UCLA
American Indian Culture and Research Journal

Title
American Indian Stereotyping, Resource Competition, and Status-based Prejudice

Permalink
https://escholarship.org/uc/item/8tf3r11h

Journal
American Indian Culture and Research Journal , 15(3)

ISSN
0161-6463

Authors
Rouse, Linda P.
Hanson, Jeffrey R.

Publication Date
1991-06-01

DOI
10.17953

Copyright Information
This work is made available under the terms of a Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, availalbe at https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/

Peer reviewed

eScholarship.org Powered by the California Digital Library
University of California

AMERICAN INDIAN CULTURE AND RESEARCH JOURNAL 15:3 (1991) 1-17

American Indian Stereotyping, Resource Competition, and Status-based Prejudice

LINDA P. ROUSE and JEFFERY R. HANSON

INTRODUCTION

Stereotypes are overgeneralized beliefs that attribute certain characteristics to a particular group.[1] Persons who hold these beliefs tend to perceive others on the basis of their group membership or ethnic identity. "Personal" stereotypes are perceptions of individual traits (such as "lazy") associated with membership in a particular group. "Cultural" stereotypes are beliefs about the way of life associated with the group as a whole (e.g., "migratory").

The stereotypes of American Indians that are held by non-Indians are deeply embedded in American history; these attitudes reflect an historically competitive relationship between Euro-Americans and American Indians. Stereotypes about American Indians have tended to be negative and self-serving. For example, in *Puritans, Indians, and Manifest Destiny,* Segal and Stineback demonstrate how the Puritan view of Indians as a morally and spiritually inferior people living outside the domain of God and civilization served to justify the economic expansion of New England colonies and the expropriation of Indian lands.[2] Further, Roy Pearce and, more recently, Robert Berkhofer have shown how notions of the Indian and the "savage" (whether

Linda P. Rouse is an associate professor and Jeffery R. Hanson is an assistant professor in the Department of Sociology and Anthropology at the University of Texas, Arlington.

viewed as noble or ignoble) were intellectual conveniences created by whites to map their own alleged superiority and progress. Even among American social scientists, crude evolutionary schemes and racial determinism were not rejected until the pioneering efforts of anthropologist Franz Boas and his program of cultural relativism/pluralism in the early 1900s.[3] Berkhofer believes that the influence of the Boasian program has caused the racist and negative stereotypes held by non-Indians to give way in favor of more positive attitudes.[4] However, pockets of prejudice and ethnic/racial stereotyping of American Indians still exist, particularly, Daniel Boxberger suggests, in areas where there is competition over economic resources.[5]

While the causes of ethnic conflict vary according to specific historical and sociocultural circumstances, recent literature on ethnicity and ethnic strife suggests some common underlying processes. Ethnic identity possesses economic, political, and symbolic dimensions which interact to condition social relations both within and between bounded groups. Politically and economically, ethnic identity serves as a means of accessing or contesting resources deemed desirable by two or more competing groups.[6] The outcomes of ethnic strife vary, ranging from a high degree of mutualism or pluralism between competing groups to the competitive exclusion of one ethnic group by another.[7]

On the symbolic level, ethnic identity involves the development of boundary mechanisms that serve to set off groups from one another.[8] These mechanisms include, but are not limited to, language, occupations, clothing, and beliefs about ancestral blood ties and ancestral charter (history). Differences between ethnic groups, especially those in competition or conflict, can be accented and/or exaggerated by racial and ethnic stereotypes.

In addition to resource competition as a source of prejudice, in contemporary American society the mass media, recreation and leisure industries, literature, and commercial advertising still contribute to an overgeneralized, inaccurate, generic depiction of "the Indian." Braves, chiefs, "squaws," and "princesses" bedecked in Plains Indian fashion, with added fixtures of canoes, tipis, and totem poles, are used to sell products, attract tourism, or in other ways promote consumerism. While these mechanisms of stereotyping may not be negative in intent, they nevertheless embrace and promote historically outdated and ethnographically inaccurate images of American Indians.

