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This is an exploratory study into the theoretical and methodological issues concerning portrayals of Native Americans in children's fiction. The purpose of this study is to analyze the portrayals of Native Americans with the goal of determining whether such portrayals in children's fiction are descriptive or evaluative. This study develops a theoretical foundation for the analysis of portrayals of Native Americans in children's fiction and selectively applies known techniques and methods to measure such portrayals. Through this process methodological issues concerning content analysis are evaluated and their data findings compared.

Both quantitative and qualitative methods are used to measure and analyze the portrayals of Native Americans and Non-Native Americans in children's fiction. Quantitatively, Pratt's (1971; 1972) Evaluative Coefficient Analysis method is used to measure the use of evaluative words to portray subjects in such books. Semi-quantitatively, Garcia's (1978; 1979) thematic analysis is used to measure the presence and frequency of themes within the portrayal of Native Americans. Qualitatively, the categories of story plot, character and group portrayals, and impressions and impressionistic techniques are employed to measure the portrayals of Native Americans and Non-Native Americans. The sample, composed from a ten percent random sample from a previously identified population, consists of six books published between 1968 and 1982.

This study concludes that portrayals of Native Americans in children's fiction tend to be more evaluative, negative, and judgmental than for Non-Native Americans. It is concluded that through stylistic methods, reinforced by perpetuated themes, portrayals of Native Americans remain static over time. More importantly, however, is the conclusion that the portrayals of Native Americans now are more subtle, more latent, and harder to manifestly perceive. Such conclusions imply the need for increased theoretical and methodological studies, as well additional in-depth analyses of recent books portraying Native Americans.
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this thesis is dedicated.
Since my youth I have held an insatiable desire to learn as much as I could about the Indians of North America. Over the years I have read, and often reread, as many books about Indians as I could find. Always I read these books with a sympathetic heart and wondered how other people could treat Indians as they did throughout history. In college the opportunity to historically study Indians broadened my interests and knowledge, and I soon realized that Indians are people that only live in the minds and attitudes of people. The term Indian brings many and varied ideas to mind, foremost of which is the notion of a people characterized by socially standardized images—socially from the Non-Indian point of view. Who really are the Indians? In coming to grips with this question, I soon realized that I held some very basic and commonly shared attitudes—that Indians are Indians. Indeed, the study of Indians became synonymous with the study of the history of Indian-white political, military, religious, economic, and to some degree, educational relations.

In the early 1970s there emerged for me a new and exciting group of people—Native Americans. Native Americans implied Indians, but the name also meant much more, most important being that Native Americans are people that are alive today. Furthermore, Native
Americans are seen as having cultural and social histories that encompass far more than just Indian-white relations, and the name Native Americans implies plurality whereas Indians purports unity. This means the study of Native Americans is an interdisciplinary adventure of many diverse and unique groups of people. Yet I had long had a sense that specific groups I had studied did not fit into the image of Indians; these people were Apaches, Nez Perce, and other distinct nations of people. These people had unique cultures and, as such, stood out from Indians. They are, however, Native Americans in the sense that Germans are Europeans.

Gradually, then, an awakening came about that my earlier attitudes about Native Americans rested upon faulty awareness and learning. As my understanding progressed I realized the tremendous role of the media in developing my attitudes about Native Americans. I am luckier than many, however, because I continually read, and such reading created anomalies in the information and attitudes I developed about Native Americans. Additionally, I had been taught in history and English, as well as elsewhere, to read and learn critically—to question everything. Others are less fortunate and read far less. There seem to be, however, some fundamental differences between my perceptions concerning the treatment of Native Americans in books and others' perceptions of the books. More
importantly, I have not developed a repertoire of erroneous, incomplete, and unjust attitudes about Native Americans. This study, then, is the analysis of a sample of books to determine one small aspect of how books affect attitudes about Native Americans.
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Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of this study is to analyze the portrayals of Native Americans in children's fictional literature. The goal is to determine whether portrayals of Native Americans in children's books are descriptive or evaluative. Descriptive portrayals are those terms which discuss, or are used by, the subject of interest and are simply neutral, such as "small," "winter," "running," "Nez Perce," and so forth. Conversely, evaluative portrayals are those in which the subject either utilizes, or is discussed in, terms that are biased in their contextual presentation or which make a judgment about the subject, such as "smelly," "quick," "savage," "conscientious," and so forth. Other studies, which are discussed below, have led to indifferent or conflicting conclusions concerning evaluative or judgmental portrayals of Native Americans. Such studies, however, have not included any analyses of the descriptive content of such portrayals. This exploratory study, then, evaluates the results and compares the findings concerning portrayals of Native Americans using both quantitative and qualitative measurements. The study also presents a theoretical foundation for the analysis of portrayals of Native Americans.

Literature is one of the most important means of reaching
people through the mass media. It is, however, along with other printed media, the only vehicle of communication that has no restrictions as to particular times and/or places. Furthermore, through literature one can: (1) develop and carefully edit a subject as desired; (2) present multiple ideas to anyone who can read; and (3) present a format that allows the reader to receive the message at his/her leisure and even to reread the message. Many books, additionally, stand the test of time—i.e., each successive generation can read and thereby be affected by the same literature—which facilitates the perpetuation of ideas and attitudes about Native Americans. Just the same, many new books on Native Americans successively appear that may be more valid or persuasive and thereby influence changes in ideas and attitudes. In other instances the popularity of a book may expose people with no previous knowledge and/or attitudes about Native Americans to the subject, and thus, create new ideas and attitudes for them.

A reader of literature, then, is affected by the reading experience in various ways and in varying degrees. In discussing the effects of reading, it is useful to distinguish between (1) the preconditions of publication, (2) the conditions of distribution of the literature, (3) the supply, content, and style of the literature or the publication itself, and (4) the readers' predispositions (Waples, et. al., 1940:7-21, 136-137). Although a
The complete study of the effects of literature would analyze each of these factors, monetary and temporal limitations often restrict studies instead to discussing individual or partial factors. The factor of interest to this study, and most other studies, is that of the publication itself. Furthermore, most studies focus upon the partial factor of the contents of the publication; i.e., subject classification, sophistication or maturity, locale, action or situation, social relationships, validity, and characters (Waples, et al., 1940:140-141). That is, researchers seek to describe the characteristics of the content or what the contents contain. Such studies (1) describe trends in communications content, (2) relate known characteristics of sources to the messages they produce, and (3) audit or compare communication content against prescribed standards. Other studies, however, focus upon the partial factor of style; i.e., difficulty, sophistication or maturity, literary and aesthetic qualities, semantics, and modes of presentation (Waples, et al., 1940:140). This study, then, seeks to describe characteristics of style in the content or how the messages are presented.

Very few people ever actually interact with or encounter people from cultures and societies identified most often as "American Indians" or "Native Americans." Most people, however, can express opinions, attitudes, facts, or arguments about Native
Americans. Much of this ability to categorize Native Americans, therefore, results from learning about them through various forms of media and face-to-face communications. It is of interest to this researcher to analyze how literature categorizes or portrays Native Americans in an effort to partially explain attitudes held by Non-Native Americans with little or no experience with Native Americans. Similarly, it is of interest to see how such portrayals may reinforce or alter previously held attitudes about Native Americans. Native Americans were selected, then, because over time their portrayals have been perceived as being static, and also because of the frequency with which they are encountered in various types and forms of literature.

Theoretical Framework and Rationale

Before focusing on the topic of this study it is necessary to conceptualize the theoretical framework and, thereby, the subsequent rationale for conducting the present research. This discussion formulates an explicit paradigmatic continuity that generally is lacking in other studies (Rosengren, 1980; Wilhoit and de Bock, 1980). Such implicit treatment, or total avoidance of the researcher's theoretical perspective, has created and perpetuated a number of misconceptions and questionable results, and has allowed researchers to measure and analyze "characterizations," "themes,"
and other categories of portrayals of Native Americans (and other subjects) under the erroneous rubric of "stereotyping." While some of the more recent studies avoid explicit use of "stereotyping" (Garcia, 1978, 1980), they have merely become less explicit about their theoretical framework and rationale. No known study, then, explicitly explains the theoretical connection for any type of measurement concerning portrayals of Native Americans in literature.

Many fields of study (e.g., education, political science, English, sociology, psychology) focus upon forms of literature to evaluate their quality and effectiveness. The field of social psychology, however, along with its inherent interdisciplinary nature, provides the greatest possibilities. It is noted that interpersonal communications, a newly created interdisciplinary field of study focusing upon communications, is conceived here to be an allied/subdiscipline of social psychology. Social psychology, then, is the field of study from which interpersonal communications ultimately derives the majority of its assumptions and concepts, if not theoretical perspectives. Conversely, a fundamental problem with social psychology as a field of study for discussing the various theories, assumptions, concepts, and so forth, applicable to this study, is the absence of any explicit scientific paradigms (Kuhn, 1970). This is not to say that social psychology has no theoretical perspectives, but rather that there are no generally
accepted theoretical paradigms in social psychology (Kuhn, 1970; Rosenberg and R. Turner, 1981; Shaw and Costanzo, 1970; Slawski, 1981). Indeed, the field of social psychology often is viewed by its approaches, its contents and problems (substantive areas), or its conceptual interests (Lindzey, 1968; Newcomb, et. al., 1965; Sampson, 1964; Sherif and Sherif, 1956). Others have synthesized theories used in social psychology into theoretical orientations (Rosenberg and R. Turner, 1981; Shaw and Costanzo, 1970) and perspectives (Slawski, 1981). Shaw and Costanzo's orientations contain too many overlapping assumptions and exemplars for a useful paradigm, while Rosenberg and Turner's present sociological perspectives and orientations are, for the most part, clarifications of theories, approaches, and concepts, and are of no paradigmatic usefulness. Slawski's perspectives are influenced more by their methods than by their images of the subject matter and exemplars (Kuhn, 1970).

These various ways of organizing studies in the field of social psychology do not provide any encompassing paradigm(s) through which a researcher can establish the exemplars, methods, ways of viewing the subject matter, and theories relevant to a given study. It is not the purpose of this study, however, to propose such a paradigm; indeed, Slawski states that "to attempt such a task in detail . . . is a lifetime's work" (1981:100).
George Ritzer's presentation of sociological paradigms, on the other hand, provides a very tenuous paradigm for social psychology in his Social Definition Paradigm (1980:83-140). The applicability of the definition paradigm to social psychology is demonstrated most effectively through their shared theoretical orientations, their shared assumptions, and their similar conceptualizations of the subject matter.

One of the primary theoretical orientations of the Social Definition Paradigm is that of symbolic interactionism (Ritzer, 1981:96-108; J. Turner, 1982:305-388). Rosenberg and R. Turner, and Slawski explicitly state the superior utility of the symbolic interactionism orientation or perspective:

Symbolic interactionism is generally regarded as the most distinctive theoretical contribution to SSP ["sociological social psychology"] (Rosenberg and R. Turner, 1981:xvi).

Symbolic interactionism is a metatheoretical frame of reference, in part a kind of philosophy which can easily be used to begin to integrate or incorporate all other social psychological theories within its scope (Slawski, 1981:100).

While Stryker in Rosenberg and R. Turner posits:

Of the theoretical orientations underlying work in social psychology, it is symbolic interactionism that has had its major development among sociologists. . . . the appeal of symbolic interactionism to sociologists reflects the fundamental compatibility of this social-psychological perspective with the structural concerns of sociology proper. A theme of this chapter is fit, . . . between more general sociological theory and symbolic interactionism as social psychological theory (1981:3).
Similarly, the subject matter for the Social Definition Paradigm is not just social facts or simple stimulus-response behavior, but rather the way individuals define their social situations and the effect of such upon ensuing actions or behavior (Ritzer, 1980:27, 89-91). Broadly defined, the field of social psychology is interested in such interaction between individuals and their environment, which thereby deduces the applicability of the definition paradigm to social psychology as the Social Psychological Definition Paradigm.

This proposed Social Psychological Definition Paradigm primarily serves the functions of (1) establishing the way the subject matter is conceived, (2) expositing some basic assumptions, and (3) providing an orientation from which theoretical models, substantive theories, and guiding theoretical concepts can be derived. (The commonality of exemplars is beyond the scope of this discussion). Generally speaking, then, the image of the subject matter is conceived of as being similar in several constructs. The most important idea is that individuals are active creators of their own social reality. A second important construct is that social reality is not a static set of coercive social facts, or even further, that reality is only that which is created by man at the moment. Theoretical interests within this paradigm focus upon the "minding" process (Ritzer, 1980:90) or what takes place
within the mind of the individual (e.g., attitudes):

Something occurs in a man's mind between the time a stimulus is applied and the response is emitted and it is this creative activity that is the concern of the social [psychological] definitionist. To the social factist, external social constraints determine behavior, while to the behaviorist there is no room for creative responses since contingencies of reinforcement determine behavior (Ritzer, 1980:90).

A third construct is the conception of a social process or a tendency to focus upon the process of social interaction rather than static structure or behavior. As a result of these conceptualizations of man's free will to define the social world, Ritzer further posits a fourth construct in the nature of an ideological theme that "sociologists of both liberal and radical persuasion tend to gravitate toward social definitionism" (1980:90). Lastly, unlike the pure Social Definition Paradigm, the subject matter is seen as being responsive to external stimuli as well as internal definition; that there is, rather, an interaction between the social definitionist's and the social factist's paradigms within the Social Psychological Definition Paradigm. This last construct more closely affiliates the image of the subject matter with the broader definition of social psychology. It is the interaction of the individual who to the best of his ability defines the social world and its environment, which in turn attempts to control the individual through norms, values, and social control agencies that are often provided by reference groups.
This image of the subject matter, therefore, allows one to exposit theoretical assumptions, models, theories, and concepts relevant to a proposed study. Theoretical models, then, will be taken from general communications models, while communications, propaganda, attitudes-behavior, and awareness/perception theories; and stereotyping, prejudice/discrimination, and minority-majority relations concepts will be incorporated to define the theoretical framework of this study.

Theories, models, and/or concepts of human communications, which implicitly underlie many studies of literature, are seen as a process explicitly stated by the paradigm's image of the subject matter. Very little work has been done in the area of general communications theory, however, as most researchers prefer to utilize general models and/or theories and concepts borrowed from one or more of the multi-disciplines incorporated into communications. This absence of high level or grand theories is partially the result of the broad spectrum of topics encompassed by the field of communications, in addition to the dilemma posed by being both an art and a science, and because of the general lack of interest in proposing a comprehensive grand theory. For the most part, therefore, scientific studies in the field of communications rely upon models and/or taxonomies of the communications process to guide their research (Cronkhite, 1976:49-74; Hooper, 1976:33-54; Mortensen, 1972:29-68).
Thereby, such models should ideally provide the freedom to incorporate middle and low range theories from which to derive specific problems. A review of previous research concerning portrayals of groups or individuals in various forms of literature, however, demonstrates their unanimous failure to state their guiding theories or the communications model that they incorporated. Although theoretical models are generally missing from research on portrayals in literature, the method of measurement—content analysis—is usually explained. By such explicit utilization of content analysis methodology, researchers implicitly (if not unintentionally) indicate the use of the communications process model which underlies content analysis methodology, as promulgated by Harold D. Lasswell:

Who
Says What
In Which Channel
To Whom
With What Effect?

This model has also been expressed mathematically by Shannon and Weaver (Borden, 1971:9; Cronkhite, 1976:57; Hooper, 1976:39-42; Mortensen, 1972:36-40; Shannon and Weaver, 1962:98):
Lasswell's communications process model has additionally been expanded into a process or communications act for achieving "isomorphism of meaning" (DeFleur, 1970:90-96):

![Communications Model Diagram]

This model of the communications process—implicit to most studies through the use of the content analysis method—is assumed by the founders of content analysis (i.e., Lasswell, et. al., 1949), and explicitly stated in texts by Berelson (1952) and Holsti (1962) discussing the methods of content analysis. As this model is appropriate to this study's paradigmatic perspectives, it will be used as the general underlying model to guide this research.

Some very important theoretical conceptualizations and middle range theories are encompassed within the communications models (both the one used here and others): (1) awareness;
(2) attitudes and behaviors (including stereotyping, prejudice/discrimination, and minority-majority relations); (3) contemporary theories of mass communications; and (4) theories of persuasion and propaganda (which includes the effects of literature). It can be seen that if one cannot perceive communication, one cannot be aware of communication nor can they respond to the communication. This is inherent in the definition of communication:

Human communication has occurred when a human being responds to a symbol; . . . [and] . . . a symbol, as used in this definition, is a sign which stands for something else only because it is used to stand for something else, whereas a signal is a sign of something else because of a natural physical relationship (Cronkhite, 1976:20, 44; emphases in the original).

Gary Cronkhite, in his text Communication and Awareness, poignantly stresses the importance of awareness and sees the level of awareness for most people, when they communicate, as being quite low because it has become reflexive, almost like breathing (1976:4-5). The concept of awareness, as used here, includes becoming (1) aware of communication, (2) aware of people, (3) aware of messages, and (4) aware of contexts. While all four processes are important, the third—which will be discussed below—is of most interest to this study, hence the first and fourth functions will be held as theoretical assumptions. The awareness of people, however, is of secondary interest in that we are interested in how people become aware of other people (i.e., Native Americans) through literature.
Psychologists and social psychologists have long been interested in social and racial awareness (Burrow, 1924-25; Clark and Clark, 1940; Diamont, 1969; Goodman, 1952; Katz, 1978; Landbreth and Johnson, 1953; Meltzer, 1941; Renninger and Williams, 1966; Stabler and Johnson, 1971; Stevenson and Stewart, 1958; Vaughan, 1963; Williams and Roberson, 1967; Yancey and Singh, 1975). These studies are important in that they show that awareness, especially of racial groups, begins at an early age and is most tractable in younger school age children.

Perception, a part of becoming aware, interacts with individual attitudes in that the way one perceives something is influenced (e.g., what to look for, what to see) by one's attitudes about it, while perceptions similarly influence (e.g., develop, change, reinforce) attitudes about it. Theoretical concepts of attitudes, therefore, are integrated with the concept of awareness. The concept of attitudes, one of longstanding importance in the field of social psychology (Allport, 1968:59-60; Lambarth, 1980: 182-183; Oskamp, 1977:4-19) is a pivotal concept in the theoretical orientation of this study. The nature of attitudes has been widely discussed (Allport, 1968; Fishbein, 1967, 1971; McGuire, 1969; Oskamp, 1977; Rokeach, 1968; Rosenberg, et. al., 1960; Thomas, 1971) and is generally viewed in one of two ways: (1) as having three components--cognitive, affective, and behavioral; and (2) as
dimensions labeled beliefs, attitudes, and behavioral intentions (Oskamp, 1977:19). Furthermore:

Beliefs, opinions, values, and habits are concepts which are related to the concept of attitude, but are not synonymous with it. Whereas an attitude is a broad evaluative orientation toward an object, a belief or an opinion is narrower and more cognitive in nature. Public opinion refers to the shared opinions of large groups of people (Oskamp, 1977:19).

Equally elusive is any agreed upon definition (Oskamp, 1977:7-17), but generally attitude can be defined as "a readiness to respond in a favorable or unfavorable manner to a particular class of objects" (Oskamp, 1977:19). Associated with the concept of attitude is the concept of behaviors—the observable and measurable actions—which are the manifestations of social interaction; that is, ultimately we are interested in the relationships between communications (e.g., literature), attitudes (e.g., prejudices or beliefs about Native Americans), and their manifestation (e.g., discrimination) in overt behavior (DeFleur and Westie, 1958). In the context of the foregoing definitions and for the purpose of this study, attitudes will be viewed as being both associated with overt behavior and composed of cognitive, affective, and behavioral or conative components.

Prejudice, and its associated behavior of discrimination, is the primary attitude of interest to this study, and is also implicit to most studies of minorities in communications. Discrimination and prejudice are also components of minority-majority
relations, but they revolve around racial attitudes or prejudice. Within this complex field, researchers are interested in (1) the development (and awareness) of prejudice or racial attitudes, (2) the relationship between prejudice and discrimination or racism, (3) the modification of both prejudice and discrimination, and (4) the effects of discrimination and prejudice. Scholars have tried to synthesize this broad area of study (Barth and Noel, 1972; Blalock, 1967; Bogardas, 1930; Brown, 1934; Frazier, 1957; Glick, 1955; Harding, et. al., 1968; Horton, 1966; Lieberson, 1961; Noel, 1968; Palmer, 1956; Rothman, 1977; Williams, 1966), but as of yet no acceptable theoretical perspective(s) exists. At best, several approaches to the studies of prejudice and minority-majority relations exist:

. . . The "ethnic group" approach. Here the focus is on a single racial, religious, linguistic, or nationality group, usually one that is a clearly identifiable minority in some modern national state. An attempt is made to describe the group's historical development, cultural traditions, distinctive values, relations with neighboring groups, and changing political and economic fortunes.

. . . The "social interaction" approach. Here the focus is not a single ethnic group, but on the interrelationships of two or more such groups, frequently on the relationships of all the major ethnic groups in a particular geographical area. Very commonly the analysis is in terms of the major forms of social interaction distinguished by Park and Burgess (1921): competition, conflict, accommodation, and assimilation.

. . . The "social problems" approach. Here the focus is on "the behavior of discrimination, the attitude of prejudice, and the consequences for the minority and majority groups of both of these (Rose, 1964:571)" (Harding, et. al., 1968:1).
The "social problems" perspective with direct emphasis upon the attitude of prejudice is the guiding approach used in this study.

Harding, et. al. distinguish between "ethnic" or "inter-group" attitudes and prejudice, which is appropriate to this study:

An ethnic attitude is an attitude which a person has toward some or all members of an ethnic group, provided that the attitude is influenced to some degree by knowledge (or presumed knowledge) of the other individual's group membership. Ethnic attitudes are frequently referred to as "intergroup attitudes," although they include the attitudes of individuals toward the groups of which they themselves are members (1968:3; emphases added).

On the other hand, they state that researchers desire to evaluate—not just describe—ethnic attitudes, and "thus arises the concept of prejudice" (Harding, et. al., 1968:4; emphasis in the original):

Consequently, it seems most useful to us to define prejudice as a failure of rationality or a failure of justice or a failure of human-heartedness in an individual's attitude toward members of another ethnic group (Harding, et. al., 1968:6; emphases in the original).

This definition clearly incorporates the three components of an attitude—the cognitive, the affective, and the conative—which also are discussed explicitly by Harding, et. al. for the more specific ethnic or intergroup attitudes, as originally discussed by Smith (1947), Kramer (1949), and Chein (1951). The cognitive component consists of perceptions, beliefs, and expectations (or the individual's picture of the minority group) that one holds about others. Beliefs and expectations are often conceived of as varying along a number of dimensions. They include: (1) simple
(or undifferentiated) versus complex (or differentiated); (2) central in consciousness versus peripheral; (3) believed tentatively versus believed with assurance; (4) inadequately grounded versus grounded on appropriate evidence; (5) inaccurate versus accurate; and (6) tenacious versus readily modified (Harding, et. al., 1968:4; Kramer, 1949:393-394, 395-398). It is within the cognitive component that the concept of stereotype, coined by Walter Lippmann (1922:79-156; 1927:435-440), is found to derive from:

A belief that is simple, inadequately grounded, at least partially inaccurate, and held with considerable assurance by many people . . . (Harding, et. al., 1968:4).

The affective component, on the other hand, includes the friendliness or unfriendliness to the minority group and the various feelings (e.g., admiration, sympathy, hate, identification, contempt, fear, envy, alienation) or emotions evoked in an individual by the actual or symbolic stimulus of the minority group (Harding, et. al., 1968:4; Kramer, 1949:394, 398-400). Lastly, the conative component encompasses beliefs, perceptions, and expectations about "what should be done" and action orientations toward a minority group; it is the tendency, desire, and/or disposition to act in certain ways (Harding, et. al., 1968:4; Kramer, 1949:393, 400-404).

Despite the absence of theoretical guidance, there exist numerous studies in the area of prejudice/discrimination (Allport, 1954; Bell, 1979; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1964; Clark, 1963;
Cole, 1975; Council for Interracial Books for Children, n.d.; Daniels and Kitano, 1970; Hartley, 1946; Kluckhohn, 1960; Knowles and Prewitt, 1969; Kramer, 1949; Kutner, et. al., 1952; Linn, 1965; Morland and Suthers, 1980; Park, 1927; Pate, 1981; Prewitt, n.d.; Raab and Libset, 1968; Rose, 1964; Royce, 1927; Schuman and Harding, 1964; Swayne, n.d.; TeSelle, 1973; Thomas, 1903-04, 1904, 1927; U.S., 1977; Vander Zanden, 1983; Van Til, 1975; Young, 1925, 1927a, 1927b). Similarly, there are also a prolific number of relevant studies concerning minority-majority relations (Baker, 1974; Bennett, 1971; Berelson and Salter, 1946; Berg, 1975; Bernard, 1925-26; Bettelheim and Janowitz, 1949; Bogardas, 1925a, 1925b; Carlson, 1971; Dinnerstein, 1979; Ehrlich and Feldman, 1977; Faris, 1925; Finney, 1926; Frazier, 1957; Gist, 1932; Gregory, 1971; Handlin, 1957; Haydon, 1978; Iglitzin, 1972; Kinton, 1974; Mack and Duster, 1973; Miller, 1976; Nash and Weiss, 1970; Noar, n.d.; Park, 1924a, 1924b; Radke, et. al., 1949; Stabler, et. al., 1970; Stanton, 1960; Sullivan and Goodell, 1975; Takaki, 1979; Wasserman, 1976; Williams and Edwards, 1969; Young, 1927a, 1927b, 1927c; Zeligs, 1936, 1938). These areas overlap and are often one and the same as denoted by the above referenced studies which could have just as easily been grouped together. The cognitive component and the concept of stereotypes, or more appropriately, the mismeasurement of stereotypes, however, are more relevant to this study.
The broad definition of a stereotype—a picture in one's mind—is used too often by professionals and laymen alike. The infamous Katz and Braly (1933) study is perhaps the greatest contribution to this erroneous measurement and use of the concept of stereotypes; or at least it has dominated the field of study concerning the cognitive component of ethnic group attitudes and prejudice. The Katz and Braly method of study had college students select from a list of eighty-four "traits" those that they considered most characteristic of various ethnic groups (1933:282-284). Based on these samples Katz and Braly then constructed an index of "definiteness of the ten racial stereotypes" (1933:288) by counting the fewest number of traits required to include fifty percent of the five hundred choices possible by all subjects, which they found to range from 4.6 for Negroes to 15.9 for Turks (1933:287). On the basis of the degree of consensus by their subjects, Katz and Braly described their research as a study of "racial stereotypes." Other studies (Gilbert, 1951; Karlins, et. al., 1969) replicated Katz and Braly and substantiated their findings (Vander Zanden, 1983:20). However, the theoretical and empirical basis for such quantum inferences must be questioned because:

Actually they (Katz and Braly) made no attempt to ascertain whether or not any particular set of judgements by an individual student did or did not result from stereotyped thinking of the sort described by Lippmann (1922). In effect, Katz and Braly were using the term "stereotype" simply as a pejorative designation for "group concept" (Harding, et. al., 1968:7-8; emphasis added).
Therefore, many of the numerous studies that have based their research upon the Katz and Braly position and methodology are in fact invalid because they are not measuring stereotypes (Bain, 1939; Blake and Dennis, 1943; Brody, 1973; Child and Doob, 1943; Edwards, 1940; Gardner, et. al., 1975; Gordon, 1962; Gregory, 1941; Hamil, 1970; Johnson and Greenbaum, 1980; Katz and Braly, 1935; LaViolett and Silvert, 1951; Martin and Halverson, 1981; Meenes, 1943; Meltzer, 1939; Razran, 1950; Saenger and Flowerman, 1954; Sherif, 1935).

