



MEIA Q

MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

Elementary and Secondary

Education Act

Title I

August, 1981

16428
82491

CALIFORNIA YOUTH AUTHORITY

State of California

EDMUND G. BROWN JR.
GOVERNOR

Youth and Adult Correctional Agency

HOWARD WAY
SECRETARY



MEIAQ

MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE
ITS DEVELOPMENT AND USE IN THE MULTICULTURAL EDUCATION COMPONENT
OF THE ESEA TITLE I EDUCATION PROGRAM OF THE CYA

Department of the

Youth Authority

INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

GEORGE R. ROBERTS

Deputy Director

TRUMBULL W. KELLY

Education Program Supervisor

GEORGE C. VIDAL, Supervisor

Compensatory Education Program

JOANN MAHAN, Ph.D.

Correctional Education Program

Supervisor

AMARJIT BAL, Ph.D.

Research Analyst II

MANNIE WEBB

Research Analyst II

VALERIE E. MORITA

Senior Stenographer

MARY YCST

Stenographer

REPORT AUTHORS

AMARJIT S. BAL, Ph.D.

JOANN MAHAN, Ph.D.

4241 Williamsborough Dr. Sacto

PEARL S. WEST,
DIRECTOR

CHARLES A. KUHL,
CHIEF DEPUTY DIRECTOR

JAMES C. BARNETT,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PREVENTION AND COMMUNITY
CORRECTIONS BRANCH

CHON GUTIERREZ,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
MANAGEMENT SERVICES BRANCH

RUTH E. KRANOVICH,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PAROLE SERVICES BRANCH

AL OWYOUNG,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
PLANNING, RESEARCH, EVALUATION
AND DEVELOPMENT BRANCH

GEORGE R. ROBERTS,
DEPUTY DIRECTOR
INSTITUTIONS AND CAMPS BRANCH

U.S. Department of Justice
National Institute of Justice

This document has been reproduced exactly as received from the person or organization originating it. Points of view or opinions stated in this document are those of the authors and do not necessarily represent the official position or policies of the National Institute of Justice.

Permission to reproduce this copyrighted material has been granted by
California Youth Authority

to the National Criminal Justice Reference Service (NCJRS).

Further reproduction outside of the NCJRS system requires permission of the copyright owner.

Funded by Title I
of the
Elementary and Secondary Education Act
Public Law 89-750

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	1
CHAPTER I - INTRODUCTION	2
CHAPTER II - DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE	5
CHAPTER III - UTILIZATION OF THE MEIAQ	8
Distribution of Prejudice Among California Youth Authority Wards as Measured by the MEIAQ	8
The Importance of Needs Assessment Information	14
Measurement of the Effectiveness of Multi-Culture Education	15
CHAPTER IV - SUMMARY STATEMENT ON THE MEASUREMENT USES OF THE MEIAQ	18
APPENDICES	21
A. MEIAQ - Technical Information: Manual for Administration, Scoring, Aggregation of Data	22
B. Semantic Differential Instrument	31
C. Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire	38
D. MEIAQ - Form B	40
E. Ethnic Pride Dimension - When the Student Answers All 18 Items	41
F. Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice and Ethnocentrism Dimensions	42
REFERENCES	43

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>	<u>Page</u>
1 Percentages of Overly Negative, Balanced and Overly Positive Students--Ethnic Pride Dimension	9
2 Percentages of <u>Prejudiced White Students</u> --Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension	10
3 Percentages of <u>Prejudiced Black Students</u> --Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension	11
4 Percentages of <u>Prejudiced Chicano Students</u> --Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension	12
5 Percentages of Ethnocentric Students over Multiple Years Data	14
6 Percentage of Students Advancing to the Balanced (Mature) View of Own Ethnicity upon Completion of Multicultural Instruction	16
7 Percentages of Students Advancing to the Non-Ethnocentric (Ethnically-Unprejudiced) Perceptions	17

ABSTRACT

This report presents the background and development of a needs assessment and evaluation instrument that has been successfully used in the Multicultural Education component of the ESEA Title I Education Program of the California Youth Authority. The history of the development of the instrument called Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire (MEIAQ), a description of the instrument, instructions for administration, and a data analysis format are provided. Included in the report are descriptive and evaluative data on prejudice related to ethnicity and women.

The multiple years' data provides a measure of the extent and nature of prejudice among the Compensatory Education student population in particular and a fairly accurate basis for characterizing the total ward population of the California Youth Authority relative to the extent and nature of intergroup prejudice. The pre and post data collected by means of the MEIAQ for a number of years demonstrates the usefulness of the instrument in determining the effectiveness of the Multicultural Education component of the Compensatory Education.

The concluding section of the report provides information on the uses of the MEIAQ in assessing ethnic prejudice and the prejudice towards women. The instrument has shown promise of utility with an incarcerated youth population. There also is evidence pointing to its usefulness with the youth in public schools.

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire (MEIAQ), introduced in this report, has been found to be a valuable instrument in the measurement of prejudice. The instrument has been used in the Compensatory Education Program of the California Youth Authority over a period of several years. ^{1/} The only instance of its use in a public school setting was in a junior high school in Stockton, California, where it was used to determine the extent and nature of racial tensions prevailing among the students of different ethnic groups.

