

NONVERBAL EXPRESSIONS OF PREJUDICE

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.  
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY  
BARON PERLMAN  
1969

## ABSTRACT

### NONVERBAL EXPRESSIONS OF PREJUDICE

By

Baron Perlman

This study was undertaken to determine if indicative measures of nonverbal behavior could be gathered in a situation where expressions of prejudice were likely.

In our experiment purporting to study student opinion on social issues, Negro or Caucasian accomplices presented either a prepared "radical" or "conservative" viewpoint to the causes and solutions of big city racial problems in the United States to Caucasian male Ss who were all from introductory psychology classes. The 80 Ss were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions: Negro radical, Negro conservative, Caucasian radical, and Caucasian conservative. Two raters were present for each session and the mean of their scores was used as the data for analysis. The scripts of the accomplices sounded spontaneous and were rehearsed by all the accomplices so that their vocal reflections and body movements were similar. While the subject was listening to the accomplice talk, his

nonverbal behavior was rated through a one way mirror. Ten nonverbal behaviors were rated for frequency of occurrence.

They were:

1. Recrossing the legs or shifting or tapping feet, any leg movement.
2. Shifting in chair, changing trunk position.
3. Apparent eye to eye contact. Face to face contact.
4. Looking up or down.
5. Shaking or nodding the head "Yes."
6. Shaking or nodding the head "no."
7. Body congruence. The top half of the accomplice and S are in similar positions. The arms are crossed for both people or one arm is leaning on the arm of the chair, etc. The bottom half of the bodies are in similar positions. The right legs are crossed for both people or we have a mirror image: the right leg crossed for one, the left for the other. Anything like this.
8. Any mouth, eye, or eyebrow movements. Nervously wetting the lips, raising the eyebrows, etc.
9. Nervous picking or playing with clothing or part of the body. Picking the nails, etc. Playing with eye-glasses, pen, or pencil. Scratching.
10. Tenseness in arms and hands. Clenching fists. Holding hands together. Rigidity in arms. Grasping arms of chair. Kneading hands together.

Analyses of variance for the nonverbal behaviors were computed. Three behaviors showed significant differences in frequency of occurrence due to the race of the accomplice. There was more body congruence and shaking the head "Yes" to a Negro accomplice and more tenseness in arms and hands to a Caucasian accomplice. Two behaviors

differed significantly depending on the speech heard. Both leg movement or tapping the feet, and apparent eye to eye contact were more frequent during the presentation of the conservative speech. Contrary to expectations, there were no significant Race X Speech interactions on the behaviors studied.

The hypothesis that nonverbal behavior would yield indicative measures was supported. A broad speculative framework was discussed. It was argued that the three nonverbal behaviors which differed significant due to Race all seemed to represent anxiety on the part of the subject. Likewise, the two behaviors which differed significantly due to Speech seemed to have the communicative meaning of boredom.

It was noted that the data obtained in this study was based only on a short 7 or 8 minute interpersonal encounter. However, the results led the author to conclude that if a longer time period were used, the data would reveal greater and clearer differences.

Some research which could be attempted was discussed. An interesting study would be that of the behaviors of Negroes towards other Negroes in such a situation.

NONVERBAL EXPRESSIONS OF PREJUDICE

By

Baron Perlman

A THESIS

Submitted to  
Michigan State University  
in partial fulfillment of the requirements  
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Psychology

1969

G 58375  
10/22/69

#### DEDICATION

This study is dedicated  
to my parents who, des-  
pite it being a long haul  
were with me all the way.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

First I would like to thank Dr. Messé. Had his office hours not been what they were I never would have made it up all those Monday mornings. His help in style, organization, and data analysis was greatly appreciated and I feel that I learned much from him.

Next my gratitude to Dr. Thorton. Chasing him around kept me in good physical condition and waiting to see him improved my patience. His comments concerning the proposal and thesis aided me greatly in obtaining the tools necessary to greatly increase my skills in psychology. Also, his insights and ideas concerning the research were illuminating and thought provoking.