Non-Indian Beliefs about Indians: Some Curious Findings

Earlier writings about non-Indian attitudes toward American Indians have implied the existence of a widely held, coherent, integrated set of beliefs, largely negative in nature. Such beliefs have been described as including perceptions of Indians living in the past, clinging to tribal ways and primitive beliefs ill-suited to success in modern society, and possessing negative personality traits such as laziness, sullenness, undependability, drunkenness, and general incompetence in handling their own affairs.[9] However, in a study of college students at one urban university in Texas in 1987, the authors found generally favorable attitudes toward American Indians, except for a small minority of students, 10 to 20 percent, who responded in a negative manner on various questionnaire items. At the same time, these students demonstrated little familiarity with details about American Indian history and ethnography. Results were mixed with respect to attitude consistency or coherency.[10]

The students did not endorse cultural stereotypes of American Indians in a highly consistent manner. Individual students accepted some stereotypic beliefs and rejected others, in fairly unsystematic fashion. There was little evidence here of the coherent, integrated set of beliefs that the literature would lead one to expect. In contrast, responses to personal stereotypes did appear to reflect a unified underlying orientation toward American Indians, along a positive to negative evaluation dimension. Attribution of negative personal traits was correlated with victim-blaming attitudes concerning American Indian competence, assimilation, and cultural deprivation. Moreover, students who attributed negative personal traits to American Indians did so independent of any knowledge or lack of knowledge about American Indians.

Yet ignorance of another group's culture is widely assumed to lead to misunderstanding between groups. Presumably, then, knowledge should be effective in countering racial and ethnic stereotypes. Do facts persuade? More precisely, to what extent and under what circumstances can new knowledge alter existing racial and ethnic prejudice? Ethnic/racial prejudice involves not only stereotypic beliefs but also an unfavorable evaluation of the group considered.

Stereotypic Beliefs and Prejudice

Since social scientists are not always in agreement on usage of the terms *belief* and *prejudice,* we will clarify our meaning. A stereotype is regarded here as a belief, a prejudice as an attitude. Attitudes are likes and dislikes . . . affinities for and aversions to certain situations, objects, ideas, persons, or groups.[11] Attitudes have three components: (1) cognitive, the mental image or picture we have of a group; (2) affective, the feelings or emotions involved; and (3) behavioral, the tendency or predisposition to act in certain ways toward members of a group.[12] James Vander-Zanden notes that the components of prejudice are interrelated though not necessarily fully congruent. Given negative stereotypes and corresponding feelings toward a group of people, one is inclined to act toward the group in negative ways.[13]

We view stereotypes primarily as a cognitive component of prejudice. However, we recognize that stereotypes themselves vary in evaluative loading. Bem captures this idea with the concept of an evaluative belief. In other words, a belief (mental picture) can have an embedded connotative (evaluative) as well as denotative (descriptive) meaning. To illustrate, some cultural stereotypes of American Indians are largely descriptive, such as migratory v. settled or rural v. urban, while others may also carry a negative connotation, such as "primitive" v. "civilized." The personal stereotypes we studied appeared to represent even more strongly an underlying evaluation of "goodness" or "badness."[14] Still, this must be distinguished from degree of affect or emotional intensity associated with a belief. One could, for example, perceive Indians as primitive without having any particularly strong personal feelings about the matter.

The hallmark of prejudice is that negative beliefs persist despite contrary evidence.[15] We believe this occurs when stereotypic evaluative beliefs are attached to strong feelings and serve to justify actions in one's own social and economic interests. Here, the social psychology of prejudice intersects with models of intergroup competition. A closer look at the origins of prejudice will help clarify this connection.