It is hoped that the publication and dissemination of this report will extend the use of the instrument to other researchers and evaluators working with the youth in a variety of settings. The feedback to us on their experiences with the instrument will be highly valuable.

The purpose of the MEIAQ instrument is to assess the respondents' prejudice toward ethnic groups and women. The extent and nature of prejudice thus measured can serve to indicate the corresponding educational needs of the respondents. Appropriate curriculum and instruction may be designed to address these identified needs. Subsequent to the intervention strategies, the reassessment of students will yield data reflecting changes in perceptions.

^{1/} The questionnaire in its present form reflects the input of several professionals specializing in Multicultural Education and measurement.

The data on effectiveness of Multicultural Education, presented in this report, is not of controlled experimental nature. The positive changes in respondents' perceptions are, however, meaningful and consistent enough to conclude that the impact of Multicultural Education on the Compensatory Education students of the California Youth Authority has been promising. The recommendation to integrate Multicultural Education with the other educational offerings to the Youth Authority students can be made as a result of these positive changes in student attitudes.

In Chapter III, the distribution of prejudice among Compensatory Education students for multiple years (1976-80) is presented by aggregating the institutional data on pretests. All ethnic groups (Black, White and Chicano) have a far less number of students prejudiced against women compared to the number of students who are ethnically prejudiced. ^{2/} The disparity between the ethnically prejudiced and unprejudiced students is not extreme, even though there are more prejudiced students than unprejudiced in each ethnic group. Only a rare individual in each ethnic group perceives his own ethnicity in an overly negative manner. Except for the 1976-77 project year, a majority of the students of all ethnic backgrounds have mature and balanced perceptions of their own ethnicity--they are neither overly positive nor are they overly negative. One gathers an impression from the review of the needs assessment data that the ethnic orientations of the Youth Authority wards, as a group, are far from

^{2/} The MEIAQ does not seem to assess student attitudes towards women as accurately as it does towards ethnic groups. We believe that prejudicial attitudes towards women's roles in our culture are more marked than is demonstrated by the data in this report. Research on nonincarcerated persons may produce different results than those in Youth Authority settings, however.

dismal. There exists a real opportunity, not an overwhelming challenge, to provide Multicultural Education to the students and expect improvement as is the case with instruction in reading, math, and other basic skills.

The data on effectiveness of Multicultural Education, presented in this report, is not of controlled experimental nature. The positive changes in respondents' perceptions are, however, meaningful and consistent enough to conclude that the impact of Multicultural Education on the Compensatory Education students of the California Youth Authority has been promising. The recommendation to integrate Multicultural Education with the other educational offerings to the Youth Authority students can be made as a result of these positive changes in student attitudes.

In Chapter III, the distribution of prejudice among Compensatory Education students for multiple years (1976-80) is presented by aggregating the institutional data on pretests. All ethnic groups (Black, White and Chicano) have a far less number of students prejudiced against women compared to the number of students who are ethnically prejudiced. 2/ The disparity between the ethnically prejudiced and unprejudiced students is not extreme, even though there are more prejudiced students than unprejudiced in each ethnic group. Only a rare individual in each ethnic group perceives his own ethnicity in an overly negative manner. Except for the 1976-77 project year, a majority of the students of all ethnic backgrounds have mature and balanced perceptions of their own ethnicity--they are neither overly positive nor are they overly negative. One gathers an impression from the review of the needs assessment data that the ethnic orientations of the Youth Authority wards, as a group, are far from

2/ The MEIAQ does not seem to assess student attitudes towards women as accurately as it does towards ethnic groups. We believe that prejudicial attitudes towards women's roles in our culture are more marked than is demonstrated by the data in this report. Research on nonincarcerated persons may produce different results than those in Youth Authority settings, however.

dismal. There exists a real opportunity, not an overwhelming challenge, to provide Multicultural Education to the students and expect improvement as is the case with instruction in reading, math, and other basic skills.

CHAPTER II

DEVELOPMENT OF THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The Compensatory Education Program of the California Youth Authority began delivering multicultural instruction to the students in various institutions of the Youth Authority in the 1970-71 project year. The systematic collection of data on needs assessment for the Multicultural Education component started in the project year 1974-75. The collection of data on component effectiveness began in the project year 1975-76. The assessment instrument used in determining the student needs and program effectiveness was based on the well-known Semantic Differential technique. A copy of the Semantic Differential instrument used in the ESEA Title I program is provided in Appendix A.

A Semantic Differential contains a number of items in the form of adjectives, each polarized to signify a total opposition of meaning at the two poles. The continuum between the two poles is divided into seven parts so that a respondent to the items on the instrument can indicate the intensity of his/her feelings toward a given concept. An illustration follows:

Item: KIND 7 6 5 4 3 2 1 CRUEL

A respondent checking space #4 indicates uncertainty or no response. A respondent checking space #7 indicates that a given idea/group elicits kind feelings, and a response in space #1 indicates that the respondent perceives the concept as cruel.