To Dr. Stollak, my committee chairman, I express sincere appreciation. His humor and proper perspective of the entire situation kept me at the task. While I tired of writing and rewriting the research, he never seemed to feel the fatigue. I wish I had more of his energy and spirit.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS . . . . .	iii
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	v
LIST OF APPENDICES . . . . .	vi
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION . . . . .	1
History . . . . .	1
Nonverbal Behavior . . . . .	3
Behavioral Unit . . . . .	9
Statement of Problem . . . . .	12
2. METHOD . . . . .	13
Subjects . . . . .	13
Accomplices . . . . .	13
Setting . . . . .	13
Raters . . . . .	14
Design . . . . .	14
Procedure . . . . .	16
3. RESULTS . . . . .	19
4. DISCUSSION . . . . .	23
Significant Differences of Behavior Due to Race . . . . .	24
Significant Differences of Behavior Due to Speech . . . . .	27
5. SUMMARY . . . . .	32
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	35
APPENDICES . . . . .	38



## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Experimental Design . . . . .	15
2. List of Nonverbal Behaviors . . . . .	18

## LIST OF APPENDICES

Appendix	Page
A. Scripts . . . . .	38
B. Instructions . . . . .	50
C. Table 3. Reliability of Raters Using Product Moment Correlations . . . . .	52
D. Table 4. Mean Frequency of Occurrence, Standard Deviations, and Mean Totals for 10 Nonverbal Behaviors . . . . .	53
E. Table 5. Analyses of Variance . . . . .	56

## CHAPTER I

### INTRODUCTION

#### History

Both clinical lore and scientific history report on the usefulness of the study of the nonverbal behavior. It is known, for example, that skillful clinicians are guided by bodily behavior of their patient. (Mahl, 1968) Likewise, looking at the scientific historical antecedents to the study of nonverbal behavior, we can go back to Darwin. He concluded that nonverbal behavior was characteristic of distinct emotional states and that expressive movements have a signaling or communicative function. (Darwin, 1955)

Freud too, was interested in nonverbal behavior.

He that has eyes to see and ears to hear may convince himself that no mortal can keep a secret. If his lips are silent, he chatters with his finger-tips; betrayal oozes out of him at every pore. (Freud, 1905, 77-78)

Freud proposed that conflicted, repressed-unconscious impulses, wishful thoughts, emotions, and memories were often manifested in action instead of verbalization.

William Reich (1958) when writing about character analysis advanced the thesis that an individual's stable defenses were manifested in the "how" of his skeletal behavior and of his speech.

Birdwhistell (1952) insisted that nonverbal behavior has organizational principles of the same structure as the principles found in oral languages. Nonverbal behavior may be an essential aspect of the verbal communication. Birdwhistell talked of basic movement elements, "kines," analogous to phonemes. The kinesic channel may be a relatively independent channel of communication and whole kinesic conversations may be held outside awareness. "On a historical basis, then, there was some reason to believe, or at least to assume as a working hypothesis, that nonverbal behavior was significantly related to many variables . . . " (Mahl, 1968)

If an interest in nonverbal behavior has a historical basis, why has the scientific study of nonverbal behavior been relatively neglected? One argument is that psychology has been primarily concerned with theoretical issues in the past, and not as interested in behavioral description. There are also methodological problems (especially storing and filming records of nonverbal behavior) which existed prior to the recent development of video tape. The cost of camera filming was and is still prohibitively expensive. Furthermore, as Mahl (1968)

noted, judges when looking at films and rating an individual's nonverbal behavior often obtained contradictory results. Devising analytic methods of nonverbal behavior has presented another problem. Many psychologists are even skeptical that gestural and body movements have psychological significance. Mahl (1968) presents an extensive discussion of these problems. Currently, the field of nonverbal behavior is relatively unexplored. "There is no secure footing, nor anything firm to take hold of. . . . he (an experimenter) must do his own exploratory research in order to evaluate the arguments of our imaginary tough minded psychologist." (Mahl, 1968)

