (Overhead #5) Nor are we suggesting that all groups are the same, or on some dimensions, even equal. (Overhead #6) But, we want to highlight the universal tendency we have to magnify differences between our group and others. We want to clarify the circumstances that increase the likelihood of **US & THEM** exaggeration as well as our own individual propensities. For example, a person may be racially open-minded, yet rationalize certain subtle religious prejudices.

**WHY** does **US & THEM** Thinking Occur?
(Overhead #7)

To some extent, **US & THEM** thinking is unavoidable.¹ We all have the need to categorize ‘what is me’ and ‘what is not me’. We would be riddled with anxiety and confusion if we couldn’t simplify and order our complex reality. (Overheads #8) Being part of a group can provide great benefits, ranging from personal sustenance and survival, to participation in great cultural achievement. (Overhead #9)

A child’s sense of vulnerability fosters the need to idealize the parent as omnipotent and thereby extract from him or her power, perfection, and ultimately, safety. Such tendencies
are also seen in adults vis-a-vis the group leader, especially at times when their potency, esteem and, most importantly, security is threatened. The stranger anxiety of infancy is revisited later in life when the individual experiences another person or group as unfamiliar and possibly threatening.

Aspects of group culture such as rituals which regulate greetings, speech, facial expressions and physical closeness, all serve to comfort group members. Shared cuisine, dress, history, heroes, myth, religion and cultural symbols set important parameters in terms of **US & THEM** which become colored with feelings of good and bad, safe and unsafe. When such boundaries are threatened, feelings of **good US** versus **bad THEM** can become heightened. For example, when geographic boundary confusion has resulted from Israeli-Arab conflicts, there has been an increased fear of and hostility toward the other group.² This insecurity seems to echo the reaction of children who don't have the security of consistent parental presence and parameters.

Similarly, at times when competing groups are close in territory and custom, people can go to extremes to distinguish **US** versus **THEM**. For example, Protestant and Catholic farmers in Northern Ireland each say of the other that "he digs with the wrong foot". Freud referred to this as the "narcissism of minor differences."³ We ourselves automatically do this in terms of feeling a kinship with or alienation from others in terms of their favorite music, mode of dress, figures of speech, etc.

There is a tendency to categorize **US & THEM** in less black and white terms as one gets older. For example, a study⁴ of the drawings of 100 children from various countries showed a typical progression in thinking about enemies. Four to six year olds drew an enemy as a scary and strange looking person, often in dark clothes and sometimes carrying a gun. They tended to describe the enemy as always bad. *(Overheads #10 and 11)*

Seven to nine year olds tended to emphasize the relationship with the enemy and describe the enemy as an individual who fights. So the emphasis was on behavior, not necessarily core aspects of badness in the enemy. However, conflicts were seen as the enemy’s fault. *(Overheads #12 and 13)*

Ten to twelve year olds tended to draw symbols such as flags to refer to the enemy, thus showing awareness of the international aspect of enmity. They began to understand the mirror image of enmity, e.g. each country saw the other country as the bad one according to their stories about their drawings. *(Overhead #14)*

Thirteen to fifteen year olds could elaborate enmity into broader concepts such as environmental destruction, drugs, war, etc. *(Overheads #15, 16, 17 and 18)*

Sixteen to eighteen year olds could begin to express an understanding of enmity as originating from within one's self or group, e.g. a focus on the role of attitudes in the origin and maintenance of enmity. *(Overhead #19)*
Children depend on caretakers to soothe them at times of discomfort. Children often use a substitute to comfort themselves in the absence of the caretaker. Pacifiers, blankets, thumbs and teddy bears are associated with the presence and function of the caretaker. Similarly, flags, ideas, words and slogans comfort us as we get older, especially when we feel insecure.

So a universal tendency to identify with our group and counter-identify with other groups has to do with issues of identity, comfort and survival. Group boundaries exist to give cohesiveness to groups and to exclude disavowed parts of group members. They tend to provide order and prevent fusion with a large, chaotic world. Group identity tends to confer some sense of goodness and specialness.

**HOW** does **US & THEM** Thinking Develop?

*(Overhead #20)*

Ideas about **US & THEM** are first learned from our parents, caretakers and society. Much of this learning begins before we have the capacity to rationally analyze it, underscoring the unconscious and unexamined nature of **US & THEM** thinking. Through repeated experiences with need satisfying caretakers, the infant associates with them good feelings and ultimately goodness. Likewise, frustrating experiences tend to be associated with the absence of familiar caretakers. This coupled with an innate fear of strangers, sets the stage for the child to put into others seen as 'not me', 'not mother', 'not family', etc., aspects of experience that aren't wanted. In doing so, sources of potential anxiety can be kept at a safe distance.

As mentioned earlier in the study of children's drawings of enemies, experiences of goodness and badness become more balanced as the individual matures. Most people come to realize that some of the sources of imperfection and threat come from within. Accordingly, they know they must be addressed as an internal issue within the self, or within one's own group, not blamed entirely on others. *(Overhead #21)*

Unfortunately, destructive leaders can heighten the sense of unquestioned internal goodness and external badness, especially at times of crisis. Hitler strengthened German self-confidence by degrading others as a subspecies to compensate for the economic and esteem crisis experienced by Germans after the First World War. Such leaders can prey on their people's need to repair esteem and security by stirring up their fears, and by stereotyping and dehumanizing other groups. One's own identity can then be raised on the destructive foundation of the devalued groups.

For example, Slovak-Americans could externalize any tendency toward nonconformity onto the unruly gypsies in Europe. When they came to America, they used blacks in much the same way, i.e. as a suitable target of unwanted parts of themselves, e.g. seeing them also as lazy, untrustworthy and shameless. Because their contempt for both blacks and gypsies could be rationalized as cultural rather than personal, their guilt feelings could be minimized. At the same time, the reciprocal Slovak-American self-image as
good, thrifty, industrious, obedient, dependable, clean and sexually restrained was maintained. Along with socialization, pressure to conform to group thinking and behavior is a strong mechanism for how such US & THEM attitudes are transmitted. 

**WHEN** does US & THEM Thinking Escalate? (Overhead #22)

US & THEM thinking is magnified at times of inter-group conflict of interests, such as intensified economic competition, religious conflict or territorial dispute. This was reflected in the struggle in the former Yugoslavia among Croatians, Serbs, Slovenes, Herzegovinians, Montenegrinos and Macedonians. These groups historically have shared an intense hatred of each other and fierce ethnic allegiance. However, under Tito they united against Hitler and the German army which became a suitable THEM target. The pride these groups took in their joint fight against the Germans lasted as long as Tito was alive. (Overhead #23)

Healthy leadership tends to restore group cohesion, self-esteem and security. When he ran for re-election, Jimmy Carter was seen by the electorate as embodying a sense of weakness, both in terms of his physical stature and stamina, mannerisms (especially his smile), and perhaps even in his name "Jimmy", as well as, his political frustrations, most particularly, his inability to secure the return of the Iranian hostages. Ronald Reagan projected a more virile image and approach that resonated with a need in the majority of Americans at the time.

There is a tendency for groups to exaggerate US & THEM differences at times of social disorganization and threat. One can avert internal fragmentation by splitting off the bad aspects of one's group, e.g. our economy, by focusing on the badness in other groups. During rough times, regressive leaders are often motivated to distract by focusing on the problems in THEM.

Countries with extremely insecure boundaries, economies and leaders are more prone to exploit weaker countries. The expanded territorial boundaries of imperialism can then provide some sense of security. Unchecked, expansionism can feed desires for superiority and grandiosity.

Just as stable individuals tend to have more balanced images of self and other, it is also true that more stable economies, companies, governments and leaders tend to have more balanced views of US & THEM, thereby reducing the likelihood of inter-group tension and conflict.
WHO is prone to exaggerated US & THEM thinking?
(Overhead #24)

Individuals who are exposed to similar social influences may nevertheless differ in the degree they are prejudiced toward other groups. Certain individual differences seem to be important in determining a person's susceptibility to extreme US & THEM thinking. These differences determine to what extent a person may absorb irrational US & THEM ideas. (Overhead #25) Research along this line has been focused upon a tendency toward intolerance generally, which seems to be related to personality authoritarianism, rigidity, self-esteem and psychological adjustment, intelligence, dogmatism, and the ability to tolerate frustration.

The Problem with extreme US & THEM thinking
(Overhead #26)

Ethnocentrism is the technical name for thinking one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are rated with reference to it. At the heart of ethnocentrism is an exaggerated sense of being special. Just as pride in an individual can be healthy or, on the other hand, compensatory, exaggerated and unhealthy, so can a sense of corporate pride, nationalism, patriotism and tribal loyalty under certain conditions go awry, and become extreme and destructive.

One's sense of group self is often laden with intense emotion. Though often beneficial, such feelings are usually unchecked by the moderating influences of reflection, reason and conscious awareness. The atrocities of the 'ethnic cleansing' policy in the former Yugoslavia reflect the extent to which leaders can seize upon longstanding group fears and hatreds in order to further their ends.

Resolving extreme US & THEM thinking
(Overhead #27)

The difference between people who rescued Jews and those who stood by during the Holocaust was in their upbringing. Rescuers were disciplined less harshly, showed more compassion by their parents, and taught a sense of connection to and responsibility for others. They also grew up with more interaction with groups different than their own compared to the bystanders.

Along with our obligation to imbue our children with an appreciation for others who are different from us, we can increase our own awareness of US & THEM thinking through workshops, readings, interaction with diverse groups, and activism.

In summary, US & THEM thinking occurs naturally to some extent. Little children associate good feelings and ultimately goodness with self, family and community, and are anxious with strangers. Parents and society naturally divide and redirect their children's good and bad feelings, e.g. more often finding good within the group and bad outside it.
The tendency of individuals to identify with the group appears deeply embedded in the survival of the individual group and therefore the species. This identification is most noticeable and intense in times of danger. Arabs say "My brother and I against our cousins, we and our cousins against the world."

Within each of us, to some degree, lies the need to split good and bad, i.e. to externalize unacceptable aspects of ourselves onto others. Likewise, within each group, there is some tendency to attribute disowned aspects of the group to other groups. Historically, this tendency has been adaptive, yet as our world shrinks due to technological advances, and as terrorism and nuclear threat remains a reality, a new adaptation is required. The change in our technology demands a change in our psychology.

REFERENCES
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(Copy the following on transparencies. They can be used during the sample talk at the time indicated.)
What do we mean by US & THEM?
"It's all according to your point of view. To me, you're a monster."
US & THEM

An exaggerated sense of our group's virtues and specialness by devaluing other groups.
Attitudes
Misunderstanding
Bias
Prejudice
Dehumanization

Actions
Avoidance
Discrimination
War
Genocide
After years of hostility, the wolf and the three pigs reconciled. Later at the celebration banquet, however, one of the pigs disappeared.
This page (45) will have the Calvin & Hobbes cartoon about New Years resolutions.

Copyright regulations prevent us from publishing this cartoon. For a hard copy of this page, please email psyr@psyr.org.
Why does US & THEM thinking occur?
This page (47) will have the Calvin & Hobbes fractured perspective cartoon with father in last picture.

Copyright regulations prevent us from publishing this cartoon. For a hard copy of this page, please email psysr@psysr.org.
Reasons some US & THEM thinking is unavoidable

Clarity
Identity
Pride
Security
- Stranger Anxiety
- Boundary Confusion
- Survival Threats

Normal Development
Brooke, Age 5

Enemy: “Someone who is very angry”
Micky, Age 8
Enemy: “Two people fighting”
Alex: Age 8
Enemy: “Coyote and Roadrunner”

(A ferocious Coyote
Tracking down helpless Duck)

(A hapless Duck
Running away from evil Coyote)
Bjorn
Age 11

"Countries at war"

Enemy:
Claudia  Age 13

Enemy:  "Nazi Germany, lack of freedom of speech, pills, poison, alcohol, violence, war, nuclear waste, Berlin wall, East/West conflict"
Kerstin  Age 14
Enemy: "Nuclear war between America and the Soviet Union"
Jorg  Age 15
Enemy:  "Environmental destruction, the end of nature"
Sandra  Age 15

Enemy:  "Death, environmental destruction, alcohol and drugs,
        Berlin Wall, WWII, Reagan/Gorbachov, war."
Britta: Age 18

Enemy: “Mankind inventing nuclear weapons, racism, nuclear war, animal experiments, CFCS (from aerosol, etc.)”
How does US & THEM thinking develop?
A sense of **US & THEM**
comes from

**Caretakers**

**Socialization**
  - learning
  - conformity
When does **US & THEM** thinking escalate?
US & THEM thinking increases when there is...