A Semantic Differential instrument was used in the project year 1974-75 for needs assessment for the Multicultural Education component of the Compensatory Education Program of the Youth Authority. Although the instrument yielded useful information, a review of student responses to the items on the Semantic Differential instrument, coupled with the input from the staff in the field, suggested a need for improvement. Two general concerns needed to be addressed:

1. The Semantic Differential instrument forces the respondent to express some form of "generalized" feeling toward the "total" ethnic group violating the assumption that groups of human beings are composed of variant types of individuals.
2. The presentation of adjectives without their situational contexts may create a stereotypic orientation and prejudicial responses toward the groups being assessed.

In order to design a more appropriate instrument that eliminated these problems, adjectives were selected from and added to the Semantic Differential instrument. The adjectives were put in a situational context and related to five numerical choices a respondent could make about a given group (ethnic or women). An illustration follows:

White people make good neighbors: All Most Some Few None

The new 34-item instrument was named Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire. Using the split-half correlation method according to measurement

theory, two parallel forms were developed--Form A and Form B (see Appendices C and D).

The Form A of the MEIAQ has been used both as a needs assessment and evaluation instrument in all projects of the Compensatory Education Program of the California Youth Authority from the 1976-77 to the 1979-80 project year.

CHAPTER III

UTILIZATION OF THE MEIAQ

The MEIAQ has been utilized both as a needs assessment and an evaluation instrument for the Multicultural Education component of the Compensatory Education Program of the California Youth Authority. The first administration of the instrument to assess ethnic/intergroup prejudice was in the 1976-77 project year.

This administration also served as the pretest in the process of evaluation of the Multicultural Education component. The following discussion deals with the comparison of pretest data for multiple years to show the distribution of prejudice and the change of prejudice among the Compensatory Education students. The attitudes of the ESEA Title I wards have been found to be similar to those wards who have not participated in ESEA classes. The data presented here may safely be assumed to approximate closely the distribution of prejudice among the wards of the California Youth Authority in general.

Distribution of Prejudice Among California Youth Authority Wards as Measured by the MEIAQ

The ESEA Title I projects in each of the ten institutions of the California Youth Authority have, for several project years, provided pretest data on the MEIAQ. A composite picture of the distribution of prejudice as measured by the instrument is presented by aggregating the institutional data on pretests.

TABLE I

PERCENTAGES OF OVERLY NEGATIVE, BALANCED AND OVERLY POSITIVE RESPONSES ON THE ETHNIC PRIDE DIMENSION, 1976-1980

Project Years	Responses	Ethnic Groups			
		White	Black	Chicano	Total
Percentages					
1976-77	Overly Negative	2	5	0	3
	Balanced	48	55	44	50
	Overly Positive	50	40	56	47
	(Total N)	(46)	(59)	(38)	(143)
1977-78	Overly Negative	1	1	2	1
	Balanced	64	64	60	63
	Overly Positive	35	35	38	36
	(Total N)	(334)	(349)	(227)	(910)
1978-79	Overly Negative	1	2	2	2
	Balanced	57	66	62	62
	Overly Positive	42	62	36	36
	(Total N)	(329)	(429)	(278)	(1,036)
1979-80	Overly Negative	1	1	0	1
	Balanced	60	70	57	64
	Overly Positive	39	29	43	35
	(Total N)	(3)	(270)	(150)	(423)

The following conclusions are suggested by the pretest data on ethnic pride among the Compensatory Education students as presented in Table 1:

1. Overly negative perception of own ethnicity is rare among the Compensatory Education students.
2. Students from all ethnic groups (White, Black, Chicano) tend to have a balanced, mature perception of their own ethnicity.

TABLE 2

Percentages of Prejudiced White Students--Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension ^{3/}

Project Years	Whites Toward Blacks	Whites Toward Chicanos	Whites Toward Women	Total No. of White Students
1976-77	50	64	10	46
1977-78	58	54	18	333
1978-79	62	54	20	329
1979-80	62	54	20	110

^{3/} ESEA Title I students in the California Youth Authority for whom pretest MEIAQ data is available.

The following conclusions are suggested by the pretest responses of White students toward other ethnic groups and women as presented in Table 2:

1. There is an increasingly prejudiced response of White students toward the Black students over the four-year period.

2. Responses of White students show a decreasing level of prejudice toward the Chicano students.

3. White students' attitudes toward women are consistently positive.

TABLE 3

Percentages of Prejudiced Black Students--Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension 4/

Project Years	Prejudiced Toward Whites	Prejudiced Toward Chicanos	Prejudiced Toward Women	Total No. of Black Students
1976-77	61	59	17	59
1977-78	52	58	26	349
1978-79	50	62	25	421
1979-80	49	66	34	194

4/ ESEA Title I students in the California Youth Authority for whom pretest MEIAQ data is available.

The following conclusions are suggested by the pretest data presented in Table 3 on the prejudice of Black students toward other ethnic groups and women:

1. The Black students responded with a decreasing trend in prejudice toward the White students over the four-year period.
2. The Black students indicated an increasing trend in prejudice toward the Chicano students over the four-year period.