### Nonverbal Behavior

Yet, an absence of experimentation in an area and a historical basis for studying nonverbal behavior does not answer the question of "Why study nonverbal behavior?" Paul Ekman (1968) considered nonverbal behavior a promising data source. According to Ekman, nonverbal behavior is a relationship language, sensitive to, and the primary means of, signaling changes in the ongoing interpersonal relationship. Nonverbal behavior is a primary means of expressing emotion. Nonverbal behavior may present information about the subject which the subject is unaware he is communicating. Finally, nonverbal behavior has a "meta-communicative" function. It may limit or qualify how the

verbal discourse and interpersonal situation should be interpreted. Experimentation has shown that nonverbal behavior provides information about interpersonal relationships, emotion, basic attitudes towards self and others.

In more natural situations, only the professional--the gifted actor, the smart psychopath, the experienced diplomat, the persuasive courtroom lawyer, the winning car salesman--is a convincing nonverbal liar. (Ekman, 1968)

While the study of nonverbal behavior is a relatively virgin area of exploration, some experimentation has been done. Much of the information stems from a concern with nonverbal behavior in a psychotherapeutic or interviewing situation. Dittman (1962) utilized films from different psychotherapy hours of a single patient and showed that the area of the body involved in movement was related to the independently rated mood. Dittman (1965) in an article concerning facial and bodily expression reaffirmed his thesis that bodily cues yield information concerning affect. Ekman (1965a, 1965b) has shown that naive judges can reliably judge affect from viewing nonverbal behavior of normal individuals during stress interviews. Also, some claim can be made to at least gross accuracy in the judgment of emotion without any contextual knowledge. Ekman and Friesen (1967a) showed that not only gross affective states but also specific emotions can often be determined from nonverbal behavior. Intensity of the emotion could also be gathered. Specific emotions can often be perceived from

facial expressions and from body acts, while head orientation and body positions will most frequently only allow perception of gross affective states. Information about intensity of emotion is available from head and body movements.

Exline (Exline, Gray & Schuette, 1965; and Exline & Winters, 1965) found that the amount of interocular contact between normal subjects and interviewers was related to the interviewer's inquiries about embarrassing themes. The activity of another person's eyes has important affective connotations. Exline et al. (1965) cited Francis Bacon and Shakespeare as literary men interested in this idea. Bacon wrote about eyes as communicating love and envy, concern and unconcern. One learns from the other's eyes something of the other's desires, willingness, or ability to relate emotionally to another.

Work has also been done investigating nonverbal behavior as it reflects psychodynamic themes or ego defenses. (Mahl, Danet, & Norton, 1959) The authors found that many inferences drawn from nonverbal behavior alone were found to be accurate when verified against the patient's verbal behavior and past history. Deutsch (1946) interpreted his own research and research of others in a Freudian framework. He was interested in relating nonverbal behavior to childhood, repressions, sexuality, and especially unconscious material. Krim (1953) believed that

expressive behavior reveals characterological and emotional attitudes and that therapists would profit from observing such behavior in addition to the verbalization of the clients.

Nonverbal behavior was studied as a component of simultaneous verbal discourse. Ekman (1965a) studied how nonverbal behavior can accent a specific part of the verbal message; head shakes, shift in eye gaze, hand taps, etc. These can draw attention to a specific word or phrase. Mahl et al. (1959) described nonverbal behavior and its relationship to verbal content. Nonverbal behavior may express the same meaning as what is being said or it may express an opposing view. It may also be related to more global aspects of the interaction, rather than to the specifics of the verbal exchange.

Ekman (1968) described research where he found nonverbal behavior a source of information about changes in psychological functioning. It also yielded information about individual differences among patients.

Linn (1965) in an experiment concerning verbal attitudes and overt behavior involving racial discrimination found discrepancies between verbal attitudes about prejudice and subsequent overt behavior involving these attitudes. One implication of Linn's study is important for this current research being proposed. Statements or predictions of behavior involving possible prejudice



expressions based on attitude measurements often have little reliability unless first validated empirically. Paper and pencil tests of prejudice may or may not predict social behavior of people.