Conflict
  - territorial
  - economic
  - religious/cultural

Insecurity

Hurt Pride
Who is prone to exaggerated US & THEM thinking?
US & THEM thinking is related to these traits

Dogmatism

Poor Self-Esteem

Low I.Q.

Difficulty with Frustration

Overall Maladjustment
the *Problem* with extreme *US & THEM* thinking

not moderated by reason

can be manipulated

is destructive
Resolving exaggerated US & THEM thinking

Good Parenting
Self-Awareness
Education
Contact with "THEM"
Activism
Chapter Five
US & THEM Exercises

Rationale
Lectures, like visiting relatives, are best in small doses. That’s one reason to use exercises in your workshop. Participants will stay attentive if the didactic parts of the workshops are short and interspersed with engaging experiential activities.

But the main reason exercises are emphasized is that active involvement in the learning process is more important in attitude clarification and modification than more intellectual interventions. The following exercises are designed to stimulate participant’s self-awareness, insight into and empathy with outgroup participants, and help create a bridge between different groups.

Exercises that relate to the participants should be selected, e.g. the privilege exercise would be good for a workshop with African Americans and Euro Americans. However, many exercises are appropriate for any group. If the presentation is short, i.e. a one or two hour talk, not only should fewer exercises be chosen, but shorter ones might be best.

Exercise Categories
As described earlier in this Manual, exercises are grouped into one or more of three categories: exercises designed to promote self-awareness; exercises that focus on fostering greater sensitivity to members of the outgroup, i.e. other-awareness; and exercises that emphasize establishing a bridge between members of the different groups. The category of the exercise is listed in the Table of Contents and in each exercise.

Exercise Selection and Sequence
Ideally, workshops should include at least one exercise from each of the three categories, i.e. self-awareness (US), other-awareness (THEM), and a bridge between the different groups.
If the workshop is only a couple hours long, two exercises cold be chosen since one could cover two areas, e.g. the Guided Fantasy exercise is aimed to increase awareness of the other group members as well as help create a bridge between the groups. Or three short exercises could be used.

It is important to sequence the exercises in the three categories. Self-awareness exercises are employed first, then those that foster other-awareness, and finally, exercises that help develop a bridge between the group members.
The Diversity Quotient (DQ)

Goals

1. To increase participants awareness of their own attitudes and behaviors about differences when they are in the majority, as well as when they are in the minority.

2. To sensitize participants to the reality that they are not simply a member of the majority, or of a minority.

Time

Fifteen minutes. (However, in a short presentation, participants can be asked to complete the DQ as they wait for the program to begin and instructed with a quick example about scoring it during the presentation. Those who don’t complete it during the presentation can finish at home.)

Materials

Enough copies of the DQ for each participant to have one to complete.

Process

1. The administration of the DQ is self-explanatory. Scoring the DQ was designed to be simple, and at the same time, yield scores approximating IQ scores. Overall, since the DQ has not been normed and is not intended to be a serious psychometric tool, the scores, by design tend to be above of 100. Wording of DQ questions was aimed at increasing self-awareness, not at minimizing socially desirable responding.

2. Even though DQ scoring is simple, participants can be intimidated scoring it. So it is helpful to demonstrate scoring it using hypothetical scores different from those in the example provided on the scoring instruction sheet. Even after doing so and fielding questions, the facilitator(s) may need to see who needs direct scoring assistance. (Before the workshop, each facilitator should have completed and scored their own DQ.)

3. Participants are not asked to reveal their DQ scores. But the facilitator can show the DQ Classification overhead after scoring is completed. Some sense of levity can be
useful at this point, e.g. “Mother Theresa was the only person so far who has scored in the Very Superior range!” However, disparaging remarks about scores in the lower ranges should be avoided. By design, people don’t often fall into the lower ranges.

4. If there is time, it is advisable to discuss participants’ reactions to completing the DQ. They can be asked if they are willing to share any insights and concerns. They can be asked about insights, concerns, whether the Majority or Minority section was easier to complete and why, etc.
What Is Your DQ?

In some settings you are in the majority (dominant culture, race, religion, etc.) and in others you are in the minority. Please complete both sections of this questionnaire. Circle only one of the four possible answers to each question. Then score it to determine your Diversity Quotient (DQ). You won't be asked to reveal it so you can be completely candid.

When I am in the Majority...

1. I am aware of being in the majority and listen to minority members’ comments about how they are affected by us.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

2. I try to include minority members in my work and social groups.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

3. When I see a minority person arrested (on TV, in the newspaper, etc.), I tend to view the entire minority group negatively.
   a. Seldom
   b. Sometimes
   c. Usually
   d. Always

3. I have voluntarily devoted time to programs/organizations which promote diversity.
   a. Three or more times
   b. Twice
   c. Once
d. Never

4. I challenge practices/policies (at work, in government, in my community or social circles) which discriminate on the basis of gender, race, ethnicity or sexual preference.
   a. Always
   b. Usually
   c. Sometimes
   d. Seldom

5. I recognize that when I'm pressured, I can revert to narrower attitudes, e.g., thinking my group is right or better and others wrong or not as good as mine.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

7. I have donated to or worked for groups which promote diversity.
   a. Often
   b. Occasionally
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

8. I believe I can learn and grow from exposure to different cultures and beliefs.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never
10. I speak in generalizations, e.g., "You can't trust Jews/Arabs/etc.", "Blacks can really dance", etc.
   a. Rarely
   b. Not often
   c. Fairly often
   d. Usually

11. Though I may or may not speak in such generalizations, I tend to think that way.
   a. Seldom
   b. Sometimes
   c. Usually
   d. Always

12. I tell disparaging (demeaning or disrespectful) ethnic jokes.
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often

13. I tell disparaging gay jokes.
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often

14. I tell disparaging jokes about the other sex.
   a. Never
   b. Seldom
   c. Sometimes
   d. Often
15. My buying, investing and memberships support businesses and organizations which promote diversity.
   
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

16. I realize that "outsiders" recognize my cultural bias better than I do.
   
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

17. I believe in equality and let people in my group know about my commitment to it.
   
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Seldom
   d. Never

18. I support minorities moving into my neighborhood.
   
   a. True
   b. False
   c. I'm opposed to this
   d. I have worked against it

15. I make unwarranted assumptions when I see a stranger of another race or culture walking in my neighborhood.
   
   a. Seldom
   b. Sometimes
   c. Usually
   d. Always
**When I am in the Minority...**

1. I realize I can make unique contributions to the majority group.
   a. Typically
   b. Sometimes
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

2. I feel proud of myself and my group.
   a. Typically
   b. Sometimes
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

3. I actively promote the self-esteem of fellow minority members.
   a. Typically
   b. Sometimes
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

4. When subjected to ridicule and/or prejudice I downplay my cultural identity and traditions.
   a. Never
   b. Sometimes
   c. Often
   d. Always

5. I am active in an organization(s) which promote(s) my minority group's welfare.
   a. True
   b. Provide financial support only
   c. False
   d. I would be ashamed to do so
6. While I realize I don't have to hide my cultural identity, I realize skills are needed to succeed in the dominant culture.

   a. Describes me  
   b. Somewhat like me  
   c. Unlike my approach  
   d. Very unlike me

7. When I succeed in the dominant culture, I don't distance myself from others of my background.

   a. True  
   b. Somewhat true  
   c. Somewhat untrue  
   d. Untrue

8. I realize that under pressure, I can tend to revert to stereotypical thinking about the majority.

   a. Usually  
   b. Sometimes  
   c. Seldom  
   d. Never

9. I sympathize with and collaborate with other minorities to achieve common objectives in the dominant culture.

   a. Typically  
   b. Sometimes  
   c. Seldom  
   d. Never

10. I talk mainly with my own people when in mixed company.

   a. Rarely  
   b. Not usually  
   c. Usually  
   d. Always
11. I tend to blame the dominant group for everything that goes wrong.
   a. Rarely
   b. Not usually
   c. Usually
   d. Always

12. I share my minority groups distinctive views and accomplishments with the dominant group.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

13. I present my minority group's views and experiences in ways majority members understand and usually respect.
   a. Usually
   b. Sometimes
   c. Rarely
   d. Never

Adapted with permission from *Working Together: Succeeding in a Multicultural Organization* by George Simons, Ph.D. with Amy Zuckerman
Crisp Publications, Inc., 1200 Hamilton CT, Menlo Park, CA 94025
DQ Scoring

1. Count the number of times you circled an "a" response (the first possible response) and enter that number in the appropriate blank (6 in the example below).

2. Then enter the number of "b" responses in the second blank space (22 in the example below) and so on.

9. When all four blanks are filled in, multiply to determine the subtotals (5 x 6 = 30, 3 x 22 = 66, etc.). Then add to obtain your DQ (100 in example below).

Example

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x (6)</td>
<td>= 30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x (22)</td>
<td>= 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x (4)</td>
<td>= 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x (0)</td>
<td>= 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DQ = 100

Now Compute Your Own DQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Points</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Your DQ =

(A score of 90-109 is typical.)
*DQ Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DQ</th>
<th>Range</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>130+</td>
<td>Very Superior (Mother Theresa)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>120 - 129</td>
<td>Superior (Mandela)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>110 - 119</td>
<td>High Average (Sadat)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90- 109</td>
<td>Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>80 - 89</td>
<td>Low Average</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 - 79</td>
<td>Borderline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60 - 69</td>
<td>Educable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Using IQ ranges as a model with added descriptions so you don’t see this as a serious diagnostic test, yet thought provoking, hopefully.
ATTITUDES (self-awareness)

Goals
1. To increase participants’ appreciation for the spectrum of attitudes toward diversity.
2. To increase participants’ awareness of their own attitudes toward various diverse groups.
3. To increase participants’ awareness of their attitude toward the other group(s) in the exercise.

Group Factors
Two or more groups which differ on an important dimension, e.g. race, ethnicity, gender, religion, class, etc.

Time
One hour.

Materials
Copy the two Attitudes about Differences pages on a transparency for use on the overhead projector.

Process
1. The facilitator(s) talk(s) about the various attitudes on the Attitudes about Differences page through anecdotal experience of their own and that of participants from previous workshops.
2. Participants are asked to spend a few minutes thinking of a time when they had an attitude toward another group similar to as many of the eight attitude descriptors on the Attitudes about Differences page as they can.
3. Unless there are fewer than twelve participants, they are divided into pairs.
4. Participants are asked to share any personal experiences reflective of any of the eight listed attitudes. (After fifteen minutes, they are asked to reconvene in the large group if they have been in pairs.)
5. The facilitator(s) then lead a discussion about the following questions.
   Do you notice a pattern to your attitudes?
   What has led to any change in your attitudes?
   Given what you’ve learned in this exercise, what conscious decision(s) can you make to affect your attitudes towards differences?
Attitudes about Differences

**Repulsion**
People who are different are strange, bad and/or crazy. Any steps to change ‘THEM’ in order to become more ‘normal’ are justifiable.

**Pity**
People who are different are born that way, which is pitiful. They are undesirable and/or less civilized. Normal behavior should be required of ‘THEM’ in order to help them.

**Tolerance**
People who are different are less evolved, and will grow out of it. They need protection and tolerance, like a child who is still learning.

**Acceptance**
People who are different must be accomodated and accepted; they are seen as less valuable than ‘US’.
Support
People who are different have rights that must be safeguarded, despite our discomfort around ‘THEM’.

Admiration
Acknowledge that being different in society is a challenge. Willing to look at oneself and work on one’s own biases.

Appreciation
Value the diversity of people. Willing to confront one’s own and other’s insensitive attitudes.

Nurturance
See diversity as indispensable in society. Is fond of differences in ‘THEM’, and willing to be an advocate of diversity.

Adapted from Dr. Dorothy Riddle
ATTUNEMENT EXERCISES
(Brief and effective)

The following exercises are designed to help participants clarify their feelings about their own and other groups, examine how they make judgements about these groups and think about the accuracy of their perceptions. Each exercise takes about thirty minutes. All exercises involve two or more distinct groups, e.g. white/black, Christian/Muslim, Palestinian/Israeli, etc.