3. Black students' responses towards women are positive, but tend to become more prejudiced over the four-year period.

TABLE 4

Percentages of Prejudiced Chicano Students--Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension 5/

Project Years	Prejudiced Toward Whites	Prejudiced Toward Blacks	Prejudiced Toward Women	Total No. of Chicano Students
1976-77	55	54	26	38
1977-78	60	66	23	226
1978-79	55	74	24	274
1979-80	55	66	26	116

5/ ESEA Title I students in the California Youth Authority for whom pretest MEIAQ data is available.

The following conclusions are suggested by the pretest data (Table 4) on the prejudice of Chicano students toward other ethnic groups and women.

1. The Chicano students show a consistent response pattern of prejudice toward the White students over the four-year period.
2. There is an increasing trend in the prejudicial responses of Chicano students toward the Black students over the four-year period.
3. The Chicano students show very little variation in their prejudice toward women over the four-year period.

A comparison of the four-year data as shown in Tables 2-4 on interethnic and intergroup prejudice of White, Black and Chicano students indicates that:

1. While the White students exhibit an increasing trend in their prejudice toward the Black students, the latter show a decreasing trend in their prejudice toward the White students.
2. The Chicano and Black students both show an increasing trend in their prejudice toward each other.
3. Except for the project year 1976-77 in the case of White students and 1977-78 in the case of Chicano students, these two groups maintain the same level of prejudice toward each other over the remaining three years.
4. While the White and Black students both show increasing trends in prejudice toward women, the Chicano students show very little variation in their prejudice toward women.
5. Over the four-year period, the percentages of White, Black and Chicano students who are prejudiced toward other ethnic groups have fluctuated somewhat around 50 percent of the measured population.
6. Prejudice toward women is exhibited by only about 25 percent of the students from White, Black and Chicano ethnic groups.

TABLE 5
Percentages of Ethnocentric Students Over
Multiple Years 6/

Project Years	White Students		Black Students		Chicano Students	
	%	Total N	%	Total N	%	Total N
1976-77	70	46	80	59	66	38
1977-78	63	333	66	349	74	226
1978-79	66	329	69	421	79	274
1979-80	72	110	71	194	77	116
Avg. % Figs.	68%		71%		74%	

6/ ESEA Title I students in the California Youth Authority for whom pretest MEIAQ data is available.

Table 5 shows that more Black students responded in an ethnocentric manner than the White or the Chicano students in the 1976-77 project year, but the Black students exhibited a decreasing trend in ethnocentrism in contrast to the White and Chicano students. The average percent figures for the three ethnic groups show the Chicanos as most ethnocentric in their responses. The responses suggest that approximately 30 percent of students from all ethnic backgrounds are nonethnocentric--they have mature perceptions of their own ethnic groups, and they are free of prejudice against the other two ethnic groups.

The Importance of Needs Assessment Information

The foregoing discussion on the four-year data collected in the ESEA Title I projects in various institutions of the California Youth Authority shows that significant number of wards are free of prejudice in spite of incarceration and

long histories of anti-social and criminal behavior. This core of "mature" students remains submerged within the institutional climate, and their potential to generate good interethnic feelings goes untapped. If the experience in rehabilitating youth points out that prejudiced interethnic perceptions of these youth interfere with the rehabilitative process in the institutions then the loss in not utilizing the unprejudiced youth in the rehabilitative process is obvious. This points out the need for a study to determine the characteristics and actual behavior patterns of the prejudiced and unprejudiced wards. With such an understanding, it may be possible to determine the means by which the "mature" unprejudiced wards can be involved in contributing to and facilitating the specific aspects of the rehabilitative process within the institutions. A question also arises whether it is possible to modify the interethnic and intergroup perceptions of the youth in the institutions of the California Youth Authority. The following discussion will attempt to suggest an answer to this question.

Measurement of the Effectiveness of Multicultural Education

The Compensatory Education Projects of the California Youth Authority provided instruction in Multicultural Education until the end of the project year 1979-80. The various projects began instruction with few resources and limited staff expertise. Over the years improved levels of sophistication were achieved in curriculum and staff development to address the institutional needs of the students. Multicultural Education, under the auspices of Compensatory Education, consistently evidenced a promising impact upon the students served. Changes in perceptions and attitudes related to ethnicity are hard to affect; yet improvements did occur according to our data and teacher reports. The

effectiveness of Multicultural Education component of the Compensatory Education Program within the California Youth Authority has been measured by means of the MEIAQ for four years since the 1976-77 project year. The feedback on the component performance to the field staff in light of the component objectives has been provided since the 1976-77 project year. Tables 6 and 7 summarize the results making it clear that students responded more positively after participation in multicultural instruction.

TABLE 6

Percentage of Students Advancing to the Balanced (Mature) View of Own Ethnicity Upon Completion of Multicultural Instruction

Ethnic Groups	Project Years			
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80
White	% 6	1	0	6
	N 7/ 46	111	123	110
Black	% 6	10	9	5
	N 59	117	179	197
Chicano	% 2	3	11	14
	N 38	77	132	116

7/ Total number including the balanced, overly negative, and overly positive students.