Prejudice Based on Ignorance versus Status-based Prejudice

Consider two types of prejudice: prejudice based on ignorance and status-based prejudice.[16] Prejudice based on ignorance is ac-

quired through socialization as folklore, particularly in the absence of much direct contact with a minority group. For example, Hollywood movie portrayals of American Indians and advertising images of the generic Plains Indian-as-Indian are sources of stereotypes that may form a basis for prejudice. Prejudice based on ignorance characteristically is imitative, does not evoke strong feelings, and can easily be modified by new information presented by a legitimate source (e.g., teachers). Stereotypic cultural beliefs about all Indians living in tipis, being warlike, migratory hunters, carrying tomahawks, carving totem poles, and speaking "Indian" are modified when students are presented with more accurate information about Indian history and ethnography. Likewise, students will accept an instructor's or text's authority and will acquire (at least short-term) familiarity with facts concerning the recognition of American Indians as United States citizens, the identity of Geronimo, the political structures of particular tribes, or the origins of corn agriculture. In this way, students' education increases their cultural literacy. But new knowledge may not connect with or modify students' positive or negative feelings toward Indians, especially where status-based prejudice is operating.

Status-based prejudice is anchored in negative personal experience, driven by status politics—wherein one ethnic or racial group is competing with another for social and economic resources. It is more likely to develop in cases where direct intergroup conflict evokes strong feelings. Two examples illustrate the point. During the 1970s, strong anti-Indian sentiment, anti-treaty lobbying, and violence occurred in Washington State as a result of a federal court ruling (the Boldt decision) that the Lummi and other treaty tribes were being unfairly excluded from exercising their salmon fishing rights. Non-Indian commercial and sport fishers perceived that such rulings reduced their own competitive advantage and would result in the irreversible depletion of salmon resources.[17] In fact, the commercialization of the salmon fishing industry by non-Indians already had a long history of resource depletion; nevertheless, the threat perceived by the more numerous and powerful non-Indian groups resulted in the incidents described above.

The ongoing ethnic and racial strife in northern Wisconsin parallels the case of the Lummi. Here, Chippewa tribes, whose off-reservation spearfishing rights were upheld in federal court, have faced intense, emotional anti-treaty and anti-Indian sentiment.

Again, the perception of the non-Indian anti-treaty protestors is that the Chippewa now have undue competitive advantage in harvesting targeted species and will deplete the current stocks of fish in the lakes of the region.[18]

Status-based prejudice is more resistant to change because of the social context of perceived competition as well as the emotional and often negative interactions of ethnic or racial groups. Rather than altering existing attitudes, new facts tend to be compartmentalized, ignored, or reinterpreted. For example, when confronted with the fact that Chippewa spearfishing methods are essentially grounded in aboriginal practice, non-Indian protesters often respond that "archaic" tribal practices are not in step with our current society and its needs.

Note that the two types of prejudice described earlier are not distinguished by their belief content, but rather by their attached affect and context of origin. The stereotypes involved are likely to be quite similar; their accompanying emotional and social supports will vary. Where racial/ethnic groups compete over scarce resources, status-based prejudice and its component stereotypes will be more pervasive.

METHOD

Research Objective

After our survey of Texas college students, we conducted a follow-up study to pursue the implications of status-based prejudice. We enlarged our survey to include college students from two other geographic areas selected for their greater American Indian visibility and resource competition between Indians and non-Indians. Our goal was to investigate whether variations in stereotyping might be attributable to status-based prejudice in areas where access to resources is perceived to be in dispute. Specifically, we hypothesized that negative stereotypes of American Indians would be more pervasive among students in our samples from North Dakota and Wisconsin than in our previously studied Texas sample.

We assumed that prejudice based on ignorance would be more uniformly distributed due to the broad influence of mass media and thus would be relatively constant for all three samples, while status-based prejudice probably would vary with the local social

context of intergroup relations. Even if the North Dakota and Wisconsin students were better informed about American Indian history and ethnography, they would still show more negative stereotyping, because factual knowledge in itself is not sufficient to counter status-based prejudice.