Despite the prolific number of erroneous studies of stereotypes, correct uses of the concept are found in a few earlier studies. (Lippmann, 1922, 1927; Lipsky, 1927; Rice, 1926a, 1926b; Weeks, 1927). A few recent works also promulgate acceptable alternatives or correct uses of the stereotype concept (Bogardas, 1950; Brigham, 1973; Ehrlich and Rinehart, 1965; Funk, 1976; Gonzalez and Williams, 1981; Hamilton, 1981; Hesselbart, 1975, 1978; Smith, 1980). Regardless of the term used--stereotypes or prejudice--the data collected are not measurements of these concepts, but rather descriptions of ethnic groups. This, then, raises considerable questions about the validity of the bulk of the studies purporting to analyze the stereotypes of Native Americans and other ethnic groups (see Appendixes A and B).

Neither this researcher nor Harding, et. al. could find any study that attempted "to determine the actual basis of the judgements recorded or to the extent to which they involved a failure of
rationality" (1968:8). This position, thereby, makes explicit that while the concepts of stereotypes and prejudice are of ultimate theoretical interest, very limited techniques for the measurements of such currently exists. This issue will be discussed further in conjunction with the effects of reading and persuasion/propaganda theory.

Melvin L. DeFleur (1970) presents one of the few attempts at organizing communications concepts and ideas into theories, particularly theories of mass communications. The Social Categories Theory (DeFleur, 1970:122-124), expressly derived from the communications model discussed previously, is the most relevant because it:

... assumes that there are broad collectivities, aggregates, or social categories in urban-industrial societies whose behavior in the face of a given set of stimuli is more or less uniform. ... knowledge of several very simple variables--age, sex, and educational attainment--provides a reasonably accurate guide to the type of communication content a given individual will or will not select from available media (DeFleur, 1970:122-123).

This theory is more in line with the Social Facts Paradigm (Ritzer, 1980:35-82), but also overlaps with the Social Behavior Paradigm (Ritzer, 1980:141-186). Its basic assumption is that people with similar characteristics also have similar folkways, and therefore, they will select similar communications content. This idea is then extended to assume that the content will cause the members of a particular category to respond in similar manner (basic Stimulus-Response (S-R) assumption of the Social Behavior
Paradigm) (DeFleur, 1970:123). This theory, however, does not exclude the notion of the "minding" process—essential to the Social Psychological Definition Paradigm—that is seemingly implicit to the adopted communications model. In fact, the assumption of the theory as presented by DeFleur merely focuses upon the content component of the model. If, however, one further develops the assumptions of the whole model it becomes apparent that there is indeed an integration of a "minding" process explicitly presented in the source, the receiver, and the encoding/decoding processes.

DeFleur also discusses an extension of The Social Categories Theory that he labels the Social Relationships Theory. This approach, however, is conceived of here as being more similar to the former than different and, therefore, will be assumed to be included in the first theory. The main contribution of the Social Relationships Theory, derived from research on the "effects" of mass communications (Lazarsfeld, Berelson, and Gaudet, 1940), is its emphasis upon:

the important role of group ties, as a complex of intervening variables between media and audience influence, . . . [and] . . . the recognition that informal social relationships play a significant role in modifying the manner in which a given individual will act upon a message which comes to his attention via the mass media (DeFleur, 1970:125, 127; emphasis in the original).

This theory is clearly an enlargement of the focus from the content (in The Social Categories Theory) to other factors that emphasize the "minding" process and the individual's control over the communications process.
Related to these first two perspectives is what DeFleur calls the Cultural Norms Theory (1970:129-139), which he considers the basis for the criticisms of the harmful effects of the media:

Essentially, the cultural norms theory postulates that the mass media, through selective presentations and emphasis of certain themes, creates impressions among their audiences that common cultural norms concerning the emphasized topics are structured or defined in some specific way. Since individual behavior is usually guided by cultural norms (or the actor's impressions of what the norms are) with respect to a given topic or situation, the media would then serve indirectly to influence conduct. Stated in social psychological terms, the media are said to provide a "definition of the situation" which the actor believes to be real. This definition provides guides for action which appear to be approved and supported by society. Therefore, conduct is indirectly shaped by exposure to communications (1970:129-130; emphasis in the original).

The Cultural Norms Theory succinctly summarizes the implicit theory behind most studies of the treatment of Native Americans and minorities in various forms of media. This essentially social factist position can be altered to a social psychological definitionist one by including the idea that individuals have a degree of freedom through their "minding" process that allows the media to (1) reinforce existing patterns, (2) create new shared convictions, or (3) change existing norms and reference groups (DeFleur, 1970:130). Such a process is embraced by persuasion and propaganda theory.

Persuasion and propaganda theories, which are often conceived of as simple "extensions and utilizations of the contemporary theories of mass communications" (DeFleur, 1970:140; emphases added), are
related to these other theories of mass communications. DeFleur presents propaganda theory as resulting from the Mechanistic S-R Theory (1970:112-117) and studies into the effects of mass communications during World War I (i.e., especially Lasswell, 1927). Modern theories—now often called persuasion theories—have been developed by the systematic replacement and/or modification of the basic assumptions of S-R theory and propaganda. Theories of persuasion have a history extending back to Aristotle's discussions of rhetoric, and continue to be a primary theoretical orientation in communications theory (Abelson, 1959; Andersen, 1971; Applebaum and Anatol, 1974; Beisecker and Parson, 1972; Bettinghaus, 1968; Brembeck and Howell, 1952; Bryson, 1948; Cronkhite, 1969; Ehninger, 1974; Fotheringham, 1966; Gordon, 1969, 1971; Miller, 1946; Reardon, 1981; Roloff and Miller, 1980; Rosnow and Robinson, 1967). Theoretically, two basic models are generally followed. The first is the psychodynamic model which is formulated upon the Individual Differences Theory, and is essentially based upon a psychological S-R model. The second model, appropriate to this study, is what DeFleur calls the sociocultural model, which is based upon both the Social Relationships and the Cultural Norms theories and the "assumption that mass communicated messages can be used to provide an individual with new and seemingly group-supported interpretations of some phenomenon toward which the individual is acting" (1970:145). Schematically,
this model of persuasion is (DeFleur, 1970:146):

- **Persuasive message**
- Defines (or redefines) sociocultural processes of group(s)
- Forming or altering definitions for socially approved behavior for group members
- Achieves change in direction of overt behavior

The relationship between propaganda and persuasion is a dubious one. It currently appears that propaganda is seen as counterfeit abuses of persuasion (Cronkhite, 1976; Ehninger, 1974; Mathesson, 1977), or as a very negative aspect of persuasion; that is, a concept no longer accepted. It seems, however, that the many studies in the area of propaganda (Albig, 1939; Barghoorn, 1964; Berelson and de Garzia, 1947; Berelson and Janowitz, 1966; Bruner, 1941; Doving, 1959; Ellul, 1965; Flowerman, 1947; George, 1959a; Lasswell, 1927; Lasswell, et. al., 1935; Merton and Lazarsfeld, 1957; Mosher, et. al., 1941; Murphy and Likert, 1938; Root, 1962; Smith, et. al., 1946; Whilton and Larson, 1964) and rumor (Allport and Postman, 1946, 1948; DeFleur, 1962; Rosnow and Fine, 1976; Shibutani, 1966) suggest that propaganda theory may instead include the concept of persuasion. The superior utility of propaganda is explicitly seen in Leonard Doob's monumental essay which presents the theory of *Propaganda: Its Psychology and Techniques* (1935). While presenting a propaganda theory, Doob also provides the most definitive definition of the concept of propaganda:
Intentional propaganda is a systematic attempt by an interested individual (or individuals) to control the attitudes of groups of individuals through the use of suggestion and, consequently, to control their actions; unintentional propaganda is the control of the attitudes and, consequently, the actions of groups of individuals through the use of suggestion (1935:89; emphases in the original).

Doob also establishes what he calls the "principles of propaganda," which similarly can be labeled scope statements (see Appendix C).

In discussing his theory of propaganda, Doob provides the basic criteria of a good theory (Cohen, 1980:191): (1) a relatively explicit theory; (2) explicit definitions; (3) a logical skeleton of theory; (4) clear scope statements as to the domain of applicability; (5) the development of testable hypotheses; and (6) the formulation of abstract problems. Specifically for this study, Doob's theory provides that:

Books . . . are without a doubt, one of the most important media for unintentional propagandists. For partially through books or through books interpreted by teachers does the younger generation obtain involuntarily attitudes toward the distinctive features of its cultural pattern (1935:393).

Doob's contention that propaganda is totally persuasive through the media, then, is a theoretical underpinning that should be used in the analysis of literature and other communications, but one that seldom has been used (for an exception see Wright, 1939).

The final consideration in this theoretical rationale is that of the effects of communication, and literature in particular. There have been numerous studies concerning the effects of literature
and efforts to alter attitudes (Beggs, 1956; Berreman, 1940; Dawson, 1959; Fischer and Torney, 1976; Georgeoff, 1968; Gezi and Johnson, 1970; Jackson, 1944; Litcher and Johnson, 1969; Manley, 1944; Menefee, 1936; Morris, 1981; Poussaint, 1970; Ruth, 1969; Smith, 1948; Weiss, 1968; Westphal, 1977; Yee and Fruth, 1971). However, Waples, Berelson, and Bradshaw's study on What Reading Does to People (1940), which is discussed above, is the most comprehensive and seminal as well as neglected study.

It was stated above that the process of becoming aware of messages would be again discussed, as would the concepts of stereotypes and prejudice. The concepts of awareness and prejudice are partially interwoven into the outline for the study of the effects of literature proposed by Waples, Berelson, and Bradshaw (1940). Awareness is explicitly subject to the preconditions and distribution of materials and implicitly a part of the publications themselves and the reader's predispositions, while prejudice is explicitly a part of all four phases. That is, racial awareness (or awareness of availability of literature) is in part subject to the preconditions and distribution, but may or may not effect the content or the reader's predispositions. Conversely, attitudes of prejudice may alter the preconditions and distribution of materials, as well as the supply, style, and content of the publication. Similarly, the reader's attitudes of prejudice are paramount preconditions to the reading of materials, so that the effects will vary greatly.
Related Methodological Research

The methodology selected for this study is primarily a quantitative descriptive form. Since it is a multi-disciplinary study, methodological considerations are drawn from various fields (Bailey, 1978; Barchs, 1959; Berger, 1982; Cicourel, 1964; Condie and Christiansen, 1977; Conkling, 1975; Dixon, 1977; Emmert and Brooks, 1970; Festinger and Katz, 1953; Galvin and Book, 1972; Goode and Hatt, 1952; Gottschalk, Kluckhohn, and Angell, 1947; Hansen and Parsons, 1968; Harrah, 1963; Kaplan, 1964; Lindzey, 1954; Lindzey and Aronson, 1968; Orenstein and Phillips, 1978; Schwartz and Jacobs, 1979; Siegel, 1956; Smith, R.G., 1978; Webb, et. al., 1966). Content analysis, the selected method for this study, has been previously discussed by the researcher (Edwards, 1981), while other seminal methodological discussions include George (1959b), Kaplan (1943), Krippendorff (1980), Lasswell, et. al. (1949), and Rosengren (1981). Many researchers emphatically perceive content analysis to be the primary or only method for the analysis of communications (Berelson, 1952; Gerbner, et. al., 1969; Holsti, 1962, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980; Stone, et. al., 1966) while others advocate both content analysis and other methods and techniques (Berger, 1982; Emmert and Brooks, 1970; Kaplan, 1943), and some, more recently, put the method in disrepute (Golding and Murdock, 1980). Regardless, content analysis
has been a method of study since at least the eighteenth century (Dovring, 1954) and the method or subject of numerous studies (see Appendix D) on the various vehicles of communications (i.e., newspapers, radio, motion pictures, literature, etc.) and their messages.

Content analysis, therefore, has been used in various forms to analyze literature and the effects of literature on people, especially children. Several general studies on literature and textbooks have adequately synthesized the research to date (see especially Bachtold, et. al., 1977; Banfield, 1975; Bekkedal, 1973; Billington, 1966; Chambers, 1968; Hester, 1975). More specifically, methods of content analysis have been used to analyze (1) blacks (Banks, 1969; Broderick, 1973; Nelson, 1926; Shuey, et. al., 1953; Walker, 1971); (2) Mexican-Americans (Blatt, 1968; Gaines, 1971); and (3) racial/ethnic groups in general (Cornelius, 1971; Dale, 1970; Elkin, 1965; Fisher, 1977; Gast, 1965, 1967, 1970; Kane, 1970a, 1970b; Miller, 1978; Monti, 1979; Pierce, 1977; Singh, 1975; U.S., 1980; Weigel, et. al., 1980). Other studies have utilized content analysis to focus upon and identify values, beliefs, and attitudes (Albrecht, 1956; American Educator, 1983; Asman, 1983; de Charms and Moeller, 1962; Holsti, 1962; Moline, 1983; Reddick, 1934). More recently other forms of bias and sexism have become the focus of content analysis studies and literature analysis (Caute, 1980;
Frasher and Walker, 1972; Kolbe and LaVoie, 1981; Queen, 1975; Schlachter, 1977; Schnell and Sweeney, 1975; Scott, 1980; Sex Discrimination Assistance Center, n.d.; United States Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). It should be noted, additionally, that literature—and in particular fiction—has been extensively critiqued and analyzed by more qualitative methodology (Brown, 1965; Eastman, 1965; Hazard, 1937; Leisy, 1929; Lubbock, 1957; Quinn, 1951; Spiller, 1957; Walcutt, 1966).

Instruments for evaluating literature have been the subject of numerous essays. Qualitative techniques and methods include simple guidelines and suggested criteria (Byler, 1973; CIBC, n.d.; Costa and Henry, 1970; EPIE, 1981; Gilliland, 1980; McGraw-Hill, 1975; Peltola, 1979a, 1979b; Rollins, 1941, 1967; Woodbury, 1979, 1980a, 1980b). Semi-quantitative methods include checklists and evaluation forms (EPIE, 1975; Garcia and Garcia, 1980; Haley, et. al., 1978; Khatri, 1980; Rosenberg, 1973; SSEC, 1975). Quantitative methods encompass sophisticated techniques like values analysis (Lester, 1982; White, 1947), and bias or evaluative assertions/loaded words analysis (McDiarmid and Pratt, 1971; Merrill, 1965; Pratt, 1969, 1971, 1972; Rosi, 1964). However, it is found that most researchers formulate their own instruments (Berelson and Salter, 1946; DeFleur, 1962; Gast, 1965, 1967, 1970; Holsti, 1969). Occasionally, as was the case with the Gast method (1965), other

Several problems are inherent to many of these instruments, particularly those formulated by one researcher and then used by others. Theoretically, as mentioned above, many of the studies infer "bias," "prejudice," or "stereotypes" from what are essentially "traits" or "characterizations" categories, which has been a major problem with many theses and dissertations analyzing Native Americans in literature (see Appendix A for a list of studies). A second problem, especially in earlier studies is the lack of formal documentation of research methods and instruments. Literally hundreds of studies, of which a part is listed in Appendixes A and B, have been done on Native Americans in various forms of media, but very few have included examples of their instruments and techniques. A third problem, specific to the quantitative studies, is that of validity and reliability. This problem is often compounded by the absence of examples of their instruments. Most importantly, however, is the problem that very few studies deal with validity and reliability at all (for exceptions, see Barron, 1981; Cata, 1977), which are often major handicaps to the method, as best exemplified by studies of "stereotypes" of Native Americans.

It should be noted at this juncture that other methods have been used to look at the images of Native Americans such as historical
analysis (Berkhofer, 1978; Byler, 1973; Churchill, et al., 1978; Costa and Henry, 1970; Ewers, 1972; Fiedler, 1968; Henry, 1973; Hoover, 1976; Hoy, 1979), while many others have used literary criticism (Aitson, 1980; Bataille and Silet, 1980; Chapman, 1975; Deloria, 1980a, 1980b; Fairchild, 1928; Jones, 1958; Keiser, 1933; Lucas, 1980; Medicine, 1979; Sanders, 1973; Tenkate, 1970; Troy, 1972), which here is defined as inclusive of qualitative content analysis. Braroe and Braroe (1977) utilized social anthropological observation techniques in looking at images and identities of Northern Plains Native Americans, while Edwards (1980) utilized observation and library research techniques to analyze the library cataloging system, as a form of institutional discrimination, to discover images presented by the cataloging system. Lastly, in a very important study of racial attitudes and self-identity in Native American children, Beuf (1977) utilized twelve methods—including content analysis—to ascertain images of Native Americans. These other methods, however, are not as applicable to a quantitative analysis of the portrayals of Native Americans in literature.

Over the past eighty years or more, many types of literature have been analyzed and critiqued for their treatment of Native Americans. However, very little research has focused upon the partial factor of publication style or aspects of how Native Americans are portrayed. More specifically, they do not determine how evaluative
assertions or value judgments are employed by various sources--i.e., authors and/or publishing companies--of such literature. Generally, previous researchers have dwelt on the publication's content or what is being said which, as such, implies that what is included and/or omitted from the contents will account for the major factors of the literature's influence upon the reader. Furthermore, the methodologies of such studies almost invariably have been qualitative or "semi-quantitative" and, for the most part, non-systematic; that is, the researchers' methods and instruments are often not explicitly provided, which means they are not easily replicated and are of questionable validity.

While many studies of the treatment of minority groups (including Native Americans) were made prior to World War II (Bissell, 1923; Fairchild, 1928; Johnson, 1911; Keiser, 1933; Lew, 1923; Malone, 1927; Reddick, 1934), it was only after the war and the development of more systematic methodologies in content analysis that such treatments emphasized quantitative measurement. Berelson and Salter's 1946 study of the treatment of minorities in magazine fiction was one of the first quantitative studies in this area, and has since become the hallmark for most research of this type. The focus of their study was minority characterizations as measured by eight broad categories, which the authors only partially defined in operational terms. Unfortunately, their instrument(s) for measuring
categories were not published anywhere and only implicitly presented in their report. A further problem with this study is that in discussing the results the authors analyzed only several of the categories in their study. To their credit, however, in doing their analysis they utilized demographic statistical data as an independent standard criteria with which to compare their results.

As a first effort at analyzing what the contents from one form of literature (popular magazine fiction) says about minorities, Berelson and Salter's study is invaluable. Subsequently, many studies were spawned to analyze what books--especially children's fiction and textbooks--were saying about minorities, including countless qualitative and quantitative studies on presentations of Native Americans.

Whereas, most post-war investigations followed the path of Berelson and Salter (and many pre-war studies) in analyzing what constitutes the treatment of minorities in literature, a few researchers have pursued assertion analysis as delineated by Janis in 1949:

Assertion analysis will probably be found to be the most productive type of content analysis, inasmuch as the "thematic content" corresponds most nearly to the overall signification of communication. . . . The assertions found in a communication are the primary content indicators of the intentions and motives of the communicator. Similarly, the effects which a communication produces on an audience are primarily due to the assertions content (p. 67).

One is, ultimately, interested in the potential effects on the audience, yet, as stated above, most researchers and literature
critics assume that it is what is said and not how it is said, as proposed by Janis, that primarily accounts for the effects of the communication on the audience/reader. It was, nonetheless, not until 1956 that a usable instrument and methods were published by Osgood, Saporta, and Nunnally. Their instrument, "Evaluative Assertion Analysis," measures evaluative assertions through the connection of an evaluative (or common meaning) term/complement of variable direction and intensity to a subject (or attitude object) by means of a connector (or verb) of varying direction and intensity, i.e., subject-verb-complement (Osgood, et al., 1956). For example, in the phrase "Indians were called savages," "Indian" is the subject or attitude object, "were called" is the verb or connector, and "savage" is the complement or evaluative term. The evaluative terms and connectors are weighted on a scale of +3 to -3 by an analyst, i.e., "were called" is scored as +2 and "savage" is scored as -3. The analyst then multiplies these scores for each subject, and the sum of the products is divided by the absolute sum of the connector weights to provide a score indicative of the evaluation of the subject by the source, as shown in Table 1. This method has been partially implemented by researchers studying similar problems (Lopatka, 1965; North, et. al., 1963; Osgood, et. al., 1957; Osgood, et. al., 1975; Snider and Osgood, 1969), but apparently has been completely adopted to analyze minorities (in textbooks) only by McDiarmid and Pratt (1971).
TABLE 1
Examples for Calculating "Evaluative Assertion Analysis"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assertion</th>
<th>C^1</th>
<th>CMT^2 (or AO)</th>
<th>Product</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Indians were called savages</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Indians were called very desperate</td>
<td>+2</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>-2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indians were said to have hurt the settler</td>
<td>-1</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Indians were hostile</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>-6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Indians made savage raids</td>
<td>+3</td>
<td>-3</td>
<td>-9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Indians raided settlers</td>
<td>-2</td>
<td>+1.5</td>
<td>-3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sum of values</td>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td>-27.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall evaluation score for "Indians" in one textbook = \(-\frac{27.5}{13}\) = -2.12

1--C = Connectors
2--CMT = Common Meaning Terms (AO = Attitude Object)

In the course of using the Osgood, Saporta, and Nunnally method to analyze the treatment of various minority groups in Ontario social studies textbooks, McDiarmid and Pratt (1971) encountered a "number of defects in the instrument" (Pratt, 1971:4).
As a solution to these defects, Pratt (1969) developed a similar instrument, the Evaluative Assertion Rating System (EARS), which "attempted to provide an 'empirical' basis for the weights assigned to assertion components, and to take into account two dimensions of evaluative assertions implicitly ignored by Evaluative Assertion Analysis" (1971:4). The two dimensions were the tense of the verb and the number of subjects. After constructing the EARS instrument, Pratt applied it to evaluate the treatment of Arabs, French Canadians, Indians, and Negroes in sixty-nine history textbooks (1969), and again in the study discussed above (McDiarmid and Pratt, 1971). On the basis of these studies Pratt conducted a secondary analysis to determine the potential for creating an instrument usable by teachers and administrators, which resulted in the creation of the Evaluative Coefficient (ECO) Analysis method and instrument (1971). As part of the ECO method, Pratt developed a standard word list, which was published in toto in a comprehensive user's manual (1972).

In summary, the study of the treatment of Native Americans in literature has emphasized the partial factor of publication contents or what is being said, and for the most part these investigations have looked at "characterizations" rather than "stereotypes" of Native Americans and/or other groups. Additionally, the focus of these studies has generally been children's fiction and
textbooks—especially during the last fifteen years—and the methodologies have been qualitative and/or very questionable. It should be noted, however, that recent studies have demonstrated greater reliability by investigating thematic frequency (Banks, 1969; Garcia, 1978, 1980; Shaughnessy, 1978). A substantial review of previous research indicates that the ECO method—which demonstrates the greatest usability to date—has been utilized primarily to study treatments of groups in textbooks. More importantly, the method has been essentially ignored by researchers. The only studies located that even partially adapted the method were Kirkness (1977)—also a Canadian study of textbooks—and, to a very limited extent, Garcia (1978, 1979) where ECO was used in conjunction with thematic frequency. Other Canadian reports were found that have referenced the method (LaRoque, 1975; Manitoba Indian Brotherhood, 1974), but neither actually used it.

**Research Problem**

The present study analyzes the value judgments about Native Americans made by sources, over time, in children's fiction. The need for such a study is clearly demonstrated by the above discussion. The present study is significantly related to the problems of racial awareness and understanding communications theory and it begins to narrow the research gap of how Native Americans are portrayed in
children's fiction. Furthermore, it provides for the productive
expansion of, and exploration with, known techniques; which will,
hopefully, expose this useful method to other researchers as well.
This research project is extremely beneficial in that it opens up
new horizons in understanding how communications messages (on Native
Americans) make evaluative assertions and judgments that may effect
the attitudes—and ultimately behaviors—of bias and prejudice
(favorable or unfavorable), and discrimination.

Specific questions, therefore, that this research answers are:

1. Are portrayals of Native Americans and other subjects
evaluative? Or are they neutral?

2. If evaluative, are the judgments made by those sources
favorable or unfavorable toward Native Americans?

3. How do judgments of Native Americans compare to those
of Non-Native Americans within the source? Between sources?

4. What is the frequency of evaluative terms to the total
space devoted to Native Americans? Non-Native Americans?

5. How frequently are specific terms or concepts applied to
Native Americans? Non-Native Americans?

6. Have sources become less evaluative over time?

7. Are standard themes used?

The outcome of this study—or the answers to these questions—will
provide a descriptive analysis of how Native Americans are portrayed
by various sources in children's fictional literature. It is impor-
tant, however, to keep in mind several important restraints or
assumptions involved in such an analysis.
First, the evaluative judgments (or ECO) analysis of how Native Americans are portrayed constitutes only a subpart of the study of literature style. The style of literature, however, is but a partial factor of the publication itself, which is one of four factors involved in evaluating the effects of the reading experience:

It is entirely proper to discuss character of production, scope of distribution, slanting of the content, or predispositions of the readers [separately], provided that we [explain that we] are talking about factors. The impropriety consists in talking about one of several factors at work as though that one factor, if clearly established, were certain to produce a corresponding and equivalent effect. Our survey of the literature has shown not merely laymen and the popular writer but even the experienced students in the field to be careless about the distinction. They discuss factors, partial factors, as though they were effects. Among the most serious offenders are those who study the reading of students. We have yet to find any comprehensive study of the effects of students' reading. But we have found many studies of isolated factors and of partial effects upon which far-reaching educational recommendations have been based (Waples, et. al., 1940:12; emphases in the original).

The assumption, then, is that identified evaluative assertions cannot be taken to be the only causal factor in the literature's effect upon the reader.

Second, it is assumed that fictional literature is, and probably will continue to be, read by children and young adults for a variety of reasons. In this connection, the third assumption is that such fictional literature is made available through either public or school libraries, particularly in this time of increasing
book costs. Both of these assumptions are underpinned by our cultural emphasis upon reading.

A fourth general assumption, related to the first, is "that the expression of value judgements in written communications has some effect on the reader" (Pratt, 1971:2). Research has shown that students' attitudes toward social issues and minorities can be effected by reading materials (Beuf, 1977; Fisher, 1968; Haugh, 1952; Litcher and Johnson, 1969; Shirley, 1966; Trager and Yarrow, 1952), and that written communications affect the ideas and beliefs of readers (Okanes, 1956; Payne, 1964; Tannenbaum, 1953; Watts, 1967; Weiss, 1961). This is to say that the literature--specifically fiction--to be analyzed has effects upon the readers in ways which can be analyzed.