TABLE 7
 Percentages of Students Advancing to the Non-Ethnocentric
 (Ethnically-Unprejudiced) Perceptions

Ethnic Groups	Project Years				
	1976-77	1977-78	1978-79	1979-80	
White	%	7	5	11	9
	Total N <u>8/</u>	46	111	123	110
Black	%	17	14	11	12
	Total N	59	117	179	197
Chicano	%	3	24	15	9
	Total N	38	77	132	116

8/ Total number including the ethnocentric and nonethnocentric students.

Positive changes occurred in the ethnocentrism patterns of all three ethnic groups in each of the four project years. The improvements also occurred in the ethnic pride of the groups, even though, comparatively speaking, these are less than the improvements in ethnocentrism scores. Some of the students, who before multicultural instruction held overly positive perceptions of their ethnic groups with a concomitant prejudiced perceptions of other ethnic groups, may have matured to not regard other ethnic groups negatively while remaining highly positive in perceptions of their own ethnic groups.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY STATEMENT ON THE MEASUREMENT USES OF THE MEIAQ

The Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire has shown promise of serving as an instrument with multiple capabilities, namely needs assessment, diagnostic and evaluative. The instrument can be used to determine the distribution of ethnic/intergroup prejudice among youth, both nonincarcerated and incarcerated. For a youthful offender rehabilitation agency, such as the California Youth Authority, the instrument can provide agency-wide or institutional data on the distribution of prejudice in a specific ward population. These data will assist in assessing the varying educational needs of the wards as well as the training needs of the staff in light of the type, extent, and severity of prejudice occurring in the population. The collection of data on the MEIAQ at regular intervals, such as yearly assessments, can serve to reveal trends in the distribution of prejudice over a number of years. An understanding of these trends can serve to alert staff to the profile of students and their changing educational needs.

The MEIAQ can be used as a process and product evaluation instrument to monitor and evaluate program effectiveness respectively in relation to the progress made by the students in multicultural instruction. Thus, it can serve to provide interim information needed to modify the instructional and curricular approaches, and to provide feedback on the accomplishment of Multicultural Education objectives. Both the process and product evaluation results can be used to aid in the development of curriculum.

The ease of administering the questionnaire and scoring the responses make the instrument useable for diagnosis of individual students by the classroom teachers, and the learning experiences can be tailored to the diagnosed needs of individual students.

The instrument may be utilized as a tool to assist in classroom management. Basically, the MEIAQ assesses the affective orientation of the students related to ethnic perceptions and perceptions of women. Prejudicial perceptions are known to generate and contribute toward disruptive and antagonistic behavior among the prejudiced students. In knowing the affective orientation of students in the area of ethnic prejudice, a classroom teacher can institute management measures which prevent, eliminate, or reduce the chances of negative student interaction due to ethnic hostility.

The method of interpretation of student scores on the questionnaire is discussed in Appendix A. This method provides a quantitative-objective criteria for characterizing a given group of students on their intergroup perceptions. The different ranges of average scores denote the varying levels of prejudice and maturity among students. This capability of the interpretation method facilitates the construction of statements for specific and measurable objectives for Multicultural Education activities. Such objectives as follow might be used:

1. The percentage of participating White, Black, and Chicano students found to have a balanced, mature perception of their own ethnicity (ethnic pride) at the pretest time will increase by ten percent upon completion of multicultural instruction. The increment in the percent

figures will be determined from the data collected by the administration of the Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire on a pre and post basis.

2. The percentage of participating White, Black, and Chicano students found to be without ethnocentric perceptions at the pretest time will increase by ten percent upon the completion of multicultural instruction. The increment in percent figures will be determined from the data collected by the administration of the Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire on a pre and post basis.

In an educational setting, where racial prejudices may be overtly expressed, the instrument shows promise of utility in determining the extent and nature of prejudice among students. This understanding can assist the staff in providing intelligent educational intervention to reduce open ethnic hostilities.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

MEIAQ -- TECHNICAL INFORMATION: MANUAL FOR ADMINISTRATION,
SCORING, AGGREGATION OF DATA

Following the development of the MEIAQ to assess students' prejudice related to ethnicity and women, procedures were developed to administer the questionnaire and process the information provided by the respondents. This manual provides instructions for questionnaire administration; definitions of the dimensions measured; formats for scoring responses and interpretations of average scores related to the three dimensions measured by the instrument.

Instructions For Questionnaire Administration

The following sequential steps are recommended to the person administering the questionnaire:

- Step #1 Before distributing the questionnaire to students, identify the students. (e.g., ESEA participants or non-ESEA participants). Make a check mark in the space provided at the top right-hand corner of the questionnaire.

- Step #2 Explain to the students that it is important that each one of them answers the way he or she truly feels. Their honest answers will help to provide a better educational experience for them. Make sure that the students are seated in such a manner that they cannot copy answers.

Step #3 Explain to the students that the information provided by each one of them will be treated confidentially. No one will be identified by his/her name in dealing with the answers provided by students.

Step #4 Distribute the questionnaires to the students. Ask students to wait until you tell them to begin answering.