Mahl (1968) studied gestures and body movements in initial interviews. He obtained positive results when analyzing nonverbal behavior during the initial interview. Individuals differ markedly in nonverbal behavior. Some of these differences seem to be sex related. Many of these differences seem to be a function of personality variables. Mahl also did work on the visual situation of the interview: its effect on gestures and body movements. When the subjects moved from the normal face to face situation to a back to back situation, there was a significant decrease in the frequency of communicative gestures. Autistic actions increased significantly.

Many of the nonverbal behaviors to be used in this study have been explored in previous experimentation and have yielded some predictive information. Scheflen (1964) found that posture was not unique to each individual but occurred in characteristic standard configurations whose common recognizability was the basis of their value in communication. He talked about postural congruence. In a general way, congruence in posture indicated similarity in views or roles in the group. Congruence, like other

postural behavior has meaning, and may represent copying or identification.

Hess (1965) believed that eyes are clues to emotions. He used a nonverbal behavior we will not use, i.e., dilation and constriction of the pupils as a measure of interest, emotion and attitudes. Argyle (1965) has done research concerned with eye contact in a dyad. Eye contact was one way of gathering feedback on another person's reactions. It was a function of the distance apart the two people are and of affiliative motivation. There was less eye contact if there was tension in a relationship. Gibson & Pick (1963) were interested in the direction of a person's gaze which usually indicated what object the person was interested in or what the person was responding to. Exline (1965) also felt that the eyes communicated the degree and affective quality of one's involvement with another.

In summary, nonverbal behavior may have direct meaning. It may emphasize, contradict, or aid in interpreting verbal behavior, or have little relations to verbal behavior. Nonverbal behavior may also signify information about activity level and the accumulation and discharge of tension or anxiety. It was claimed by many researchers that psychotherapy could profitably enlarge its scope and pay more attention to gestures and body movements. On a more general level: nonverbal behavior exists and therefore can be studied. We would want to determine what

nonverbal behavior exists in certain situations and what it means. Whether, when, and how nonverbal behavior serves as an independent source of information about certain relevant variables is important but it is a subsidiary issue. And it can only be judged after a great deal of research. (Mahl, 1968)

### Behavioral Unit

Nonverbal behavior has been discussed very generally and the question must now be asked of what are the behavioral units in the analysis of nonverbal behavior. One of the methodological problems in studying nonverbal behavior has been to define just what to study. Mahl (1968) utilized several measures. He looked at general postural changes in an individual. Communicative gestures such as shaking one's head yes or no were considered. Finally, Mahl labeled a third type of nonverbal behavior, autistic gestures (such as playing with one's clothing or body, etc.). But these were still gross measures of nonverbal behavior and they must be reduced to a more specified units of analysis.

Ekman (1968) concerned himself with the time factor and felt that it can radically influence the results obtained. As an example, using arbitrary units defined by behavior occurring during standardized time segments will not, in all probability, lead to valid results. Ekman

based this statement on previous research. The unit he uses now, the nonverbal act/position, is based upon readily observable visually distinct patterns of nonverbal activity which determine both the unit boundaries and a taxonomy. The beginning and end of this unit is defined in terms of natural start and stop points in behavior. An act begins when a movement is first detectable, and ends when a movement is no longer apparent, or when another visually distinctive type of movement commences. "Our unit of analysis is thus geared to what can be observed and is distinctive to the unaided eye . . . " (Ekman, 1968) This behavior unit which Ekman described is the one to be used in the proposed study. A nonverbal act is defined as a movement within any single body area.

Ekman described two ways of looking at nonverbal behavior. The first was called the indicative approach. Direct measures of the nonverbal behavior were taken. Meaning of nonverbal behavior was defined in terms of how the nonverbal behavior varied systematically with other prescribed variables. The second approach mentioned was the communicative one. This measures observers' judgments; determining the meaning nonverbal behavior conveys to others.