A fifth assumption is that the role of literature as a factor in the resulting effects is revealed by its manifest content and by the collection of symbols of which it consists. Related to this is the assumption that appropriate methods of analysis can identify the stimuli provided in given publications (Waples, et. al., 1940:147).

A final assumption is that while the primary function of reading fiction may be manifestly for distraction or respite, other less than obvious social effects may result by conveying new meanings and stimulating emotions about the various subjects, regardless of the intent of either the source or the reader.
This analysis of previous research indicates an absence of theoretically grounded and methodologically sound research in the study of literature and its effects. Given a virtual absence of quality research on Native Americans in literature, the assumptions as outlined above are utilized to orient this study. In addition, Garcia (1978, 1980) and Pratt (1969, 1971, 1972) serve as empirical exemplars or sources, and Pratts' ECO Analysis method provides the foundation for this study's methodology. The theoretical orientation for this study, as traced above, begins with the proposed Social Psychological Definition Paradigm. More substantively, this study derives direction from Lasswell's expanded communications process/act model (see page 11). This model encompasses middle range theories concerning awareness, attitudes, mass communications, and persuasion/propaganda. As applied to this research, then, the theoretical orientation provides: (1) that individuals are capable of thinking and interacting with their environment; (2) that communications is a process or act between two or more people; (3) that through a "minding" process awareness of others is both controlled by and controls the communications process; (4) that the communications process, and more specifically literature, affects attitudes—particularly attitudes of prejudice or bias about Native Americans; (5) that communications in literature portray given subjects, but in and of themselves do not create stereotypes; (6) that mass media
communications, as explained by the Cultural Norms Theory, reinforce existing patterns, create new shared convictions, and change existing norms and reference groups; (7) that extremely evaluative communication becomes more than persuasive and is unintentional propaganda, which if perpetuated over time becomes intentional propaganda; and (8) that the communications act through literature affects the reader's attitudes in varying degrees.

Combining this paradigmatic orientation and the trends from the most recent studies (Bachtold, et. al., 1977; Banfield, 1975; Barron, 1981; Bekkedal, 1973; Broderick, 1973; Cata, 1977; Garcia, 1978, 1980; Hester, 1975) the following are the expected results of this study:

1. That books published in the 1960s will be more evaluative than books published in the 1970s and 1980s.

2. That the evaluativeness of the books, based upon the sample average score, will be less than ten percent (<10%).

3. That the percentage of descriptive words for all subjects, groups, and books will be greater than ninety percent (>90%).

4. That books published after 1975 will have improved because of outside demands and, therefore, will have a descriptive percentage greater than ninety-five percent (>95%).

5. That books published after 1975, similarly, will have an even lower Evaluativeness Score of less than five percent (<5%).

6. That evaluative judgments will be favorable (i.e., >75%) toward Native Americans.

7. That judgments of Native Americans will be less favorable than those of others.
8. That the percentage of evaluative terms to the total space devoted to Native Americans will be greater than that for Non-Native Americans.

9. That the percentage of negative evaluative judgments about Native Americans will be greater than five percent (>5%), while negative evaluative terms for Non-Native Americans will be less than five percent (<5%).

10. That similar themes concerning Native Americans, found by Garcia in textbooks, will be found in the fiction books.
A major obstacle of content analysis studies is establishing the population's boundaries. In determining the population boundaries for this study, a review of previous sampling procedures and a pre-investigation study were conducted. Generally speaking, the majority of previous studies utilized some type of recommended readings list for their populations. Such lists often came from Portraits, Bookfinder, and Wilson's Catalogs, while more recently Barron (1981) used bibliographies as well, and Cata (1977) utilized local sources and available books. Based upon the assumption that the primary way in which individuals come into contact with fictional books on Native Americans is through their public and/or school libraries, an investigation also was made of their acquisition processes. Accordingly, interviews with public and school librarians were conducted, along with reading various guides (e.g., Woodbury, 1979, 1980a, 1980b). The public library acquisition process consists of reading book reviews in The Library Journal, School Library Journal, Booklist, The Hornbook Magazine, Publishers Weekly, Wilson's Catalogs, CIBC Bulletin, Center of Children's Books Bulletin, and various announcements from publishing companies. Each librarian then
indicates the books he or she feels should be ordered. Based upon the recommendations of the librarians and rereading the reviews, the librarian in charge of acquisitions then orders the suggested books as allowed by current finances. Replacement of books is based upon demand, while removal generally is based on the book's physical condition, although complaints also are also considered. The recommended process for school libraries is similar to that of the public library, although the guides used for selecting the books are different. Rather than using The Library Journal and others, school libraries rely on Wilson's Catalogs first, then upon Bookfinder, Adventuring with Books, Books for You: A Booklist for Senior High Students, Your Reading: Booklist for Junior High Students, School Library Journal, and finally, Booklist.

Since the major guides used were found to be Wilson's Catalogs, The Library Journal, Bookfinder, Booklist, Publishers Weekly, School Library Journal, The Hornbook Magazine, and various lists published by the National Council for Teachers of English (NCTE), a preinvestigation study was made of these sources. During the first phase of this research it was determined that books on Native Americans are primarily found under the 300 (Social Sciences), 572/573 (Anthropology), and 900 (History) classifications of the Dewey Decimal Classification System. Therefore, the researcher decided to narrow the population to these three forms of nonfiction
literature. Subsequent research indicated that all the books listed in the other major guides also were included in the more comprehensive Wilson's Catalogs, and this guide, therefore, was used as the source for the research population. The Wilson's Catalogs used were the Children's Catalog (1956, 1961, 1966, 1971, 1976, 1981, 1982), the Fiction Catalog (1960, 1971, 1975, 1980, 1981), the Junior High School Library Catalog (1965, 1970, 1975, 1980, 1981), the Public Library Catalog (1968, 1973, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981), and the Standard Catalog for High School Libraries (1957, 1962, 1967, 1972, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1981). The researcher and an associate read all listings, looking for particular key items, to identify books from this universe for the population. The primary indicator was the work "Indian," while secondary identifiers included: (1) specific Native American national names (i.e., Cheyenne, Apache, Eskimo) for all groups north of Mexico; (2) specific Native American individuals (i.e., Chief Joseph, Geronimo); and (3) specific historical events/places known to have involved Native Americans (the only one, ultimately, being "Custer's Last Stand"). Utilizing these general requirements, all the titles in the various Wilson's Catalogs published between 1960 and 1982 were placed into population listings. After all titles had been recorded, the population listings were culled further by the researcher's associate who selected only those books with an original copyright of 1960-1982. These books then
formed the research population. For sampling purposes the population was left stratified by reading level (i.e., Preschool or Easy, Children's, Junior High, Senior High, Adult), literature type (i.e., fiction, nonfiction), and Dewey Decimal Classification form (i.e., 300, 572/573, 900). Table 2 presents the research population by level, type, form, and respective subpopulation sizes, with a total population size of $N_p = 1013$ books.

It originally had been proposed (Edwards, 1983) to do a stratified random sample of the population developed in the pre-investigation study, as discussed above. A ten percent sampling was made based upon the researcher's interest to achieve a proportional error of $\pm .10$; i.e., $P \pm 2 (SE)$ or $P \pm .10$. In order to achieve this, a sample size of $N_s = 100$ was required. Furthermore, because of the extremely small subpopulation sizes for anthropological (i.e., 572/573) forms of literature, it was decided to purposively sample all the books in this literature form. Additionally, because of the conceived importance of preschool materials in the development of racial awareness and attitudes, this level also was purposively oversampled. The total sample size, therefore, was to be 112 books (see Table 2); however, the proposed procedures (Edwards, 1983) did not work well with such a sample.

The first problem encountered was that of book size. Pratt (1971) indicated that sampling within a textbook would
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Form</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Random Sample</th>
<th>Purposive Sample</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Preschool (Easy)</td>
<td>Fiction/Nonfiction</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Children's</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Junior High School</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior High School</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adult (Public Library)</td>
<td>Nonfiction</td>
<td>Social Sciences</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Fiction)</td>
<td>Anthropology</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>History</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fiction</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>P = 1013</td>
<td>$S_1 = 100$</td>
<td>$S_2 = 12$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
provide equivalent results even at fifty percent sampling. Therefore, it was determined that a random sampling of those pages upon which the subjects were listed would be feasible. The next step was to determine the average number of words per page and per book, and the average number of pages per book for each class of books. Thirty percent of the sample books were selected randomly for this analysis. The total number of pages for each book was first recorded and five randomly selected pages were then counted to obtain the total number of words per page. Next, the mean average number of words per page was calculated. Then, by multiplying this number by the total number of pages, the total average number of words for the book was obtained. These figures for each book were then summed up for all the books in the class to obtain the class mean. From these figures it was decided that a ten percent sampling of pages should provide a theoretically sound and methodologically usable amount of data.

A second problem, which became apparent after initial attempts to analyze several books to validate the above sampling procedures, was endeavoring to determine how many subjects in a given book to evaluate. This was particularly true for nonfiction books that discussed numerous distinctive Native American nations and groups.

A third, and more crucial problem, was the amount of time required to sample one book at even ten percent, and the overwhelming amount of new data to process. At this point it was determined,
therefore, that the research population would have to be redefined into a more workable size.

Theoretically, younger children are the group most susceptible to influence by reading books as demonstrated by studies of racial awareness and the effects of reading discussed in chapter one. It also may be assumed that children would prefer to read more entertaining books, which are found most frequently in fiction. Theoretical support for this decision is found in Waples, et. al. (1941), where the authors state that recreational reading has greater influence because the reader already is interested in the material. Secondly, there has been very little research on nonfiction. It would be more useful at this point, therefore, to be able to compare stylistic portrayals of Native Americans in fiction with previous studies, rather than providing a strictly descriptive analysis of how nonfiction is presented.

The research population for this study, therefore, was redefined as those books listed in the fiction category in Wilson's Children's Catalogs. The population for this level and category, as previously determined, is sixty-two books (N=62). Furthermore, the same random sample for this group was utilized, providing a more workable sample of six books (see Table 2; n=6).

The sampling procedure within each book was conducted through a random quota sampling of the identified subjects or strata resulting
in ten random samples per subject. As each subject did not appear on each page randomly selected, the page served merely as a starting point. The pages were read until the subject was located. From that line on, data on the subject was measured by the procedures discussed below for the number of lines equivalent to one page, which produced, therefore, the equivalent of ten full page measurements for each subject. The sampling procedure was justified upon the need to obtain enough data to allow for statistical analysis, while also limiting the amount of data to a workable level. At the children's level the average book was found to contain a mean of 230 words per page, which at ten pages per subject produced an average of twenty-three hundred words per subject for analysis of descriptive and evaluative terms. This, then, works out to be an approximately seven percent (.0712) sampling for each subject, based upon average figures. Within the research sample, two books were close to the average size of book for that category, while two were larger and two were smaller than average, indicating a fairly representative sampling based upon the size of the books.

The method of measurement used, as stated in chapter one, was the Evaluative Coefficient (ECO) Analysis developed by David Pratt, with some minor procedural changes to adapt it to fiction from textbook types of literature. These procedures, originally delineated by Pratt in "Value Judgements in Textbooks" (1971) and more
comprehensively explained in his "users" manual, How to Find and Measure Bias in Textbooks (1972), were used to measure subjects in children's fiction.

**Measurement Procedures**

The following steps are followed in measuring how sources of children's fiction make evaluative and/or descriptive judgments about subjects treated in such books.

1. The first step, discussed in detail above, is to define the sources to be analyzed, which is accomplished by first defining a functional population from which a random sample is then drawn. Sources are defined here as the author(s) and/or publisher(s) of each book selected to be analyzed.

2. The second step operationally defines the subjects of interest. In selecting subjects certain criteria are imposed. First, during the initial reading each subject in the book is tracked by recording the number of each page on which that subject appears. Secondly, each subject should appear on at least twenty percent (20%) of the total pages in the book. In determining subjects, minor characters and groups are collapsed into related groups (e.g., "General Canby" is counted as part of the subject "soldiers"). Lastly, the following broad definitions are used in forming subject categories that are to be measured using ECO Analysis:
a. "Indians" or "Native Americans" or "Amerindians" or "Eskimos": any group of people or images (e.g., animals, spacemen) identified simply by one of these nomenclatures, or by illusion (e.g., "feathered creature") and/or description (e.g., dressed in buckskin and feathers) as being a member of such a groups.

b. "________ Indians/Eskimos/tribe": any group of people (not images) referred to by their proper (e.g., Dine) or ascribed nomenclature (e.g., Navajo, Apache).

c. "Non-Indian/Native American/Eskimo" or "(Name of specific group)"; any group of people not of Native American/Indian/Eskimo ancestry (e.g., "whites," "blacks," "soldiers," "settlers"). This category will be subdivided as required—that is, where specific groups of Non-Native Americans are the subject of more than ten evaluative statements, then separate scores for them are kept.

d. "Characters": any person (e.g., Geronimo, Custer) or singular image (e.g., general, chief, the boy, Yogi Bear) regardless of group affiliation that is referred to in the contents by the source. Again, separate score sheets for each "character" are made.

3. The next step is to prepare an adequate supply of score sheets or instruments (see Appendix E) and to secure a copy of the ECO Word List (see Appendix F). Pratt's instrument was modified for this study to include columns for recording descriptive terms and the word type (e.g., verb, adjective).

4. The fourth step is to select and train analysts (Pratt, 1972:16-17). However, financial and time restraints precluded this step to self-training on the part of this researcher.

5. The fifth step in the measurement of portrayals in fiction is to read the individual books in their entirety. In reading the
book each subject, when first encountered, is listed by page number. Each succeeding page mentioning the subject is recorded, which both facilitates the random sampling and also provides an additional measurement of frequency. Furthermore, a list of themes employed by Garcia (1978, 1980) is used as an instrument for recording the frequency and appearance of themes in the book, which also are recorded by page number. This data then is transcribed onto the ECO Analysis Administrative Data Instrument (see Appendix E).

6. The sixth step is to write a short qualitative analysis and story description of the book.

7. The next step is to designate subject categories. This is done with two primary guidelines: (1) representative sampling; and (2) Native American/Non-Native American distinctions. Once this is done, a series of ten randomly selected page numbers for each subject is generated. Each page, or the first succeeding page mentioning the subject, then is analyzed. Each time a word is used by or in reference to the subject—evaluative or descriptive—it is recorded on the score sheet. Articles and prepositions are eliminated from the analysis. Individual score sheets are maintained for each subject. As this process proved to be very time consuming, an improved technique was developed for this step. After choosing the random pages they then are xeroxed. Utilizing different colored pens for each subject, each word is scored on the xeroxed page of the text,
thus combining this step with step number ten below. While most words that make value judgments or descriptions are usually adjectives, such words may also be adverbs, verbs, nouns, or pronouns:

- X admired bravery
- X assisted in the crime
- X became more modest
- X committed an offence
- X did a dishonorable action
- X had courage
- X had very civilized ways
- X lived a good life
- X may have been foolish
- X murdered Y
- X ruthlessly took the money
- X seemed to be insane
- X's personality was stable
- X's prejudice was obvious
- X talked disloyally
- X treated Y
- X told a lie
- X tried to be charitable
- X was known to be very wise
- Y disliked X's dishonesty

(Pratt, 1972:19; emphases in the original).

8. In measuring or recording words, the following guidelines are incorporated:

a. In the situation where the term is negatively applied to the subject, i.e., "Jim was not intelligent," the recorded term is the reversed term, "unintelligent."

b. In recording the passages the researcher has to be alert for instances of irony.

c. Quotations are treated as usual, unless the quotation is explicitly rejected by the source. This is because quotations may be used by the source to convey an attitude as much by the quotation selected as by the statements made by the source itself.

9. This step simply consists of recording, by type of word, each listed word as a verb, adjective, adverb, noun, or pronoun.

10. The next step, after listing all the terms in reference to the subjects of interest in the source, is to score each term as
favorable (+), unfavorable (-), or neutral (0) in the "direction" column of the score sheet. Words are scored according to the ECO Word List. For words not listed, a synonym is used and/or the following criteria/guideline:

One way of deciding whether or not a word is evaluative is to apply the "congruency" test; that is, to ask whether the word would be most appropriately applied to "saints" or "heros," or alternately to "sinners" or "villains." Let us suppose an analyst is uncertain whether the word "contemptible" is evaluative: use of this test would suggest that one is more likely to speak of a "contemptible sinner" than of a "contemptible saint." Similarly, a word like "cooperative" is more likely to be applied to a saint or hero than a sinner or villain. Hence "contemptible" and "cooperative" are evaluative terms. But words like "tall" or "powerful" could be applied equally appropriately to saints or sinners, heros or villains, and hence are descriptive or neutral (Pratt, 1972:18).

However, Pratt dictates that "the Word List should be followed except where to do so would clearly misrepresent the author's intent," and that "the cardinal rule in this kind of analysis is, [to] never violate the original meaning" (1972:20, 21; emphases in the original).^4

11. Once the measurements are recorded and scored, the data is then analyzed statistically:

a. The first statistical analysis performed is the Coefficient of Evaluation (Pratt, 1972:22), which requires a minimum of ten (10) evaluative terms per subject. The formula used is:

\[
\frac{100 (F)}{F + U}
\]

where \(F\) = favorable terms and \(U\) = unfavorable terms. The Coefficient of Evaluation will always be between zero (totally unfavorable) and one hundred (totally favorable) with fifty representing the point of ambivalence. It should be noted that Pratt also refers to fifty as "neutral," which
is a misnomer as "neutral" evaluations would really be
descriptive rather than evaluative. It is for this reason
that this study records descriptive, as well as evaluative,
terms. The proportion of the evaluative terms used by a
source to refer to a subject favorably and expressed as a
percentage, then, is called the Coefficient of Evaluation.

b. The second analytical technique is to determine the Evalu­
avitiveness Score, which is simply the proportion between the
number of evaluative terms referring to the subject in the
source to the total number of words devoted to the subject
in the source and presented as a percentage. This analytical
measure is indicative of the frequency with which value
judgments are expressed about the subject relative to the
amount of space devoted to the subject. The formula used is:

\[
\frac{100 \times \text{(Total Evaluative Words)}}{\text{Total Words}}
\]

c. A third type of analysis consists of comparing various
variables--e.g., "Indian" to "Non-Indian"--in contingency
tables for variance within a source, and between sources,
utilizing chi-square (\(X^2\)).

d. A fourth type of analysis is to group the sources by publi­
cation dates to determine trends in evaluations of subjects
in the sources over time.

e. A fifth analysis is a description of themes and their
frequencies.

f. A sixth analysis is to regroup the books for within and
between book analyses to evaluate for trends over time.

g. The final analysis consists of a comparative analysis of
the quantitative and qualitative data.

Based upon these results, inferences are made about what
kind of attitudes, impressions, values, and judgments are made by
sources as a partial explanation of how Native Americans are
portrayed in children's fiction.
Chapter 3

RESULTS

The qualitative research findings will be presented first. Next, the quantitative results for each book will be presented.

These within book analyses will be followed by a comparison of data between books, across books, and over several time periods: (1) Time 1 = 1968-1970; (2) Time 2 = 1974-1978; and (3) Time 3 = 1980-1981. The expected results, again, of this study are:

1. That books published in the 1960s will be more evaluative than books published in the 1970s and 1980s.
2. That the evaluativeness of books, based upon the sample average score, will be less than ten percent (<10%).
3. That the percentage of descriptive words for all subjects, groups, and books will be greater than ninety percent (>90%).
4. That books published after 1975 will have improved because of outside demands, and therefore, will have a descriptive percentage greater than ninety-five percent (>95%).
5. That books published after 1975, similarly, will have an even lower Evaluative Score of less than five percent (<5%).
6. That evaluative judgments will be favorable (i.e., >75%) toward Native Americans.
7. That judgments of Native Americans will be less favorable than those of others.
8. That the percentage of evaluative terms to total space devoted to Native Americans will be greater than that for Non-Native Americans.
9. That the percentage of negative evaluative judgments about Native Americans will be greater than five percent (>5%).
while negative evaluations for Non-Native Americans will be less than five percent (<5%).

10. That similar themes concerning Native Americans, found by García in textbooks, will be found in the fiction books. The last part of this chapter will discuss parallelisms between the qualitative findings and the quantitative results.

Tables 5 through 10, discussed below in conjunction with each book, summarize the quantitative data collected on each subject. Each cell in the contingency tables presents the observed frequency along with the percentages in parentheses. Additionally, each table provides, below the contingency table, the ratios of positive evaluative terms to negative evaluative terms for each subject and for each book as a whole. Lastly, the calculated chi-square ($X^2$), the degrees of freedom (df), and the level of statistical significance (e.g., $p<.001$) for the chi-square are given on each table. The analytical statistic of chi-square ($X^2$) tests to see if the terms used are independent of the subjects. This is done to more closely determine if the differences across the cells exist because the terms are related to the subjects, or, if the differences exist simply because of chance alone or because of sampling error. For this study, then, all chi-square tests of significance will begin with the following null hypothesis, alternative hypothesis, and level of significance or alpha error:

1. $H_0$: Evaluative and descriptive terms are not related to the subjects.
H : Evaluative and descriptive terms are related to the subjects.

2. Accepted level of alpha error: \( \alpha = 0.01 \).

Tables 11 through 16, discussed in the second part of this chapter, are presented in the same format as Tables 5 through 10 and provide statistical results for comparisons between groups and books.

Summary data are provided in Appendix G. Table 28 in Appendix G summarizes for each subject by book, for each group, and for the total book, the Coefficient of Evaluation scores; which are, once again, the proportion of evaluative terms used by a source to refer to a subject favorably and that is expressed as a percentage. A high score would be a positive portrayal and a low score would be a negative portrayal. Table 29 in Appendix G delineates the second analytical measure or the Evaluativeness Score, a percentage which measures the frequency that value judgments are expressed about a subject relative to the amount of space or total descriptive and evaluative words.

**Qualitative Findings**

Procedurally, the qualitative measurement of the books in the sample is quite simple. (It is remembered from chapter two that while reading the book, frequency counts by page number were kept for both subjects and themes.) After reading the book the qualitative analysis was made first, and then the semi-quantitative analyses were
made utilizing the ECO Analysis Administrative Data Instrument. In measuring portrayals qualitatively, then, the three very crude, basic, and broad categories are (1) the story plot, (2) the character and group portrayals, and (3) the impressions of the book. It is clear, therefore, that the qualitative methods have greater scope than the quantitative, which measure portrayals only. Furthermore, the data is less structured and usually recorded in roughly two handwritten pages, which is about one-tenth the amount of space and/or data accumulated by the quantitative ECO Analysis Score Sheet Instrument. Each book will be discussed by category first.

The story plot for each book is as follows:

1. Akavak, an Eskimo Journey. The time setting is not explicitly stated by the source, but through pictures and descriptions it appears to take place many years ago. The story is about Eskimos, and specifically a young man, Akavak, and his grandfather. The grandfather wishes to travel to see his brother because he feels that he will die soon. As the whole family cannot travel at that time, Akavak must take his grandfather. The majority of the story, then, is about their trip, which is filled with numerous environmental and spiritual obstacles. They finally get within sight of the brother's "village" and sled down the mountain, but on the way the grandfather dies. The book ends with the brother singing a song.

2. Sing Down the Moon. The time setting is the 1860s and the story is about the Navajos, other Native Americans, and Non-Native Americans. The story is narrated through the perspective of a young woman, "Bright Morning," who along with a friend, is kidnapped by two Spanish men and sold to an American woman. The two girls eventually escape with the help of a Nez Perce girl. Then the American soldiers come and burn their "village," after which the Navajos surrender and are removed to the Bosque Redondo. Bright Morning marries Tall Boy and together they run away to live secretly in the mountains near their home. They have a child and are
very happy until soldiers come nearby, then they leave again. The story ends with them returning to live in their old "village," supposedly happily ever after.

3. The Spirit is Willing. The time setting is the 1880s in Arizona and the story is about two Non-Native American girls, Portia and Carrie. Geronimo has "escaped" so Portia cannot leave town and she must spend the summer there. Carrie and Portia decide to hold a seance during which they believe they contact a spirit. They decide that it is the spirit of an "Indian mummy." They attempt to see the mummy, which is on display in a saloon, but are caught. Portia pretends to faint and to be under the spell of the mummy's spirit, which creates an uproar. As a result of all the publicity Portia's mother decides to leave town, regardless of the risk of Geronimo. It is then disclosed that the whole thing is a ruse, but the book ends when Carrie decides to continue the seances because she has information that others want to know and the predictions are harmless anyway.

4. Squaw Man's Son. The time setting is the 1880s in Oregon and California, and the story is about the Modocs, although it is allegedly about a "halfbreed," Billy. Billy's father sends his mother "back to her people" so the father can become respectable. After a period of time Billy's father remarries, but his step-mother makes him live at the livery. Eventually Billy runs away to live with his mother and the Modocs. The Modocs are told to move onto a reservation, but they want to stay where they are, and war breaks out. The was is long and violent, but eventually the Modocs surrender. While in prison, Billy's father comes to get him. At "home" things still do not work out so his father sends Billy to live with his father's brother. The book ends with Billy leaving the day Captain Jack is hung.

5. Sarah Bishop. The time setting is the 1780s during the Revolutionary War, and the story is about a young girl, Sarah Bishop. Sarah's father, a British sympathizer, is tarred and feathered and dies. Sarah tries to find her brother, who is in the American army and finally learns that he has died while a British prisoner. Sarah is blamed for starting a fire so she runs away. She finds a cave near a lake and decides to live there, going into a nearby town every once in a while for various reasons. She makes friends with the Longknife family, who shows her how to do things and helps her out every now and then. She starts
going to see a particular young man in town, but is soon
accused of being a witch. Through her friend, Morton, she
is acquitted. The book ends with her going back to her
cave, but promising to come back to town soon.

6. Where the Buffaloes Begin. The time setting is not explicitly
stated, but it is clearly set in the nineteenth century or
earlier. The story is about a boy named "Little Wolf" who
awakes one morning and decides to ride off to find out where
the buffaloes begin. He rides for a long time and eventually
comes to a misty lake from which he hears strange sounds.
After some time he sees the buffaloes coming out of the
lake, and soon they are running and Little Wolf is riding
among them. After a long time, as they are nearing his
village, Little Wolf spots the Assiniboines preparing to
attack his village, so he directs the buffaloes to stampede
the Assiniboines. The story ends with the buffaloes
disappearing into the horizon after stampeding the
Assiniboines and "saving" the village.

Qualitative analysis for character and group portrayals
are as follows for each book:

1. Akavak, an Eskimo Journey. Eskimos in general are portrayed
as simple, if not poor, people who believe in a variety of
spirits and beings. They are inaccurately portrayed as
residing in permanent villages. Spirits and other beings
are negatively portrayed, and often put down or mocked by
the source. Akavak appears to be positively portrayed,
almost as a superman-type person. Grandfather seems to be
ambivalently portrayed, having tremendous knowledge and
experience, but also being "strangely" mystic or spiritual.