Step #5 Move around the classroom to make sure that each student has provided complete background information at the top of page #1.

Step #6 Tell the students that in this questionnaire you are interested to know how they feel about:

- a) Their own ethnic group,
- b) Ethnic groups other than their own, and
- c) Women.

Note: Take time to explain (give a couple of examples from the questionnaire) to the students how they are to make one choice under each group, for each of the statements.

Step #7 Tell students that you will read each statement twice and they should choose their answers after understanding the statement. (You may wish to assign a teaching assistant to those students who cannot read and those who have difficulty keeping up while you read the statements.)

Step #8 Indicate that you are going to begin reading the first statement if there are no questions on how to answer.

Step #9 Begin reading. (Discourage students from interrupting the administration.)

Step #10 Upon finishing all the statements, ask students if anyone needs assistance with a statement that was missed. You may help but the answers must be the students' own. Full completion of the answer sheet by each student is very important. Allow additional time to finish if needed.

Step #11 Collect the answer sheets; put a rubberband around them and send to the designated individual for scoring and data analysis.

Formats For Response - Scoring And Response-Interpretation

The Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Awareness Questionnaire measures three dimensions of ethnic and intergroup immaturity or prejudice of an individual or a group. Each of the three dimensions is characterized by three intensity levels of prejudice. The definitions of dimensions and levels are contained in the discussion contained in this section. The questionnaire provides positively and negatively worded items. An example of the former is: (Blacks) make good neighbors and an example of the latter is: (Whites) make bad teachers. The method of scoring the positively worded items differs from the negatively worded items. However, no check mark and conflicting check marks under any

column of the questionnaire should be treated as an invalid answer for any item (statement).

Ethnic Pride

Attitudes toward one's own ethnic group have been designated as a measure of Ethnic Pride. Level I of the Ethnic Pride dimension denotes an overly negative attitude toward one's own ethnic group. Level II denotes a "balanced" or mature attitude, and Level III denotes an overly positive attitude toward one's own ethnic group. The scoring method for responses on the Ethnic Pride dimension is as follows:

1. On a positive item, give the following numerical weights:

All	Most	Some	Few	None
5	4	3	2	1

2. On a negative item, give the following numerical weights:

All	Most	Some	Few	None
1	2	3	4	5

3. Add the scores on all items answered by the student.
4. Divide the total from 3 above by the number of items answered. This will yield the mean (average) score for the individual respondent.
5. Compare the respondent's mean score with the numerical ranges of the three Ethnic Pride levels. The three numerical ranges are:

Overly Negative	(1.0 - 2.4)	- EP Level I
Balanced	(2.5 - 3.5)	- EP Level II
Overly Positive	(3.6 - 5.0)	- EP Level III

Assign the appropriate Ethnic Pride (EP) level to the respondent.

Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice

The dimension of Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice pertains to the perceptions of the respondent to specific ethnic groups (other than his own) and to women as a group. The questionnaire in its present design can be used to assess the intensity of prejudice of an individual or a group, belonging to any ethnicity, toward Whites, Blacks, Chicanos, and Women. If assessment of prejudice toward any other ethnic group is desired, the instrument can be easily adapted by creating a column for that ethnic group.

The dimension of Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice has three levels corresponding to the intensity of prejudice expressed. Level I denotes highly prejudiced perceptions of a given ethnic group. Level II denotes a perception less intense than Level I, and Level III denotes a "prejudice-free" perception. The scoring method for responses on the Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice (MIP) is as follows:

1. On a positively worded item, score the response as follows:

All	Most	Some	Few	None
0	0	0	1	1

2. On a negatively worded item, score the response as follows:

All	Most	Some	Few	None
1	1	0	0	0

3. Add the scores on all items answered by the respondent.
4. Divide the total by the number of items answered. This will yield the mean (average) score for the individual.
5. Compare the mean score with the numerical ranges of the three Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice levels (MIP levels). The three numerical ranges are:

Highly Prejudiced	(.51 - 1.0)	- MIP Level I
Somewhat Prejudiced	(.26 - .50)	- MIP Level II
Unprejudiced	(.00 - .25)	- MIP Level III

Assign the appropriate Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice level to the respondent.

Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism is defined as attitudes of superiority about one's own ethnicity, with varying degrees of negativism toward specific ethnic groups. Level I of the ethnocentrism scale of measure denotes an unrealistically superior view of own ethnicity with a concomitantly inferior rating of other ethnic groups.