In this study the indicative approach will be used. Frequency of nonverbal behavior units will be recorded. The use of frequency and duration as a measuring method is

supported by many psychologists, including Ekman and Skinner. Skinner (1953) claimed that the frequency of a response is emphasized by most of the concepts which have foreshadowed an explicit recognition of probability as a datum. These frequencies are of the observable facts and may be studied as such, rather than as evidence for the embodiment of probability in neural or psychic states. Duration is also important as the basic facts can be discovered only by examining behavior during appreciable intervals of time. Duration will not be used in this study. The communicative meaning of non-verbal behavior will be deduced from the frequency of occurrence of nonverbal behaviors.

The indicative approach does not completely exclude the communicative approach, however. An attempt to establish a relationship between nonverbal behavior and other classes of events which have been manipulated (our independent variables) will be made. Once this relationship is established, the nonverbal act has psychological meaning in that it can be considered to indicate the other related variable. It seems that once indicative information is gathered, communicative information of the behavior (if it exists) can be found.

Ekman mentioned five indicative measures: (1) non-verbal behavior may be indicative of characteristics of the person emitting them. (2) Relate nonverbal behavior in

relation to the situation in which the behavior occurs.

(3) Rate behavior in relation to what the other interactant does, or to his characteristics. The 4th and 5th relate nonverbal behavior to previous and subsequent nonverbal and verbalized behavior. The first three indicative measures are part of the underlying rationale in our experimental design.

### Statement of Problem

In this experiment the usefulness of nonverbal behavior as a dependent variable is being tested. Nonverbal behavior will hopefully communicate to the E differences between the various experimental conditions. The purpose of this experiment is to study nonverbal behavior as an expression of prejudice. By manipulating two independent variables (race of accomplice and viewpoint of racial disorders) prejudice will be determined from differences among the dependent variables (nonverbal behavior). Prejudice as defined here can be viewed as sensitization to the situation by a subject. Differences in behavior when hearing the same viewpoint are hypothesized to result from a S's awareness of whether the accomplice is Negro or Caucasian. This awareness (sensitization) is manifested in the S's nonverbal behavior. Another hypothesis is that it will be possible to give indicative measures of nonverbal behavior communicative meaning.

## CHAPTER 2

### METHOD

#### Subjects

The Ss were 80 Caucasian males obtained from the introductory psychology classes at Michigan State University in the spring of 1969.<sup>1</sup>

#### Accomplices

Four male accomplices,<sup>2</sup> two Negro and two Caucasian were hired from the theater department at Michigan State University.

#### Setting

A small room with a one way mirror, two chairs, and a low table provided the experimental setting. The chairs

---

<sup>1</sup>Ss were only male Caucasians since the E was not interested, at this time, in the interaction effects between a female S and a male accomplice. Research has shown that males and females exhibit different types of non-verbal behaviors in different frequencies.

<sup>2</sup>The two Negro actors were Alan Smith and Donald Trammel. The two Caucasian actors were Ray Price and Glen Sussman. I would like to thank all of them for the time

were soft backed and had arms since much of the literature on nonverbal behavior involves a S sitting in such a chair. The chairs were placed facing each other on a slight angle towards the one way mirror approximately five feet apart.

### Raters

A pilot study was run to train five raters<sup>3</sup> all of whom were undergraduates at Michigan State University receiving credits for research methods in Psychology. Two of them were present for every experimental session in order to obtain independent measures of nonverbal behavior. Raters viewed the session through the one way mirror and used labelled counters to gather the frequency of behaviors.

### Design

All accomplices learned both a radical and conservative script. A copy of the scripts can be found in Appendix A. One script presented a radical viewpoint about the causes and solutions of racial disorders, the other script was a conservative viewpoint about the same topic. The scripts were written so that each could be said by a

---

and effort they spent and for their helpful comments and suggestions.

<sup>3</sup>The five raters were Cliff Beresh, Betty Hills, Rosemary Klein, David Lauridsen, and Ruth Sugar. I would like to thank them for the many hours they worked and for their helpful comments.