2. Sing Down the Moon. Native Americans are positively portrayed
This is based primarily on the descriptions rather than the
depth of characterizations. All portrayals are shallow and
evaluative, but those for Native Americans are less so than
those for Non-Native Americans. Individual Native American
characters run the whole range of characterizations from
positive to negative to descriptive portrayals.

3. The Spirit is Willing. Native Americans are generally mocked
and very negatively portrayed, while Non-Native Americans
are very positively portrayed. The main characters have
very full and colorful characterizations, while the mummy
is ambivalently portrayed—sometimes positive, other times negative—and is imbued with a romantic "Noble Indian" characterization. Geronimo is the scapegoat and is portrayed as the general bad guy, while Apache Sam is ambivalently portrayed. Mexicans and Chinese are both negatively portrayed.

4. **Squaw Man's Son.** Native Americans are ambivalently portrayed in that Modocs are favorably presented but other Native Americans in the book and specific characters are very negatively portrayed. Non-Native Americans are neutrally portrayed, although many are portrayed as snooty and bigoted. Captain Jack is positively portrayed, as are Billy, his mother, and his step-family members. Other Modoc characters are ambivalently or negatively portrayed. Overall, portrayals are quite shallow or poorly developed, and characters and groups are more like props in a fictionalized documentary.

5. **Sarah Bishop.** Native Americans are neutrally to positively portrayed, while colonial Americans are often negatively or ambivalently portrayed, and the British positively to ambivalently portrayed. On the whole it is a very neutral book. It is probably the best in this study, although characterization of the Longknifes, while generally good, contains some demeaning and standard positive images.

6. **Where the Buffaloes Begin.** The character Little Wolf is ambivalently portrayed, while the group Assiniboines is incredibly negatively portrayed. Even the buffaloes are at times negatively portrayed in this highly evaluative book.

The final category is an analysis of the impression of the books. This includes the analyst's impressions and/or reactions to the books:

1. **Akavak, an Eskimo Journey.** This book is perceived as being basically a good book, although certain elements (e.g., the subject "Spirits") are very negatively portrayed and there are inaccuracies. The book leaves the reader with a feeling of futility in the Eskimo way of life, but pride in their endurance as well.
2. *Sing Down the Moon.* This book gives the overt impression of being very favorable toward Native Americans and very negative toward Non-Native Americans. After some time, however, the covertly negative impressions surface, so that the reader actually receives a very negative presentation of Native Americans. This is particularly true of the source's portrayal of Navajo culture, which contains inaccuracies and omissions.

3. *The Spirit is Willing.* This book leaves the reader with the feeling and attitude that Native Americans are either lawless and/or romantic people. It is made clear that good and bad Anglos are better than Native Americans, Chinese, and Mexicans, although the reader is led to believe that Carrie is supposed to be more egalitarian thinking. This is to say that the main character is portrayed to be above reproach, but negative evaluations exist through other characters. The book contains defamation of characters, oversimplifications, questionable accuracy, omissions, and numerous other methods of creating impressions that negatively evaluate Native Americans.

4. *Squaw Man's Son.* This book is, from title to concluding hysterical note, replete with inaccuracies, innuendos, omissions, defamations, dehumanizations, and overgeneralizations to name but a few of the propagandistic methods used in portraying people and historical events. The book attempts to tell the story from the perspective of a "half-breed youngster," obviously seeking realism and accuracy. The source, however, equates evaluative language, attitudes, and actions of the day to realism. Additionally, the source attempts to portray the Modocs as the "good guys," but simply ends up portraying most of the Non-Native Americans more negatively than some of the Modocs.

5. *Sarah Bishop.* The best book in this study, although Native Americans still seem to be negatively or demeaningly portrayed. The Longknifes are described neutrally, but their role and actions are clearly subservient to those of Sarah. The portrayal, then, is manifestly descriptive, but somehow--covertly and/or latently--negatively evaluative. As such, most would classify the evaluative portrayal of Native Americans as neutral to positive, but with the portrayals overall being descriptive.
6. Where the Buffaloes Begin. The contents of this book are overshadowed by the accompanying drawings, which are manifestly positive portrayals. Latently, however, they are very biased; i.e., (1) they never show people smiling or happy, (2) the people are either blurred or portrayed in an unkept manner, and (3) scenery is often portrayed gloomily. The text, however, is manifestly negative, especially toward the Assiniboines. The book contains loaded words, oversimplifications, and omissions in its portrayals.

The qualitative measurements generally yield, then, negative critiques of the books, although several of the books contain a greater range of portrayals from which some are positive. An exception is the book Sarah Bishop (#5) by Scott O'Dell, which is found to be more positively critiqued. In analyzing the first category—the story plot—a major finding is that all the books are historically set in the nineteenth century or earlier. As such, this portrays Native Americans as being people of the past. (It will be recalled that the universe and population were selected upon the criteria of Native Americans and did not include Non-Native Americans, which means that inferences cannot be so easily drawn concerning them; i.e., it cannot be inferred that Non-Native Americans are usually portrayed as people of the past.) A second major finding is that Native Americans are either (1) in conflict with either Native Americans or Non-Native Americans, or are (2) helpers for Non-Native Americans—Native Americans never help other Native Americans. A third finding, from the character and group portrayals, is that Native Americans are generally
portrayed more negatively than Non-Native Americans. A last finding is that all the books utilize impressionistic techniques that more evaluatively portray Native Americans.

Quantitative Results for Individual Books


The first book analyzed is Akavak, an Eskimo Journey by James Houston. The book is eighty pages long including the cover page, and is listed as being fourth to sixth grade reading level by Wilson's Children's Catalog (1971:416; 1976:532-533). There are two main Native American character subjects—"Akavak" and "Grandfather"—and two minor group characterizations—"Eskimos" and "Spirits." As the subject "Eskimos" is not listed on a sufficient enough number of pages it is not measured. The subject "Spirits" includes the following groups/individuals: (1) Night spirits; (2) Spirits of ancestors; (3) Mountain spirits; (4) Wind giants; and (5) Dwarf people. While this subject appears on less than ten pages, which was set as the sampling size, because of the smaller number of pages in the book the subject still appears in ten percent of the book and is, therefore, included in the study. All three subjects in the book are Native American, but the source has provided a very clear we-they dichotomy. Resulting from the fact that the source establishes these entities as antagonists,
the subject "Spirits" is treated as a "they" subject while the subjects "Akavak" and "Grandfather" are considered as "we" subjects for comparisons, although the dichotomy may be a false one for the Eskimos themselves.

Table 3 indicates the chi-square ($X^2$) test of significance, which, again, tests to see if the terms used are independent of the subjects or if differences exist simply because of chance or sampling error alone. The null hypothesis ($H_0$) is set to be that evaluative and descriptive terms are not related to the subjects. Conversely, if statistically significant differences are found, then the alternative hypothesis, ($H_a$) that evaluative and descriptive terms are related to the subjects and not because of chance or sampling error, is accepted. Similarly, the level of significance or the accepted level of alpha error is $\alpha = .01$. The statistic chi-square ($X^2$), as found for the book Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, is calculated $X^2 = 148.2$ with four degrees of freedom ($df = 4$). Using the above null hypothesis and alpha level with the chi-square table, it is found that $X^2_{.01 \ df = 4} = 13.2$. Since the critical $X^2$ value is less than the calculated $X^2$ value, the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the evaluative and descriptive term distributional differences across the cells are statistically significant for the subjects in this book as reported in Table 3. Evaluative and descriptive term frequencies, then, are directly related to or dependent upon the subjects and who the subjects are. Furthermore,
Table 3
Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1): Observed Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akavak (#1)</td>
<td>Grandfather (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>19 (3.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>458 (80.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>95 (16.61%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>572 (100.00%)</td>
<td>660 (100.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratios</th>
<th>.2000</th>
<th>.3735</th>
<th>.0714</th>
<th>.2308</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$X^2 = 117.7$</td>
<td>$df = 4$</td>
<td>$X^2_{.01 df=4} = 13.2$</td>
<td>$p &lt; .001$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* -- indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
Table 3 indicates that the descriptive and negative cell
distributions for the subject "Spirits" (#3) are both individually
statistically significant. This means that the observed term
frequencies in each cell can, by themselves, account for the
significance in the distribution of terms. This, then, makes these
two frequencies uniquely significant in comparison to others in
this book.

Since the chi-square analysis is statistically significant,
it is of interest to further analyze the results. First of all,
the ratios of positive to negative terms in Table 3 indicate and/or
substantiate the imbalance of portrayals in the negative direction.
A ratio of 1.0000 would indicate a balanced or ambivalent portrayal,
while a larger score would indicate a positive portrayal and a
smaller score would indicate a negative portrayal. In this case,
the ratios indicate that for the subject "Akavak" (#1), there are
twenty positive terms used for every one hundred negative words
used. For the subject "Spirits" (#3), however, there are only
seven positive words used for every one hundred negative terms,
which can be inferred to be significant, also, because of the fact
that the corresponding negative frequency cell is individually
statistically significant.

The subjects selected for further analysis are listed below
in Table 4 along with: (1) the frequency of pages mentioning the
subject; (2) the total frequency of descriptive and evaluative
terms; (3) the Coefficient of Evaluation, or percentage of
evaluative terms used by the source to refer to the subject
favorably, for which a low score is negative, an average score is
ambivalent, and a high score is positive in terms of the subject's
portrayal; and (4) the Evaluativeness Score, or the percentage
of value judgments or evaluative terms expressed about a subject
to total words about the subject.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Akavak</td>
<td>56 (1)*</td>
<td>572 (2)*</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grandfather</td>
<td>51 (2)</td>
<td>660 (1)</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Spirits</td>
<td>8 (3)</td>
<td>99 (3)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Coefficient of Evaluation} = \frac{100 \times F}{F + U} \]

\[ \text{Evaluativeness Score} = \frac{100 \times \text{(Total Evaluative Words)}}{\text{Total Words}} \]

*--indicates ranking

The page and total word frequencies are indicative of the
major characters and groups in the book—that is, it would be
expected that the major characters would be ranked highest on both page (or scope) and word (or depth) frequencies. There are, however, some interesting discrepancies between the two measures for various subjects. In looking at the subject portrayals by page frequency rankings for the character subjects it is seen that "Akavak" (#1) has slightly more scope, or page frequency, than the second subject, "Grandfather" (#2), giving the illusion of being the main character. Conversely, in looking at the depth of the portrayals indicated by the total number of evaluative and descriptive words it is observed that the subject "Grandfather" (#2) is latently a more major subject in the book. The most interesting discrepancy, however, is not the differences in rankings but rather the ratio of words to pages for the subjects. Subject number three—"Spirits"—is interesting particularly in that the manifest visibility of the subject is quite low in comparison to the other two subjects, but is portrayed by a high frequency of evaluative and descriptive terms which combine to create a highly developed portrayal of the subject "Spirits." The depth of the portrayal is also found to be very evaluative. In looking at the Evaluativeness Scores it is found that this source, more so than any other in this study, makes judgmental portrayals of the subject "Spirits" nearly two-thirds of the time. Furthermore, it is observed that the Coefficient of Evaluation score indicates that
the subject "Spirits" is significantly negatively evaluated. That is to say, the score is less than would be expected for a normal sample, which should range between twenty-five and seventy-five percent. Conversely, if the score had been between twenty-five and fifty percent the score would have been negatively evaluated or ambivalent in the negative direction. While the range for ambivalence is left ambiguous, it is generally conceived of as including scores between thirty-three and sixty-six percent. Scores on either side of the normal range (25%-75%) are considered, therefore, substantively significant. Scores greater than fifty percent, however, indicate positive evaluative portrayals and scores less than fifty percent indicate negative portrayals. Thus, a score of thirty-eight percent is considered to be an ambivalent score in the negative direction, while a score of sixty percent is considered to be ambivalent in the positive direction. Deriving from the low frequency of being mentioned, the unusually high rate of words to portray the subject, and the negatively skewed evaluation, the "they" subject "Spirits" is given a significantly latent and negatively evaluative portrayal by the source.

In looking at the distribution of scores in Table 3 for Akavak, an Eskimo Journey it is seen that the "we" subjects of "Akavak" and "Grandfather" have much greater percentages of descriptive words than evaluative terms, but the "they" subject
"Spirits" has a larger proportion of negative evaluative terms than both descriptive and positive words combined (i.e., 56.37% > 39.39% + 4.04%). Furthermore, it is observed that the percentage of descriptive terms for each subject is less than predicted: "Akavak" (#1), 80.07% < 90%; "Grandfather" (#2), 82.73% < 90%; and "Spirits" (#3), 39.39% < 90%. Additionally, the percentage of descriptive terms for the book as a whole is only 78.36%, which is much less than expected. Since only slightly more than one-third of the portrayals of subject number three—"Spirits"—and a little more than three-fourths of all portrayals in the book are descriptive, the use of evaluative terms in this book is much greater than that found in any of the other books in this study. Such a result is substantively significant for this study, and suggests further analysis in this direction. In looking at the types of terms, then, the subjects are found to be ranked as provided in Table 5.

The rankings in Table 5 indicate that the subject "Grandfather" (#2) is portrayed the most descriptively, but that all three subjects are clearly portrayed evaluatively. Furthermore, the rankings also verify other trends noted above (i.e., the subject "Grandfather" also is ranked the highest for positive evaluative judgments and the subject "Spirits" (#3) is clearly the most negatively biased portrayal). It is interesting, however, that the subject "Akavak"
(#1) ranks the lowest in positive evaluations, which serves to reinforce the very negative portrayal of this subject.

Table 5

Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1):
Positive, Negative, and Neutral Word Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)* Grandfather</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3) Spirits</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2) Grandfather</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.70%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(56.37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(82.73%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3) Spirits</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) Akavak</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1) Akavak</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.04%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16.61%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(80.07%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) Akavak</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2) Grandfather</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) Spirits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.32%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(12.58%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(39.39%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*—indicates the subject number

Analysis of the results, then, demonstrates that the book Akavak, an Eskimo Journey significantly portrays Eskimos and their way of life negatively. Furthermore, the source specifically portrays the "they" subject (#3) in a statistically significantly negative and judgmental style. Lastly, it is found that the "they" subject (#3) and the book as a whole are significantly more evaluative than any of the others in this study.


The second book analyzed is Sing Down the Moon by Scott O'Dell.
The book is 137 pages long, and is listed as being fifth to seventh grade reading level by Wilson's Children's Catalog (1976:555; 1981:511-512). Although a number of individuals and groups are presented in the story, only six subjects are measured. These include two Native American character subjects, three Native American group subjects, and one Non-Native American group subject. The subject "Non-Indians" actually includes one unnamed character and two groups—the Spanish and the soldiers—while the subject "Indians" comprises all Native Americans other than Navajos and specific Navajo characters, who are presented either as separate subjects or as the group "Navajos."

It is seen from Table 6, using the same null hypothesis (H₀) that evaluative and descriptive terms are not related to the subject and the same level of significance or accepted level of alpha error (α = .01), that calculated \(X^2 = 29.8\) with df = 10. The table \(X^2_{.01 \, df=10} = 23.2\), which is less than the calculated \(X^2\). Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the observed evaluative and descriptive term distributional differences across the cells are statistically significant for the subjects in this book, Sing Down the Moon, as reported in Table 6. Evaluative and descriptive term frequencies, then, are directly related to or dependent upon the subjects (Hₐ) and who the subjects are.

Since chi-square analysis is statistically significant, it is of interest to further analyze the results. First of all, Table 6
Table 6
Sing Down the Moon (Book #2): Observed Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Bright Morning (#1)</th>
<th>Family (#2)</th>
<th>Navajos (#3)</th>
<th>Tall Boy (#4)</th>
<th>Indians (#5)</th>
<th>Non-Indians (#6)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>18 (3.01%)</td>
<td>2 (0.73%)</td>
<td>12 (1.92%)</td>
<td>11 (1.46%)</td>
<td>9 (4.23%)</td>
<td>8 (2.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>558 (93.16%)</td>
<td>258 (94.16%)</td>
<td>590 (94.00%)</td>
<td>692 (92.14%)</td>
<td>197 (92.49%)</td>
<td>317 (92.66%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>23 (3.84%)</td>
<td>14 (5.11%)</td>
<td>23 (3.68%)</td>
<td>48 (6.39%)</td>
<td>7 (3.29%)</td>
<td>32 (8.96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>599 (100.01%)</td>
<td>274 (100.00%)</td>
<td>625 (100.00%)</td>
<td>751 (99.99%)</td>
<td>213 (100.01%)</td>
<td>357 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios (+/-)</td>
<td>.7826</td>
<td>.1429</td>
<td>.5217</td>
<td>.2292</td>
<td>1.2857</td>
<td>.2500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 29.8 \quad df = 10 \quad \chi^2_{.01 df=10} = 23.2 \quad p < .001 \]
lists the ratios of positive to negative words, which provides some interesting results. The ratios range from a high of 1.2857 for the subject "Indians" (#5) to a low of .1429 for the subject "Family" (#9). This means that for the subject "Indians" there are 128 negative words used for every one hundred negative words used, which indicates a substantively significantly positive portrayal of the subject "Indians." Furthermore, it is observed that the character subject "Tall Boy," which has a ratio of .2292, and the subject "Non-Indians," which has a ratio of .2500, both have very low positive to negative ratios, indicating, again, significantly negative portrayals for these two subjects. Subjects further analyzed for this book are listed in Table 7 along with page and word frequencies and statistical scores for the Coefficient of Evaluation, or the percentage of evaluative terms used by the source to refer to a subject favorably, and the Evaluativeness Score, or the percentage of value judgments or evaluative terms expressed about a subject to total words about the subject.

In looking at the page and word frequencies several interesting results and trends are observed. First of all, the narrator (Subject #1) of this first person story, while having the highest page frequency, ranks only third in word frequency. This means that although the subject appears to be the main character based upon the scope or number of pages upon which the subject is mentioned,
the depth or word frequency indicates that the subject is less important than manifestly portrayed. Latently, then, the subject "Bright Morning (#1) is not the major character; that is, this subject is not the one best developed in terms of descriptive and evaluative characterizations. Conversely, the subject "Tall Boy" (#4) is ranked fourth in page frequency and, having almost half the number of the third ranked subject, would normally be considered a minor subject in the story. According to the subject's word frequency, however, the character subject "Tall Boy" is ranked number one for depth of portrayal. This means that manifestly the character subject "Tall Boy" appears to be a rather unimportant one, yet in analyzing the word frequency it is inferred that the portrayal is latently greater than that for all other character or group subjects in the book Sing Down the Moon. In looking at the Coefficient of Evaluation scores some other interesting results stand out. Most striking is the score for the subject "Indians" (#5) that is found to be fifty-six percent, which is the only Coefficient of Evaluation score in the positive direction for this book, although the score is more an ambivalent one (i.e., <75%). That is, given a normal distribution, it is expected that most scores would be between twenty-five and seventy-five percent. This means that scores less than or greater than these extremes are significant as delineated by the proposed results. Three of the subjects' scores are significantly negative:
(1) "Non-Indians," 20% < 25%; (2) "Tall Boy," 19% < 25%; and
(3) "Family," 12% < 25%. The other two subjects--"Bright Morning"
and "Navajos"--both are portrayed ambivalently, but in the negative
direction. Additionally, two of the observed Evaluativeness Scores
are of interest. First, the subject "Non-Indians" (#6) is found to
be the most evaluated subject in the book with an Evaluativeness
Score of eleven percent, which means that eleven percent of the subject
"Non-Indians" portrayal is evaluative. The subject "Non-Indians"
portrayal, therefore, is both significantly negative and broadly
evaluative, particularly in comparison to other subjects. The other
Evaluativeness Score of interest is the one for the subject "Tall Boy"
(#4), which is, along with the subject "Indians" (#5), the second
most evaluative portrayal in the book. When this finding is combined
with the other results on the subject--"Tall Boy"--it can be inferred
that the portrayal is latently and broadly judgmental, and significantly
negative. Lastly, but perhaps more importantly, it is observed from
the Coefficient of Evaluation scores that the subject "Family" (#2),
which is a minor group subject in the story, is unexplicably the
most negatively judged subject in the book *Sing Down the Moon.*
Because of the limited role of the subject, this negative evaluation
of the subject "Family" is inferred to be an unconscious portrayal
by the source. Similarly, however, the portrayal also is inferred
to be latently judgmental, regardless of the subject's scope and
depth of portrayal, because it subtly or covertly maligns Navajo families through an unusually negative portrayal. The source, thereby, negatively evaluates Navajo culture through latently judgmental portrayals of the subjects "Family" (#2) and "Tall Boy" (#4), who symbolize Navajo men in this story.

Table 7

Sing Down the Moon (Book #2): Page and Word Frequencies, Coefficient of Evaluation, and Evaluativeness Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Bright Morning</td>
<td>117 (1)*</td>
<td>599 (3)*</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Family</td>
<td>48 (6)</td>
<td>274 (5)</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>99 (2)</td>
<td>625 (2)</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Tall Boy</td>
<td>57 (4)</td>
<td>751 (1)</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>55 (5)</td>
<td>213 (6)</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Non-Indians</td>
<td>92 (3)</td>
<td>357 (4)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a--Coefficient of Evaluation = \( \frac{100 (F)}{F + U} \), where F = total favorable terms and U = total unfavorable terms

b--Evaluativeness Score = \( \frac{100 \text{ (Total Evaluative Words)}}{\text{Total Words}} \)

*--indicates ranking

Table 6 also presents the distribution of scores for each subject in Sing Down the Moon. The first observation is that neutral words overwhelmingly account for the largest percentage of the
portrayals for all but one subject. The percentage of descriptive terms for the subject "Non-Indians" (#6), however, is lower than expected (88.80% < 90%). Further analysis of the types of terms used for each subject would be interesting. Table 8, therefore, ranks each subject by frequency of type of term.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5)* Indians (4.23%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6) Non-Indians (8.96%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(3) Navajos (94.40%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Bright Morning (3.01%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4) Tall Boy (6.39%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Family (94.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(6) Non-Indians (2.24%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2) Family (5.11%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) Bright Morning (93.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3) Navajos (1.92%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1) Bright Morning (3.84%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(5) Indians (92.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4) Tall Boy (1.46%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(3) Navajos (3.68%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4) Tall Boy (92.14%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(2) Family (0.73%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5) Indians (3.29%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) Non-Indians (88.80%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*—indicates the subject number

In looking at the rankings in Table 8, several trends observed above are again found along with some other interesting results.
First of all, it is found that Non-Native Americans have the least descriptive portrayals of all the subjects and, therefore, all Native American subjects are more descriptively portrayed than Non-Native Americans. This result is substantively significant because it is the only case in this study where a source does so in a book. Second, it is observed that the subject "Indians" (#5) is ranked first in positive and last in negative portrayals. This reinforces the fact that the subject also has the highest positive to negative terms ratio. Third, it is seen that the subject "Tall Boy" (#4) is ranked fifth in positive and neutral evaluations, but is ranked second in negative judgments, which corroborates trends found by the Coefficient of Evaluation and the Evaluativeness Scores to negatively portray this subject. Interestingly, it is noted that the subject "Navajos" (#3) is the most descriptively portrayed subject, but is ranked lower in positive and higher in negative evaluative portrayals than the subject "Indians" (#5). It is inferred from these rankings, therefore, that specific Native American groups, i.e., "Navajos," are more descriptively portrayed than the ambiguous subject "Indians," and that the evaluative portrayal for "Navajos" is more negative than for "Indians." This result is also found by the Coefficient of Evaluation, which is fifty-six percent for the subject "Indians" and thirty-four percent for the subject "Navajos." Lastly, while the overall portrayal of the subject "Family" (#2) is found to be
descriptive, the part of the portrayal that is evaluative is decidedly biased in the negative direction. Substantiating the Coefficient of Evaluation result, the subject "Family" is ranked lowest in positive portrayals with less than one percent. That is, the source essentially has nothing positive to say about the Navajo family, which is the reverse of what would be expected based upon the knowledge of the importance of the family in Navajo life. This result becomes even more significant when it is observed that, conversely, the subject "Family" ranks high in negative judgments with over five percent. This means, then, that the evaluative portrayal of the subject "Family" is almost entirely negative. Statistical analyses of the results, then, demonstrate for the book Sing Down the Moon that Native American subjects are positively evaluated relative to Non-Native Americans. Additionally, it is inferred that the Navajo institutional subject, "Family," and the Native American character subject, "Tall Boy," are substantively significantly more negatively evaluated than other Native American subjects. More importantly, however, the portrayals of Native American subjects are essentially descriptive in style. Conversely, the portrayals of Non-Native Americans are uniquely more evaluative than those for Native Americans or than expected. As such, this book presents the appearance of having a positively evaluated portrayal of Native Americans, but in fact is simply an unusually negatively evaluated portrayal of Non-Native Americans.
The third book analyzed in this study is Betty Baker's *The Spirit is Willing*. The book is 136 pages long including the cover page, and is listed as being fifth grade and up reading level by Wilson's *Children's Catalog* (1981:440). While there are numerous potential subjects in the book, only nine are measured and analyzed. It is noted, however, that the page frequencies for the subjects "Chinese" (#8) and "Apache Sam" (#9) are not large enough to meet the minimum sampling requirement of ten pages. They are included in the study because both are crucial to the plot of the story. Secondly, the subject "Apache Sam" provides an additional Native American character subject, while the subject "Chinese" provides an additional ethnic group for comparison. More importantly, it is noted that no Native American subject, except the "Mummy" subject, appears with great frequency so that measurement of the subject "Apache Sam" adds to the overall sample size for Native Americans in ethnic comparisons.

It is seen from Table 9, using the same null hypothesis ($H_0$) and alpha error, or level of significance, calculated $X^2 = 148.8$ with df = 16. The table $X^2_{.01 \ df=16} = 32.0$ and is less than the calculated $X^2$ and as such the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the distributional differences found in Table 9 are statistically significant for the subjects in the book.
Table 9
The Spirit is Willing (Book #3): Observed Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (4.21%)</td>
<td>21 (3.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>326 (91.57%)</td>
<td>501 (93.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>15 (4.21%)</td>
<td>21 (3.93%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>356 (99.99%)</td>
<td>535 (100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratios

\[ X^2 \approx 148.8 \quad df = 16 \quad X^2_{.01 \text{ df}=16} = 32.0 \quad p < .001 \]

\(^*--indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution\)
The Spirit is Willing. Evaluative and descriptive term frequencies, then, are directly related to or dependent upon who the subjects are ($H_a$). Furthermore, Table 9 demonstrates that the negative term frequency distribution for the subject "Indians" (#6) is individually statistically significant. This means that the observed term frequency in this one cell alone accounts for the significance in the distribution of terms and to which subjects they apply. The negatively biased portrayal of the subject "Indians," therefore, also is statistically and substantively significant in comparison to the other subjects within this book.