Role Reversal (Other-Awareness and Bridge)

Participants pair with someone from a different group. They are asked to pretend they are a member of the other group and discuss such things as...

- What it’s like to be a member of that group.
- Some issue on which the groups conflict.
- How their group is misunderstood by the other.

...or any other topic deemed appropriate by the facilitator(s).

After the roleplay, participants process the experience in the entire group.

Fate (Self- and Other-Awareness)

Small groups containing members of each group are formed. Participants are asked to make a list of their personal experiences, which were due to their inclusion in their group. These experiences are recorded on newsprint with felt-tip markers. One sheet lists the experiences of one group and a second sheet the other group. Members of the groups then rate the listed experiences as positive, neutral or negative, e.g. (+), (0), and (-).

Lists are then posted so that everyone can view each groups two lists. The facilitator(s) lead all the participants in a discussion of the proportion of positive versus negative experiences of the groups, participants’ feelings about it and any conclusions about the differences.

US & THEM in the Media (Self-Awareness)

The two quizzes for this activity are just after these Attunement Exercises. They can be copied on to transparencies and displayed on the overhead projector. Or they can be copied and distributed. Though they may trigger some laughter, they tend to also provoke thoughtful discussion.
Adjectives (Self- and Other-Awareness)

Small groups are formed and segregated along the dimension of interest, e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, etc. Groups are instructed to write down three adjectives which best describe members of the own group. Then they are asked to list three adjectives which best describe members of the other group. Adjectives are written on newsprint with felt-tip markers. Completed lists are posted so that everyone in the room can view them.

Participants reconvene in the large integrated group. The facilitator(s) lead(s) a discussion focusing on the differences in group self-perceptions and the other group’s perceptions of them. Participants are encouraged to share their feelings and thoughts about the differences.

Guided Fantasy (Other-Awareness and Bridge)

Based upon a script the facilitator(s) have written, participants are asked to close their eyes and imagine that they are a member of the other group. They are asked to visualize themselves waking up in the home of such a person, going to the bathroom and attending to hygienic needs as such a person would do, looking in the mirror and seeing themselves as such a person, experiencing their body as such a person, dressing as such a person would, greeting people as that person, experiencing oneself in the community as such a person, doing the kind of work of that person, having the kind of customs and mannerisms of such person, as well as engaging in the social and religious activities of such a person. The script should describe activities and interactions very specifically.

After the guided fantasy, participants process the experience with the guidance of the facilitator(s).

My Group Identity (Self-Awareness)

The questionnaire for this exercise is two pages after this page. Bring as many copies of it as might be needed. The blank line in the title of this exercise and the blank lines in the first three questions are filled in on the first copy you make. Then the rest of the copies are made from it. So if your workshop focuses upon ethnicity, the title of the questionnaire would be “My Ethnic Identity”. The first two questions refer to what one was taught about one’s own group and the third question refers to what the respondent was taught about other groups. The wording used to fill in those three blanks need to reflect that intention. If no particular dimension is the focus of your workshop, this exercise can be titled “My Cultural Identity”. After participants complete the questionnaire, it can be processed in the group.
US & THEM in the MEDIA

Quiz #1
Identify which paired expression was used by the British press covering the Gulf War to describe the English by writing Us in the blank, and writing Them to indicate their description of the Iraqis.

_____ Have an Army, Navy and Air Force
_____ Have a War Machine

_____ Have reporting guidelines
_____ Have censorship

_____ Have propaganda
_____ Have press briefings

_____ Take out
_____ Destroy

_____ Kill
_____ Neutralize

_____ Lads
_____ Hordes

_____ Cowardly
_____ Cautious

_____ Young knights of the skies
_____ Bastards of Baghdad (This is a hint.)

_____ Blindly obedient
_____ Loyal

_____ Ruthless
_____ Resolute

_____ Brave
_____ Fanatical

From Give the Middle East Peace a Chance by Swedish Professionals Against Nuclear Arms, Stockholm.
US & THEM in the MEDIA

Quiz #2
Identify in similar fashion which Cold War phrase refers to the U.S. and which to the U.S.S.R.

__________ The free world
__________ The evil empire

__________ Ruled by a regime
__________ Ruled by a government

__________ Consummate politicians
__________ Wily, cunning leaders

__________ Secret police
__________ Security organization

__________ Has allies
__________ Has satellites

__________ Engaged in a long overdue modernization of defenses
__________ Engaged in an unparalleled military build-up

__________ Subverts defenseless countries
__________ Aids neighbors in distress

__________ Destabilizes unfriendly regimes
__________ Supports wars of liberation

__________ Has world-wide spy network
__________ Has far-flung intelligence gathering

__________ Disseminates information
__________ Spreads propaganda

Discussion Question: Which distinctions (in both quizzes) reflect real differences?

From the PBS Documentary *Faces of the Enemy* Discussion Guide.
My Group Identity

Please answer the following questions candidly filling in the blank with the word “group”, “religion”, “race”, nationality”, “ethnic group”, etc as directed by the facilitator.

1. I was taught to believe these things about my ______________ ...

2. I was taught to believe these things about ______________ ...

3. I was taught to act this way toward ______________ ...

4. I looked up to these role models...

5. I admired them because they had these qualities...

6. Of the influences I’ve mentioned, the ones which have had the greatest impact upon me are...
PREJUDICE (self-awareness)

Goals

1. To share feelings and ideas about prejudices in a non-threatening manner.
2. To explore the validity of common prejudices.

Group Size

An unlimited number of groups of three members each.

Time

One hour.

Materials

1. Two blank 3” x 5” index cards for each participant.
2. Ten 3” x 5” index cards prepared ahead of time according to the Directions for Preparing Prejudice Cards.
3. A pencil for each participant.

Physical Setting

For each group, a grouping of three chairs arranged in a triangle, with one chair facing the other two.

Process

1. The facilitator distributes two blank index cards and a pencil to each participant. He reads the list of ten prejudices from the prepared cards and directs the participants to write one additional object of prejudice on each of their two blank cards, a different item on each card.
2. The facilitator collects the index cards, adds them to the ten prepared cards, and shuffles the stack.

3. The facilitator divides the participants into triads. One member from each group takes two cards off the top of the stack, looks at both and selects one. The other card is returned to the stack. Each of these members then returns to his place, facing the other two members of the triad.

4. The member with the card in each triad announces the group subject of his card to the other two members. These two group members make disparaging and stereotyped remarks about the group on the prejudice card while the member holding the card refutes their statements and defends the attacked group. (Three to five minutes.)

5. Each member takes a turn being the person who selects a card and defends the group on the prejudice card.

6. The facilitator leads the total group in a discussion of the following points:

   What type of prejudiced statements were made by the participants?

   Did any participants admit having any prejudices? What were they?

   Were any prejudices held in common by a number of members?

   How did the selected members defend the objects of the prejudices?

   How did the members feel when they were seated alone defending their subject against the other group members?

   How did members feel if they perceived themselves as fitting a stereotyped subject?

   How did members feel when they were making stereotypical remarks?

   What did this exercise tell group members about their own prejudicial perceptions and behavior?

   The facilitator then leads a discussion of the fallacies of the usual prejudices found in society today, the results of such attitudes, and ways to deal with or refute them.

**Variations**

1. The experience can be conducted in dyads.
2. The stereotype can be defended by a person who is a member of the stereotyped group.

3. Participants can be asked to defend a subject against which they are personally prejudiced.

**DIRECTIONS FOR PREPARING PREJUDICE CARDS**

On each of ten 3" x 5" index cards, write the name of group that is relevant to the participants.

Sample Items

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Women</th>
<th>Catholics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>Jews</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreigners</td>
<td>WASPs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italians</td>
<td>Liberals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polish People</td>
<td>Obese People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>Conservatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arabs</td>
<td>Smokers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Rich People</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>Labor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muslims</td>
<td>Pro Life Advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Old People</td>
<td>Pro Choice Advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teenagers</td>
<td>Gun advocates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Men</td>
<td>Intellectuals</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Whites</td>
<td>Northerners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asians</td>
<td>Southerners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Straights</td>
<td>Gays</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>People on Welfare</td>
<td>Lesbians</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Developed by Richard Raine*
PREJUDGING

Goal
To sensitize participants to how they ‘prejudge’ individuals of different groups and to moderate such prejudgeting of those individuals.

Time
Thirty minutes.

Materials
1. Copies of the Prejudging worksheet for each participant.
2. A pencil for each participant.
3. Personal solar system page and Prejudging worksheet copied on to overhead transparencies.

Process
1. Brief introductory remarks with the personal solar system overhead and the Prejudging worksheet overhead shown on the overhead projecter.

Sample Introductory Remarks
If you look only from the center of your personal or cultural solar system, your mind will automatically conclude that:

- The world consists of "us" and "them".
- We are right, they are wrong.
- We are good, they are bad.
- We are beautiful, they are ugly.

As a result, it is not uncommon in history to find one group persecuting another because they see them as subhuman, morally inferior, technologically backward
or not having true faith. Less severe but real prejudice appears when a person rejects others on the basis of, "I wouldn't want my sister to marry one," or "Some of my best friends are ________, but..."

Learning how our minds prejudeg others is a first step in managing the prejudice.

**SUBJECTIVE - OBJECTIVE**

We can turn opinions, feelings and preferences into "facts" simply by the way we talk about them. We say things like "The sales group is too noisy" rather than "I'm having difficulty concentrating when so many people are talking at once." Or "Arabs are too pushy" rather than "I get uncomfortable when Hakim speaks and gestures so close to me."

Prejudice starts when we interpret what we experience (something subjective) as an absolute truth about others (something objective). We then believe it ourselves, and spread it to other people.

2. The facilitator(s) asks participants to change the three sample statements at the top of the Prejudging worksheet to a statement about the participant's feelings toward the group named in the statement. For example, a man might write for the first statement.

   *Women are too emotional.*  I often feel stuffy around women who are animated about their feelings.

3. After five minutes, the facilitator(s) asks participants to volunteer their rephrasings to the first statement and comments upon the various rephrasings, focuses likewise on rephrasings to the two subsequent statements.

4. Participants are asked to divide themselves into diverse breakout groups of 5-8 participants. They are asked to complete the second section of the Prejudging worksheet on their own. After five or ten minutes, they are asked to share their information with other group members. After a discussion of this exchange, a group spokesperson is assigned to summarize their discussion to the entire group.

5. The facilitator(s) summarizes the most important points of these group discussions and closes the exercise with salient comments.

**Sample Closing Remarks**

Our minds have what psychologists call confirmation bias. We try to fit new information into old categories, to combine what we learn with what we already know.
PREJUDGING Worksheet

Change each statement below about a group to a statement about one's individual feelings toward others.

Women are too emotional.

Americans are too individualistic.

Hispanics stick to themselves too much.

What do you say about other groups? Change two of your prejudices or stereotypes about others into statements about yourself.

1. What I say about them:

   What I’m actually saying about me:

2. What I say about them:
As a result, we warp incoming data and ignore information that doesn’t agree with what we think we already know.

If we learned to think of a certain group of people as “lazy”, we always notice when they are unsuccessful, late or unambitious, but may not focus on such characteristics of people from another or our own group. If we believe people from a certain culture are greedy, we will focus on their people when they are taking and selectively ignore when they give. Prejudice is a self-fulfilling prophecy.

Adapted from Working Together: Succeeding in a Multicultural Organization
by George Simons, Ph.D. with Amy Zuckerman, pp 14 and 15. Crisp Publications, Inc.,
1200 Hamilton Ct, Menlo Park, CA 94025; (800) 442-7477.
Personal Solar System

- The world consists of "us" and "them".
- We are right, they are wrong.
- We are good, they are bad.
- We are beautiful, they are ugly.
Prejudging Worksheet

Change each statement below about a group to a statement about one’s individual feelings toward others.

Women are too emotional.

Americans are too individualistic.

Hispanics stick to themselves too much.

What do you say about other the other group(s) in this Workshop? Change two of your prejudices or stereotypes about others into statements about yourself.

1. What I say about them:

What I’m actually saying about me:

2. What I say about them:

What I’m actually saying about me:
The Changing Face of US & THEM

Goals

2. To help participants realize the fickle nature of enmity, i.e. how who we see as US and who we see as THEM changes.

2. To stimulate realistic hope by showing that enmity is malleable.

Time

Fifteen to twenty-five minutes.