Negro or Caucasian accomplice. The actors worked together in learning the scripts and added pauses, "you knows," "I think," tone of voice, postural and gestural cues, etc. As reported by the raters, in agreement with the E's expectations, all scripts sounded spontaneous and almost identical, no matter who was saying them.

Ss were randomly assigned to one of the two races of accomplice, giving either the radical or conservative viewpoint. Therefore, there were four experimental conditions with twenty Ss to each condition. The experimental design is diagrammed in Table 1.

TABLE 1  
EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

Viewpoint	Race of Accomplice	
	Negro	Caucasian
Radical	20	20
Conservative	20	20

The S was not told or led to believe in any way that the E was interested in his nonverbal behavior. No mention was made of the one way mirror. The drapes covering the mirror were only partly drawn so as to not accentuate the mirror's presence. Instructions (see Appendix B)

were read by one of two Caucasian Es in a uniform manner so as to avoid any test effect.

The use of the selection of a number and letter to determine the topic of discussion avoided giving the S any insight into the true nature of the experiment. It was feared that if the S was told directly that his opinions to the causes and solutions of racial problems were being studied, and if the S was in a dyad with a Negro accomplice, that the S may have correctly surmised that the Negro S is not a subject at all. A small box containing 80 pieces of paper each listing a number and letter was used for the supposed random selection of topic and speaking order.

### Procedure

The Ss were told that the E was interested in studying undergraduate opinions concerning social issues in the United States. All accomplices were informally but neatly dressed for the experimental sessions.

The accomplice and S were seated. The S did not know that the accomplice was working for the E. Care was taken to treat the accomplice at all times just as if he was any other subject. For example, when reading instructions, the E looked at both the S and accomplice with equal frequency. The S and accomplice were told that they were to discuss one of several social issues the E had chosen. One of them was asked to pick a piece of paper from the

small box. The E then looked at a list of numbers and letters and told the S and accomplice that according to the letter picked, they were to discuss the causes and solutions of racial problems in the United States; specifically causes and solutions of racial disorders in the big city, and that according to the number picked, the accomplice was to speak first.

The "S" (actually the accomplice) was asked to talk for up to ten minutes (actually he talked for the length of his script); then the real S talked for up to ten minutes giving his opinions; finally they discussed their views for an additional ten minutes. It was made clear that the first time each spoke, that the other was not to interrupt. To further insure that the accomplice's talk did not appear prepared, the S and accomplice were given about three minutes to think about that they wanted to say before the accomplice began. If the experimental session lasted over 35 minutes, the E re-entered the room and informed the pair that their time was up. The E was not present in the room during the actual session.

It was during the accomplice's speech, while the S was listening, that the S's nonverbal behavior was rated. The ten nonverbal behaviors of the S which were scored for are found in Table 2.

TABLE 2  
LIST OF NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS

---

Nonverbal Behaviors	
<hr/>	
1.	Recrossing the legs or shifting or tapping feet, any leg movement.
2.	Shifting in chair, changing trunk position.
3.	Apparent eye to eye contact. Face to face contact.
4.	Looking up or down.
5.	Shaking or nodding the head "Yes."
6.	Shaking or nodding the head "No."
7.	Body congruence. The top half of the accomplice and S are in similar positions. The arms are crossed for both people or one arm is leaning on the arm of the chair, etc. The bottom half of the bodies are in similar positions. The right legs are crossed for both people or we have a mirror image: the right leg crossed for one, the left for the other. Anything like this.
8.	Any mouth, eye, or eyebrow movements. Nervously wetting the lips, raising the eyebrows, etc.
9.	Nervous picking or playing with clothing or part of the body. Picking the nails, etc. Playing with eyeglasses, pen, or pencil. Scratching.
10.	Tenseness in arms and hands. Clenching fists. Holding hands together. Rigidity in arms. Grasping arms of chair. Kneading hands together.

---

## CHAPTER 3

### RESULTS

Five combinations of pairs of raters were used, and reliabilities for each pair on each of the ten behaviors was calculated using product moment correlations. A table of these reliabilities (Table 3) is presented as Appendix C. Raters A and B had the highest reliability. It appeared as if rater C accounted for the low reliabilities in the pairs C and D, and C and E.