Since this chi-square analysis is statistically significant, it is of interest to further analyze the results. First of all, Table 9 lists the ratios of positive to negative words that provide some additional interesting results. The ratios range from a high of 1.6154 for the subject "Carrie" (#2) to a low of .0690 for the subject "Indians" (#6). This means, again, that for the subject "Carrie" the source utilizes 162 positive words for every one hundred negative terms, which is a substantively significantly positive portrayal of this subject. Conversely, the source uses only seven positive words for every one hundred negative terms to evaluatively portray the subject "Indians." This is clearly a negative portrayal of the subject "Indians," which is of even greater interest when combined with the fact that the subject is also statistically
significantly negatively portrayed. Generally, the ratios for the other subjects indicate and substantiate the trend to more positively evaluate Non-Native Americans than Native Americans by the source in this book, The Spirit is Willing. Secondly, subjects are further analyzed for this book, as presented in Table 10, by scope or page frequency, depth or word frequency, and statistical scores for the Coefficient of Evaluation and Evaluativeness Score.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Portia</td>
<td>93 (3)*</td>
<td>356 (3)*</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Carrie</td>
<td>136 (1)</td>
<td>535 (1)</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Non-Indians</td>
<td>134 (2)</td>
<td>493 (2)</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mummy</td>
<td>60 (4)</td>
<td>160 (4)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Mexicans</td>
<td>17 (5)</td>
<td>146 (6)</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>15 (6)</td>
<td>88 (8)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Geronimo</td>
<td>10 (7)</td>
<td>42 (9)</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Chinese</td>
<td>7 (9)</td>
<td>89 (7)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Apache Sam</td>
<td>8 (8)</td>
<td>148 (5)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a—Coefficient of Evaluation = \(100 \frac{F}{F + U}\), where \(F\) = total favorable terms and \(U\) = total unfavorable terms

b—Evaluative Score = \(100 \frac{\text{Total Evaluative Words}}{\text{Total Words}}\)

*—indicates ranking
It is seen that for this book, *The Spirit is Willing*, the two frequencies are ranked the same for the first four subjects. The subject of interest, however, is "Apache Sam" (#9) who is ranked eighth on page frequency with only eight pages, but is ranked fifth on the total words frequency just behind subject number four, "Mummy," which appears on nearly eight times as many pages. Clearly, the subject "Apache Sam," who appears only in the conversations of others, received little scope in the book, yet the depth of the portrayal is extensive, indicating a latent portrayal of the subject. Another trend found in these frequency rankings is that non-Anglo subjects (#4-#9) are all found to be secondary characters or groups in the book, although several are important to the plot. A parallel trend is observed in the statistical Coefficient of Evaluation scores, which demonstrates that these same subjects (#4-#9) are all negatively skewed (<25%), with the subject "Indians" (#6) being the most negatively evaluated subject in the book with six percent. It is interesting to note that the subject group "Non-Indians" (#3) is also negatively evaluated, although not substantively significant (i.e., 37% > 25%). Additionally, an important trend is noted in the Evaluativeness Scores where Native American subjects (#4, #6, #7, and #9) rank highest in the proportion of evaluative terms. Furthermore, the portrayals of Native American subjects "Indians" (#6), "Geronimo (#7), and "Apache Sam" (#9), are more
evaluative than expected (>10%). The largest Evaluativeness Score found is for the subject "Indians" (#6) which is thirty-six percent, indicating that more than one-third of the portrayals of "Indians" are judgmental.

In looking at the data distribution in Table 9 for the book The Spirit is Willing, it is seen that the subjects "Portia" (#1), "Carrie" (#2), "Non-Indians" (#3), "Mummy" (#4), "Mexicans" (#5), and "Chinese" (#8), all have, as expected, a preponderance of descriptive terms (>90%). Conversely, three of the four Native American subjects are less descriptive than expected: (1) "Indians" (#6), 63% < 90%; (2) "Geronimo" (#7), 86% < 90%; and (3) "Apache Sam" (#9), 87% < 90%. Moreover, as a group subject, "Indians" are portrayed by less than two-thirds descriptive terms, which means that more than one-third of the portrayals of "Indians" in this book are evaluative. Further analysis of the types of terms used for each subject would be interesting. Table 11, therefore, ranks each subject by percentage frequency of type of term.

The rankings in Table 11 indicate some very interesting trends. First, Native American subjects are the top four ranked subjects for negative evaluations. The group subject "Indians" (#6) is the most negatively evaluated, while the more ambiguous character subject "Mummy" (#4) is the least negatively evaluated Native American subject. Second, Native American subjects are the
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)* Portia (4.21%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6) Indians (33.72%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2) Carrie (93.64%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2) Carrie (3.93%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(7) Geronimo (11.90%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3) Non-Indians (93.51%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9) Apache Sam (2.70%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(9) Apache Sam (10.13%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(5) Mexicans (92.47%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3) Non-Indians (2.43%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(4) Mummy (6.88%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(8) Chinese (92.13%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(7) Geronimo (2.38%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(8) Chinese (6.74%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1) Portia (91.57%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(6) Indians (2.33%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(5) Mexicans (6.16%)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(4) Mummy (91.25%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(4) Mummy (1.88%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(1) Portia (4.21%)</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9) Apache Sam (87.16%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5) Mexicans (1.37%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(3) Non-Indians (4.06%)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(7) Geronimo (85.71%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(8) Chinese (1.12%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(2) Carrie (2.43%)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(6) Indians (63.95%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*--indicates the subject number
bottom four ranked subjects for neutral or descriptive evaluations. Closer observation further demonstrates that the negative and neutral term rankings for Native American subjects are inversely related. A third result from these rankings concerns the other two non-Anglo or minority group subjects, "Mexicans" (#5) and "Chinese" (#8). These two group subjects are ranked last in positive evaluations and between Native American and other Non-Native American subjects in negative judgments, yet are ranked fairly high for neutral portrayals. That is, the portrayals for the subjects "Mexicans" and "Chinese" are both more descriptive than all Native American subjects and one Non-Native American character subject, "Portia" (#1). A further interesting result is found for the subject "Apache Sam" (#9), which is based upon a smaller sampling than the other subjects, yet the subject is ranked third on both positive and negative evaluations and number seven on neutral words. This corroborates the results, discussed above, concerning the unusually evaluative, though ambivalent, portrayal of the subject "Apache Sam."

Statistical analysis of the results demonstrates that in the book The Spirit is Willing,Native American subjects—especially the subject "Indians" (#6)—are both substantively and statistically negatively portrayed. In addition to this biased degree of quality, the portrayals of Native Americans are also proportionately more
evaluative. Native Americans, furthermore, are more negatively portrayed than are all Non-Native Americans, including "Mexicans" (#5) and "Chinese" (#8).


The fourth book analyzed in this study is Evelyn Sibley Lampman's Squaw Man's Son. The book is 173 pages long, including the cover page, and is listed as being fifth grade and above reading level by Wilson's Children's Catalog (1981:496). The subjects in the book are too numerous to evaluate individually and, therefore, many individual character subjects are included in their respective group categories or subjects. As such, there are four Native American individual character subjects, two Native American group subjects, one Non-Native American individual subject, and two Non-Native American group subjects for a total of nine subjects actually measured for this book.

In Table 12, as with the previous book analyses, the statistic of chi-square ($X^2$), which tests to see if the terms used are independent of the subjects, is presented. Once again, this is done to more closely determine if the differences across the cells exist because the terms are related to the subjects, or if the differences exist simply because of chance alone or because of sampling error. Chi-square tests utilize the following null
### Table 12

**Squaw Man's Son (Book #4): Observed Word Frequencies**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Billy (#1)</td>
<td>(19)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Captain (#2)</td>
<td>(16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Father (#3)</td>
<td>(17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Mother (#4)</td>
<td>(6)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Indians (#5)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Soldiers (#6)</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Modocs (#7)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-Indians (#8)</td>
<td>(9)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scarface (#9)</td>
<td>(7)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.52%)</td>
<td>(3.58%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(3.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(0.55%)</td>
<td>(0.31%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.51%)</td>
<td>(1.34%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.01%)</td>
<td>(2.09%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>718</td>
<td>504</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>406</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>560</td>
<td>642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>318</td>
<td>3797</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(95.10%)</td>
<td>(90.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(93.68%)</td>
<td>(95.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(91.32%)</td>
<td>(96.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(94.12%)</td>
<td>(95.82%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(91.12%)</td>
<td>(93.55%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.38%)</td>
<td>(5.60%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td>(1.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(18.13%)</td>
<td>(3.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.37%)</td>
<td>(2.84%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.88%)</td>
<td>(4.36%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th></th>
<th>755</th>
<th>477</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>538</td>
<td>196</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>182</td>
<td>327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>595</td>
<td>670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>349</td>
<td>4059</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ratios</th>
<th></th>
<th>1.0556</th>
<th>.6400</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>2.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.0000</td>
<td>.0303</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.0833</td>
<td>.3462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4737</td>
<td>.2917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.4802</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 125.1 \quad df = 16 \quad x^2_{.01} df=16 \approx 32.0 \quad p < .001 \]

*---indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution*
hypothesis, alternative hypothesis, and level of significance or alpha error of $\alpha = .01$:

$H_0$: Evaluative and descriptive terms are not related to the subjects.

$H_a$: Evaluative and descriptive terms are related to the subjects.

For this particular book, *Squaw Man's Son*, it is found that calculated $X^2 = 125.1$ with $df = 16$. Using the above null hypothesis and alpha level, the table chi-square is $X^2_{.01 df=16} = 31.9$. Since the critical $X^2$ value is less than the calculated $X^2$ value the null hypothesis is rejected. This means that the evaluative and descriptive term distributional differences across the cells in Table 12 are statistically significant for the subjects in this book. Furthermore, it is seen from Table 12 that the negative cell distribution or portrayal for the subject "Indians" (#5) is individually statistically significant. This means that the observed negative term frequency in this one cell alone accounts for most of the significance in the distribution of terms. In comparison to the other subjects within this book, then, the fact that the subject "Indians" is negatively evaluated to the degree that it is, is uniquely significant.

Since the chi-square analysis is statistically significant, it is of interest to further analyze the results. First of all, of related interest, are the ratios of positive to negative
evaluations found in Table 12 for each subject and the book as a whole. It is seen that the highest ratio is for the subject "Mother" (#4) at 2.0000, while the lowest is observed for the subject group "Indians" (#5) at .0303. This latter ratio is extremely significant because of its very low value, and also because the negative cell of this ratio is statistically significant. Furthermore, the negative evaluation for the subject "Indians" at eighteen percent is three times greater than the next largest evaluative portrayal, which is the negative evaluation of the subject "Scarface Charley" (#9) at almost seven percent. These ratios indicate that for the subject "Mother" the source uses two hundred positive terms for every one hundred negative words, whereas for the subject "Indians" the source utilizes three positive terms for every one hundred negative words to portray the respective subjects. As would be expected, the ratio for the major character subject "Billy" (#1) is very close to being balanced (1.0556); i.e., a ratio of 1.0000 would mean a balance of positive to negative evaluations or an ambivalent portrayal. Secondly, the subjects are further analyzed for this book as presented in Table 13, by frequency of pages mentioning the subject, the total frequency of descriptive and evaluative terms, the Coefficient of Evaluation, and Evaluativeness Scores.
### Table 13

*Squaw Man's Son* (Book #4): Page and Word Frequencies, Coefficient of Evaluation, and Evaluativeness Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Billy</td>
<td>161 (1)*</td>
<td>755 (1)*</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Captain</td>
<td>71 (5)</td>
<td>447 (5)</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jack</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Father</td>
<td>65 (6)</td>
<td>538 (4)</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Mother</td>
<td>46 (8)</td>
<td>196 (8)</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>55 (7)</td>
<td>182 (9)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Soldiers</td>
<td>76 (4)</td>
<td>327 (7)</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Modocs</td>
<td>119 (2)</td>
<td>595 (3)</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Non-</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>105 (3)</td>
<td>670 (2)</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Scarface</td>
<td>43 (9)</td>
<td>349 (6)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a---Coefficient of Evaluation = \( \frac{100 \ (F)}{F + U} \), where F = total favorable terms and U = total unfavorable terms

b---Evaluativeness Score = \( \frac{100 \ (\text{Total Evaluative Words})}{\text{Total Words}} \)

*---indicates ranking

The page and total word frequencies are indicative of the major characters and groups in the book—that is, it would be expected that the major characters would be ranked highest on both page and word frequencies. There are, however, some interesting discrepancies between the two measures for various subjects. The group subjects of "Indians" (#5), "Soldiers" (#6), and "Modocs"
(7) all are portrayed in a narrower depth or ranking (given in parentheses next to the frequencies listed above) in terms of descriptive and evaluative terms in comparison to their scope or page frequencies. Secondly, both the subjects "Father" (#3) (also Non-Indian) and "Non-Indians" (#8) have greater depth of coverage in words than would be predicted by their respective page frequencies. These differences in frequencies can be inferred as unconscious portrayals by the source. The page or appearance frequencies that are low for certain subjects present a manifest illusion of their being minor subjects, but are in fact latently much more important subjects because they are treated in greater depth. A third point of interest is the large difference in rankings for the Native American subject "Scarface Charley" (#9). "Scarface Charley," having been mentioned on the minimum number of pages for inclusion in this analysis, ranks ninth in page frequency and sixth in total word frequency. Lastly, the subject "Soldiers" (#6) is notable because by page frequency the subject is considered a major identifiable group in the book, yet the total coverage by descriptive and evaluative words is ranked much lower than for page frequency. This discrepancy may be inferred, again, as unconscious treatment by the source. Manifestly it appears that the subject "Soldiers" plays an important part in the book, but latently the subject's portrayal is really limited to that of
a minor subject because of the lesser depth or word frequency.

While none of the Coefficient of Evaluation scores for subjects are skewed in the positive portrayal direction, several are skewed in the negative direction: (1) "Indians" (3%); (2) "Soldiers" (8%); and (3) "Scarface Charley" (23%). This means, again, that the larger the score the more favorable the portrayal, while conversely, the smaller the score the less favorable or more unfavorable the portrayal. As a percentage of favorable terms to total evaluative words, the Coefficient of Evaluation scores range from zero to one hundred percent. As such, the scores for a normal distribution would be expected to be between twenty-five and seventy-five percent, and scores outside this range can be considered skewed and, therefore, significant. Additionally, scores between fifty and seventy-five percent are in the positive direction but ambivalent, while scores between twenty-five and fifty percent are in the negative direction but ambivalent. Coefficient of Evaluation scores, then, range from a low of three percent for the subject "Indians" (#5) to a high of sixty-seven percent for the character subject "Mother" (#4). In general, group subjects are subject to evaluative terms relatively more often than character subjects by the source, and Native American group subjects (#5, #7) are negatively evaluated relatively more
often than Non-Native American group subjects (#6, #8).

Interestingly, the two most negatively evaluated subjects are "Indians" (#4) and "Soldiers" (#6), which, it is noted, are frequently portrayed as antagonists and protagonists in the various medias. The Evaluativeness Score, or the percentage of value judgments expressed by the source about a subject relative to the total words, provides another statistic on the subjects. From Table 13, then, it is observed that the subject group "Indians" (#5) has twice as many evaluative judgments (19%) than any other subject. Additionally, the two Native American character subjects, "Captain Jack" (#2) and "Scarface Charley" (#9), both have the second greatest number of evaluative judgments (9%).

In looking at the distribution of scores in Table 12 for *Squaw Man's Son* it is clear that the overwhelming number of words used in association with subjects are neutral or descriptive terms. The percentage of descriptive or neutral terms for the subject "Indians" (#5), however, is to be noted as being lower than predicted (81.32% < 90%) for books in general. As such, it is of interest to analyze the types of terms used to portray subjects. Table 14, therefore, ranks the subjects for each type of term and for each character.

The rankings in Table 14 indicate several interesting trends and results. First, the subject "Captain Jack" (#2) is
Table 14
Squaw Man's Son (Book #4): Positive, Negative, and Neutral Word Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)* Captain Jack</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(9) Scarface Charley</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(6) Soldiers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.58%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(6.88%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(96.02%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3) Father</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(2) Captain Jack</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4) Mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(5.60%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(95.41%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4) Mother</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(7) Modocs</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1) Billy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.06%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.37%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(95.10%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(1) Billy</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(6) Soldiers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(7) Modocs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.52%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(94.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(9) Scarface Charley</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3) Father</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>(3) Father</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.01%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(3.16%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(93.68%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>(7) Modocs</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(8) Non-Indians</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>(9) Scarface Charley</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.51%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(11.34%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(91.12%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>(8) Non-Indians</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(1) Billy</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>(2) Captain Jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(11.34%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(2.38%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(90.83%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>(5) Indians</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(4) Mother</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>(5) Indians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.55%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(1.53%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(81.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>(6) Soldiers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(0.31%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*—indicates the subject number
ranked first in positive evaluations. Second, Native American subjects, including "Captain Jack," compose the top four rankings for negative evaluations. Third, like book number three, the top three ranked negatively evaluated subjects (#5, #9, #2) are inversely the bottom three ranked descriptive subjects (#9, #2, #5). Contrary to results discussed above, the rankings in Table 14 clearly indicate that the subject "Soldiers" (#6) is the most descriptive portrayal in the book Squaw Man's Son, although the evaluative portion of the portrayal is essentially negative.

Lastly, it is found that the specific Native American group subject "Modocs" (#7), in comparison to the general subject group "Indians" (#5), is more descriptively portrayed. Furthermore, the subject "Modocs" is fairly evenly balanced in rankings across types of terms and is more balanced in its evaluative portrayal than the subject "Indians." It is inferred, therefore, that the source is more evaluative about "Indians" in general than for the specific group "Modocs."

Statistical analysis of the results demonstrates that for the book Squaw Man's Son, Native American subjects—especially the subject "Indians" (#5)—are negatively portrayed both substantively and statistically speaking. Generally, portrayals of Native American subjects are more evaluative than those of Non-Native American subjects, although there are exceptions for both (e.g., "Mother")
("Father" (#3)). Lastly, although both the subject
"Indians" (#5) and the subject "Soldiers" (#6) have significantly
low Coefficient of Evaluation scores, the subjects are diametrically
neutrally described. That is, the subject "Soldier" is the most
descriptive portrayal in the book, while the subject "Indians" is
the most evaluative portrayal in the book.

Book Number Five (#5): Sarah Bishop (Boston: Houghton Mifflin
Company, 1980).

The fifth book to be analyzed in this study is Sarah Bishop,
which is also by Scott O'Dell. The book is 186 pages long, including
the cover page and the author's forward, and is listed as being
sixth grade and up reading level by Wilson's Children's Catalog
(1982:62). There are more than twenty-eight characters and groups
in the story, but only five main subjects are measured and analyzed.
Subjects are grouped to obtain the maximum scope and depth without
great variance, yet allow for a sample and valid analysis of the
book. Initially nine subjects were selected, but it was later
decided that three of the subjects were minor enough to be included
in the subject "Non-Indians." The subjects, then, include one
Native American character subject, one Native American group subject,
one Non-Native American character subject, and two Non-Native
American group subjects.

It is seen from Table 15, using the same null hypothesis
Table 15
Sarah Bishop (Book #5): Observed Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>British (#1)</th>
<th>Sarah (#2)</th>
<th>Indians (#3)</th>
<th>Non-Indians (#4)</th>
<th>Longknives (#5)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.85%)</td>
<td>(0.95%)</td>
<td>(1.19%)</td>
<td>(0.56%)</td>
<td>(1.63%)</td>
<td>(1.15%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>826</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>867</td>
<td>466</td>
<td>3033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(96.92%)</td>
<td>(97.75%)</td>
<td>(96.44%)</td>
<td>(97.53%)</td>
<td>(95.10%)</td>
<td>(96.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.23%)</td>
<td>(1.30%)</td>
<td>(2.37%)</td>
<td>(1.91%)</td>
<td>(3.27%)</td>
<td>(1.85%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>650</td>
<td>845</td>
<td>253</td>
<td>889</td>
<td>490</td>
<td>3127</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(99.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>1.5000</td>
<td>.7273</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.2941</td>
<td>.5000</td>
<td>.6207</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 15.3 \quad df = 8 \quad \chi^2_{.01 df=8} = 20.0 \quad p < .10 \]
(H₀) and alpha error, or level of significance, that calculated
\( \chi^2 = 15.3 \) with \( df = 8 \). The table \( \chi^2_{0.01 \ df=8} = 20.0 \), which is
greater than the calculated \( \chi^2 \) and as such the null hypothesis
is not rejected. This means that the overall distributional
differences found among terms used to describe and evaluate subjects
in this book do not vary significantly at the .01 (alpha) level.
The differences, however, are nearly significant at the .05 level,
and are significant at the .10 level.

Although the chi-square analysis is rejected at the .01
level, it is noted that this level of significance is very rigid
for an exploratory study such as this one. Normally an alpha
level of .10 in an exploratory study can be considered acceptable.
In any case, it is of interest to further analyze the results for
this book, Sarah Bishop. First of all, it is observed that Table 15
also lists the ratios of positive to negative terms, which provides
some interesting results. It is observed that the ratios of
positive to negative terms range from a high of 1.5000 for the
subject group "British" (#1) to a low of .2941 for the subject
group "Non-Indians" (#4). This means that for the subject "British"
the source utilizes 150 positive words for every one hundred negative
terms, which is a substantively significantly positive portrayal of
the subject "British." Conversely, for the subject "Non-Indians"
the source uses only twenty-nine positive terms for every one
hundred negative words. Both Native American subjects (3, 5) have twice as many negative terms with a positive to negative ratio of .5000. Although most ratios are less than balanced, the ratio for "Non-Indians" is unusually low, which tends to indicate a substantively significantly negative portrayal of this subject in Sarah Bishop. Secondly, subjects are analyzed for this book, as presented in Table 16, by scope or page frequency, depth or word frequency, and statistical scores for the Coefficient of Evaluation and Evaluativeness Score.

Table 16
Sarah Bishop (Book #5): Page and Word Frequencies, Coefficient of Evaluation, and Evaluativeness Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation (%)</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>British</td>
<td>121 (3)*</td>
<td>650 (3)*</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sarah</td>
<td>183 (1)</td>
<td>845 (2)</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Indians</td>
<td>20 (5)</td>
<td>253 (5)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Non-Indians</td>
<td>151 (2)</td>
<td>889 (1)</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Longknifes</td>
<td>41 (4)</td>
<td>490 (4)</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a--Coefficient of Evaluation = \( \frac{100 \cdot F}{F + U} \), where \( F \) = total favorable terms and \( U \) = total unfavorable terms

b--Evaluativeness Score = \( \frac{100 \cdot \text{Total Evaluative Words}}{\text{Total Words}} \)

*--indicates ranking
The page and word frequencies, again, indicate which subjects are the major characters or groups in the book. It is observed that Native American subjects (#3, #5) are minor subjects, being ranked fourth and fifth on both the page and word frequencies, indicating a balance in depth and scope of their portrayals, which is substantively significant to this study. The subject "British" (#1) also has a balanced portrayal, ranking number three on both frequencies. The subject "Sarah" (#2) and "Non-Indians" (#4) are reversed in their rankings, but the difference is not that great considering the broadness of the latter subject; that is, "Non-Indians" encompasses many characters and groups.

Once again it is observed that none of the Coefficient of Evaluation scores for the subjects are positively skewed, although the score for the subject group "British" (#1) is ambivalent in the positive direction. Four of the five scores, conversely, are in the negative direction, with the score for the subject "Non-Indians" (#4) being negatively skewed (23% < 25%), which therefore yields a mean negative Coefficient of Evaluation for Sarah Bishop of twenty-six percent (see Appendix G). Furthermore, Native American subjects (#3, #5) are observed to be consistently evaluated in the negative direction with both having a Coefficient of Evaluation score of thirty-three percent, while Non-Native American subjects (#1, #2, #4) exhibit a broad range of Coefficient
of Evaluation Scores (23%-60%). The Evaluativeness Score, however, provides a substantively significant finding in that none of the subjects are very evaluatively portrayed as all scores are less than ten percent. This finding is reinforced by looking at Table 15, from which it is observed that all subjects are overwhelmingly descriptively portrayed as predicted (>90%). Regardless, it is noted that Native American subjects are more evaluatively portrayed than are Non-Native Americans. It is further observed that the portrayal of the character subject "Longknifes" (#5) is more evaluative than that for the group subject "Indians" (#3). Conversely, portrayal of the Non-Native American character subject (#2) is less evaluative than that for Non-Native American group subjects (#1, #4).

In looking at the data distribution in Table 16 once again, it is noted that for the book Sarah Bishop all subjects have, as predicted, a preponderance of descriptive terms (>90%). Additionally, because the book was published after 1975 it is predicted that subjects will be more neutrally portrayed by the use of a higher percentage of descriptive terms. This proposed result is found to be true in Sarah Bishop for all subjects: (1) "Sarah" (97.75% > 95%); (2) "Longknifes" (95.10% > 95%); (3) "British" (96.92% > 95%); (4) "Non-Indians" (97.53% > 95%); and (5) "Indians" (96.44% > 95%). It is noted, nonetheless, that Native American
subjects have the least descriptive portrayals, or rather that the portrayals are the most evaluative. Further analysis of the types of terms used for each subject would be interesting. Table 17, therefore, ranks each subject by percentage frequency of terms.

Table 17
Sarah Bishop (Book #5):
Positive, Negative, and Neutral Word Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)* British (1.85%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(5) Longknifes (3.27%)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2) Sarah (97.75%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(5) Longknifes (1.63%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(3) Indians (2.37%)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(4) Non-Indians (97.53%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>(3) Indians (1.19%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(4) Non-Indians (1.91%)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>(1) British (96.92%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2) Sarah (0.95%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(2) Sarah (1.30%)</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>(3) Indians (96.44%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>(4) Non-Indians (0.56%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(1) British (1.23%)</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>(5) Longknifes (95.10%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*—indicates the subject number

In looking at Table 17 some very interesting and substantively significant trends stand out. First, as with previous books analyzed in this study, the two Native American subjects (#5, #3) are ranked first and second in negative terms. Secondly, it is observed again that the descriptive or neutral rankings for
Native American subjects are both inversely ranked (#3, #5) from the negative term rankings and ranked fourth and fifth, or lowest, in descriptive portrayals. These results, then, tend to substantiate other results discussed above. Another interesting trend is observed for the subject "British" (#1), which has been shown to have a positive Coefficient of Evaluation. The subject "British" ranks first in positive words, last in negative terms, and in the middle for neutral words, which combine to present a very positive evaluative portrayal. That is, holding the fact that the portrayal is considered descriptive, that portion of the portrayal that is evaluative is given the illusion of being very positive. This is accomplished through the process of utilizing more positive terms and less negative words for the subject "British" in relationship to the other characters. This is the same process employed for Native American subjects, which allows the source to covertly evaluatively portray subjects. That this technique is used, is best substantiated by the trend found in Sarah Bishop and other books to inversely correlate negative and positive portrayals for Native American subjects. This result is corroborated by a last result observed in Table 17. While the portrayals of Native Americans, as well as all other subjects, are uniquely descriptive, the subjects also rank high on both positive and negative evaluations. This means, therefore, that the book Sarah Bishop, while
being overtly descriptive or having very small percentages of evaluative portrayals, actually portrays Native Americans negatively as indicated by these trends.