Level II of ethnocentrism denotes perceptions less intense than Level I, and Level III denotes a "prejudice-free" perception. The scoring method for responses on the ethnocentrism dimension utilizes the respondent's individual item answers/scores under the Ethnic Pride and Inter-Ethnic Prejudice dimensions. A comparison of the responses determines the score for any given item under the Ethnocentrism dimension. The scheme works as follows:

1. On a positively worded item, assign a score of "0" if the respondent has checked "All," "Most," or "Some" under the Ethnic Pride dimension, and has checked "All," or "Most," or "Some" under the Inter-Ethnic Prejudice dimension for all the ethnic groups under consideration.
2. On a positively worded item, assign a score of "1" if the respondent has checked "All," or "Most," or "Some" for his own ethnic group, and has checked "None" or "Few" for one or more ethnic groups other than his own.
3. On a negatively worded item, assign a score of "0" if the respondent has checked "None" or "Few" or "Some" for his own ethnic group, and has checked "None" or "Few" or "Some" under the Inter-Ethnic Prejudice dimension for all the ethnic groups under consideration.
4. On a negatively worded item, assign a score of "1" if the respondent has checked "None" or "Few" or "Some" for his own ethnic group, and has checked "All" or "Most" for one or more of the other ethnic groups under consideration.

5. On a negatively worded item, invalidate the response if the respondent has checked "All" or "Most" for both his own ethnic group and for one or more other ethnic groups under consideration.

6. On a negatively worded item, invalidate the response if the respondent has checked "All" or "Most" for his ethnic group, but has checked "None" or "Few" or "Some" for one or more ethnic groups other than his/her own.

7. Add the scores on all items answered by the respondent.

8. Divide this total by the number of items scored.

9. Compare the mean score with the numerical ranges of the three Ethnocentrism levels (EC levels). The three numerical ranges are:

Highly Prejudiced	(.51 - 1.0)	- EC Level I
Somewhat Prejudiced	(.26 - .50)	- EC Level II
Unprejudiced	(.00 - .25)	- EC Level III

Assign the appropriate Ethnocentrism level to the respondent.

Appendices E and F provide a guide to relating mean scores and levels of prejudice to the total score of a respondent on the ethnic pride, ethnocentrism and multi-ethnic intergroup prejudice dimensions measured by the MEIAQ.

Aggregation of the MEIAQ Data

The MEIAQ data on individual respondents for each of the three dimensions measured by the instrument, i.e., ethnic pride, multi-ethnic intergroup prejudice, and ethnocentrism can easily be aggregated for a group of respondents (students). After each respondent has been assigned a "level" of prejudice/maturity, it is simply a matter of calculating the number and percentages of those respondents who fall under each level of the three dimensions. The following format can be used to display the data.

Dimensions		Levels of Prejudice			Total N
		1	2	3	
Ethnic Pride	N				
	%				
Ethnocentrism	N				
	%				
Multi Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice	N				
	%				

Depending on the quantity of data, aggregation can be achieved by means of a hand calculator or a computer program. Other statistical procedures can be applied as required. Since each respondent is assigned an average score and a level of prejudice related to a given dimension of prejudice, these scores can be aggregated to determine the overall average score and the standard deviation for the group.

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

	<u>MYSELF</u>							
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

111781

-31-

90B-4596Bks

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

	<u>CAUCASIAN AMERICANS</u>							
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

111781

-32-

90B-4596Bks

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

BLACK AMERICANS

	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

CHICANOS

	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

NATIVE AMERICANS

	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

111781

90B-4596Bks

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

ASIAN AMERICANS

	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

111781

90B-4596Bks

APPENDIX B
SEMANTIC DIFFERENTIAL INSTRUMENT

SCHOOL _____

DATE _____

ETHNICITY _____

	WOMEN							
	7	6	5	4	3	2	1	
GOOD	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	BAD
HONEST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISHONEST
VALUABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WORTHLESS
SUCCESSFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNSUCCESSFUL
FAIR	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNFAIR
JUST	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNJUST
KIND	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CRUEL
CLEAN	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DIRTY
AGREEABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DISAGREEABLE
PLEASANT	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	UNPLEASANT
SMART	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	DUMB
HOPEFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	HOPELESS
HARDWORKING	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	LAZY
THRIFTY	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WASTEFUL
MORAL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	IMMORAL
BRAVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	COWARDLY
POWERFUL	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	WEAK
ACTIVE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	INACTIVE
STABLE	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	_____	CHANGEABLE

APPENDIX C

Form A

MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE
ANSWER SHEET

STUDENTS: DO NOT WRITE IN THIS SPACE

Name _____

YA#: _____

Sex: Male _____

School _____

Pre

Post

Class _____

Age: _____

Female _____

ESEA Participant Non-ESEA

Today's
Date: _____

Ethnic Group: White, Black, Chicano
(Circle One) Native American, Japanese
Mexican American, Chinese
Other: _____

I.D.#: _____

MEIAQ Administrator's Name _____

Statements	White					Black					Chicano					Women				
1. Make good neighbors.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
2. Make good teachers.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
3. Like good music.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
4. Are good mayors and governors.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
5. Are good to do business with.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
6. Make good athletes.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
7. Are likely to get in trouble with the law.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
8. Are smart.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
9. Are kind.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
10. Are easy to understand when they talk.	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None

111781
90B-4596Bks

Form A
MULTI-ETHNIC INTERGROUP AWARENESS QUESTIONNAIRE

I.D.# _____

-2-

Statements	White					Black					Chicano					Women				
	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None	All	Most	Some	Few	None
11. Are careful with their money.																				
12. Can be trusted.																				
13. Are handsome/beautiful.																				
14. Feel sorry for themselves.																				
15. Get along well with other ethnic groups.																				
16. Can be counted upon.																				
17. Want something for nothing.																				
18. Are honest.																				