Table 4, presented as Appendix D, presents the mean frequency of occurrence and standard deviations for each of the ten nonverbal behaviors for each of the four experimental conditions. In addition, mean totals are also given. Nine analyses of variances were computed, one for each of the ten behaviors (except for "head shaking no" which did not occur with enough frequency). The full summaries of these analyses were presented as Appendix E (Table 5).

For behavior 1, recrossing the legs . . . , (see Table 5), the F value for Speech was significant ( $p < .01$ ) while Race and a Race X Speech interaction was not significant. The frequency with which the S recrossed his legs or

shifted or tapped his feet differed significantly depending upon whether the S heard a radical or conservative speech. As Table 4 shows, the mean frequency of behavior 1 to a conservative speech was 8.51 as compared to 5.26 for a radical speech. This behavior gave no significant indicative measures for race of accomplice.

The analysis of variance for behavior 3, apparent eye to eye contact--face to face contact, yielded a significant Speech effect ( $p < .05$ ) but Race and the interaction Race X Speech were not significant. The mean frequency of behavior 3 to a conservative speech was 6.25 while to a radical speech it was only 4.39 (Table 4). Thus, the S looked more at the accomplice and orientated his head more toward the accomplice when the latter was giving a conservative speech. The race of the actor does not significantly influence behavior 3.

Behavior 5, nodding head "yes," was one of three behaviors where significant differences appeared in the indicative measure depending on the race of the accomplice. Race was significant ( $p < .01$ ) while Speech and the Race X Speech interaction were not significant. Mean frequency of behavior 5 to a Negro was 3.98 and to a Caucasian it was 1.72 (Table 4). The S nodded his head "yes" with significantly different frequency depending on the race of the accomplice. As seen in Table 4, the mean frequency of body congruence per 10 minute session was very low as compared to

other behaviors. The main effect of Speech and the interaction Race X Speech were not significant but Race was significant ( $p < .01$ ) (Table 5). Even though the absolute frequencies were low, there were more body congruences between a S and a Negro actor (0.61) than to a Caucasian actor (0.27). (See Table 4.) Since body congruence is usually measured with frequency and duration, any communicative meaning hypothesized for behavior 7 will be very speculative.

Behavior 10, tenseness in arms and hands . . . , yielded a significant main effect Race ( $p < .05$ ) while Speech and the Race X Speech interaction were not significant. Tenseness in arms and hands, etc., was displayed significantly more by the S when he was listening to a Caucasian actor. The mean frequency of occurrence when with a Negro was 1.43 as compared to 2.99 when with a Caucasian (Table 4).

In summary, three behaviors showed significant differences in frequency of occurrence due to the race of the actor. There was more body congruence and shaking the head "yes" to a Negro actor while there was more tenseness in arms and hands, etc. to a Caucasian accomplice. Two behaviors differed significantly depending on the speech heard. Both leg movement or tapping the feet and apparent eye to eye contact showed more frequency to the conservative

viewpoint. There were no significant Race X Speech interactions for any of the behaviors studied.



## CHAPTER 4

### DISCUSSION

It appears that our most general hypothesis is supported. Nonverbal behavior does vary in the different experimental conditions. Out of the ten behaviors chosen, nine occurred with enough frequency to allow good indicative measures to be taken. The only exception was behavior six, shaking the head "no." The problem is now one of translating this indicative information about nonverbal behavior into communicative data.

Basically; the S exhibits more body congruence and shook his head "yes" more to a Negro accomplice, yet exhibited more tenseness in his arms and hands when with a Caucasian. Leg movement or tapping the feet and apparent eye to eye contact occurred with a higher frequency to the conservative speech.

The system of communicative meaning to be attempted assumes that the nonverbal behaviors represent a continuum ranging from boredom to anxiety. The three behaviors which differ significantly due to Race all seem to represent anxiety. Likewise, the two behaviors which differ significantly

due to Speech can be seen to have the communicative meaning of boredom. A very broad speculative framework will be discussed with some attempt to try to conceptualize the underlying variables leading to the observed behavior.