Substantive and partial statistical analysis of the results demonstrates that in the book Sarah Bishop Native Americans are negatively portrayed relative to Non-Native Americans. More significant, however, is the fact that it is the only book in this study that meets the predicted results concerning increased descriptive portrayals. Furthermore, it is shown that, despite improved evaluativeness, the source still portrays Native Americans the same way as the other sources in this study. Lastly, it is interesting that the Native American character subject "Longknives" (#5) has the most evaluative portrayal, rather than the group subject "Indians" (#3) as generally found in the other books.


The last book to be analyzed, Where the Buffaloes Begin, was written by Olaf Baker but copyrighted by Frederick Warne and Company, Incorporated. The book in unpaged (unp), but is forty-four pages long, including the front and back cover pages, and is listed by Wilson's Children's Catalog under fiction as being at the second to fourth grade reading level (1982:52). The book contains two human subjects, which are measured and analyzed, and one nonhuman
subject--buffaloes--which was measured but is not analyzed here because it proved to be the only subject of its type in this study and is outside the definitions, or scope, provided in the procedures discussion in chapter two. As with the first book, Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, this source presents all Native American subjects, but in a we-they dichotomy. There is, then, one "we" character subject and one "they" group subject in the book. It is noted, qualitatively, that this dichotomy is exaggerated by the fact that the "we" subject is an identifiable character subject "Little Wolf" (#1), while the "they" subject is an impersonal, but specified, group subject "Assiniboines" (#2).

It is seen from Table 18 that in the chi-square analysis for this particular book, using the same null hypothesis ($H_0$) and alpha error or level of significance, $X^2 = 10.1$ with df = 2. The chi-square table shows that $X_{0.01}^2 = 9.2$. Since the table $X^2$ is less than the computed $X^2$, the null hypothesis is rejected, indicating that the differences in the distributions in Table 18 are statistically significant and that the terms vary by subject. Evaluative and descriptive term frequencies, then, are directly related to, or dependent upon, the subjects ($H_a$) and who the subjects are...

Since chi-square analysis is statistically significant, it is of interest to further analyze the results. First of all,
Table 18
Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6): Observed Word Frequencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Wolf (#1)</td>
<td>Assiniboines (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7 (5.34%)</td>
<td>3 (2.78%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>118 (90.08%)</td>
<td>87 (80.56%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6 (4.58%)</td>
<td>18 (16.67%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>131 (100.00%)</td>
<td>108 (100.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratios

\[
\frac{+}{-} = 1.1667, \quad \frac{1}{.1667} = .4167
\]

\[X^2 = 10.1, \quad df = 2, \quad X^2_{.01 df=2} = 9.2, \quad p < .01\]
it is observed that Table 18 lists the ratios of positive to negative words, which are very interesting. The obvious result is the substantively significantly large difference in the ratios. The obvious trend is the negativeness and imbalance in the portrayal of the subject group "Assiniboines" (#2), and the more balanced portrayal of the character subject "Little Wolf" (#1). The ratio of positive to negative evaluative terms for the subject "Little Wolf" is found to be 1.1667, which is a nearly balanced portrayal with the source using 116 positive words for every one hundred negative words. Conversely, the ratio of positive to negative terms for the subject "Assiniboines" is substantively significantly skewed in the negative direction with a ratio of .1667, which means that for every sixteen positive terms the source utilizes one hundred negative words to evaluate the subject "Assiniboines."

Subjects are also analyzed, as found in Table 19, by word and page frequencies, and by Coefficient of Evaluation and Evaluativeness Scores.

In looking at the subject portrayals it is seen that subject number one, "Little Wolf," the major character subject in the story, has 3.67 times the scope in appearances or page frequencies as the other subject, "Assiniboines." Conversely, the depth or word frequency for "Little Wolf" is only 1.12 times that of "Assiniboines." More importantly, however, is the
significantly higher proportion of words to pages for the "they" subject "Assiniboines" (#2), which is eighteen to one, than for the "we" subject "Little Wolf" (#1), which is found to be just under six to one. This difference is, again, inferred to be an unconscious and latent evaluative portrayal of the "they" subject "Assiniboines." It is noted, however, that both subjects rank the same on both frequency counts, which manifestly and latently indicates balanced portrayals between subjects. Yet, the ratios of words to pages, pages to pages, and words to words, indicate that the portrayals are covertly imbalanced between the "we" and the "they" subjects. The Coefficient of Evaluation scores also indicate a substantial difference between the we-they subjects, where the subject group "Assiniboines" is substantively significantly skewed toward a very negative evaluation or portrayal (14% < 25%), whereas the subject character "Little Wolf" is found to be ambivalent but in the positive direction (52% > 50%). The scores, it is remembered, are expected to normally range from twenty-five to seventy-five percent, with fifty percent being perfectly ambivalent in evaluativeness. Scores on either side of the range are considered, thereby, substantively significant. Scores greater than fifty percent indicate positive evaluative portrayals and scores less than fifty percent indicate negative portrayals. While the range for ambivalence is left ambiguous,
it is generally conceived of as including scores between thirty-three and sixty-six percent. Thus a score of thirty-eight percent is ambivalent in the negative direction, and the score fifty-two percent is ambivalent in the positive direction, while the score fourteen percent is significantly negative. The second analytical technique, the Evaluativeness Score, additionally demonstrates that the source uses nearly twice the number of judgmental terms to portray the "they" subject "Assiniboines" (19%) as for the "we" subject "Little Wolf" (10%), both of which are, furthermore, substantively significantly greater than predicted for a book published after 1975 (>5%). More significant and relevant to this study, however, is that the Evaluativeness Scores statistically substantiate that portrayals of Native Americans, both "we" and "they" subjects, are again becoming significantly evaluative. The portrayals in this book, Where the Buffaloes Begin, are the second most evaluative in this study. Another trend inferred from these results is that books (i.e., Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1), Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6)) in which sources employ we-they dichotomies with Native American subjects only are substantively significantly more evaluative than books (i.e., Sing Down the Moon (Book #2), The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), Squaw Man's Son (Book #4), Sarah Bishop (Book #5)) that employ Native American-Non-Native American ethnic comparisons.
Table 19
Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6): Page and Word Frequencies, Coefficient of Evaluation, and Evaluativeness Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subject Number</th>
<th>Subject</th>
<th>Page Frequency</th>
<th>Word Frequency</th>
<th>Coefficient of Evaluation</th>
<th>Evaluativeness Score</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Little Wolf</td>
<td>22 (1)*</td>
<td>131 (1)*</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Assiniboines</td>
<td>6 (2)</td>
<td>108 (2)</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a—Coefficient of Evaluation = \( \frac{100\, (F)}{F + U} \), where F = total favorable terms and U = total unfavorable terms.

b—Evaluativeness Score = \( \frac{100\, (\text{Total Evaluative Words})}{\text{Total Words}} \).

*—indicates ranking.

The distribution of scores in Table 18 for Where the Buffaloes Begin shows that the "we" subject "Little Wolf" (#1) has a larger percentage of descriptive words than the "they" subject "Assiniboines" (#2). It is also clear that, although the subject "Little Wolf" barely has a greater percentage of neutral words than proposed for books in general (90.08% > 90%), both major subjects have smaller percentages of descriptive portrayals than predicted for books published after 1975 (#1: 90.08% < 95%; #2: 80.56% < 95%). The percentage difference for the "they" subject is almost fifteen percent and, therefore, is substantively significant. This difference between the we-they subjects in positive to
negative terms, once again, stands out. These results, then, suggest further analysis of the terms by type, found in Table 20, that ranks subjects by frequency percentages.

Table 20
Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6):
Positive, Negative, and Neutral Word Rankings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Negative</th>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)*</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>(1)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Little Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assiniboines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Wolf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.34%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(16.67%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(90.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(1)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>(2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Assiniboines</td>
<td></td>
<td>Little Wolf</td>
<td></td>
<td>Assiniboines</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.78%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(4.58%)</td>
<td></td>
<td>(80.56%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*—indicates the subject number

In looking at Table 20 several by now familiar trends are observed. First, it is observed that the "we" subject "Little Wolf" (#1) ranks first for positive and neutral evaluations and last for negative evaluations. Conversely, the subject "Assiniboines" (#2) ranks first in negative terms and last in positive and neutral terms. Secondly, and more importantly, it is seen that the rankings for the "they" group, like for Native Americans and "they" subjects in other books, are inversely ranked for negative and neutral portrayals. While both portrayals are found to be substantively significantly evaluative and negative, these results by rank
substantiate that the "they" subject "Assiniboines," which is a specific group subject, also is the most biased portrayal in the book and, indeed, the second most evaluative in this study.

Statistical analyses of the results, then, demonstrate that the book, Where the Buffaloes Begin, significantly portrays Native American subjects and their way of life negatively. The source, by using all Native American subjects and a we-they dichotomy, reverses the general trend to more descriptively portray Native Americans. The portrayals, however, are found to fit the patterns of other books as well. That is to say, the negative portrayal of the "they" subject "Assiniboines" (#2) is inversely related to the descriptive portrayal. Similarly, through other stylistic techniques, the source also compounds the evaluative portrayal for a latent, covert negative portrayal of the "they" subject "Assiniboines."

Comparison of Books

This section of the results chapter will look at distributional differences between books, having observed how Native American and Non-Native American subjects are portrayed within individual books. Data from Tables 3, 6, 9, 12, 15, and 18 have been summated and grouped by either: (1) ethnicity (Native American and Non-Native American) for the books Sing Down the Moon
(Book #2), The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), Squaw Man's Son (Book #4), and Sarah Bishop (Book #5) (see Table 21); or (2) dichotomy ("we" and "they") for Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1) and Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6) (see Table 22). Subjects are also classified by either ethnicity or dichotomy in summarizing the Coefficient of Evaluation and Evaluativeness Scores (see Appendix G). Books number one and number six, Akavak, an Eskimo Journey and Where the Buffaloes Begin, do not contain ethnic separation per se and are dichotomized, therefore, into "we" and "they" groups. In Where the Buffaloes Begin, the "they" group comprises a second specified Native American group (Assiniboines) who are the antagonists to the "we" subject who is from an unnamed Native American group. In Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, the "they" group encompasses a variety of concepts within the Eskimo belief system, while the "we" group includes both Eskimo character subjects. If these term distributions are found to be statistically significant, then ethnicity and dichotomy will be held constant to analyze term distributional differences across books (see Tables 23 and 24). Similarly, books will be held constant to analyze ethnic and dichotomy differences in term distributions (see Tables 25 and 26). As with previous tables, each of these tables contain: (1) positive, neutral, and negative cell frequencies with the frequency percentage in parentheses; (2) the ratio of positive to negative words for each
cell; and (3) the chi-square test of significance, which includes both the table and calculated chi-square values, the degrees of freedom, and the greatest level of significance (e.g., p<.001).

A statistical test of significance is made for the data distribution in Table 21 using chi-square ($X^2$), which tests to see if the terms used in portrayals of Native American and Non-Native American subjects are independent of these subjects. This is done, again, to more closely determine if the differences across cells exist because the terms are related to the subjects, or if the differences exist simply because of chance or sampling error. As such, the null hypothesis ($H_0$), the alternative hypothesis ($H_a$), and level of significance or alpha error ($\alpha$) are established as follows:

$$H_0: \text{Evaluative and descriptive terms are not related to the subjects.}$$

$$H_a: \text{Evaluative and descriptive terms are related to the subjects.}$$

$$\alpha = .01.$$  

Assuming this null hypothesis ($H_0$) and level of significance or alpha level ($\alpha$), it is seen from Table 21 that calculated $X^2 = 203.7$ with df = 14. Since table $X^2_{.01 \ df=14} = 29.1$, which is less than the calculated $X^2$, the null hypothesis is rejected and the observed differences are statistically significant. Additionally, two separate cells within the table are also found
Table 21
Observed Frequencies by Book and Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Books/Ethnicity</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sing Down the Moon (#2)</td>
<td>The Spirit is Willing (#3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA 1</td>
<td>NNA 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.11%)</td>
<td>(2.24%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>2295</td>
<td>317</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(93.22%)</td>
<td>(88.80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>115</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.67%)</td>
<td>(8.96%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Totals

|                | 2462 | 357  | 436  | 1619  | 2524 | 1535  | 743  | 2384  |
|                | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) | (100.00%) |

Ratios

|                | .4522 | .2500 | .1667 | .8095  | .4496 | .5625  | .5000 | .6944  |
|                |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |

\[\chi^2 = 203.7 \quad df = 14 \quad \chi^2_{.01 df=14} = 29.1 \quad p < .001\]

1—NA stands for Native Americans
2—NNA stands for Non-Native Americans
*—indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
to be statistically significant; that is, each cell's difference between observed and expected frequencies is large enough to be greater than $X^2_{.01 df=14} = 29.1$. This means that the observed greater than expected frequency of negative terms to portray Native Americans in book number three, *The Spirit is Willing* by Betty Baker, is by itself statistically significant. Similarly, the observed lower than expected frequency of negative terms to portray Non-Native Americans in book number five, *Sarah Bishop* by Scott O'Dell, is by itself statistically significant. This latter result is particularly noteworthy in that the frequency distributions for *Sarah Bishop* (Book #5) by themselves are found not to be statistically significant. When compared with other books, however, it is found that the low percentage of negative evaluations used by the source to portray Non-Native Americans is indeed significant. This infers that the negative portrayal of Non-Native Americans is significantly less than expected, which would cause, thereby, the seemingly balanced portrayal of Native Americans to be latently more negative. Further comparison shows that the observed frequency of all evaluative terms for both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans in *Sarah Bishop* (Book #5) are less than expected, meaning that the book is less evaluative than would be expected. Conversely, it is found that observed frequencies of all evaluative terms for Native Americans and positive terms for Non-Native Americans in
The Spirit is Willing (Book #3) are greater than expected, meaning that the book is more evaluative than expected. This indicates that the portrayal of Native Americans in The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), then, is manifestly negatively judgmental, while the portrayal of Native Americans in Sarah Bishop (Book #5) is latently negatively judgmental because of the statistically less than expected negative portrayal of Non-Native Americans, but is manifestly descriptive.

Since the chi-square analysis is found to be significant, it is of interest to see if there are any other patterns or trends. First of all, the majority of books listed in Table 21 are found to contain descriptive portrayals (>90%) for both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans. The descriptive portrayal of Native Americans in The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), however, is less than expected (83.94% < 90%), as is the descriptive portrayal of Non-Native Americans in Sing Down the Moon (Book #2) (88.80% < 90%). These differences are substantiated by the Evaluativeness Scores (see Appendix G). In looking at the ratio of positive to negative terms for these two categories it is observed that their ratios are significantly low. It is additionally observed that the ratios for all groups are less than balanced (1.0000), indicating that all evaluations are in the negative direction. The ratios range from a low of .1667 for Native Americans in The Spirit is Willing
(Book #3) to a high of .8095 for Non-Native Americans in the same book. Furthermore, it is found from these ratios that the portrayals of Native Americans in The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), Squaw Man's Son (Book #4), and Sarah Bishop (Book #5) are more negative than the portrayals of Non-Native Americans. Conversely, the portrayals—while not positive portrayals—of Native Americans in Sing Down the Moon (Book #2) are less negative than those for Non-Native Americans. Lastly, it is observed that the differences in ratios within The Spirit is Willing (Book #3) between Native American and Non-Native American subjects is substantively significant. Similarly, the difference in ratios within Sing Down the Moon (Book #2) between Native Americans and Non-Native Americans is observed to be substantively large, if not significant.

A statistical test of significance for the data distribution in Table 22 yields $X^2 = 134.6$ with df = 6. Assuming the same null hypothesis ($H_0$) and level of significance or alpha level as stated above, the table $X^2_{.01 \text{ df}=6} = 16.8$, which is less than the calculated $X^2$. This means the null hypothesis is rejected and the observed differences in Table 22 are statistically significant. Additionally, it is found that the differences in the neutral and negative cells of the "they" category in Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1) are statistically significant on their own accord. This indicates that the observed less than expected frequency of descriptive terms
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Books/We-They</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (#1)</td>
<td>Where the Buffaloes Begin (#2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.04%)</td>
<td>(4.06%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>* 39</td>
<td>1004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(39.39%)</td>
<td>(81.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>* 56</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(56.57%)</td>
<td>(14.45%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>1232</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>.0714</td>
<td>.2809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+1=</td>
<td>(X^2 = 134.6 )</td>
<td>df = 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*--indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
and the observed greater than expected frequency of negative terms used to portray the "they" subjects in Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1) are each separately statistically significant, making the portrayal very negatively judgmental.

Since the chi-square analysis is significant, it is of interest to see if there are many other patterns or trends. First of all, in looking at Table 22 the most striking result is the phenomenal level of the negative evaluations in the portrayal of the "they" subjects (16.67% and 56.57%). Secondly, it is observed that only the "we" category in Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6) has a frequency of descriptive terms greater than predicted (90.08% > 90%). It is further noted that the difference between we-they positive term percentages for Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1) is nearly zero (4.06% ~ 4.04%), but the difference for Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6) is nearly three percent. It is substantively significant that the percentage of positive evaluations for "they" subjects in Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6) is less than in Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1), while for "we" subjects positive evaluations increased. These trends infer that portrayals of "they" subjects have become less positive over time, whereas portrayals of "we" subjects have become more positive. These results are more substantively significant when it is observed that the percentage of negative evaluations for both categories have decreased over time.
Next, in looking at Table 22 it is also seen from the ratios of positive to negative words that the "they" subjects have more negative portrayals and that, more importantly, the portrayal of the "we" subjects in *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6) is in the positive direction \((1.1667 > 1.0000)\). Indeed, based on the ratio of positive to negative evaluations of subjects, the portrayals of the "we" subjects in *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6) are the only positive evaluations in this study. These differences, then, substantively significantly indicate an extreme polarity in the portrayals of "we" and "they" subjects in book number six, *Where the Buffaloes Begin* by Frederick Warne and Company, Incorporated. Similarly for book number one, *Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* by James Houston, while the differences are not as significant, the "they" subjects are relatively more negatively portrayed than the "we" subjects—although both are very negatively portrayed. These results, again, imply that differences in we-they portrayals have increased or gotten worse over time.

Having found considerable statistical significance for both Tables 21 and 22, analyses are make (see Tables 23-26) to try to determine if this statistical significance is due more to book differences or to ethnic/dichotomatic differences. Table 23 shows the distributions for the books *Sing Down the Moon* (Book #2), *The Spirit is Willing* (Book #3), *Squaw Man's Son* (Book #4), and
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Books</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sing. Down the Moon (#2)</td>
<td>The Spirit is Willing (#3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>60 (2.13%)</td>
<td>61 (2.97%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>2612 (92.66%)</td>
<td>1871 (91.05%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>147 (5.21%)</td>
<td>123 (5.99%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>2819 (100.00%)</td>
<td>2055 (100.01%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Ratios**

| +/− | .4082 | .4959 | .4802 | .6207 | .4797 |

\[ x^2 = 90.6 \text{ df } = 6 \quad x^2_{.01 \text{ df } = 6} = 16.8 \quad p < .001 \]

*—indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
Sarah Bishop (Book #5), while holding ethnicity constant. The calculated $X^2 = 90.6$ with $df = 6$, and the table $X^2_{.01 df=6} = 16.8$ using the same null hypothesis ($H_0$) and level of significance or alpha level ($\alpha = .01$). Since the calculated $X^2$ value is greater than the critical $X^2$ value the null hypothesis is again rejected, meaning that the distributional differences in evaluative judgments among books shown in Table 23 are statistically significant. It is seen, however, that the observed lower frequency of negative terms in book number five, Sarah Bishop, is also statistically significant, although it does not solely account for this significance of $X^2$. These results suggest, therefore, that book number five, Sarah Bishop, does indeed show a different pattern when ethnicity is held constant.

Since the chi-square analysis is significant, it is of interest to see if there are any other patterns or trends. First, it is observed that the books are all more descriptive than evaluative (i.e., >90%). Similarly, it is observed in Table 23 that by holding ethnicity constant the differences in evaluative portrayals for the books Sing Down the Moon (Book #2), The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), and Squaw Man's Son (Book #4) are very minimal, while book number five, Sarah Bishop, again stands out, particularly the low negative portrayal. In looking at just evaluative terms, it is observed that the ratios for positive to negative words are
all substantially less than 1.0000 (which would be a balanced portrayal). This means that all evaluative portrayals are more negative than positive, ranging from a low of forty-one positive words for every one hundred negative terms for book number two, Sing Down the Moon, to a high of only sixty-two positive words for every one hundred negative terms to evaluatively portray subjects in book number five, Sarah Bishop. Evaluative portrayals, based upon ratios of positive to negative words, and descriptive portrayals, based upon percentages of neutral words, are ranked by book as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Book</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Ratio</th>
<th>Evaluative Rank</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Descriptive Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Sing Down the Moon</td>
<td>.4082</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>92.66</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The Spirit is Willing</td>
<td>.4959</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>91.05</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Squaw Man's Son</td>
<td>.4802</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>93.55</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Sarah Bishop</td>
<td>.6207</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>96.99</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is seen from the above rankings that book number five, Sarah Bishop, has both the highest evaluative rank or positive to negative terms ratio, and the highest ranking for percentage of descriptive words. Conversely, book number three, The Spirit is Willing, has the second highest positive to negative terms ratio, but the lowest percentage of descriptive terms, while both books number two, Sing Down the Moon, and number four, Squaw Man's Son, rank higher in use of descriptive terms than their ratios of positive to negative terms. Generally,
then, very little of substantive significance is found when ethnicity is held constant.

Table 24 shows the distributions for books *Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* (Book #1) and *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6) while holding the we-they dichotomy constant. It is found that the calculated $X^2 = 8.4$ with df = 2, and the table $X^2_{.01 \ df=2} = 9.2$ using the same null hypothesis ($H_0$) and level of significance or alpha level ($\alpha = .01$). Since the calculated $X^2$ value is less than the critical $X^2$ value, the null hypothesis is not rejected, meaning that the term distributional differences are not significant and terms are independent of books number one and number six (*Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* and *Where the Buffaloes Begin*, respectively). It is noted from Table 24, however, that the term distributional differences are in fact significant at the level of significance or alpha level of $\alpha = .02$. As such, it is valuable to further analyze the data on book differences, holding we-they constant. First, looking at the descriptive portrayal percentages it is seen that neither book is very descriptive, although there has been improvement over time. Similarly, evaluative portrayals are greater than expected (i.e., >10%) although, again, both positive and negative evaluations, and hence the ratios of positive to negative words, have improved over time. Generally, then, very little of significance is found holding we-they constant. Nonetheless, it is observed that books
Table 24

Observed Frequencies by Book with We-They Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (#1)</th>
<th>Where the Buffaloes Begin (#6)</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(4.06%)</td>
<td>(4.18%)</td>
<td>(4.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>1043</td>
<td>205</td>
<td>1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(78.36%)</td>
<td>(85.77%)</td>
<td>(79.49%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(17.58%)</td>
<td>(10.04%)</td>
<td>(16.43%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>1570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(99.99%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>.2308</td>
<td>.4167</td>
<td>.2481</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$X^2 = 8.4$  $df = 2$  $X^2_{.01 df=2} = 9.2$  $p < .02$
having Native American dichotomies of we-they subjects are far more evaluative than books having Native American and Non-Native American ethnic subjects.

Since the results from holding ethnicity and dichotomy constant (see Tables 23 and 24) demonstrate very little substantive or statistical significance between books, except for the very broad tendency for books to apparently be improving. Table 25, then, shows the distributions for Native Americans and Non-Native Americans while holding books constant. A statistical test of significance yields $X^2 = 39.3$ with $df = 2$, while the table $X^2_{.01 df=2} = 9.2$. Since the calculated $X^2$ value is greater than the critical $X^2$ value the null hypothesis is rejected, meaning that the differences in Table 25 are significant and that the types of terms are dependent upon ethnicity. More importantly, it is found that the observed lower rate of negative terms used in portrayals of Non-Native Americans and the observed greater frequency of negative terms found in portrayals of Native Americans are both individually statistically significant so that each cell could account for the statistical significance of $X^2$ in Table 25 by itself. This means that the portrayals of Non-Native Americans in these books—Sing Down the Moon (Book #2), The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), Squaw Man's Son (Book #4), and Sarah Bishop (Book #5)—taken as a whole are significantly ($p<.001$) less negative than
Table 25
Observed Frequencies by Ethnicity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA(^1)</td>
<td>NNA(^2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(2.12%)</td>
<td>(1.88%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>5708</td>
<td>5605</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(92.59%)</td>
<td>(95.08%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>* 326</td>
<td>* 179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(5.29%)</td>
<td>(3.04%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>6165</td>
<td>5895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ratios</td>
<td>.4018</td>
<td>.6201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ x^2 = 39.3 \quad \text{df} = 2 \quad x^2_{.01 \text{ df}=2} = 9.2 \quad p < .001 \]

1--NA stands for Native Americans
2--NNA stands for Non-Native Americans
*--indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
expected, while the portrayals of Native Americans in these same books, taken together, are significantly \( p < 0.001 \) more negative than expected.

Since the chi-square is significant, it is of further interest to see if there are any other patterns or trends. First, it is again noted that the ratio of positive to negative judgments are both less than 1.0000, indicating generally negative evaluations of both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans, however, the ratio of positive to negative words is less for Native Americans than for Non-Native Americans \( (.4018 < .6201) \). Secondly, in looking at Table 25 it is observed that both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans, holding books constant, are more descriptive than evaluative as was predicted (>90%). In terms of evaluative words only, however, it is found that Native Americans are evaluated more frequently. Lastly, it is interesting to note that Native Americans have a larger percentage of positive portrayals than Non-Native Americans, which is substantively significant.

Generally, ethnicity is found to have both statistical and substantive significance, when books are held constant, upon the portrayal of subjects. The difference is, furthermore, individually significant for negative evaluations or judgments. This means that if the subject is Native American the portrayal is significantly negative, whereas the portrayal of Non-Native Americans is
significantly less negative. In sum, then, portrayals of Native Americans are negatively biased because the subjects are Native Americans, and not because of book or source biases.

Table 26 shows the distribution for the dichotomy of we-they subjects while holding the books constant. From the table it is observed that a test of significance provides a calculated $X^2 = 64.8$ with $df = 2$, while the table $X^2_{.01} df=2 = 9.2$. Since the calculated $X^2$ value is greater than the critical $X^2$ value, the null hypothesis is rejected, which means that the relationships in Table 26 are statistically significant. Additionally, it is found that the observed greater frequency of negative evaluations of "they" subjects are independently statistically significant ($p<.001$).