Data Collection

The Three Samples

Early in the fall 1987, questionnaires were distributed to 226 undergraduate students in introductory sociology and anthropology courses at the University of Texas, Arlington, a public institution with an enrollment of approximately twenty thousand. Arlington is located in the metropolitan area that includes Fort Worth and Dallas. In the fall of 1988, questionnaires were distributed by colleagues to 83 undergraduate students in introductory economics and anthropology courses at the University of Wisconsin, La Crosse, a public institution of approximately eight thousand located in predominantly rural western Wisconsin. At the beginning of the spring term 1989, questionnaires were given to 153 undergraduate students in several introductory anthropology sections and one American Indian course at the University of North Dakota, Grand Forks. This university has a student population of about twelve thousand and is located in a predominantly rural state with five Indian reservations.

As indicated in table 1, the three sample areas differ with respect to visibility of Native Americans. UT–Arlington has 105 American Indians and Alaska Natives enrolled out of 22,342 students (0.5 percent); it has no organizations and no programs specific to them. Hence Native Americans are not a very visible minority on campus; nor are they particularly visible in the larger metropolitan area of several million people.

At the University of North Dakota, Native Americans are much more visible on campus, with an enrollment of 300 out of 10,500 students (3.0 percent) and an active student organization. This university also has specific academic and technical programs to accommodate Native American students. Native Americans constitute the most visible minority group in North Dakota, especially in rural areas, where there has been a long history of Indian-white competition and anti-Indian sentiment.

The University of Wisconsin, La Crosse is intermediate in terms

TABLE 1
Relative Proportion of American Indians for Three States Where Samples Were Drawn

	North Dakota	Wisconsin	Texas
Total Indian	20,000	29,300	41,000
Total population	653,000	4,706,000	14,000,000
Percent Indian	3.0	.6	.2
Percent rural Indian	80%	53.5%	8.0%

Figures from 1980 census; Inner Circle, Tribal American Network, Inc., 1987, Dallas, Texas.

of Native American visibility and accommodation. While enrollments are low (27 Indians or Alaska Natives out of 9,000, or .3 percent) in rural western Wisconsin, where La Crosse is located, American Indians constitute one of the most visible minority groups. In addition, their overall visibility has been heightened of late as a result of the heated controversy stemming from the exercise of Chippewa off-reservation spearfishing rights in northern Wisconsin. Chippewa spearfishing activity has led to increasingly militant demonstrations from non-Indian anti-treaty protesters because the Chippewa have been granted special privileges over a shared resource, which, the protesters believe, will lead to depletion of targeted fish species and a decline in tourism. This economic and racial controversy has saturated the Wisconsin media, with potential impact on college students.[19]

The Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of three parts. First, students went through a set of dichotomous concepts concerning American Indians. They were asked to check for each word pair the degree to which one or the other concept best reflected what "American Indians" means [to you], with zero being neutral; e.g., Migratory 3 2 1 0 1 2 3 Settled. In the second part of the questionnaire, students filled in background information on age, sex, race, and year in school and answered ten questions pertaining to exposure to various sources of information about American Indians (e.g., proximity to a reservation, Indian friends or

acquaintances, school, mass media). The final section of the questionnaire was a forty-item opinion and knowledge survey in which students were asked to respond to a series of statements (from 1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Some items selected from this section were used to measure factual knowledge, general orientation, and victim-blaming. Others provided a check on stereotyping. A few items covered resource issues such as protection of Indian burial sites and honoring of treaty rights. A more detailed description of items used is provided along with our findings.[20]

Data Analysis Strategy

Lack of visibility contributes to ignorance about a minority group, but higher visibility may be accompanied by intergroup competition. Therefore, for each of our samples we examined how visible Native Americans were (a) in sheer numbers, (b) in proportion to other minority groups in the same area, (c) with respect to proximity of a reservation, (d) as friends or acquaintances of non-Indians, and (e) through other sources of information.