Process

Two members of the audience are recruited to read every other sentence. They are instructed to read them loudly and quickly. Then the facilitator talks briefly about the changing nature of enmity. The audience is encouraged to share their experiences about shifting alliances and adversaries in their personal lives.

Variations

1. Each audience member can read a sentence in order of seating.

2. Two members of the presenting team each read every other sentence.
Changing Allegiances

1755  We loved the British and hated the French. (French & Indian War)

1776  We loved the French and hated the British. (American Revolution)

1799  We hated the French. (Sea Battles with the French)

1812  We loved the French and hated the British. (War of 1812)

1840s  We loved Southerners and hated Mexicans. (War with Mexico over Texas)

1861  We hated the Southerners and the British. (Civil War)

1898  We hated the Spanish. (Spanish-American War)

1899  We hated the Chinese and the Filipinos. (Conquest of the Philippines)

1900  We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese. (Boxer Uprising in China)

1904  We loved the Japanese and hated the Russians. (Russo-Japanese War)
1914  We hated the Mexicans.  (Marines land at Vera Cruz)

1914  *We loved the British & French but hated Austrians & Germans.  (Beginning of World War I)*

1915  We loved the Italians.  (Italy joins the allies)

1916  *We hated the Mexicans (Pershing invades Mexico)*

1917  We loved the Japanese and Chinese but not the Russians.  
      (Russian Bolshevik Revolution)

1918  *We loved the Italians and hated the Russians.  
      (U.S. troops invade Russia)*

1927  We loved the Japanese and hated the Chinese.  (U.S. bombards Nanking)

1935  *We hated the Italians.  (Italy invades Ethiopia)*

1936  We loved the Chinese and hated the Russians.  (Communists plunder China)

1939  *We loved the British & French and hated Germans and Russians.  (Beginning of World War II)*
1940  We loved the Finns and hated the Russians.  (Russia invades Finland)

1941  We loved the Russians and hated the Finns.  (Russia fights Germany and Finland)

1941  We loved the Chinese, British, & Russians but hated the Germans, Italians, and Japanese.  (World War II)

1942  We loved some French and hated others.  (Vichy Regime)

1942  We loved the Chinese, Russians, and British.  (World War II continues)

1945  We loved the French and hated the Germans, Italians, and the Japanese.  (End of World War II)

1947  We hated the Russians but loved the Germans and Italians.  (Beginning of the Cold War)

1951  We hated the Chinese and loved the Japanese.  (Korean War)

1959  We loved the Cubans.

1962  We hated the Cubans.

...and on and on it goes.

VALUES

Goals

1. To clarify one's own value system.
2. To explore values held in common within a group.
3. To study differences existing between groups.
4. To moderate stereotyping.

Group Size

Unlimited. There should be two identifiable subgroups whose values might be expected to differ, such as males and females, blacks and whites, older and younger, labor and management, etc.

Time

Approximately 1½ hours.

Materials

1. Two Traditional American Values Worksheets for each participant.
2. Newsprint, felt-tip markers, and masking tape.
3. Pencil for each participant.

Physical Setting

Room with movable chairs, large enough to stage a multiple role play.

Process

1. Participants are instructed to complete the Traditional American Values Worksheet independently, without any discussion with others. They are asked to sit quietly and to reflect on their values while others finish.
2. Subgroups are formed that are expected to differ from each other. Each subgroup is given a felt-tip marker and newsprint, on which one volunteer records the
3. commonly rejected values of members of that group. (These subgroups should consist of no more than twelve members. Several subgroups of the same "type" may be formed to insure that adequate air time is provided for each member to be included.) Thirty minutes is allowed for this phase.

4. Participants are given worksheets again and asked to complete them, but this time to try to do it as if they were a member of the other group. They are, in effect, trying to predict what the hypothetical "average" person in the other group would and would not hold valuable. This is done independently.

5. Subgroups receive additional newsprint and are asked to find out what the most common predictions of the members are.

6. The two sets of posters are placed on the walls, and everyone is asked to read them all without discussion.

7. Subgroups reassemble to react to what was predicted about them and to the accuracy of their prediction.

8. Each subgroup is asked to select one of its members to participate in a role-play and to think of a situation in which value differences might arise that could be acted out.

9. The facilitator solicits suggestions from the subgroups on a role-play situation to be staged in front of the room. He gives the subgroups five minutes to coach their representative who will be playing the role of a member of the opposite group.

10. The role-play is staged. Participants are asked to watch for behaviors which denote stereotyping.

11. The facilitator leads a discussion of the entire exercise, soliciting both personal statements (what I learned about me and about the other group) and process statements (what I learned about stereotyping). Subgroups may be asked to reassemble to reassess their tendency to make "should" statements about the other group.

From the Annual Handbook for Group Facilitators
TRADITIONAL AMERICAN VALUES WORKSHEET

Instructions: Place a plus sign (+) in front of those values which correspond to your own, and place a minus sign (-) in front of those which you personally reject. Then go back and rank the three values which you hold most strongly, by placing the number 1 beside your preeminent value, 2 by the second held, etc. Rank the three which you reject most strongly in a similar way: Place 1 beside the value you reject most strongly, etc. So your strongest value will have a +1 in front of it and most rejected value a -1.

“It is valuable to”:

_____ Get ahead       _____ Help your fellow man
_____ Be honest       _____ Be tolerant
_____ Participate in government  _____ Explore
_____ Work hard      _____ Win
_____ Be clean       _____ Look out for yourself
_____ Obey the law   _____ Be productive
_____ Be loyal to your country  _____ Spread democracy to other countries
_____ Live          _____ Know your heritage
_____ Be free       _____ Be constructive
_____ Pursue happiness  _____ Save time
_____ Accrue goods and wealth  _____ Find a better way
_____ Become educated  _____ Be religious
_____ Stand up for your beliefs  _____ Be proud of your community
Stereotypes (Self-awareness)

Goals

1. To discover how one makes judgments about others on the basis of age, race, sex, or ethnic stereotypes.

2. To provide an opportunity to examine personal reactions to prejudice.

Group Size

Unlimited

Time

Approximately 1½ hours.

Materials

1. A set of eight Data Sheets for each participant.

2. A pencil for each participant

3. Newsprint and a felt-tipped marker

4. Masking tape

Physical Setting

A room large enough to allow all participants to write in relative privacy and to conduct group discussions without distracting one another.

Process

The facilitator gives each participant a copy of Data Sheets AI, RI, SI, and EI and a pencil. The participants are told to circle the choice under each item that they think is indicated by the information they have about the person being examined. The facilitator tells them that they have eight minutes in which to complete all four work sheets.

After eight minutes, the facilitator calls time and collects Data Sheets. A set of Data Sheets (AII, RII, SII, and EII) is distributed to the participants and they are given eight minutes to complete them.
While the participants are marking their work sheets, the facilitator tabulates and summarizes the members' judgments from the first set of Data Sheets (AI, RI, SI, and EI) on a previously prepared sheet of newsprint. (See Data Summary.)

The facilitator calls time and collects the Data Sheets from the participants. The facilitator divides the participants into groups of five to seven members each and directs them to share their reactions to the experiences. (Ten minutes.)

While the participants are engaged in group discussion, the facilitator tabulates and summarizes the responses from the second set of Data Sheets and the prepared newsprint poster. Then the facilitator directs the participants to assemble in one group, and posts the newsprint tabulations where all can see them.

The facilitator elicits comments from the group about their reactions to the experience. (Five to ten minutes.)

The facilitator directs the participants' attention to the tabulations of the confidence rating in the two sets of Data Sheets and summarizes the responses, including any contrasts in the responses from the first and second rounds. The facilitator then leads the group in a discussion of the implications of the data in the two sets of responses as they relate to the issue of stereotyping people. (Fifteen minutes.)

The participants cite examples of ways in which prejudices about age, race, sex, or ethnic background operate in their lives, both socially and on the job. Various strategies for coping with the negative impact of prejudice are then developed by the participants and listed on newsprint by the facilitator. (Ten to fifteen minutes.)

Each participant is directed to privately consider areas or situations in which he or she can personally apply what is learned to back-home or on-the-job situations. (Five minutes.)
Data Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>AI</th>
<th></th>
<th>RII</th>
<th></th>
<th>SII</th>
<th></th>
<th>EII</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Item</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Confidence in judgments (average of all ratings)*

Developed by Thomas J. Mulhern, Ph.D. and Maureen A. Parashkevov.
**Character:** Nurse at Letchworth Village Developmental Center named Lee Scott.

**Instructions:** For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Lee.

1. When assigned new responsibilities:
   a. catches on quickly    b. continues old patterns

2. Preference in music:
   a. classics             b. disco

3. Political attitude:
   a. conservative            b. liberal

4. Work performance:
   a. energetic but impulsive   b. slow but thorough

5. Considers job valuable because:
   a. pension is good     b. work is challenging

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

*Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Degree of confidence*
Character: Twenty-eight-year-old male named Bill Rogers, resident of Minneapolis.

Instructions: For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Bill.

1. Favorite television program:
   a. news                           b. adventure

2. Employment
   a. laborer                       b. accountant

3. Preference in clothing:
   a. conservative, dark colors     b. bright colors, sharp style

4. Religious background:
   a. Episcopal                     b. Baptist

5. Sports preference:
   a. basketball                    b. tennis

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

Little  1  2  3  4  5  6  7 High Degree
Confidence of confidence
DATA SHEET

**Character:** Airline clerk, resident of Cleveland, named Chris Jones.

**Instructions:** For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Chris.

1. In difficult situations:
   a. acts independently  
   b. is dependent on others

2. Personality on day-to-day basis is characterized by:
   a. marked emotionality  
   b. little emotionality

3. Regarding automobiles specifically and mechanical devices in general:
   a. is skillful  
   b. possesses little skill

4. Family matters at home:
   a. frequently affect work performance  
   b. rarely affect work performance

5. When making decisions:
   a. relies on rational methods  
   b. relies on intuition

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little Confidence</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>High Degree of confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>


DATA SHEET

Character: Twenty-eight-year-old male, resident of New York City, named Joseph.
Instructions: For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Joseph.

1. Preference in beverages:
   a. beer       b. Scotch

2. Preference in recreation:
   a. boxing matches   b. opera

3. Number of children:
   a. two       b. five

4. Occupation
   a. teacher     b. policeman

5. Political attitude:
   a. conservative    b. liberal

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Degree
Confidence of confidence
Character: Sixty-three-year-old nurse at Letchworth Village Developmental Center named Lee Scott.

Instructions: For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Lee.

1. When assigned new responsibilities:
   a. catches on quickly
   b. continues old patterns

2. Preference in music:
   a. classics
   b. disco

3. Political attitude:
   a. conservative
   b. liberal

4. Work performance:
   a. energetic but impulsive
   b. slow but thorough

5. Considers job valuable because:
   a. pension is good
   b. work is challenging

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Degree
Confidence of confidence
**DATA SHEET**

*Character:* Twenty-eight-year-old black male named Bill Rogers, resident of Minneapolis.

*Instructions:* For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Bill.

1. Favorite television program:
   - a. news
   - b. adventure

2. Employment
   - a. laborer
   - b. accountant

3. Preference in clothing:
   - a. conservative, dark colors
   - b. bright colors, sharp style

4. Religious background:
   - a. Episcopal
   - b. Baptist

5. Sports preference:
   - a. basketball
   - b. tennis

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Little</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>High Degree of confidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
Character: Female airline clerk, resident of Cleveland, named Chris Jones.
Instructions: For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Chris.

1. In difficult situations:
   a. acts independently
   b. is dependent on others

2. Personality on day-to-day basis is characterized by:
   a. marked emotionality
   b. little emotionality

3. Regarding automobiles specifically and mechanical devices in general:
   a. is skillful
   b. possesses little skill

4. Family matters at home:
   a. frequently affect work performance
   b. rarely affect work performance

5. When making decisions:
   a. relies on rational methods
   b. relies on intuition

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

Little  1  2  3  4  5  6  7  High Degree
Confidence of confidence
Character: Twenty-eight-year-old male, resident of New York City, named Joseph O'Shaugnessy.

Instructions: For each of the items below, circle the choice that you think best describes Joseph.