Since the chi-square is significant, it is of further interest to see if there are any other patterns or trends. First, it is observed that the portrayals of both "we" and "they" subjects are substantively significantly less descriptive than would be predicted (i.e., >90%). The descriptive portrayals of "they" subjects, furthermore, are substantively significantly less than the descriptive portrayals for "we" subjects (60.87% < 82.32%). Secondly, it is observed that the negative portrayal is substantively significantly more evaluative for "they" subjects than for "we" subjects (35.75% > 13.50%). A third observation is that while the
Table 26
Observed Frequencies by We-They

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term Direction</th>
<th>We-They</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They</td>
<td>We</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(3.38%)</td>
<td>(4.18%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>1122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(60.87%)</td>
<td>(82.32%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>* 74</td>
<td>184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(35.75%)</td>
<td>(13.50%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Totals</th>
<th>207</th>
<th>1363</th>
<th>1570</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
<td>(100.00%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ratio

| +: -           | .0946   | .3098  | .2481  |

\[ X^2 = 64.8 \quad df = 2 \quad X^2_{.01 \ df=2} = 9.2 \quad p < .001 \]

*--indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
positive portrayals of both "we" and "they" subjects are fairly equal, the ratio of positive to negative words clearly indicates a near absence of positive evaluations for "they" subjects. Lastly, it is observed that books using dichotomatic comparisons are significantly more evaluative and hence negative in their portrayals of subjects, particularly "they" subjects. Generally, then, "they" subjects are, both substantively and statistically, significantly negatively portrayed. While "we" subjects are also substantively significantly evaluative, in comparison to "they" subjects they are descriptive.

In analyzing book and ethnic differences several trends over books, and thereby time, have been suggested. As stated in the introduction of this chapter and in the proposed results for this study, it is of interest to see if patterns over time are to be found based on the data from the books in this study. To facilitate this analysis the books have been collapsed into three time periods: (1) Time 1 ($T_1$): 1968-1970; (2) Time 2 ($T_2$): 1974-1978; and (3) Time 3 ($T_3$): 1980-1981. The earliest book in the sample is Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1), published in 1968, and the most recent book is Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6), copyrighted in 1981. Both of these books, it is noted, encompass dichotomatic rather than ethnic comparisons. Nonetheless, these dichotomatic categories have been included with the ethnic
groupings, so that the "we" subjects are included with Non-Native Americans and the "they" subjects are incorporated with Native Americans. The theoretical justification for this is that both "they" subjects and Native American subjects are the assumed "others" in all the stories except Sing Down the Moon (Book #2) and Squaw Man's Son (Book #4) where similar dichotomies exist; e.g., between the Navajos ("we") and other Native Americans ("they") in Sing Down the Moon (Book #2). These additional differences between "we" and "they" Native American subjects are, however, beyond the scope of this study. If, however, there is interest in looking at the strictly compatible ethnic comparisons only, this is accomplished simply by ignoring the first and last groups of data presented in Table 30 in Appendix G. The other four books, with ethnic comparisons, were published in 1970 (Sing Down the Moon (Book #2)), 1974 (The Spirit is Willing (Book #3)), 1978 (Squaw Man's Son (Book #4)), and 1980 (Sarah Bishop (Book #5)). Therefore, books number one, Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, and number two, Sing Down the Moon, will collapse into Time 1; books number three, The Spirit is Willing, and number four, Squaw Man's Son, will collapse into Time 2; and books number five, Sarah Bishop, and number six, Where the Buffaloes Begin, will collapse into Time 3.

Before analyzing these chronological trends, however,
it is of interest to look at patterns across books. It will be recalled that it is predicted that books published between 1960 and 1970 will be more evaluative than books published between 1971 and 1982. Furthermore, it is predicted that books published after 1975 will be more descriptive than books published between 1960 and 1974. In this study there are two books published between 1960 and 1970 (Akavak, an Eskimo Journey (Book #1) and Sing Down the Moon (Book #2)), and four books published between 1971 and 1982 (The Spirit is Willing (Book #3), Squaw Man's Son (Book #4), Sarah Bishop (Book #5), and Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6)). In taking the mean scores (see Appendix G), patterns over these time periods can be analyzed by the categories Native American/"they", Non-Native American/"we", and the total book. In doing so, the following patterns are found for Native American subjects: (1) the percentage of positive evaluations decreases slightly; (2) the percentage of negative evaluations decreases greatly, but still remains high at ten percent for books published between 1971 and 1982; (3) the percentage of neutral descriptions greatly increases, but is still less than predicted (i.e., >90%); (4) the Coefficient of Evaluation barely increases and remains substantively significantly negative; and (5) the Evaluativeness Score clearly decreases, but remains greater than expected (12% > 10%). Conversely, it is found for Non-Native American
subjects and the book as a whole that: (1) the percentage of positive evaluations remains the same; (2) the percentage of negative evaluations are greatly reduced; (3) the percentage of neutral descriptions increases, but is still slightly less than the predicted ninety-five percent; (4) the Coefficient of Evaluation for Non-Native Americans significantly increases, although it is still ambivalent in the negative direction, while for the total book the score only slightly increases; and (5) the Evaluativeness Scores are more than cut in half. Analysis of books published after 1975 (see Appendix G) found very little change from these results. Furthermore, the results of this analysis of books published after 1975 refute the propositions that books would be more descriptive (i.e., >95%) and, conversely, less evaluative (i.e., <5%). Only the portrayal of Non-Native Americans comes close with ninety-four percent of the portrayals being descriptive. Generally, then, there are very few changes observed in portrayals across books within nominal time periods.

In consideration of these minimal across book findings, it now remains to see if there are any patterns or trends over time. Table 27, then, presents the mean percentages for positive, neutral, and negative terms, Coefficient of Evaluation scores, and Evaluativeness Scores for Native American/"they" subjects, Non-Native American/"we" subjects, and the total books for each
Table 27
Mean Scores Over Time

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NA(^1)/They %</td>
<td>NNA(^2)/We %</td>
<td>Books %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>+</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Mean Coefficient of Evaluation | 19 | 21 | 24 | 23 | 40 | 33 | 24 | 47 | 34 |
| Mean Evaluativeness Score | 34 | 15 | 15 | 12 | 6  | 8  | 12 | 7  | 9  |

1--NA stands for Native Americans
2--NNA stands for Non-Native Americans
of the three designated time periods. To facilitate interpretation of Table 27 scores, the evaluative and descriptive word frequencies are graphed separately in Figure 1 for Native American, Non-Native American, and total book portrayals over the three time periods as represented by the books of this study. Figure 1, then, visually expresses (1) the trends in use of evaluative and descriptive words to portray Native American/"they" and Non-Native American/"we" subjects in books, and (2) the trends to evaluate and/or describe subjects by books in general.

It is seen from Table 27 and Figure 1 that the results provide some interesting trends. First of all, it is seen that portrayals of Native Americans and Non-Native Americans and the books themselves are more descriptive than evaluative. Related to this observation it is found that between Time 1 and Time 2 descriptive portrayals all increased, with the greatest increase for Native Americans and the least increase for the book as a whole. Conversely, between Time 2 and Time 3 descriptive portrayals for Native Americans and Non-Native Americans remained constant to the same, while for books in general descriptive portrayals became more evaluative between Time 2 and Time 3. Furthermore, it is observed that portrayals of Native Americans are less descriptive, or more evaluative, than Non-Native Americans or the books in general. More importantly, however, are comparisons with the
Figure 1

Evaluations: (+)(0)(-)

\[ T_1 = \text{Time 1 (1968-1970)}; \quad T_2 = \text{Time 2 (1974-1978)}; \quad T_3 = \text{Time 3 (1980-1981)} \]
expected scores for descriptive or neutral portrayals. In Time 1 all categories are observed to be less than the expected descriptive portrayal frequency, although Non-Native Americans and books are within five percent. At Time 2, while Non-Native Americans and books are observed to be more descriptive than expected, Native Americans remain more evaluative than expected. As a function of increased expectations and the general absence of changes in descriptive portrayals, it is found that portrayals for all three categories at Time 3 are less descriptive than expected, with the greatest difference observed for Native Americans and the least for Non-Native Americans. A last note on neutral evaluations or descriptions is that between Time 1 and Time 2 portrayals of Native Americans, relative to Non-Native Americans and books, have greatly improved, but are still more evaluative than expected.

In looking at the results for positive evaluative portrayals in Table 27 and Figure 1, the clearest trend is that such portrayals for Non-Native Americans and books remain constant over all three time periods and are both fixed at three percent. This substantively significant result becomes more important when it is observed that the percentage of positive evaluations of Native Americans is equal to those of Non-Native Americans and books at Time 1. Conversely, at Time 2 and Time 3 the percentage of positive portrayals for Native Americans is slightly less than for Non-Native Americans and books.
In analyzing the results for negative evaluations in Table 27 and Figure 1, several substantively significant results are found. Most interesting is the observation that negative evaluations are generally inverse functions of the neutral descriptions. This is substantively significant because both types of evaluative terms are expected to be a function of neutral or descriptive terms, not just negative (or positive) terms. Another clear result is that between Time 1 and Time 2 negative evaluations generally decreased, with the greatest decrease for Native Americans and the least decrease for books. Very significant to this study, however, is the finding that between Time 2 and Time 3 negative evaluations of Native Americans and books increased, while negative evaluations of Non-Native Americans continued to decrease so that the percentage of postive and negative evaluations at Time 3 are equivalent. Comparisons of the results to the expected results indicate that at Time 1 all categories are more negatively evaluative than expected, but that the difference for Native Americans is very significant. At Time 2 Native Americans are just slightly less negatively portrayed than expected, while for Non-Native Americans and books the percentage of negative evaluations is considerably lower than expected. This trend toward improvement, however, reverses at Time 3 for Native Americans and books to become more negatively
evaluative than expected, while for Non-Native Americans the trend toward less negative evaluations continues and is less than expected. Furthermore, it is seen that negative portrayals for Native Americans are more than twice as evaluative as for Non-Native Americans and books across all three time periods.

Figure 2 graphically portrays the mean Coefficient of Evaluation scores from Table 27 for Native Americans, Non-Native Americans, and books in each time period. The most obvious result found is that no score at any time is over fifty percent, which means that all scores are in the negative direction. Even more importantly this means that no portrayals, least of all for Native Americans, are greater than seventy-five percent positively evaluated as predicted in the proposals for this study. Another very clear finding is that Native Americans, Non-Native Americans, and books are all substantively significantly negatively evaluated at Time 1, with Native Americans the most negatively evaluated, books the least negatively evaluated, and Non-Native Americans in between. Between Time 1 and Time 2 marked improvement is noted for Non-Native Americans, who become the least evaluative, and for books. Such increases reflect greater ambivalence for these two categories, particularly for Non-Native Americans. Conversely, for Native Americans between Time 1 and Time 2 the Coefficient of Evaluation increased a few percentages, but remains significantly
Figure 2
Coefficient of Evaluation Over Time

$T_1 =$ Time 1 (1968-1970); $T_2 =$ Time 2 (1974-1978);
lower than expected. Between Time 2 and Time 3 similar trends and results are observed. Additionally, it is seen that over time the Coefficient of Evaluation increases the greatest percentage for Non-Native Americans and the least for Native Americans. It is interesting to note that between Time 2 and Time 3 the Coefficient of Evaluation levels off for Native Americans and books, but continues a steady increase for Non-Native Americans. Similarly, it is observed that over time the Coefficient of Evaluation for books tends to be more positive, but parallels the portrayals of Native Americans. The portrayal of Non-Native Americans, therefore, is seen to continually improve substantively more than for Native Americans and books. Conversely, the portrayal of Native Americans is seen to remain substantively significantly negative, while Non-Native Americans and books increasingly become more ambivalent, over the time periods of this study: 1968-1970, 1974-1978, and 1980-1981.

Lastly, Figure 3 presents the mean Evaluativeness Scores from Table 27 for Native Americans, Non-Native Americans, and books for each time period. The most obvious trend is that the evaluativeness of all portrayals improved between Time 1 and Time 2. The greatest decrease in evaluativeness is for Native Americans with the percentage of evaluativeness at Time 2 being about two-thirds of what it was at Time 1. Substantively significantly more important
Figure 3
Evaluativeness Scores Over Time

\[ T_1 \text{ = Time 1 (1968-1970); } T_2 \text{ = Time 2 (1974-1978);} \]
\[ T_3 \text{ = Time 3 (1980-1981)} \]
is the observation that at Time 2 portrayals of Non-Native Americans and books are less evaluative than expected (6% < 10%; 8% < 10%), as proposed by this study, while the portrayal of Native Americans remains more evaluative than proposed (12% > 10%). Between Time 2 and Time 3 a very interesting trend occurs in that the evaluativeness of Native Americans stabilizes at twelve percent while Non-Native Americans and books unexplainably become slightly more evaluative. Furthermore, because of this leveling off, all three are more evaluative at Time 3 than proposed (i.e., >5%), with portrayals of Native Americans remaining almost twice as evaluative as Non-Native Americans.

Table 27 and Figures 1, 2, and 3 clearly demonstrate that portrayals of Native Americans are, and remain, more negative and evaluative than for Non-Native Americans and books in general. Second, the results clearly show that such negative and evaluative portrayals of Native Americans remain consistently greater than would be expected over time. The results presented over time demonstrate that between Time 1 (1968-1970) and Time 2 (1974-1978) children's fiction made strides toward improving books. This is observed from the general patterns toward more descriptive portrayals overall, and more ambivalent evaluative portrayals, although the patterns are much less so for Native Americans than for Non-Native Americans and book in general. Conversely, between
Time 2 (1974-1978) and Time 3 (1980-1981) a general leveling off is observed, except for the Coefficient of Evaluation for Non-Native Americans that continues to steadily improve. This is to say, then, that at best, portrayals of subjects have remained the same since 1978, particularly for Native Americans. It can be inferred, however, that overall there has been a regression tendency, i.e., portrayals have gotten worse since 1978. Regardless of the position, the fact is that there has been no improvement per se since 1978, particularly in the already highly negative and overly evaluative portrayals of Native Americans in children's fiction as inferred from this study's results. Clearly, then, the data results indicate why some studies infer positive change in the portrayals of Native Americans and others find consistency or continuing negative portrayals. Studies analyzing just trends through changes in frequency counts, will measure the definite improvements observed over time, but then fail to recognize that despite this improvement the portrayals remain more negative and evaluative in comparison to Non-Native Americans and books as a whole (or to the proposed criteria or predicted standards). Conversely, studies utilizing randomly selected categories will measure the negativeness and/or evaluativeness of portrayals of Native Americans, which are then compared to a proposed standard, and thereby find that portrayals of Native Americans remain
consistently biased because they fail to measure relative changes. As such, therefore, it is of interest to compare the qualitative findings to these quantitative results.

Comparison of Quantitative Results with Qualitative Results

Since the qualitative findings and quantitative results have already been presented above, the results of the semi-quantitative method will be presented first. The primary measurement, and the only one of interest here, is the thematic frequency that is part of the ECO Administrative Data Instrument. Measurement of themes proved to be a difficult task as each book tended to incorporate slightly different themes. Thus, frequencies are very rough and are considered estimates only. The presence or absence of themes, however, at this point is more important. A complete list of themes observed in each book, along with rough estimates of their frequency of occurrence, is provided in Appendix H. (It is noted that due to library loan constraints there was not enough time to measure either themes or other categories from the ECO Administrative Data Instrument for Akavak, an Eskimo Journey.)

The most obvious finding of this data measurement is the decline of theme appearance and frequency for both the 1980 and 1981 books (Sarah Bishop (Book #5) and Where the Buffaloes Begin (Book #6)). The most persistent themes are the "Noble Savage" and "Indians and
the Land." The themes with the greatest frequency rates within books, however, are: (1) "Indian Warriors;" (2) "Chiefs;" and (3) "Indian-White Relations." It is also found that measuring themes produces a large number of categories peculiar to each separate book, but with no category through which all books can be compared. This means that the thematic measurement—at least for small samples—is generally inappropriate.

The qualitative and quantitative measures can now be compared, having presented the very minimal findings of the qualitative measures. First of all, it is found that the qualitative measurements usually yield negative critiques of the books. The exception is Sarah Bishop (Book #5) which is perceived to be manifestly a descriptive book with basically balanced or ambivalent evaluative portrayals, a fact that substantiates the quantitative results. The thematic measurement, however, demonstrates that both of these methods miss several very latent but old themes in the book Sarah Bishop (Book #5): (1) "Indians as the White Man's Helper" and (2) "Indians and the Land."

Conversely, the qualitative and thematic analyses measure the portrayal of Native Americans in Sing Down the Moon (Book #2) as being latently negative through subtle impressions and themes, while the quantitative results indicate an ambivalent portrayal of Native Americans and a more negative portrayal of Non-Native
Americans. Similarly, the qualitative analysis of *Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* (Book #1) measures the portrayal of Native Americans to be quite good, while the quantitative ECO Analysis demonstrates significant levels of biased or judgmental evaluations of both "we" and "they" Native American subjects. The qualitative thematic analyses of *Squaw Man's Son* (Book #3) indicate that the book is significantly evaluative. Themes such as "Indian Warriors," "Chief," "War Dances/Councils," "Intertribal Warfare," and "Smelly Indians" appear with high frequency, while impressionistic techniques simplify, obliterate, and generally malign the portrayals of Native American subjects in this book, *Squaw Man's Son* (Book #3). Yet the ECO Analysis measures the composite portrayal as being ambivalent, although more negative than for Non-Native Americans in the same book.

The qualitative measurement of *The Spirit is Willing* (Book #2) finds the book to be significantly negative in its portrayal of Native Americans and ambivalent to positive in the evaluative portrayals of Non-Native Americans. The quantitative and thematic analyses, as with other books, verify or collaborate this finding. Similarly, the qualitative analysis of *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6) perceives significant differences between the portrayal of the "Assiniboines" ("they") and that of the main character "Little Wolf" and his "village" ("we"). These differences are also found through the quantitative ECO Analysis of judgmental terms.
The thematic analysis, however results in low frequencies of themes, although the very standard themes of "Noble Savage," "Warriors," "Indians and the Land," "Intertribal Warfare," and "Sneaky/Animal-like are all present in the story. Generally, then, each method of analysis results in a variety of findings that sometimes concur with each other, and other times do not, but each finds judgmental portrayals that the others fail to measure.
Chapter 4

CONCLUSIONS

The purpose of this study is to analyze value judgments about Native Americans made by sources—authors and publishers—in children's fiction over time. As such, the study analyzes how Native Americans and Non-Native Americans are portrayed in fiction through the expanded use of a known method to measure evaluative and descriptive words. Specifically, based upon previous research and theoretical constructs, the study expects the following results in response to questions proposed in the introduction (p. 40):

1. That books published in the 1960s will be more evaluative than books published in the 1970s and 1980s.

2. That the evaluativeness of the books, based upon the sample average score, will be less than ten percent (<10%).

3. That the percentage of descriptive words for all subjects, groups, and books will be greater than ninety percent (>90%).

4. That books published after 1975 will have improved because of outside demands and, therefore, will have a descriptive percentage greater than ninety-five percent (>95%).

5. That books published after 1975, similarly, will have an even lower Evaluativeness Score of less than five percent (<5%).

6. That evaluative judgments, based upon other current research, will be favorable (i.e., >75%) toward Native Americans.
7. That judgments of Native Americans will be less favorable than those of others.

8. That the percentage of evaluative terms to total space devoted to Native Americans will be greater than that for Non-Native Americans.

9. That the percentage of negative evaluative judgments about Native Americans will be greater than five percent (>5%), while the negative evaluations for Non-Native Americans will be less than five percent (<5%).

10. That similar themes concerning Native Americans, found by Garcia in textbooks, will be found in fiction books.

In looking at the results in Figures 1, 2, and 3, and Table 27 in chapter three, it is seen that books published between 1960 and 1970 are, as predicted, more evaluative than books published between 1971 and 1982. In looking at Table 30 in Appendix G, however, it is found that the more recent books, *The Spirit is Willing* (1974) and *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (1982), are both separately more evaluative than the book *Sing Down the Moon*, which was published in 1970. Similarly, the book *Squaw Man’s Son* (1978) is seen to be as equally evaluative as *Sing Down the Moon*. A second related proposition is that the results will indicate that the Evaluativeness Scores will be less than ten percent (<10%). In looking back at Figure 3 and Table 27, and at Table 30 in Appendix G, it is observed that the expected results are not found. It is seen from Table 30 that the books *Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* (Book #1) and *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6) are both more evaluative than expected; i.e., book number one,
Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, is more than twice as evaluative as expected (22% > 10%), while book number six, Where the Buffaloes Begin, is substantively more evaluative than predicted (14% > 10%). It is further observed that both of these highly evaluative books involve dichotomies rather than ethnic comparisons, which means that no Non-Native Americans are involved. It is inferred, therefore, that books involving only Native American subjects are more evaluative than books including other subjects. Book number six, Where the Buffaloes Begin, is a good example where a very positively-oriented ambivalent Native American subject is the protagonist, while a very negatively portrayed Native American group subject is the antagonist. The "they" group can thereby be justifiably negatively judged because it is Native Americans talking about and confronting Native Americans. An illusion of a positive portrayal is made by the extensive scope of the "we" subject while the negative portrayal of Native Americans slips unconsciously by, but is in reality latently perceived. The latent, covert portrayal of the subject "they" is largely ignored, then, due to the substantially positive, manifest, and overt portrayal of other Native American subjects as "we." This style thereby allows the source to perpetuate significantly negative portrayals of Native Americans and negative to ambivalent portrayals by the illusion of positive portrayals through varied levels of negative portrayals.
On the reverse side of these expected results is the proposition that the percentage or proportion of descriptive words for each subject and book will be greater than ninety percent (>90%); and furthermore, it is predicted that for books published after 1975 descriptive words will account for more than ninety-five percent (>95%) of the words used to portray a subject. This proposition does not hold up, which can be seen in Table 27 and Figure 1 in chapter three and Table 30 in Appendix G. Native Americans are descriptively portrayed less than ninety percent (<90%) in book number three, *The Spirit is Willing* (93.94% < 90%), and less than ninety-five percent (<95%) in book number four, *Squaw Man's Son* (92.59% < 95%). Conversely, Non-Native Americans are descriptively portrayed less than ninety percent (<90%) in only book number two, *Sing Down the Moon* (88.80% < 90%). It additionally is seen that both books with a we-they dichotomy (*Akavak, an Eskimo Journey* (Book #1) and *Where the Buffaloes Begin* (Book #6)) have, for all groups, descriptive portrayals that are less than ninety percent (<90%) (78.36% < 90% and 85.77% < 90%, respectively). Clearly, then, the only book with descriptive portrayals as predicted is book number five, *Sarah Bishop*, although it is noted that several descriptive portrayals are close to the predicted levels.

Similarly, it is found from Table 30 in Appendix G and Figure 3 and Table 27 from chapter three, that two of the three books
published after 1975 did not have lower Evaluativeness Scores as predicted. Only book number five, Sarah Bishop, has an Evaluativeness Score less than five percent (<5%) (3% < 5%).

The prediction of increased descriptive or neutral portrayals of Native Americans, and books with such portrayals, is again based upon purported improvement over the past ten to fifteen years by sources in portraying Native Americans. While Figure 3 suggests that progress has been made, it also indicates that a marked reversal is occurring, that books and portrayals are again becoming significantly evaluative.

A fifth proposition predicted finding that evaluative judgments are favorable (i.e., >75%) toward Native Americans. Subsumed in this is the prediction that there is a tendency toward more favorable portrayals of Native Americans. Based upon the calculated Coefficient of Evaluation scores, as found in Table 30 in Appendix G and Figure 2 and Table 27 in chapter three, it is seen that no score is greater than seventy-five percent. This means that no portrayals of Native Americans, as well Non-Native Americans, are significantly positive, nor is there any trend toward positive portrayals for Native Americans. More important is the tendency of portrayals of Native Americans to fluctuate with the times or current events. Negative portrayed in the 1960s, awareness of such portrayals resulted in ambivalent, but in the negative direction,
portrayals by 1970. Paralleling contemporary conflict images, portrayals are again found to be negative in 1974. Between 1974 and 1980, increasing efforts for humanistic treatment are reflected in marginally improved portrayals. The new wave of conservativism of the 1980s, however, is seen to coincide with increased negative portrayals of Native Americans. Conversely, it is found that the portrayals of Non-Native Americans, which also have been consistently in the negative direction, do demonstrate a tendency toward more favorable portrayals.

It is clearly observed, then, that judgments in portrayals of Native Americans are less favorable than for Non-Native Americans as predicted, except for book number two, Sing Down the Moon. Sing Down the Moon, published in 1970, may be inferred to be indicative of the times where Non-Native Americans were portrayed more negatively, while Native Americans were ambivalently portrayed. This more negative portrayal of Non-Native Americans thereby creates an impression that Native Americans are positively portrayed, when in fact the portrayal is still very much in the negative direction. Similarly, by looking at the Evaluativeness Scores for Native Americans and Non-Native Americans in Figure 3 and Table 27 in chapter three, it is observed that the percentages of evaluative to descriptive terms for Native Americans are indeed greater than for Non-Native Americans as predicted, except again for book number two, Sing Down the Moon, as observed in Table 30 (Appendix G).
An eighth proposition predicted finding that the percentage of negative evaluative judgments about Native Americans are greater than five percent (>5%), while the negative evaluation percentage for Non-Native Americans are less than five percent (<5%). The data results presented in Table 25 in chapter three, reveal that the observed percentage of negative evaluations for Native Americans is 5.29%, which is greater than five percent as predicted. The percentage for Non-Native Americans is found to be 3.04%, which is less than five percent as also predicted. Furthermore, and of noteworthy importance, it is noted that these cells in Table 25 are both independently statistically significant. This indicates that portrayals of Native Americans are statistically more negative and evaluative than would be expected or predicted. From these findings, then, it is inferred that sources employ a style of writing whereby they: (1) portray Non-Native Americans more descriptively than Native Americans; (2) counter this with more evaluative terms about Native Americans than expected using both positive and negative terms; and (3) counter the first two stylistic methods by portraying Non-Native Americans with fewer than expected evaluative terms, especially negative terms. Thus, the subjects, which are statistically descriptive, are actually evaluatively portrayed within the guise of such descriptive portrayals. That is, within the statistically allowable range of evaluative terms, portrayals
of Native Americans are made statistically negative in comparison to Non-Native Americans, but appear to be neutral or ambivalent because of the averaging effect in the scope of the descriptive portrayal. In fact, the depth of the already negative evaluation (i.e., >5%) is compounded by the less than expected depth of the negative portrayals of Non-Native Americans, which thereby increases the effectiveness of the negative portrayal of Native Americans. Overtly, then, the portrayal of Native Americans is manifestly descriptive, but covertly the portrayal is manifestly negative.

The last proposition predicted finding that similar themes concerning Native Americans, found by Garcia in textbooks, would be found in the fiction books analyzed in this study. While in no way an accurate picture of thematic frequencies, it is found that the standard themes used by Garcia are applicable, but not comprehensive enough, to the books in this study. Such a finding, however, is almost inherent to the books because all the stories are set in the eighteenth century or pre-Non-Native American contact period. Thus, it is difficult to avoid many of these themes—most of which imply negative portrayals—but some books are better than others. Books number one, Akavak, an Eskimo Journey, and number six, Where the Buffaloes Begin, which have no Non-Native American subjects, are both relatively low in thematic frequency but high in evaluative assertions frequency. Book number two, Sing Down the Moon, which
portrays Native Americans more positively than Non-Native Americans in terms of words, contains numerous negative themes. Despite these variances in uses of themes, no one theme is manifestly found in all of the books sampled. However, the "Noble Savage" theme appears in four of the books, as does the "Indians and the Land" theme. Both themes are inherent or latent to the other two books, but are not manifestly apparent. Other themes are also found through qualitative analysis to be inherent to the stories, but are immeasurable with the quantitative or semi-quantitative thematic methods available.