Next we compared the three samples along several dimensions of beliefs: factual knowledge, cultural stereotypes, personal stereotypes, and victim-blaming. We also looked at students' perceptions of Indians' rights. The focus of the analysis was on the relationship between geographic location and type of belief. Geographic location was used as an indicator of social context. Thus, the three purposive samples drawn from different areas permitted comparison of respondents from social contexts that varied in extent of intergroup competition over resources.

To confirm differences in American Indian visibility across our three samples, the bivariate relationship between geographic location and visibility was examined and its statistical significance assessed by chi square tests. (If the chi square value was large enough that the probability of its occurring by chance was less than .05, obtained differences between samples were considered statistically significant.) The relationship between geographic location and factual knowledge about American Indians (with facts scores split at the median) was similarly assessed. The remaining comparisons across samples were made using two other statistics. The nonparametric Kruskal-Wallis test ranks all cases from three or more groups in a single series, computes the rank sum

for each group, then computes the "H statistic," which has approximately a chi square distribution. To check the findings, we also ran a median test, which calculates the median for three or more samples as a whole, then evaluates departures in the proportion above and below this median for the individual samples, using the chi square statistic. Questionnaire items for which both tests indicated statistically significant sample differences will be discussed in this paper.

FINDINGS

Visibility

Statistically significant differences in responses from students in our three samples empirically supported our contention that these samples were drawn from varied social contexts with respect to intergroup relations between Indians and non-Indians. In the UT-Arlington sample, three out of 226 students identified themselves as American Indian. Additionally, the UT-Arlington student sample showed considerable racial and ethnic diversity. Three quarters identified themselves as white, as compared to over 90 percent in both the UW-La Crosse and UND samples. Minorities such as Blacks, Hispanics, and Asians were considerably more visible at UT-Arlington.

Another indicator of variation in intergroup contact is proximity of a reservation. Only 10.1 percent of the UT-Arlington respondents said that they live within fifty miles of a reservation, as compared to 35.7 percent from UW-La Crosse and 43.8 from UND. A notable 87.5 percent of the UT-Arlington students indicated that they live more than seventy-five miles from a reservation or simply did not know of one in the area. (Texas has only three reservations, the closest of which is located in southeast Texas, five hours away from Arlington by car. The other two are very small and are located in extreme west Texas near El Paso.)

A large number of UT-Arlington students in our sample had no American Indian "friends or acquaintances" (45.3 percent versus 30.1 percent at UW-La Crosse and 18.3 percent at UND); only 24.5 said they had "friends or acquaintances" who actively participated in American Indian culture or heritage (versus 25.0 percent at UW-La Crosse and 46.1 percent at UND). When asked

what kind of influence Indian friends or acquaintances have had on them, where there was any influence, only 13.8 percent of the UT-Arlington students said it was "negative" as compared to 16.7 percent of the UW-La Crosse sample and 27.8 percent of the UND sample.

Concerning exposure in their high school curriculum to information about American Indian history and culture, students at UW-La Crosse reported the most and at UND significantly less, with UT-Arlington students in between. There were no statistically significant differences among the three samples in the rank given to magazines or to TV/movies as sources of information about American Indians. TV/movies were most often ranked as the number one source of information. Magazines averaged fourth most important source in each of the three samples.

Newspapers were a significantly less important source of information for UT-Arlington students than for the UW-La Crosse and UND samples, while books were ranked significantly higher by UT-Arlington students as an information source. UND students, however, reported reading significantly more books "in the last year" and "ever" concerning American Indians. Informal conversation appeared far more important, and classroom lectures less important, for the UND sample than for either the UT-Arlington or UW-La Crosse students.

The mean relative importance rankings for each potential source of information are summarized in table 2. Do the significant differences in the quantity and types of exposure these students have had to American Indians correspond to differences in stereotypic thinking?