1. Preference in beverages:
   a. beer         b. Scotch

2. Preference in recreation:
   a. boxing matches b. opera

3. Number of children:
   a. two          b. five

4. Occupation
   a. teacher      b. policeman

5. Political attitude:
   a. conservative b. liberal

Circle the number that best represents the degree of confidence you have in the above judgments.

Little 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 High Degree
Confidence of confidence
CULTURES (Self-Awareness)

Goals

1. To explore the effects of cultural behaviors or traits on others.
2. To experience cross-cultural encounters.
2. To increase awareness of how cultural mannerisms and rituals are derived from cultural attitudes.

Group Size

Four groups of four to eight members.

Time

2 hours.

Materials

1. A copy of the Four Cultures Instructions Sheet for each participant.
2. A pencil for each participant.
3. A copy of the Four Cultures Traits Sheet, cut into four strips so that each strip contains a different Trait Description.
4. A paper cup for each group.
5. A box of raisins, peanuts, or small candy for each group.
6. Masking Tape.
7. A newsprint poster on which is printed the schedule of group visits as follows:

| Round 1: | Group 2 visits Group 1 and Group 4 visits Group 3. |
| Round 2: | Group 3 visits Group 2 and Group 1 visits Group 4. |
| Round 3: | Group 3 visits Group 1 and Group 4 visits Group 2. |

Physical Setting

A room large enough to provide each group with privacy and with an area in which to entertain, and eight movable chairs for each group. Separate rooms are ideal for the development and rehearsal stages.
Process

1. The facilitator introduces the activity as an opportunity to explore the effects of cultural behaviors or traits. The participants are divided into four groups, and the groups are assigned to different areas in the room or separate rooms, if available. (Five minutes.)

2. The facilitator distributes a copy of the Four Cultures Instruction Sheet and a pencil to each participant and one of the four Trait Descriptions from the Four Cultures Traits Sheet to each group (a different description for each group). The groups are directed to read their sheets quietly and to keep their information within their groups. (Five minutes.)

3. The facilitator tells the groups that they will have fifteen minutes to develop and rehearse their six cultural activities and then instructs them to begin. (Fifteen minutes.)

4. When all the groups have developed their six activities or at the end of the fifteen minutes, the facilitator calls time and gives each group a paper cup full of raisins, peanuts, or small candy. The facilitator says that this food will be the refreshments that each group will have available to offer to visitors. The facilitator then posts the schedule of visits and directs the groups to take two minutes to prepare themselves for the first visit. (Five minutes.)

5. The facilitator announces the beginning of round 1, and the groups conduct their first visits according to the posted schedule. (Ten minutes.)

6. After about eight minutes, the facilitator suggests that the visitors begin their farewells. At the end of ten minutes, the facilitator calls time and directs the members of each group to return to their area and discuss the reactions to the activity among themselves. During this time, the facilitator refills the groups' paper cups. (Five minutes.)

7. The facilitator conducts round 2 and 3 in the same manner as round 1, allowing a few minutes for group discussing and refilling of the cups at the completion of each round. (Thirty minutes.)

8. When the groups' discussion of round 3 have been completed, the facilitator announces that the visiting groups are to ‘go native’ - that is, adopt the mannerisms and customs of the groups they are visiting - during round 4. The facilitator then announces the schedule for round 4:

   Select one of the following:
   
   Group 2 visits Group 3 and Group 4 visits Group 1 OR
   Group 1 visits Group 2 and Group 3 visits Group 4 OR
   Group 1 visits Group 2 and Group 3 visits Group 4.

   Round 4 and the groups' discussions of it are then conducted. (Fifteen minutes.)
9. The entire group is assembled, and the facilitator leads a discussion of reactions to and perceptions resulting from the experience. The following items may be included:

What were common themes in the groups' discussions after each round?

How did it feel to play the role of a member of another culture?

What were some of the most difficult or negative aspects of dealing with members of another culture?

What were some of the most enjoyable or positive aspects of dealing with members of another culture?

How did it feel to attempt to ‘go native’? Which was more comfortable--the role your group had been assigned or to ‘go native’?

What were the reactions of the host groups when the visitors attempted to ‘go native’?

Which of the four cultures are most like our own? Which are like other cultures that the participants have experienced?

What other things did the participants learn about cross-culture interactions?

What generalizations can be drawn from what you learned?

How can these be applied in real life situations?

What implications do the reactions described have for real life?

(Twenty minutes.)

Variations

1. The visits can be conducted nonverbally.

2. Following step 9, participants can be asked to volunteer ways in which they, as individuals, will change their behavior as a result of their learning from the experience.

3. The issue of leadership can be examined as part of the groups' behaviors.

4. Different cultures can be developed to accommodate more groups, and additional rituals (e.g., buying and selling or trading) can be added.

Developed by Dwight L. Gradin
FOUR CULTURES INSTRUCTION SHEET

1. The following is a fairly natural sequence of welcoming visitors. Your group is to create specific ways of expressing each activity below in accordance with the traits and characteristics that are distinctive of your group. Be as talkative as you want to be and create as many gestures as you wish, but be careful that the way in which you express yourself reflects your cultural traits. (This is a group activity.)

- The equivalent of waving "Hello" as guests approach from a distance.
- The equivalent of a close greeting, such as the custom of shaking hands.
- The equivalent of inviting your guests to come in or to come with you.
- The equivalent of inviting your guests to sit down on a chair or floor.
- The equivalent of inviting your guests to partake of refreshments.
- The equivalent of seeing your guests to the door and bidding them farewell.

Time will be allotted for you to develop and rehearse this sequence within your group.

2. The second part of this activity will be to act out your roles by conducting visits with other groups.

If you are the Host group: Demonstrate your traits and act out your host activities as you have designed and rehearsed them.

If you are the Visitor group: Maintain the traits and attitudes that are characteristic of your group, but allow your hosts to treat you according to the dictates of their own culture.
FOUR CULTURE TRAITS SHEET

Trait Description

You are Group 1

You are a lordly, martial, highly regimented people with a sense of superiority that shows in your gestures and speech. You like organization and you like things to be in their proper places.

When guests arrive, you take charge and, although you treat them well, you insist that they do things your way.

-----------------------------------------------

Trait Description

You are Group 2

You are a gentle, meek, submissive people with much grace and movement in your gestures.

When guests arrive, you put them in a superior position and are apologetic in the way you treat them.

-----------------------------------------------

Trait Description

You are Group 3

You are a very warm, friendly, expressive people with gestures that demonstrate your warmth and friendliness.

When guests arrive, you are open and free in the way you treat them, and you try hard to please.

-----------------------------------------------

Trait Description

You are Group 4

You have a very calm, relaxed outlook on life - one that borders on being lackadaisical. You are unhurried in what you do.

When guests arrive, you acknowledge their presence and do get around to serving them, but hurry is abhorrent to you.
Privilege (Self- and Other-Awareness)

Goals

For participants to experience and see the separations caused by the privileges the dominant group or majority takes for granted.

Time

Thirty-five minutes.

Group Characteristics

This exercise should be done only with a racially, culturally, and/or ethnically mixed group. There should be at least 3 or 4 minority members.

Materials

Each of the majority statements is printed on a separate piece of paper which are folded and distributed among the participants. Use a bowl, hat, or paper bag for each person to take a slip of paper with one statement on it.

Physical Setting

It is important to have a large open space for the whole group to move a noticeable distance.

Process

Participants start at the back of the room. The longer walls are at their side so they have room to walk forward at least 25 feet. If the room is small, a hallway might be feasible.

- Statements are read one at a time by participants. If the statement applies to an individual, that person steps forward one step. If it does not apply, the individual stays in place.
• When all statements have been read, participants are encouraged to look around the room and notice what they are feeling. Processing begins as individuals report their feelings. It is useful to include some of the following points if they have not come from the participants: "It is not about blame." "No one in the room made the things happen that were read" "Most of us (from all groups) have been unaware of the privileges." "It is possible for all of us to have the privileges without anyone losing anything."

• While people are still in the separated formation, have them number off for the number of groups you would like to have process further. It is ideal to form discussion groups of about six to eight people.

It is important to have people process feelings both in large groups and the small groups. It is also helpful to have the small groups discuss what needs to happen in order to change the situation. They can then report back to the large group.

Variation

Before breaking into discussion groups, designate the "far end" of the room as "The American Dream" and to have everyone race for it. Minority people sometimes don't even want to bother going for it. The majority people sometimes don't want to reach for it, since it seems to easy—or they fell guilty about those left behind.

MAJORITY PRIVILEGE STATEMENTS

I can, if I wish, arrange to be in the company of people of my race (or ethnic group) most of the time.

If I should need or choose to move, I can be pretty sure of renting or purchasing housing in an area which I can afford and in which I would want to live.

I can be pretty sure that my neighbors in such a location will be neutral or pleasant to me.
I can go shopping alone most of the time, pretty well assured that I will not be followed or harassed.

I can turn on the television or open to the front page of the paper and see people of my race (or ethnic group) widely represented in positive ways.

When I am told about our national heritage or about "civilization," I am shown that people of my race (or ethnic group) made it what it is.

In school, I can be pretty sure that my children will learn about the contributions of their race (or ethnic group).

Whether I use checks, credit cards, or cash, I can count on my race (or ethnic group) not to work against the appearance of financial reliability.

I can arrange to protect my children most of the time from people who might not like them.

I can swear, or dress in second hand clothes, or not answer letters, without having people attribute these choices to the bad morals, the poverty, or illiteracy of my race (or ethnic group).

I can speak in public to a powerful group without putting my race (or ethnic group) on trial.
I can do well in a challenging situation without being called a credit to my race (or ethnic group).

I am never asked to speak for all the people of my racial (or ethnic) group.

I can criticize our government and talk about how much I fear its policies and behavior without being seen as a cultural outsider.

I can be pretty sure that if I ask to talk to "the person in charge," I will be facing a person of my race (or ethnic group).

If a traffic cop pulls me over I can be sure I haven't been singled out because of my race (or ethnic group).

I can walk down a residential street in a wealthy neighborhood and no one will think that I am a maid or a gardener.

If I make any grammatical errors, no one will attribute my mistakes to my race (or ethnic group).

I can walk into a store late in the evening and probably no one will think that I am there to rob the store.

Almost everyone who looks at me will assume that I am an American citizen and can speak English.
If I have a responsible job, no one thinks I got it because of "quotas."

I can borrow money from the bank or lending institution without the loan officer wondering if I can pay it back.

People hear that I am a college graduate and no one is surprised.

If I want to teach my children about my culture, there are many museums and cultural events to which I can take them.

I can drive a large, expensive car without worrying that someone will think, "Isn't that typical?"

No one assumes that when I give an opinion on something that I am speaking on behalf of my race (or ethnic group).

People of a different race (or ethnic group) waiting at a bus stop with me late at night will not likely be frightened of me.

Adapted by Virgil Cruz and Jean Cooley. Based upon an essay by Peggy McIntosh
"White Privilege: Unpacking the Invisible Knapsack," Hungry Mind Review, Fall 1994
Appreciation (Self-Awareness and Bridge)

Goals

1. To increase self-awareness through the Japanese technique of Naikan* by:
   (a) Learning to focus on the support we receive.
   (b) Exploring what we give in return.
   (c) Identifying the problems we cause.

2. To enhance our understanding and valuing others as well as our environment.

3. To increase appreciation for "the life I have."

Group Size

Unlimited. There can be two identifiable subgroups whose thinking or viewpoints are likely to differ, such as males and females, blacks and whites, etc.

Time

2 hours. Need a timekeeper.

Materials

1. Paper and pens/pencils for notes and letters.

2. Newsprint, felt-tip markers, and masking tape.

Physical Setting

1. Room with movable chairs.

2. Large enough room so talk in one subgroup doesn't distract those in others.

* Pronounced like the Nikon camera.
Process

1. Participants are instructed to form into groups of 5 or 6. (Five minutes.)

2. They are asked to think of all the people from whom they have received what they needed in life—past and present. The facilitator prompts each group to think about people close to them as well as people they do not know such as farmers, merchants, wholesalers, shippers, etc. The facilitator writes the 'benefactors' on newsprint. (Fifteen minutes.)

3. The facilitator asks group members to take time in silent contemplation to thank the people who have provided for them. (Three minutes.)

4. Participants are asked to share their thoughts and feelings with all present. (Ten minutes.)

5. List all the groups to which the people from the first exercise belong such as their nationalities, racial/ethnic groups, minorities, etc. A person may belong to more than one group. (Five minutes.)