Pratt's ECO Analysis methodology is found to be adaptable to the analysis of fiction books. The major difficulty with the technique of measurement is one found in all content analyses using words as the unit of measurement, and that is the problem of reliability. Many of the words encountered as part of the portrayals are not on Pratt's ECO Word List (see Appendix F), nor could synonyms always be used. Pratt's procedures were adhered to rigidly, but there still exists a degree of subjectivity to the scoring of words. The sampling procedures used within the books proved to be functional but time consuming. It required an average of thirty-plus hours to measure the portrayals in each book, and initial reading and tracking of subjects required additional time. While the sample size may be statistically
questioned, it is evident that without assistant researchers, larger samples using the ECO Analysis would be unfeasible. Additionally, it is felt that while ECO Analysis eventually resulted in useful data, other methods and techniques are needed to analyze the portrayals of Native Americans and other subjects. The researcher has previously demonstrated that qualitative content analysis methodology critically is needed for measuring portrayals of Native Americans (Edwards, 1981). New content analysis methodology is needed to measure impressionistic styles of sources and to measure more structured aspects of content such as the dimensions of propaganda and prejudice manifested in the content.

This study, then, accomplishes the objectives of (1) applying ECO Analysis, previously used with textbooks, to children's fiction, (2) analyzing value judgments about Native Americans portrayed in fiction, and (3) determining how portrayals of Native Americans are made. It has been found that books became increasingly more descriptive until 1981, at which time the trend seemed to have reversed itself to perpetuating evaluative portrayals. Furthermore, it is found that while portrayals of Native Americans overtly and manifestly appear to be descriptive, they are in fact covertly evaluative and, as such, are significantly negative. It also has been found that portrayals of both Native Americans and Non-Native Americans are relative in that the Coefficient of Evaluation
scores are less than ambivalent; that the difference is in the
degree of negativeness in portrayals. Additionally, this study
shows that portrayals of Native Americans, in contrast to Non-
Native Americans and the total books, are very irregular, which
would account for the different findings concerning portrayals of
Native Americans in literature. While trends toward improved
portrayals are noted, it continues to be observed that such
portrayals continue to be in the negative direction. Lastly, it
has been found that books on Native Americans only, are generally
far more evaluative; and, more specifically, the "they" subjects
are consistently, significantly, and negatively portrayed. That is,
portrayals of Native Americans confronting other Native Americans
provide sources freedom to develop overtly and manifestly negative
portrayals of Native Americans through the averaging method of
overtly and manifestly portraying other Native Americans as "we"
groups in a more favorable fashion, but still in the negative
direction. Similarly, negative portrayals are produced by sources
through subtle illusions of negative themes, and thus, overwhelming
the power of illusionary descriptive portrayals. In sum, portrayals
of Native Americans tend to be more evaluative, more negative, and
more judgmental than for Non-Native Americans. Through stylistic
methods, reinforced by perpetuated themes, portrayals of Native
Americans are found to be about the same in 1981 as in 1968, only
more subtle, more latent, and harder to manifestly perceive.
In summary, this study found, in answer to the questions posed in chapter one, that for children's fiction:

1. Portrayals of Native Americans are generally evaluative while the portrayals of Non-Native Americans are generally neutral or descriptive.

2. Judgments made by sources are unfavorable toward Native Americans and are significantly negatively evaluative.

3. Generally, within books, evaluative judgments of Native American subjects are more negative than for Non-Native American subjects; while between books, evaluative portrayals are statistically significantly more negative for Native Americans than for Non-Native Americans, whose portrayals are statistically less negative than expected.

4. The frequency of evaluative terms to the total space devoted, or the Evaluativeness Scores, for Native Americans in each time period are thirty-four percent, fifteen percent, and fifteen percent, whereas for Non-Native Americans the Evaluativeness Scores for each time period are twelve percent, six percent, and eight percent.

5. The frequency of specific terms applied to portray a subject is indicated by the ratio of positive to negative terms. For Native Americans the ratio indicates that for every forty positive terms used there are one hundred negative terms used (.4018), whereas for Non-Native Americans sixty-two positive terms are used for every one hundred negative terms (.6201). This means that more negative terms are used than positive terms to portray all subjects, but more so for Native Americans.


7. Theme appearance and frequency is seen to decline over time. Persistent themes are the "Noble Savage" and "Indians and the Land," while the themes with the greatest frequency rates when they appear in books are "Indian Warriors," "Chiefs," and "Indian-White Relations."
Implications

The results and findings of this study pose theoretical, methodological, and practical implications. Theoretically, this study indicates that children's fictional literature involving Native Americans as subjects clearly incorporates propaganda and other persuasive techniques and includes notions of prejudice. As such, the results and findings of this study need to be further studied to determine their accuracy. After more data is available, a theory can then emerge to describe and predict the effects of reading materials about Native Americans. More importantly, this study has shown the relevancy of theoretically based studies of literature, which thereby implicates the need for additional studies both in children's fiction and in other categories of literature.

This study also indicates the need for greater methodological explorations in content analysis and the study of literature/media contents. This study reinforces the researcher's belief that the contents of literature affect the reader through covert, latent, and unconscious methods. Quantitative analyses are generally limited to measuring manifest portrayals while allowing some inferences into the latent content and/or effects. Thus, this study clearly indicates the need for additional qualitative methods for analyzing literature. Furthermore, it clearly points out the need to renew propaganda analysis and values analysis, as well as
the need to develop a formal method for analyzing media content for dimensions of prejudice or attitudes of prejudice. Additionally, this study makes clear the need to computerize ECO Analysis, to expand the ECO Word List, and to require multiple recorders or data collectors. Lastly, while the sampling procedures for this study proved to be sound, further procedures for using ECO Analysis with nonfiction literature is desperately needed because of the dearth of studies in the critical field of nonfiction. A final consideration is in the area of practical implications. Foremost is the need for an expanded ECO Word List to improve reliability. Secondly, there is a need for additional studies, but with larger sample sizes and more analysts. Perhaps most urgent is the need for further study of recent books to confirm the observed trends concerning the portrayals of Native Americans. Indeed, if the findings of this study are valid and reliable, then such needs to be both publically announced and challenged, because the current system of literature is institutionally perpetuating prejudiced attitudes by various means. While literature may not be the cause of such attitudes, this study shows that it certainly reinforces negative, highly evaluative, and often standardized portrayals of Native Americans through the use of standard themes and/or evaluative judgments about Native Americans.
The term "American Indian" probably has more definitions than any other proper nomenclature, yet no other generic term for a group of peoples evokes such commonly held ideas. While the term "Native Americans" is not an adequate appellation either, it is less evaluative and less ambiguous in the sense that it is usually applied to two or more different cultures or societies rather than to individuals or one particular group. As such, the term "Native Americans" will be used descriptively like the term "European" for all groups and not for specific groups or individuals. Conversely, the term "Indian" will be used as an evaluative term that is ambiguously applied. (Also see footnote 4 for additional discussion of the use of the term "Indian").

The ideas for this discussion are taken from Ritzer (1980), pp. 89-91.

The following definitions of awareness and perception are implicit to the discussion, but are explicitly stated here for continuity:

**Awareness**: Having or showing realization, perception, or knowledge.

**Perception**: The process through which organisms understand their environment by means of their senses.

Perception is a process, then, to gain awareness. Conceptualization is the "minding" process between perception and awareness. Therefore, failure to perceive or notice a stimulus or something in the environment will disallow perception and awareness. Faulty perception may or may not be altered by the "minding" or conceptualization process. Regardless, the concept and vis-a-vis the perception is expressed through awareness, whether the awareness is valid or not. In comparing these two concepts to the communications model, perception may be seen as the receiver and awareness as the process of encoding and transmitting.

It should be pointed out that the research utilizes a more stringent or narrow definition for some descriptive words. In particular, anthropological terms are scored generally as evaluatively because of their ability to make value judgments concerning the subject. Terms like "tribe," "band," "warrior," "chief," and so forth are scored as evaluative terms. Furthermore, the analyst negatively score the term "Indian" if it was used inappropriately. That is, the term "Indian" is not conceived of as being inherently negative, but is used generally in context to simplify, belittle,
generalize, and evaluate a subject. If the subject category is "Indians," then the term is treated as neutral or descriptive, whereas the term is scored negative when used to mean a known subject, i.e. "Captain Jack."

The scoring of anthropological words and similar terms is justifiable because the use of such terms serves to time-lock or freeze Native Americans into being solely people of the past and/or people inherently less than Non-Native Americans. The notion of inequality derives from the fact that anthropological terms also generally imply notions of social evolution, to wit tribes are politically less developed and therefore "inferior" somehow. These implications, thereby, latently load such words as judgmental or evaluative.

In doing the analysis of the data and rereading Pratt's material (1971, 1972), problems concerning Pratt's second analytical technique, the Index of Evaluativeness, were found. First of all, his discussion of the Index of Evaluativeness was found to be conflicting. Pratt begins, "If the total number of lines or words of text devoted to a subject is divided by the number of evaluative terms applied to that subject," but then concludes ". . . the analyst can determine a score indicative of the expressed frequency with which value judgments are expressed about the subject relative to the amount of space devoted." (1972:25-26). The ratio Pratt proposed is:

\[
\text{Total Words} \div \text{Total Evaluative Words} = \text{Index of Evaluativeness}
\]

Conversely, the ratio he actually intends in this conclusion is:

\[
\frac{\text{Total Evaluative Words}}{\text{Total Words}} = \text{Ratio of Evaluativeness}
\]

This later statistic, then, was labeled the "Ratio of Evaluativeness" by the research. Further consideration, however, indicated that such an analytic score would be more useful if expressed as a percentage, which was labeled the "Evaluativeness Score":

\[
\frac{100 \times \text{Total Evaluative Words}}{\text{Total Words}} = \text{Evaluativeness Score}
\]

It is noted that a full discussion of these aspects is beyond the scope of this thesis. That is to say, examples of inaccuracies, omissions, and so forth will not be made.
7. The edition used in this analysis did not have a cover or back page.

8. It should be noted that:

The publisher has made every effort to determine the copyright of the original version of this story, which appeared in Volume XLII, No. 4, of St. Nicholas Magazine in February, 1915. The search has been to no avail (Baker, 1981:unp).

It is furthermore noted that the copyright is actually listed under the publisher:


This indicates, therefore, that the source of this book may in fact be considered to be Frederick Warne and Company, Incorporated, rather than Olaf Baker, who is the author in name only.

9. While the book is listed in many guides as fiction, it is not fiction in the literary sense, and is most appropriately catalogued—at the Missoula County Library at least—under the Dewey Decimal classification of 398.2 of the social science non-fiction section.

10. In reading the book the researcher found the reading level to be actually at the eighth grade level, rather than at the second to fourth grade level.

11. It is noted that book number five, Sarah Bishop, must be considered, at this point, an anomaly to the general pattern. For a graphic presentation of book differences see Appendix G.
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APPENDIX C
THE PRINCIPLES OF PROPAGANDA

1. **Principle of the intention of the propagandist.** In intentional propaganda, the propagandist is aware of his interested aim; in unintentional propaganda, he does not appreciate the social effect of his own actions.

2. **Principle of perception.** The propagandist makes his stimulus-situation stand out from its competing ground.
   
   2a. Perceptual principle of auxiliary attitudes. The propagandist makes his stimulus-situation outstanding through the arousal of auxiliary attitudes.
   
   2b. Perceptual principle of repetition. The propagandist repeats his stimulus-situation to increase the probability that it will be perceived.
   
   2c. Perceptual principle of simplification. The propagandist simplifies his stimulus-situation to bring it within the range of perception.

3. **Principle of the type of propaganda.** The propagandist employs any one or all of the following types of propaganda: revealed, delayed revealed, and concealed propaganda.
   
   3a. Principle of revealed propaganda. In revealed propaganda the propagandist enables people to perceive his aim through direct suggestion.
   
   3b. Principle of delayed revealed propaganda. In delayed
revealed propaganda the propagandist reveals his aim only after he has aroused related attitudes.

3b1. Temporal principle of delayed revealed propaganda. In delayed revealed propaganda the propagandist enables people to perceive his aim at a moment when that aim can be integrated into the previously aroused related attitudes.

3c. Principle of concealed propaganda. In concealed propaganda the propagandist refrains from stating his aim and integrates through indirect suggestion the aroused related attitudes into a new attitude which predisposes people toward that aim.

4. Principle of related attitudes. In the process of suggestion, the propagandist arouses related attitudes that are instrumental in bringing about the desired integration.

4a. Principle of related dominant attitudes. The propagandist employs attitudes that are already dominant as related attitudes or he arouses related attitudes that remain dominant over a period of time.

4b. Principle of related central attitudes. The propagandist arouses related attitudes that are central attitudes.

4c. Principle of related auxiliary attitudes. The propagandist arouses auxiliary attitudes that also function as related attitudes.
4d. Principle of variation. The propagandist varies the content of his stimulus-situation, in order to arouse related attitudes in different people and, by changing their stereotypes, to construct new attitudes in others through positive suggestion.

5. Principle of the desired integration. The propagandist secures a desired integration that predisposes people toward his aim.

5a. Principle of the type of integration. The desired integration is either a central or a segmental attitude.

5b. Principle of action. The propagandist secures a desired integration that leads to action.

6. Principle of the sphere of unpredictability. Before the desired integration is achieved between the related attitudes and, except in the case of concealed propaganda, the comprehension of the propagandist's aim and before it leads to action, there is a sphere of unpredictability due to the temporal character of the propaganda, the presence of competing propagandists, and the complexity of the personalities in the group with which the propagandist must deal.

6a. Principle of the auxiliary submissive attitude. The propagandist reduces the sphere of unpredictability by restricting the mental field through the arousal of a submissive attitude toward a stimulus-situation which
has prestige and the effect of which is a tendency toward increased suggestibility.

6a1. Principle of positive social value. The propagandist includes within his stimulus-situation objects and persons with positive social value.

6a2. Principle of the impression of universality. The propagandist produces an impression of universality.

6a3. Principle of selection of propaganda. When the prestige of the propagandist or of the stimulus-situation is not diminished by the revelation of his aim, revealed propaganda is employed; when the prestige is diminished by that revelation, concealed propaganda is employed; when it is diminished by an immediate but not by a subsequent revelation, delayed revealed propaganda is employed.

6b. Principle of indicating the paths of action. In revealed and delayed revealed propaganda, the propagandist reduces the sphere of unpredictability by indicating the paths of action to which the desired integration may lead.

6c. Principle of reinforcing. The propagandist reduces the sphere of unpredictability by preventing the desired integration from remaining latent or from disintegrating.

6c1. Reinforcing principle of repetition. The propagandist repeats the same or similar stimulus-situations.
6c2. Principle of additional related pre-existing attitudes. The propagandist arouses other pre-existing related attitudes.

6c3. Principle of additional related new attitudes. The propagandist forms new attitudes through positive suggestion by changing people's stereotypes.

6d. Principle of limitation. The propagandist reduces the sphere of unpredictability by producing the initial, relatively stable integration.

7. Principle of counter-propaganda. The propagandist uses counter-propaganda when conflicting attitudes tend to prevent the desired integration from emerging.

7a. Principle of negative suggestion in counter-propaganda. In counter-propaganda, the propagandist uses negative suggestion to render conflicting attitudes ineffective.

7b. Principle of positive suggestion in counter-propaganda. In counter-propaganda, the propagandist uses positive suggestion to form new related attitudes that will counteract conflicting attitudes.

8. Principle of persuasion. The propagandist uses persuasion as a supplementary method.

8a. Prestige principle of persuasion. The propagandist
employs persuasion on people with prestige toward whom
later a submissive attitude is directed by other people.

8b. Temporal principle of persuasion. Persuasion supplements
propaganda at a crucial moment to bring about the desired
integration and action among certain people.
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# ECO Analysis Score Sheet/Instrument

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source:</th>
<th>Score:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Title:</td>
<td>Subject:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| 1.     | 23.    |
| 2.     | 24.    |
| 3.     | 25.    |
| 5.     | 27.    |
| 6.     | 28.    |
| 7.     | 29.    |
| 8.     | 30.    |
| 9.     | 31.    |
| 10.    | 32.    |
| 11.    | 33.    |
| 12.    | 34.    |
| 13.    | 35.    |
| 14.    | 36.    |
| 15.    | 37.    |
| 16.    | 38.    |
| 17.    | 39.    |
| 18.    | 40.    |
| 19.    | 41.    |
| 20.    | 42.    |
| 21.    | 43.    |
| 22.    | 44.    |

*—i.e., Verb, Adverb, Noun, Adjective

\[ + = \frac{100 (F)}{F + U} = \frac{100 x}{+} = \frac{-}{=} = \frac{-}{=} = \frac{-}{=} \]
ECO Analysis Comparison Instrument

Source: Rating:

Title:

Subjects:

Qualitative Review:
ECO Analysis Administrative Data Instrument

Sample Group: 
Sample Number: 
Random Sample No.: 
Source: 
Publisher: 
Subjects: (list) 1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 
Catalog Source: 
Title: 
Copyright: 
Vol._ Page_
1.0 TRENDS AND FREQUENCIES

1.1 LENGTH/SPACE

1.1.1 Total number of pages in the book:

1.1.2 Total number of pages per subject:

1.1.3 Total number of illustrations (i.e., maps, drawings, pictures):

Positive (+): Neutral (0): Negative (-):

1.1.4 Total number of illustrations on each subject:

+ 0 - + 0 -

1. 2. 3. 4. 5. 
6. 7. 8. 9. 10. 
1.2 TEMPORAL SETTING

1.2.1 Is the story time explicitly given? Yes____ No____

1.2.2 At what time does the story begin? _______ NA____

1.2.3 At what time does the story end? _______ NA____

1.2.4 If the story time is not explicitly given, is it presented implicitly? (i.e., illustrations, descriptions of the environment, events in the story):

Yes____ No____

1.2.5 What is the appropriate story time as suggested by the source?

| Pre-Columbian | 1800 | 1900 | Present Invasion |

1.3 SOURCE

1.3.1 Has the source provided evidence of professional research?

Yes____ No____

What? How?

1.3.2 Has the source written other materials on Native Americans?

Yes____ No____ Number____ Level____ Type____

1.3.3 Is the source of Native American ancestry?

Yes____ No____ Nation/Tribe__________
1.4 THEMES

1.4.1 What themes are presented in the story?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Themes:</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Noble Savage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. White Man's Helper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Indian Maiden</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Red Varmint</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Chief</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Protestor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Indian/Non-Indian Relations</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Meeting of Two Cultures</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Indians and the Land</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Contemporary Issues</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Other: (list)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## ECO Word List

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>able</th>
<th>conscientious</th>
<th>fat</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>achievement</td>
<td>conspirator</td>
<td>fearful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>admirable</td>
<td>corrupt</td>
<td>fearless</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>advanced</td>
<td>courageous</td>
<td>feeble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>adventurous</td>
<td>courteous</td>
<td>ferocious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>afraid</td>
<td>coward</td>
<td>fierce</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>agile</td>
<td>crafty</td>
<td>fiery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>alert</td>
<td>criminal</td>
<td>fine</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>amazing</td>
<td>cruel</td>
<td>foolish</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ambitious</td>
<td>cultured</td>
<td>foreign</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>angry</td>
<td>daring</td>
<td>free</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ardent*</td>
<td>dauntless</td>
<td>friendly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>attractive</td>
<td>dear</td>
<td>furious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>audacious</td>
<td>dedicated</td>
<td>genius</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>backward</td>
<td>delicate</td>
<td>gentle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bad</td>
<td>delightful</td>
<td>gentleman</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>barbarian</td>
<td>dependent</td>
<td>gifted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>beautiful</td>
<td>deserter</td>
<td>glorious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bickering</td>
<td>determined</td>
<td>good</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bitter</td>
<td>devoted</td>
<td>goodwill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blind</td>
<td>devout</td>
<td>gracious</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>blood-thirsty</td>
<td>dictator</td>
<td>grave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>boastful</td>
<td>dirty</td>
<td>great</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bold</td>
<td>disgruntled</td>
<td>greedy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brave</td>
<td>dishonest</td>
<td>handsome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bright</td>
<td>disloyal</td>
<td>happy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>brilliant</td>
<td>distinguished</td>
<td>hard</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>butcher</td>
<td>drunk</td>
<td>hardworking</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>calm</td>
<td>eager</td>
<td>hearty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>capable</td>
<td>elegant</td>
<td>haughty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>careful</td>
<td>eloquent</td>
<td>healthy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charitable</td>
<td>enduring</td>
<td>heathen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>charming</td>
<td>energetic</td>
<td>helpful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cheap</td>
<td>enthusiastic</td>
<td>hero</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>chivalrous</td>
<td>experienced</td>
<td>honest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>civilized</td>
<td>expert</td>
<td>honorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clean</td>
<td>extremist</td>
<td>horde</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>clever</td>
<td>failure</td>
<td>horrible</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cold</td>
<td>fair</td>
<td>hospitable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>colorful</td>
<td>faithful</td>
<td>hostile</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>common</td>
<td>false</td>
<td>howling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>complex</td>
<td>famous</td>
<td>humble</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idealistic +</td>
<td>outrage -</td>
<td>ruthless -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>idle -</td>
<td>outstanding +</td>
<td>sacrificial 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ignorant -</td>
<td>pagan -</td>
<td>sad -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>imaginative +</td>
<td>panic-stricken -</td>
<td>savage -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>impatient -</td>
<td>patient +</td>
<td>scheming -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>important +</td>
<td>patriotic +</td>
<td>scholarly +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>independent +</td>
<td>peaceful +</td>
<td>selfish -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>industrious +</td>
<td>pillager -</td>
<td>sensitive +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inferior -</td>
<td>pious 0</td>
<td>serious +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>infidel -</td>
<td>pitiless -</td>
<td>shrewd 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ingenious +</td>
<td>pleasant +</td>
<td>shrieking -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insane -</td>
<td>pleasurable +</td>
<td>simple 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insolent -</td>
<td>plotting -</td>
<td>sincere +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspired +</td>
<td>plunderer -</td>
<td>skillful +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>inspiring +</td>
<td>polite +</td>
<td>slaughter -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>intelligent +</td>
<td>poor 0</td>
<td>slow -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interesting +</td>
<td>popular +</td>
<td>smelly -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>jealous -</td>
<td>primitive -</td>
<td>soft +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>just +</td>
<td>problem -</td>
<td>splendid +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kind +</td>
<td>promising +</td>
<td>strange 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>late -</td>
<td>proper* 0</td>
<td>striking +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lazy -</td>
<td>proud +</td>
<td>strong +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>liar -</td>
<td>prowling -</td>
<td>successful +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lively +</td>
<td>pure +</td>
<td>sullen -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lovely +</td>
<td>quality +</td>
<td>superb +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loving +</td>
<td>quarrelsome -</td>
<td>superior +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>loyal +</td>
<td>quick +</td>
<td>suspicious -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lurking -</td>
<td>quiet +</td>
<td>swarm -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>magnificent +</td>
<td>raiding -</td>
<td>sweet +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>martyr 0</td>
<td>reasonable +</td>
<td>sympathetic +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>massacre -</td>
<td>rebel* 0</td>
<td>talented +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean -</td>
<td>reckless -</td>
<td>tenacious 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>menacing -</td>
<td>remarkable +</td>
<td>terrible -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>merciless -</td>
<td>renegade -</td>
<td>terrified -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mistaken* 0</td>
<td>renowned +</td>
<td>terrifying -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mob -</td>
<td>resentful -</td>
<td>terrorist -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>moderate* 0</td>
<td>resourceful +</td>
<td>thief -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>modest +</td>
<td>respected +</td>
<td>threatening -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>murderer -</td>
<td>respectful +</td>
<td>thrifty +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mutinous -</td>
<td>revengeful -</td>
<td>tireless +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>natural +</td>
<td>rich 0</td>
<td>tolerant +</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>nice +</td>
<td>right +</td>
<td>tough* 0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>noble +</td>
<td>rioter -</td>
<td>traitor -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>normal +</td>
<td>robber -</td>
<td>treacherous -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>notable +</td>
<td>rough -</td>
<td>trickery -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
troublesome -
true +
trustworthy +
ugly -
uncivilized -
undisciplined -
uneducated -
unfriendly -
unreliable -
unselfish +
unskilled -
untrustworthy -
useful +
vain -
valiant +
valuable +
venerable* 0
vicious -
victorious +
vigorous +
vviolent -
warlike -
warm +
wasteful -
weak -
well-known +
wild -
wise +
wonderful +
worthy +
wrong -
zealous* 0

---"Note: The rationale for the development of this list is reported in Appendix I. The values are based on judgments by students in Grades 11 and 12 and in a teacher education program. An asterisk beside a word indicates that there was significant disagreement between the two groups regarding the value to be assigned to the word" (Pratt, 1972:39; emphasis in the original).
Table 28
Coefficient of Evaluation Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>51.35</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>43.90</td>
<td>60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>39.02</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>27.19</td>
<td>61.76</td>
<td>12.50</td>
<td>42.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>37.50</td>
<td>34.50</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>66.67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>21.43</td>
<td>18.64</td>
<td>22.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>18.18</td>
<td>56.25</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#6</td>
<td>7.69</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>25.71</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>16.67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>32.14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>21.05</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>31.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>31.14</td>
<td>33.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>14.29</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native Americans</td>
<td>36.00</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>44.74</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>40.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>53.85</td>
<td>21.93</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Book</td>
<td>32.44</td>
<td>29.41</td>
<td>18.75</td>
<td>33.15</td>
<td>28.99</td>
<td>38.30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coefficient of Evaluation = \( \frac{100 \times F}{F + U} \)

where F = total favorable terms
U = total unfavorable terms
Table 29
Evaluativeness Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subjects</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#8</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#9</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native Americans</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-Native Americans</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>We</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Book</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Evaluativeness Scores = \( \frac{100 \times \text{(Total Evaluative Words)}}{\text{Total Words}} \)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Term</th>
<th>Books</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Measure: as English Journey</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>They</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Coefficient of Evaluation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7%</th>
<th>21%</th>
<th>11%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>31%</td>
<td>34%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Evaluativeness Score**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>0%</th>
<th>10%</th>
<th>20%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>19%</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---
1—NA stands for Native Americans
2—NNA stands for Non-Native Americans
*—indicates statistical significance for individual cell distribution
APPENDIX H
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noble Savage</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Man's Helper</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Maiden</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Varmint</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian Warrior</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chief</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protestor</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian-White Relations</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meeting of Cultures</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indians and the Land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contemporary Issues</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Object of Display</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traitor to Whites</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy Indian</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable/Good Worker</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Freed&quot; Indian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heathen Indian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ghosts/Spells/Witchcraft</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dumb Indian</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>War Dancing/Council</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor Material Life</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inensitive</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Different Habits, etc.</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intertribal War</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal-like</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>