Stereotypic Beliefs

We looked at how the three samples performed on the questionnaire's factual knowledge items, to obtain an index of students' factual knowledge about American Indians. We recoded statements from the questionnaire so that students who agreed with a true statement or disagreed with a false statement were counted as having a correct answer. A "neutral" response to these statements was considered a wrong answer. A respondent's score on the factual knowledge items was the total number of correct answers, from 0 to 10. The questions covered topics such as the origin of corn agriculture, use of tipis and totem poles, granting of

TABLE 2
Comparison of Mean Values for Importance Assigned to Various Information Sources*

	UT–Arlington	UW–La Crosse	UND–Grand Forks
TV or movies	2.81	2.49	2.95
Magazines	4.03	3.98	4.18
Books	2.46	2.84	3.26
Newspapers	4.24	3.63	3.49
Informal conversations	4.28	4.26	3.10
Lectures	3.30	3.70	3.95
Actual books read last year	.36	.29	.71
Actual books ever read	1.63	1.61	1.85
High school curriculum	1.49	1.62	1.28

*Respondents ranked numbers 1 to 6 in importance as sources of information about American Indians. (The lower the score, the higher the importance assigned to this source.) The mean rankings for each are reported. For 7 and 8, response categories were 0=none; 1=1–2; 2=3–4; 3=5 or more. Students were also asked how much of their high school curriculum contained lessons about American Indian history and culture: 0=none; 1=very little; 2=some; 3=considerable (at least two weeks devoted to American Indian studies).

citizenship to American Indians, and invention of snowshoes. While our choice of questions was subjective, we selected questions that represented the three general categories of Native American prehistory, history, and ethnography.

For the three samples combined, the mean facts score was 4.48. The most frequently occurring score was 5. Half the respondents scored at or below 4. If a "passing" score is considered six or more correct, 31.5 percent passed our ten-item quiz on knowledge of American Indian history and culture. Although scores averaged slightly higher for UND students, no statistically significant difference appeared among the three samples in factual knowledge.

Findings regarding cultural stereotypes tended to be consistent across the samples. Respondents generally viewed Native Americans as traditional, rural, hunters, associated with the past. These

traits are consistent with the generic stereotype of Native American culture promulgated in the media and the recreation and leisure industry. The point should be remembered, however, that these traits need not have a negative connotation. The stereotype is inaccurate and may contribute to prejudice based on ignorance, but it does not necessarily reflect status-based prejudice. In all three samples, only a small minority of students accepted the cultural stereotypes that Native Americans had crude languages, were warlike savages, or were lacking in cultural diversity ("all Indians are alike").

Findings concerning personal stereotypes presented a somewhat different picture. While students endorsing negative personal stereotypes of American Indians were again in the minority, interesting differences emerged among the three samples. These differences were consistent with our hypothesis that negative stereotypes would be more prevalent in the UW–La Crosse and UND samples. Recall that the personal stereotypes about American Indians, more than the cultural stereotypes, are evaluative beliefs. Compared with UT–Arlington students, a significantly greater percentage of UW–La Crosse and UND students perceived Native Americans as lazy, weak, undependable, and unpatriotic (see table 3). In addition, in responses that we regarded as reflecting a victim-blaming orientation, significantly fewer UW–La Crosse and UND students favored Native American self-determination (i.e., Indians were seen as not competent to handle their own affairs); significantly more UW–La Crosse and UND students felt that Native Americans had only themselves to blame for their position in American society. These results supported the findings of a Canadian study by Gibbons and Ponting wherein a non-Indian sample from the heavily Indian-populated Plains provinces were significantly more likely than the non-Plains sample to cite as the major differences between non-Indians and Indians the latters' personality deficiencies (e.g., laziness, lack of ambition, lack of initiative).[21]

Opinions on Indian Rights

Two additional survey questions provided indicators of perceived resource competition, from which status-based prejudice may emanate. On issues like hunting and fishing rights, land claims and treaties, students from UW–La Crosse and UND should reflect more negative opinions than students from UT–Arlington.