6. Participants are asked to thank all of the groups to which these people belong for their support of their member(s) in silent contemplation. (Three minutes.)

7. Participants are asked to share their thoughts and feelings with all present. (Ten minutes.)

8. Participants are asked to list two or three people against whom they have felt or acted biased because they belonged to a different group than theirs or because they acted differently. At least one of these individuals should be someone about whom they later changed their mind. (Five minutes.)

9. Participants are asked to write a letter of apology to at least one of these individuals for their initial reaction to them merely on the basis of their membership in a group or their initial impression. (Ten minutes.)
10. Participants are asked to share a couple of letters of apology out loud in their subgroups. Then a couple are shared in the entire group. (Ten minutes.)

11. Participants are asked to write a thank you letter to a group to which that (those) individual(s) belong for the support they have received from their members' efforts. They are asked to be as specific as they can about that support. (Ten minutes.)

12. The facilitator begins the final exercise by discussing "giving back" and then asks participants to please reflect upon the question, "in gratitude for what I have received, what can I give back?" (Five minutes.)

13. Participants are then asked to share their ideas with their subgroups. Then a couple are asked to share them with the entire group. (Ten minutes.)

14. The facilitator summarizes the Appreciation exercise focusing upon the 4 goals of the exercise citing examples that are provided by the participants. (Ten minutes.)

Based upon the Naikan therapy of Yoshimoto Kinuko as described in Naikan Psychotherapy: Meditation for Self-Development by David K. Reynolds, University of Chicago press, 1983.
Coalition Building (Bridge)

Goals
To develop skills of negotiation, cooperation and coalition building among groups who are traditionally adversaries.

Time
One hour.

Scenario
(The following sample scenario is American based. It may be necessary to alter the gang names, ethnicity’s, locations, etc. to make the exercise relevant to participants.)

Participants are members of one of three gangs: the Spanish Lords Spanish-speaking); the Ebony Knights (Black) and the Roman Legions (Italian and Irish). Each gang has its own president and warlord. Gang members live in three areas: the Spanish Lords in East Harlem, the Ebony Knights in Central Harlem, and the Roman Legion on Northwest Harlem.

There have been frequent rumbles among the gangs resulting from trespassing by members of one gang on the turf of another. It has become a matter of pride and prestige to go to any necessary lengths to protect the gangs' turf. Softness on this issue is not permitted by the leadership in any gang.

The gangs live on the streets, are interested in sports, but have no adequate space to participate in them without trespassing on the turf of other gangs.

A federal grant is available to build and operate in the heart of Harlem a Youth Sports and Cultural Center, with basketball courts, swimming pool, volleyball, tennis courts, and a stage. First, however, the youth must form an organization representing all ethnic and other groups and appoint for the benefit of all groups. A Settlement House representative has suggested that if the gangs would like to see such a center, they should form the organization and report this to him. He will then help them apply for the federal funds. All three gangs would like to have the center, but they don't want to lose control of their turf.

Some Roman Legion would rather not have the Sports Center that have to use it at the same time as the Ebony Knights. Some Ebony Knights would rather not have the Center that have to use it at the same time as the Spanish Lords or the legion.
Process

1. Divide the group into three gangs, then read the scenario.

2. Each gang meets separately and plans how to get together with other gangs to set up the organization. They must (a) overcome the rule against trespassing on one another's turf; (b) get the other gangs to join the organization; and (c) plan how to appoint representatives to the governing body of the organization. Each gang decides how to proceed.

3. When any gang has decided its first move, it will report this to the facilitator, who will then announce it aloud. If it is an approach to one of the other gangs, someone from the first gang will make this approach, or send a written note through the facilitator, who will read the note aloud for all to hear. The response to this communication will be given to the facilitator, who will announce it, and then be delivered orally by a member of the responding gang, or in writing through the facilitator. This process will continue and might culminate in a meeting to seek agreement on the rules for the use of the Center.

4. Cut the exercise a half hour before the end of the session and spend the rest of the time in a general critique of the behavior of all parties. Some areas to explore:

   (a) What helped each gang to approach an agreement? What stood in the way?

   (b) How did gangs deal with dissension in their own ranks?

   (c) How did gangs deal with distrust or non-cooperation from other gangs?

   (d) What was the leadership style of each gang? Was power filtered from the top down, or was a consensus style used? Did the style change in the course of the exercise? How and Why? Was there passive resistance to a solution coming from anyone within a gang for any reason? What reasons? How was any such resistance dealt with?

From the *Alternatives To Violence* Project Manual, 1994. (AVP, 3049 E. Genesee Street, Syracuse, NY 13224)
Relationship (Bridge)

Goals
To envision and begin to develop a more positive relationship between estranged groups.

Group Characteristics
Audience composed of two (or more) distinct groups which need reconciliation.

Time
One hour

Materials
1. Newsprint
2. Felt-tipped markers
3. Masking tape
4. Paper and pencils

Physical Setting
Ideally two rooms (or more, if there are more than two distinct groups). Or, one Room large enough to allow each of the groups to talk without distracting each other.

Process
1. Groups are separated and given the previously listed materials. Each group decides upon several brief sentences which describe their vision of a positive relationship with the other group(s). If in a separate room, they write them on newsprint once there is agreement on the intent and wording of each sentence.

If groups share the same room, the sentences are written on paper. Once the list is completed, they are transposed with a marker onto newsprint (in order not to influence or distract the other group's list development). Sentences should be written in the present tense, as if already happening, e.g. "We trust each other." Also, statements should be positive, e.g. "We settle our differences peacefully" rather than "We don't fight." The facilitator can provide one or two examples such as these and check to see that each group is writing statements this way. (Twenty minutes.)
2. The facilitator asks the groups to reconvene but to sit with their own group. The completed lists on newsprint are taped next to each other, with the input of the participants, the facilitator notes the statements which the groups have in common and underlines them. (It doesn't matter if the wording is different, as long as the idea is essentially the same.) (Ten minutes.)

3. Then each group is asked to decide which statements on the other list(s) they agree With which were not on their own list. That is, which other sentences do they want to add to their own list. After consensus is reached, these statements are added to that group's list on a sheet of paper (not newsprint at this time). (Ten minutes.)

4. Now each group ranks the top three priority statements, by putting a 1, 2 or 3 in front of the statement on their sheet of paper. Finally, the statements which each group decides (again by consensus, if possible) will be most difficult to achieve should be noted with a check mark as indicated in the example. (Five minutes.)

5. A member of each group now copies the completed list on the newsprint for all to see. The facilitator works with all participants to complete a final combined Relationship Vision on a fresh sheet of newsprint. The facilitator first lists statements given the highest priority by the groups as shown in the example. Check marks are also copied onto this combined list. It's possible that a statement may have more than one check mark, i.e. if more than one group rated it as difficult to achieve.

If agreement between groups on a statement isn't reached, the facilitator can try to get a compromise statement accepted. If not, the statement can be left off the combined list. (Ten minutes.)

6. Keep the combined list up for the rest of the workshop. Ask everyone to copy it onto a sheet of paper, take it home after the workshop and keep it where they can review it. (Five minutes.)

Our Relationship Vision

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group X</th>
<th>Group Y</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>We maintain regular contact</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We work at understanding each other

We work cooperatively on community projects

We enjoy each other  X
Dialogue (Bridge)

Goals

1. To directly express one’s feelings about one’s own group to a person from a different group (in terms of race, nationality, religion, etc.).

2. To express one’s feelings about the different group to a person of that group.

3. To express one’s hopes about how one’s own group and the listener’s group will get along.

4. To accurately and empathetically listen to the feelings about those same topics when the person from the other group speaks.

Group Factors

Two (or more) distinct groups, e.g. black/white, female/male, labor/mgt, etc. Groups should have a somewhat comparable number of participants present.

Time

Thirty to forty-five minutes.

Materials

‘Floor’ and ‘Listener’ cards copied from those at the end of this exercise and distributed so that each dyad has one of each.

Process

1. Dyads (or triads if three groups are present, e.g. blacks/whites/Latinos) are formed by asking participants to pair with someone from the other group who is seated nearest them. They are instructed to sit facing each other.

Note: The facilitator can handle uneven group numbers in several ways, e.g.

a. Unpaired participants from the larger group can pair with another person from the larger group. One of them can roleplay being a person from the smaller group.
b. Unpaired participants can join a willing dyad as an observer. They can then share their observations not only with the other two members of the triad, but also the entire group.

c. Unpaired participants can join a dyad to form a triad. This option should be avoided if there is antagonism between the groups since it could develop into a “two against one” experience.

2. The facilitator distributes the Floor and Listener cards so that each dyad has one of each.

3. Dyads are asked to decide who will have the ‘Floor’ first as signified by that person holding the Floor card passed out by the facilitator. The facilitator can emphasize that the Listener may have the more challenging job.

4. The facilitator asks the person who has the Floor to express her/his feelings about their own group. The Listener is instructed to paraphrase this communication when there is a pause. When this has been accomplished to the satisfaction of the person with the Floor, they reverse roles.

5. After each person is satisfied that they have been understood, they alternately express their feelings about the other’s group(s). Again when each is the Listener, they are encouraged to accurately and empathetically paraphrase to the satisfaction of the person with the Floor card.

6. Finally, the person with the Floor is asked to express his/her hopes for how their groups will get along. The Listener reflects these wishes back “listening with their heart as well as their ears”, even if they do not share these hopes.

7. First in the dyad (or triad) and then in the entire group, participants are asked to discuss the Dialogue experience, e.g.

   What did you learn about yourself? Your partner?

   Which was the harder role for you? Why?

   How does this relate to your communication difficulties in your other relationships, e.g. with your spouse, friends, children, parents, co-workers, boss, supervisors, etc?

8. In wrapping up the Dialogue exercise, the facilitator can summarize some of the key aspects of the participants’ discussion. They can be reminded that Dialogue is:

   • Used to discuss sensitive issues, intense feelings, and conflicts.
• Not a discussion or argument, i.e. is sequential, not simultaneous communication.

• Requires demonstrated understanding, not agreement.

**FLOOR**
1. Focus on your feelings.
2. Be specific.
3. Minimize criticism.
4. Don’t go on and on.

**LISTENER**
1. Don’t interrupt.
2. Don’t rebut.
3. Paraphrase when speaker has spoken.
4. The speaker is the judge of whether you heard them accurately.

*Note: The boxes above can be copied onto card stock (e.g. 70 to 90 lb. weight paper available at printing shops) in the quantity needed, and then cut out for this exercise.*
Heterosexuality Questionnaire (Self-Awareness for heterosexuals)

Goals

1. To reduce participants’ anxiety and defensiveness as the issue of sexual orientation is explored.
2. To increase participants’ awareness of their own prejudices about sexual orientation.
3. To increase participants’ awareness of societal prejudices about sexual orientation.

Time

Twenty to thirty minutes.

Materials

A copy of the Heterosexuality Questionnaire for each participant and a pencil.

Process

1. The facilitator distributes a copy of the Heterosexuality Questionnaire and a pencil to each participant.
2. After participants have completed the questionnaire, the facilitator solicits their thoughts and feelings about the questions it raises.

Variation

If time is limited, the facilitator can read the questions out loud as the Heterosexuality Questionnaire is shown on the overhead projector.

Note: This exercise can be used alone or as a prelude to one or both of the other sexual orientation exercises, Out of the Closet and Hurdles.
HETEROSEXUALITY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. What do you think caused your heterosexuality?

2. When and how did you first decide you were a heterosexual?

3. Is it possible your heterosexuality is just a phase you may grow out of?

4. Is it possible your heterosexuality stems from a neurotic fear of others of the same sex?

5. If you've never slept with a person of the same sex, is it possible that all you need is a good gay lover?

6. Why do heterosexuals feel compelled to seduce others into their lifestyle?

7. With all the societal support marriage receives, the divorce rate is spiraling. Why are there so few stable relationships among heterosexuals?

8. Why do heterosexuals place so much emphasis on sex?

9. Considering the menace of overpopulation, how could the human race survive if everyone were heterosexual like you?

10. Could you trust a heterosexual therapist to be objective? Don't you fear she/he might be inclined to influence you in the direction of her/his own leanings?

11. How can you become a whole person if you limit yourself to compulsive, exclusive heterosexuality, and fail to develop your natural, healthy homosexual potential?