DO NOT WRITE BELOW THIS LINE

T = _____	T = _____	T = _____	T = _____	T = _____
N = _____	N = _____	N = _____	N = _____	N = _____
$\bar{X} = \frac{T}{N} =$ _____	$\bar{X} = \frac{T}{N} =$ _____	$\bar{X} = \frac{T}{N} =$ _____	$\bar{X} = \frac{T}{N} =$ _____	$\bar{X} = \frac{T}{N} =$ _____
Level _____ (EP or MIP or EC)	Level _____ (EP or MIP or EC)	Level _____ (EP or MIP or EC)	Level _____ (EP or MIP or EC)	Level _____ (EP or MIP or EC)

Where T = Total Score
N = Number of Items Responded
 \bar{X} = Average Score of the Respondent
EP = Ethnic Pride Dimension
MIP = Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice Dimension
EC = Ethnocentrism

111781
90B-4596Bks

APPENDIX D

MEIAQ - FORM B

1. Make good judges.
2. Make good parents.
3. Are good on their job.
4. Are good police officers.
5. Make good friends.
6. Try hard to improve themselves.
7. Are fair.
8. Are lazy.
9. Are clean.
10. Know right from wrong.
11. Are helpful.
12. Are brave.
13. Cannot solve their problems without help.
14. Say something and stick to it.
15. Would rather be on welfare than work.
16. Are intelligent.

APPENDIX E

Ethnic Pride Dimension When the Student Answers all 18 Items

SCORES CONVERSION TABLE I

Points	Mean Score	Level	Points	Mean Score	Level	Points	Mean Score	Level
90	5.0	O	63	3.5	B	44	2.4	O
89	4.9	V	62	3.4	A	43	2.4	V
88	4.9	E	61	3.4	L	42	2.3	E
87	4.8	R	60	3.3	A	41	2.3	R
86	4.8	L	59	3.3	N	40	2.2	L
85	4.7	Y	58	3.2	C	39	2.2	Y
84	4.7		57	3.2	E	38	2.1	
83	4.6	P	56	3.1	D	37	2.1	N
82	4.6	O	55	3.1		36	2.0	E
81	4.5	S	54	3.0		35	1.9	G
80	4.4	I	53	2.9	2	34	1.9	A
79	4.4	T	52	2.9		33	1.8	T
78	4.3	I	51	2.8		32	1.8	I
77	4.3	V	50	2.8		31	1.7	V
76	4.2	E	49	2.7		30	1.7	E
75	4.2		48	2.7		29	1.6	
74	4.1	3	47	2.6		28	1.6	1
73	4.1		46	2.6		27	1.5	
72	4.0		45	2.5		26	1.4	
71	3.9					25	1.4	
70	3.9					24	1.3	
69	3.8					23	1.3	
68	3.8					22	1.2	
67	3.7					21	1.2	
66	3.7					20	1.1	
65	3.6					19	1.1	
64	3.6					18	1.0	

APPENDIX F

Multi-Ethnic Intergroup Prejudice and Ethnocentrism Dimensions

SCORES CONVERSION TABLE II

If the Student Scores the Following Points (total)	and Answers <u>18</u> out of 18 Items:	and Answers <u>17</u> out of 18 Items:	and Answers <u>16</u> out of 18 Items:	and Answers <u>15</u> out of 18 Items:	LEVEL
0	.00	.00	.00	.00	
1	.06	.06	.06	.07	3
2	.11	.12	.13	.13	Least Prejudiced
3	.17	.18	.19	.20	
4	.22	.24	.25	.27	
5	.28	.29	.31	.33	
6	.33	.35	.38	.40	2
7	.39	.41	.44	.47	
8	.44	.47	.50	.53	
9	.50	.53	.56	.60	
10	.56	.59	.63	.67	
11	.61	.65	.69	.73	
12	.67	.71	.75	.80	1
13	.72	.76	.81	.87	Most Prejudiced
14	.78	.82	.88	.93	
15	.83	.88	.94	1.00	
16	.89	.94	1.00		
17	.94	1.00			
18	1.00				

NOTE: In practice, for the purpose of displaying and interpreting the data, Levels 1 and 2 can be combined to denote the prejudiced respondents, and Level 3 can be treated as the unprejudiced.

REFERENCES

ANNUAL REPORTS
COMPENSATORY EDUCATION IN YOUTH AUTHORITY

- 1976-77 Mahan, JoAnn, et al. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1978.
- 1977-78 Bal, Amarjit and Mahan, JoAnn. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1979.
- 1979-80 Ward, Jane, et al. Compensatory Education Program Description and Evaluation, 1981.

OTHER REFERENCES

- Mahan, JoAnn and Bal, Amarjit. "Measurement of Interethnic Intergroup Perceptions of Youth Authority Students," Youth Authority Quarterly, Spring, 1978.
- Snider, James and Osgood, Charles, ed. Semantic Differential Technique (A Sourcebook). Chicago: Aldine Publishing Company, 1969.