TABLE 3
Percent Agreement with Personal Stereotypes and Victim-Blaming across Samples

	UT–Arlington	UW–La Crosse	UND–Grand Forks
Personal Stereotypes[a]	%	%	%
Lazy	10	28	45
Weak	6	16	15
Undependable	10	18	37
Unpatriotic	13	27	28
Victim-Blaming[b]			
Favor self-determination	87	73	70
Indians to blame	5	11	11

[a]Measured by dichotomous concepts/word pairs for which respondents checked along a seven-point scale (center neutral) ''What 'American Indians' means to you'': lazy-energetic, strong-weak, undependable-dependable, patriotic-unpatriotic. Responses on the side of the negative concept were scored as agreement.

[b]Item wordings: ''Indian people are competent to handle their own affairs and should be allowed self-determination (freedom to decide their future)'' and ''American Indians have only themselves to blame for their social and economic position in American society today.''

Students were asked to what extent they agreed or disagreed with the statement that Native Americans should be granted ''special privileges'' such as hunting and fishing rights. Predictably, significantly more UW-La Crosse and UND students disagreed than did those at UT-Arlington (UT-Arlington = 48 percent, UW-La Crosse = 70 percent, UND = 61 percent). The high percentage in the UW-La Crosse sample may be attributed in part to the strong feelings associated with the current Chippewa spearfishing controversy. We also asked whether the United States should continue to honor treaties and the land claims protected therein. At least twice as many in the UW-La Crosse and UND samples disagreed as those at UT-Arlington (UT-Arlington = 10 percent, UW-La Crosse = 24 percent, UND = 20 percent). We infer that these differences correspond to the variation in social context across our samples.

CONCLUSION

Across the three samples, fact scores did not vary significantly, nor did cultural stereotypes. While most students agreed that American Indians are culturally diverse, their average scores were low on specific knowledge of American Indian history and culture. Also, they tended to share some traditional cultural stereotypes that reflect a pervasive generic "folk ethnography" promulgated by the media and recreation and leisure industry. Correspondingly, for all three samples, the highest ranked source of information about American Indians was TV/movies.

Significant differences appeared across the samples, however, in personal stereotyping and opinions on American Indian rights. Although the majority of students in each of the three samples did not embrace negative stereotypes, negative stereotyping was more likely to occur among students from UW–La Crosse and UND than from UT–Arlington. In this study, then, variation in negative stereotyping corresponded to differences in Native American visibility and perceived resource competition.

Conclusions drawn from these results should be tempered by recognition of the methodological shortcomings of the analysis. First, the study involved three nonrandom, purposive samples of students who may be considered only loosely representative of the three different geographic locations/social contexts selected. Second, we did not include direct measures of affect or perceived social support; we could only draw inferences about attitudes from the distribution of stereotypic beliefs in a given social context. Third, although we have provided strong supporting evidence for differences across samples in Native American visibility and resource competition, alternative explanations have not been addressed. For example, could variation in negative stereotyping across the samples be a result of time lapsed in data collection, simple rural-urban differences in rates of prejudice, or unmeasured sample characteristics like social class background? While we have not eliminated all such possibilities, we do know that stereotypic beliefs did not vary by age or gender for students in our samples, that respondents in all three samples were similar in level of educational attainment, and that they were homogeneous in specific knowledge of and cultural stereotyping of American Indians.

The findings of our study are not conclusive but are consistent

with the conceptual framework employed, which links the social psychology of prejudice with models of intergroup competition. Such a perspective should prove useful in further investigations of Native American stereotyping and has potentially broad applicability to other racial and ethnic groups. Understanding the differences between status-based prejudice and prejudice based on ignorance should also be helpful to educators and policy makers in their efforts to address prejudice and to improve intergroup relations.