12. There seem to be very few happy heterosexuals. Techniques have developed which might enable you to change if you really want to. Have you considered trying aversion therapy?

Source: John Wiley & Sons, 1991
Out of the Closet
(Other-Awareness for heterosexuals; Self-Awareness for others)

Goal
1. To increase participants’ understanding of individual and institutional forms of homophobia.
2. To sharpen their awareness of the difficulties associated with ‘passing’ vs. the formation of a positive homosexual identity.

Group Factors
This activity may work best with participants who are not already accepting of various sexual orientations.

Larger groups are also better for this exercise since they allow for a more representative grouping of sexual orientations.

Time
One hour.

Materials
One 2 x 2 inch piece of card stock for each participant. One word identifying a sexual orientation is typed or printed on each card. They are then folded and put in a paper bag.

Most of the cards have Heterosexual printed on them. For example, in a group of thirty participants three Homosexual cards should be placed in the mix, and one or two Bisexual cards. In larger groups additional identities can be added, e.g. a Transsexual card, Asexual card, and Transgendered card.

With a smaller group, it may be best to divide the identities equally, e.g. three Heterosexual, Homosexual and Bisexual cards each in order to have adequate representation of sexual orientation diversity without the more ambitious goal of relative correspondence to the number of these identities in society.

Process
1. Each participant draws one card from the paper bag. They are asked to read the card to themselves to learn their assigned sexual identity, but not reveal it to anyone else at this time. Then they are asked to fold it and put it in their pocket or purse, out of sight.
2. The facilitator then announces that they are to “Find your community”. The facilitator(s) should observe not only how participants go about arranging themselves in groups, but also their interaction once they have done so. (For example, Dr. Walters, in a personal correspondence, mentioned that homophobic individuals may act effeminate if they group themselves with a gay community.)

3. Once all the groups have formed, a tally of the number of people in each is listed for all to see. Participants are then asked to return to their seats.

4. Finally, while assuring that they do not share their identities with others, participants are asked to put their cards back in the paper bag. The facilitator asks for a volunteer to take out the cards and read each identity. The facilitator records each one and displays the total of each identity. Typically, the number of heterosexual cards is less than the number of those who congregated with that community, i.e. identified themselves as such or ‘passed’.

4. The group discusses their experience with the activity.

*How many disowned their roleplay identity?*

*How comfortable did they feel with their identity?*

*What did the facilitators notice in terms of participant’s behavior?*

*Did identities differ in terms of openness, loudness, animation, etc.?*

---

Hurdles
(Other-Awareness for heterosexuals; Self-Awareness for others)

Goal
To increase participants’ understanding and empathy for the daily ‘hurdles’ faced by gay, lesbian, and bisexual individuals.

Group Factors
While this exercise is especially helpful to homosexual youth, it is used with any group open to learning more about the vicissitudes of minority sexual orientation.

Time
One hour.

Materials
Seven hurdles constructed of sturdy presentation board or laminated cardboard. They should be four feet long and five inches wide. On each of the hurdles, one of the following words are clearly written in bold lettering: Self, Family, Friends, Job, Religion, Neighborhood, and Other.

Process
1. The facilitator asks for a volunteer to roleplay a gay, lesbian, or bisexual person who is coming out about her/his homosexuality.

2. Seven additional volunteers are requested to come to the front of the room to hold each of the seven hurdles. They are asked to hold their hurdles so that they are visible to the actor and the rest of the group.

3. The actor chooses the order of subsequent hurdles s/he wishes to face. Each time the actor chooses a new hurdle, they share with the group why that particular challenge was chosen and what problems s/he anticipates with it.

4. The person holding the selected hurdle comes forward and adjusts its height to the actor’s specifications. Thus, the actor chooses the order of the hurdles and the degree of difficulty associated with each one. For example, if the actor believes coming out to his/her family would be relatively easy, they would ask the volunteer holding that hurdle to place it near the floor as it is confronted by the actor.

5. As the actor faces each of the hurdles, s/he not only describes why the hurdle is set at a certain height, but also any particular issues s/he expects to encounter in coming out to the individual or group represented by the hurdle.
6. The actor chooses an aspect of his/her own life that would be particularly salient in establishing a positive gay identity and assigns it to the hurdle labeled as Other.

7. When the actor has finished confronting all the hurdles they are willing to face, the facilitator can point out how the configuration of hurdles represent a visual record of the actor’s coming out process.

8. Depending upon available time, this process is repeated once or twice. That is, another actor is sought as well as different volunteers to hold the hurdles. The actor(s) select the order and height of their hurdles with related explanations of what they expect to face. There is usually significant variability in hurdle order and difficulty across actors.

9. The facilitator saves fifteen minutes to process the activity in the entire group after the roleplays.

Variations

Hurdles may be modified and used with other issues in which a minority person faces possible exclusion and/or retribution if they genuinely and openly express themselves.

Differences (Other-Awareness and Bridge)

Goal
To foster a positive view of personal differences in exercise participants.

Time
Thirty minutes.

Materials
A blank sheet of paper and a pencil for each participant.

Process
1. The facilitator distributes paper and pencils to participants.

2. Participants are asked to walk around the room noticing others who are most different from themselves.

3. After a minute, the facilitator asks participants to pair with someone who they think is very different from them.

4. Participants are asked to list as many differences as they can in five minutes, e.g. gender, birthplace, job, religion, sexual orientation, age, etc.

5. The facilitator calls time and asks for several pairs of volunteers to announce their number of differences and to give examples of some differences.

6. The facilitator asks participants to share their thoughts, feelings, and insights about the activity.

7. Members of each pair are asked to spend five minutes discussing the difference between them that each finds most interesting.

8. When the facilitator calls time, several pairs of volunteers are asked to report their reactions during this part of the exercise.

Adapted with permission from Managing Diversity in the Workplace by S. Kanu Kogod, Ph.D., pp. 31-32. Copyright 1991 by Pfeiffer, an imprint of Jossey-Bass, Inc., Publishers. All rights reserved.
Speaking Up (Bridge)

Goals

1. To give participants permission to speak up when they witness demeaning, prejudiced remarks.
2. To improve participants ability to effectively respond to such remarks.

Time

Two hours.

Materials

Copies of the Speaking Up Guidelines and Practice Scenarios at the end of this exercise for each participant.

Physical Setting

1. Movable chairs.
2. A room large enough for participants to form discussion groups.

Process

1. The facilitator gives an introductory talk covering the following points. (10 minutes)

*Demeaning remarks, jokes, and language have become accepted in our society. Prejudicial behavior often goes unnoticed, or at least unchallenged. They can become accepted when no one speaks up about them.*

*Some people remain silent because they agree. Most of us remain silent because we are uncomfortable speaking up. We feel alone in our feelings, yet others in such situations may be silently reacting as we are.*

*We feel uncomfortable imagining the attention our dissent will bring us. Fear can easily lead to our silence, which later can give way to either justification or regret, depending upon how honest we are with ourselves.*
When we witness prejudice, we may experience an adrenaline rush, i.e. the “fight-flight” response. Our heart rate increases, breathing becomes quicker, and muscles tense.

But fighting or fleeing won’t help. We need to become capable and confident in our ability to use our adrenaline energy in a way that is moderated by reason, and has as its aim healing, not further hurting.

We must conquer our impulse to flee (ignore the remark), or on the other hand, relinquish the urge to vanquish the ‘offender’ with a sharp retort.

When you speak up, the speaker may try to cover up, put you down, or trivialize what you said. Their acceptance of your comments is not needed to prove that you did the right thing.

2. Participants are asked to report their own experiences with prejudiced and demeaning remarks. The facilitator can ask the speaker how they felt about how they dealt with the situation. Then other participants are asked to provide their own ideas about responding in that situation. (15 minutes)

3. The facilitator or one of the participants makes two lists on a blackboard or on newsprint. One list includes guidelines the participants believe can be effective in responding to prejudiced remarks, i.e. a “Do” list. The second list has “Don’ts”. (15 minutes)

4. The Facilitator passes out the Speaking Up Guidelines and Scenario sheets and discusses the Guidelines. Participant response is encouraged with attention focused on similarities and differences between the Speaking Up Guidelines and the Do’s and Don’ts lists the group developed. (15 minutes)

5. Participants are asked to form groups of about six by moving their chairs into small discussion circles. The facilitator chooses the most relevant (to the participants) Scenarios for the small groups to discuss and write a response to as a group. They are asked to also consider nonverbal behavior in their response. (10 minutes)

6. Each group is asked to select two of its members to come to the front of the room to roleplay the scenario. One of them uses the response devised by the group to deal with the enacted scenario. The facilitator elicits feedback from participants about the roleplayed response and adds any needed comments. (10 minutes)

7. One or two relevant scenarios are processed as time allows. (20 or 40 minutes)

8. The facilitator concludes by encouraging a discussion with all participants about how they expect this Exercise may affect how they will handle similar situations they may encounter in real life. (15 minutes)
9. The facilitator selects one of the participants who reads the passage attributed to Martin Niemoller at the bottom of the sheet handed out to them. (5 minutes)

Adapted with permission from *Affirming Diversity: One on One. Effective Responses to Prejudiced Remarks*. Unpublished workshop booklet by Annis Pratt, Ph.D. Birmingham, MI.
Speaking Up Guidelines

1. **Take a deep breath, look directly at the person and speak in a level, confidant tone.**

2. **Use “I” Messages**, e.g. "I learn a lot working with different kinds of people", “I’m really uncomfortable with that term”, and “I don’t want you to think I agree with your comments about Jews”.

3. **Don't accuse**, e.g. "You really have a problem with Arabs!"

4. **Avoid combat dialogue.** Don't get into a cycle of trying to one-up the other person.

5. **Don’t be preachy or self-righteous.** Keep in mind that we are all capable of insensitive remarks and behavior. Don’t speak down to the other person.

### Additional Points

Hesitation may diminish the effectiveness of your message. However, if the right moment slips by, it is important to speak up later rather than not at all.

Practice. Although spontaneity is ideal, practice is needed until you have the ability and confidence to speak up ‘spontaneously’.

One exchange will not be an instant remedy. However, speaking up can begin a process of attitude, or at least behavior, change for the speaker. It may also have a positive impact upon bystanders.

Pat yourself on the back for trying!

### Speaking Up Examples

**Comment:** I don't see why I should be made to feel guilty for what went on hundreds of years ago.

**Response:** Although we’re not guilty for the problem of slavery, we are responsible to help heal the wounds it has caused in our country, even today.

**Comment:** My grandparents came from Poland, worked hard, and made it. I don't see why Blacks can't do what we did.

**Response:** Blacks came here as slaves. Immigrants chose to come, often saved money first, and were able to get together with others from their country who helped them in the beginning.
Scenarios

What, if anything, would you say in the following situations?

1. You often sit with two Arab friends in class and the library. When you’re with several other friends, one of them says “I don’t see why you bother to hang with them. If those Arabs wanted to be friends, they wouldn’t all sit in their own section of the cafeteria.”

2. You are with three other white women whom you play tennis with regularly. After the match while having coffee together, one of the women confides that she and her family are moving from the area because “It’s changing” (racially).

3. A woman gets a ride to work from a man. After he starts picking up another man who works with them, he begins telling demeaning jokes about women during their commute.

4. You are at a restaurant with three other couples. One of the men starts telling jokes using racial slurs.

5. You are a white man. A Latino woman offers a suggestion during a meeting. Her remark is ignored, but five minutes later another white man makes the same suggestion, and group members express their enthusiasm about it.

6. You are the white host at a summer picnic. The group includes relatives and friends. Your uncle makes a derogatory reference about blacks, calling them n…….

7. As you are dining at a restaurant, the conversation turns to a man who has made a lot of money in a new business. One person in your group says, “Well, he's Jewish. You know how they know how to make money.”

In Germany they came first for the Communists, and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Communist. Then they came for the Jews and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a Jew.

Then they came for the trade unionists and I didn't speak up because I wasn't a trade unionist. Then they came for the Catholics, and I didn't speak up because I was a Protestant. Then they came for me, and by that time there was no one left to speak up.

Martin Niemoller, Lutheran Pastor,
upon his release from Dachau Prison in 1945
**Arm Wrestling** (Self-Awareness and Bridge)

**Goal**

1. To increase participants’ awareness of win-win possibilities.

**Time**

Twenty to thirty minutes.

**Process**

1. Participants are asked to pair with whoever is closest, and not to talk during the activity.

2. They are told the object is to pin the other’s hand as many times as possible in 30 seconds. Participant pairs are asked to do this standing unless they have access to a table or desk.

3. When the facilitator says “start” they begin and arm wrestle until the facilitator says “stop” 30 seconds later.

4. The facilitator determines who had the most pins of their partner. Typically, the ‘winners’ are a pair who have figured out that they can get the most pins of their partner by cooperating, not competing. That is, they non-verbally decide at some point in the exercise to provide no resistance to their partner and quickly move their arms back and forth together. The facilitator should observe who discovers this solution and may even point it out instead of determining the winners by asking for totals.

5. This brief experience can lead to a discussion in the large group, e.g.:

   *When have you been over-competitive?*

   *How do you gauge if you’ve become over-competitive?*

   *When is competition needed?*

   *What is the relationship between cooperation and competition?*

   *Can you recall a time when you discovered a win-win solution?*
Closings

People must learn to hate, and if they can learn to hate, they can be taught to love, for love comes more naturally to the human heart than its opposite. Even in the grimmest times in prison, when my comrades and I were pushed to the limits, I would see a glimmer of humanity in one of the guards, perhaps just for a second, but it was enough to reassure me and keep me going. Man’s goodness is a flame that can be hidden but never extinguished.

Nelson Mandela in Long Walk to Freedom

Lord, make me an instrument of Thy peace. Where there is hatred let me sow love; Where there is injury, pardon; Where there is doubt, faith; Where there is despair, hope; Where there is darkness, light; and Where there is sadness, joy.

St. Francis of Assisi

Teach your children what we have taught our children - that the earth is our mother. Whatever befalls the earth befalls the sons and daughters of the earth.

This we know. The earth does not belong to us; we belong to the earth. This we know. All things are connected - like the blood which unites one family. All things are connected.

Whatever befalls the earth befalls the sons and daughters of the earth.
We did not weave the web of life; we are merely a strand in it.
Whatever we do to the web, we do to ourselves...

Chief Seattle

Our husbands shall not come to us, reeking with carnage, for caresses and applause. Our sons shall not be taken from us to unlearn all that we have been able to teach them of charity, mercy, and patience. We women of one country will be too tender of those of another country to allow our sons to be trained to injure theirs. From the bosom of the devastated earth a voice goes up with our own. It says, “Disarm, Disarm!” The sword of murder is not the balance of justice! Blood does not wipe out dishonor nor violence indicate possession.

Julia Ward Howe (1819-1910)
Mother’s Day Proclamation excerpt

(You may prefer your own poem, song, literary passage, etc. to close the Workshop.)
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US & THEM
Facilitator Feedback Form

Please complete a copy of this form after conducting a workshop. Thank you for your help in our efforts to upgrade this manual.

How many US & THEM Workshops have you conducted?

How long was your Workshop(s)?

What do you like best about this Manual? Why?

Least? Why?

Additional comments or suggestions about the Manual?

How likely would you be to attend training sessions on improving your US & THEM Workshops?

If at all likely, would you be able to attend such training at the annual American Psychological Association Conference in August?

Please send your completed copy of this form to:

Michigan PsySR c/o Steve Fabick
640 N. Old Woodward, Suite 201, Birmingham, MI 48009-3865
or email comments to stevefabick@aol.com.

Thanks!
Participant Booklet

US & THEM

Moderating Group Conflict
Attitudes about Differences

Repulsion
People who are different are strange, bad and/or crazy. Any steps to change ‘THEM’ in order to become more ‘normal’ are justifiable.

Pity
People who are different are born that way, which is pitiful. They are undesirable and/or less civilized. Normal behavior should be required of ‘THEM’ in order to help them.

Tolerance
People who are different are less evolved, and will grow out of it. They need protection and tolerance, like a child who is still learning.

Acceptance
People who are different must be accommodated and accepted; they are seen as less valuable than ‘US’.

Support
People who are different have rights that must be safeguarded, despite our discomfort around ‘THEM’.

Admiration
Acknowledge that being different in society is a challenge. Willing to look at oneself and work on one’s own biases.

Appreciation
Value the diversity of people. Willing to confront one’s own and other’s insensitive attitudes.

Nurturance
See diversity as indispensable in society. Is fond of differences in ‘THEM’, and willing to be an advocate of diversity.

Adapted from Dorothy Riddle, Ph.D.
WORKSHOP EVALUATION

Please complete this evaluation before you leave. Your comments will help improve this program for others.

1. What was the most valuable part of this workshop?

2. What was the least valuable part?

3. Please rate the overall value of this presentation. Then rate each aspect of the presentation by circling the appropriate number.

   | great value | moderate value | little value |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Overall, how would you rate the total presentation? 1 2 3 4 5

Talk on US & THEM? 1 2 3 4 5

Group exercises? 1 2 3 4 5

Visual materials? 1 2 3 4 5

4. Do you have any suggestions for how the speaker(s) might improve this presentation?

Date: Group:
My Personal Plan

The awareness I have gained in this workshop that I most want to apply in my daily life is

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

After this US & THEM workshop, I plan to apply the awareness described above by

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________

________________________________________________________________________
Follow Up

After the US & THEM workshop, participants are encouraged to continue their education and activism. Ideally, the workshop is only the first phase of your raising your understanding of ‘THEM’. We hope you become involved in a Study Circle as the second phase of this process. Your facilitator(s) can help coordinate the formation of Study Circles at the end of the workshop, but will not be participating in them.

Participation in a Study Circle leads to Community Action ideas about the issue addressed. Some resources are provided below to facilitate that process. Action follow up is needed to maintain and build on the understanding you have gained from this workshop. The workshop can be seen as Phase One is this growth process, with the Study Circle as Phase Two and Community Action as Phase Three.

US & THEM: Phase Two

Form a Study Circle

A study circle is a simple process for small group deliberation with the following characteristics:

- A study circle is comprised of 10-15 people who meet regularly over a period of weeks or months to address a critical public issue. The balanced composition of the group should be along the dimension of interest, e.g. race, gender, ethnicity, nationality, etc.
- A study circle is facilitated by a person from each of the groups who is there not to act as an expert on the issue, but to serve the group by keeping the discussion focused, helping the group consider a variety of views, and asking difficult questions.
- A study circle is open to many perspectives. The way in which study circle facilitators are instructed and discussion materials are written gives everyone "a home in the conversation," and helps the group explore areas of common ground.
- A study circle progresses from a session on personal experience (how does the issue affect me?) to sessions providing a broader perspective (what are others saying about the issue?) to a session on action (what can we do about the issue here?).

For more information on setting up a Study Circle (and excellent discussion materials on many issues), contact:

The Study Circles Resource Center
697 Pomfret Street, P.O. Box 203, Pomfret, Connecticut 06258
(860) 928-2616 FAX (860) 928-3713
e-mail <src@neca.com>
US & THEM: Phase Three

Joint Community Action

Community action can be either a response to an ‘US & THEM’ type of problem or a coordinated effort to strengthen intergroup understanding before problems erupt.

An example of a community response to religious intolerance occurred in Billings, Montana. In 1992, rocks were thrown through the windows of homes displaying menorahs for Hanukkah. In response, 10,000 people put candles in their windows to show support for the 100 Jewish residents of Billings.

Other ideas are intergroup clean-up and environmental projects, efforts to reduce neighborhood violence, joint social gatherings, collaborative political action, getting rid of drug houses, etc.

Resources

The following publications provide examples and guidance in taking joint community action. They are available from Center for Living Democracy, 289 Fox Farm Road, Brattleboro, VT 05301. Tel orders 802-254-1234.

Community Oriented Policing & Problem Solving
Describes how citizens in diverse communities are taking responsibility for public safety, getting rid of drug houses and reducing violence. Lots of practical advice. 202 pages. (1992) $10

Neighborhood Organizing
Produced by the city of Seattle to encourage citizens to take advantage of a city program that funds citizen-initiated projects. Can provide help in developing a similar program in your city or town, or just benefit from its practical organizing tips and examples. 37 pages. (1994) $3

Building Deliberative Communities
An introduction to "community conventions" in which diverse citizens deliberate over their future. 36 pages. (1995) $3

Making Your Community Livable: Programs That Work
Short descriptions of community-based strategies by and for the elderly. Ideas about crime prevention, transportation, and home maintenance programs for seniors. 32 pages. (1996) Free
US & THEM Resources

Children’s Books

America: My Land, Your Land, Our Land (Lee & Low, $15.95), written by W. Nikola Lisa and illustrated by 14 outstanding American artists, who are themselves a diverse group. The simple text focuses on differences in American topography, such as woodland and farmland. Each illustration places different kinds of people in that land. Makes point that this is all our land and it's all beautiful, though different -- just like its people. Fine introduction to the topic of racial and ethnic differences. Ages 3-6.

Freedom’s Gifts: A Juneteenth Story (Simon & Schuster, $16), written by Valerie Wesley and illustrated by Sharon Wilson, is about the Texas holiday that marks the date--June 19, 1865 -- slaves in Texas learned that the Emancipation Proclamation had been signed, more than two years after the fact. Ages 8 and up.

Mama Provi and the Pot of Rice (Atheneum, $16) by Sylvia Rosa-Casanova, illustrated by Robert Roth. Lucy and her parents live on the eighth floor of an apartment building; her grandma lives on the first floor. When Lucy gets the chicken pox, grandma makes a big pot of rice to take to her ailing granddaughter. On her way up, she stops on each floor to trade some of her rice for her neighbors' offerings. When she reaches the eighth floor she has a multicultural feast: fresh-baked white bread, black beans, collard greens, apple pie and, of course, her delicious rice. Lucy and grandma get a real taste of the value of living in a diverse community. Ages 5-8.

Adult Books


**Videos**

The *Shadow of Hate* produced by three-time Academy Award winner Charles Guggenheim, spans three centuries to examine this country’s ongoing struggle to live up to its ideals of liberty, equality and justice for all. Historical footage and personal accounts dramatize stories of racial, religious, gender, ethnic and sexual orientation problems. 40 min.

Comes with 128 pg text and a Discussion Guide.

*(Available from Teaching Tolerance, 400 Washington Ave., Montgomery, AL 36104 $25)*

*Weapons of the Spirit* is a moving remembrance of the courage of the residents of the French village of Le Chambon. These people saved 5000 Jewish lives from Nazi persecution. Newsreel footage, interviews with rescuers and those saved recapture this “conspiracy of goodness” in the midst of terror and death. Available in *50 min. version for age 12 and up ($50) and in 90 min. version ($75)* from Social Studies School Service, 10200 Jefferson Blvd, Rm J4, P.O. Box 802, Culver City, CA 90232-0802, (800) 421-4246.

*Prejudice: The Monster Within* alternates between historical perspectives and the candid opinions of American teenagers. Includes segments on African Americans, Native Americans, the detention of Japanese Americans, the Holocaust, as well as current problems such as ethnic cleansing in Bosnia. Also, sensitizes viewers to more mundane prejudices such as calling someone a “nerd” or a “dumb blonde”. 30 min.

*(Also available from Social Studies School Service  $60)*

**Organizations**

**Center for Living Democracy** promotes racial and ethnic dialogue in America. Contact them at 289 Fox Farm Rd, Brattleboro, VT 05301, (802) 254-1234.

**Common Ground Network for Life and Choice** facilitates creative problem-solving on the issue of abortion. Their address is 1601 Connecticut Ave., NW, Suite 200, Washington, DC 20009, (202) 265-4300.

**George Simons International** provides consulting and training in the field of cultural and gender diversity. Contact them at 740 Front Street, Suite 335, Santa Cruz, CA 95060, (408) 426-9608.

**Intercultural Press Inc.** publishes a semi-annual catalog of books relevant to a wide variety of multicultural situations. Their address is P.O. Box 768, Yarmouth, ME 04096, (207) 846-5168.
National Coalition Building Institute provides 3 and 5 day trainings so volunteers can conduct prejudice reduction workshops. Contact them at 1835 K Street, NW, Suite 715, Washington, DC 20006, (202) 785-9400.

Study Circles Resource Center promotes the use of study circles on critical social and political issues. Contact them at 697 Pomfret Street, P.O. Box 203, Pomfret, CT 06258, (860) 928-2616.