NOTES

1. Daryl Bem, *Beliefs, Attitudes, and Human Affairs* (Belmont, CA: Brooks/Cole, 1970).
2. Charles M. Segal and David C. Stineback, *Puritans, Indians, and Manifest Destiny* (New York: G. P. Putnam's Sons, 1977).
3. Roy H. Pearce, *Savagism and Civilization* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins Press, 1953); Robert F. Berkhofer, *The White Man's Indian* (New York: Alfred A. Knopf, 1978). For Boas the anthropological perspective centered on the concept of cultural relativism, where cultural patterns should be interpreted within the context of the societies in which they occur rather than through the ethnocentric lens of Western culture. This view was a radical departure from the racist and unilinear evolutionary schemes that had dominated American anthropology during the nineteenth century.
4. Jeffery R. Hanson and Linda P. Rouse, "Dimensions of Native American Stereotyping," *American Indian Culture and Research Journal* 11:4 (1987):33–58.
5. Daniel L. Boxberger, *To Fish in Common: The Ethnohistory of Lummi Indian Salmon Fishing* (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1989).
6. Abner Cohen, "Variables in Ethnicity," in *Ethnic Change*, ed. C. F. Keyes (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1981), 307-331; Leo A. Despres, "Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Guyanese Society," in *Ethnicity and Resource Competition in Plural Societies*, ed. Leo A. Despres (Paris and The Hague: Mouton, 1975), 87-117.
7. George De Vos, "Ethnic Pluralism: Conflict and Accommodation," in *Ethnic Identity: Cultural Continuities and Change*, ed. George De Vos and Lola Romanucci-Ross (Werner-Green Foundation for Anthropological Research, 1975), 5-41; Thomas N. Headland, "Why Foragers Do Not Become Farmers: The Competitive Exclusion Principle and the Persistence of Professional Foragers" (Unpublished ms., 1989); Regina E. Holloman, "Ethnic Boundary Maintenance, Readaptation and Societal Evolution in the San Blas Islands of Panama," in *Ethnicity and Resource Competition*, 29–40.
8. Frederick Barth, *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries* (Boston: Little, Brown, 1969); Manning Nash, *The Cauldron of Ethnicity in the Modern World* (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1989).
9. Gretchen M. Bataille, "Education and the Images of the American Indian," *Explorations in Ethnic Studies* 1:1 (1978):37–49; Gretchen M. Bataille and

Charles L. P. Silet, "Economic and Psychic Exploitation of American Indians," *Explorations in Ethnic Studies* 6:2 (1983):8–23; Tim Shaughnessy, "White Stereotypes of Indians," *Journal of American Indian Education* (January 1973):20–24.

10. Hanson and Rouse, "Dimensions of Native American Stereotyping."
11. Bem, *Beliefs, Attitudes and Human Affairs.*
12. James W. VanderZanden, *Social Psychology* (New York: Random House, 1987).
13. Ibid.
14. Hanson and Rouse, "Dimensions of Native American Stereotyping."
15. VanderZanden, *Social Psychology.*
16. The terms *prejudice based on ignorance* and *status-based prejudice* were suggested by Dr. Frank Weed, associate professor in sociology at the University of Texas, Arlington.
17. Boxberger, *To Fish in Common.*
18. *Milwaukee Journal,* 1 May 1988; *Wisconsin State Journal,* 6, 10, 28 April 1989, 7 May 1989, 14 January 1990; *The Capital Times* (Madison, WI), 26 April 1988, 2 January 1990; *The Circle* (Minneapolis, MN), May 1989.
19. Ibid.
20. Copies of the questionnaire are available from the authors on request.
21. Roger Gibbons and J. Rick Ponting, "Contemporary Perceptions of Canada's Native Peoples," *Prairie Forum* 2:1 (1977):57–81.