Significant Differences of Behavior  
Due to Race

Anxiety

As Table 4 shows, there is more body congruence on the part of a S when he is with a Negro accomplice. Body congruence is usually measured by frequency and duration. As will be recalled in this case only frequency measures were taken. Therefore, more body congruence per 10 minute session may not mean that the S is identifying with the accomplice. Two people in body congruence for a full ten minutes has different meaning than two people in body congruence seven or eight times for one or two seconds each in ten minutes.

Scheflen (1964) discussed congruence as indicating similarity in views or as copying. More body congruence per ten minutes to the Negro seems to suggest that the S is moving around more than during the Caucasian speeches. He is in body congruence, then shifts about before forming another body congruence.

The explanation which seems to give meaning to this behavior is that the S is sensitive to the fact that the

accomplice is Negro or Caucasian. With a Negro, the S while listening shows that he is "with" the Negro, he agrees with the Negro. The S may feel guilt over past interpersonal situations with Negroes, or over the Caucasians' treatment of Negroes. The S copies the Negro's posture: communicating that they agree to reduce anxiety.

It is hypothesized that the S is nonverbally communicating his anxiety. Therefore, the frequency of body congruences is higher to the Negro than the Caucasian. This hypothesis is partially supported by behaviors 2 and 9 (shifting in chair or changing trunk position and nervous picking, scratching, etc.) which, although not significantly different for Negroes and Caucasians, do show more frequency to a Negro. More movement, more congruence possibly indicates more anxiety.

The S also shakes his head "yes" significantly more to a Negro than to a Caucasian accomplice. The S is communicating agreement with the Negro. But there is no significant difference between yes nods to a radical Negro or conservative Negro. Again it is hypothesized that the S feels guilty or threatened and his nonverbal behavior communicates this, while also alleviating his anxiety.

Tenseness in the arms and hands, etc. is also hypothesized to communicate anxiety. This hypothesis is supported by everyday observation and past research. There is significantly more of this behavior to a Caucasian than to

a Negro. The S when with a Negro, does not seem to be too influenced by what is said. The significant differences due to Speech are found in behaviors which seem to indicate boredom. If any directional communicative meaning can be established, it appears that differences due to speech lie nearer the boredom end of the continuum. But with a Caucasian, the S may be anxious because of that is said, i.e., he expects the Negro to be radical and it does not surprise him. Or if the Negro is conservative the S feels some safety. But to have another Caucasian say things very radical may be anxiety producing. It is threatening to have a Caucasian call oneself a racist and advocate sweeping change.

With the conservative Caucasian speech, the S may feel anxious for opposite reasons. The S is hearing another Caucasian say things which are irrational and ladden with prejudice. To test this hypothesis it would be necessary to have a group of Ss hear a middle of the road speech by both Negroes and Caucasians and record frequency of tenseness in arms and hands, etc.

### Boredom

As described above, the Caucasian subject may be expecting a Negro to say certain things and might find the radical viewpoint boring. More body congruence could, therefore, represent fidgeting in the chair. The movement

could communicate boredom. To the Negro conservative speech more body congruence could easily keep its communicative meaning of boredom. The S's expectations of a battle of ideologies has not materialized as the Negro is not calling for speratism or radical change. The S may, therefore, find the situation boring. Besides further research centering on nonverbal behavior, another experimental means of obtaining relevant information would be the self-report. The S could be asked how he felt, was he bored or anxious, and did he have any ideas as to why. Such data might prove to illuminate our speculations.

#### Significant Differences of Behavior Due to Speech

##### Anxiety

There is significantly more of behavior 1 (leg movement or tapping feet) to the conservative speech. If it is assumed that the 80 Ss are well read liberals who "know where it's at," then the above hypothesis is possible. The Ss could find the radical speech in agreement with their views but to have someone talk conservatively could be anxiety or even anger arousing.

The analysis of variance for behavior 3 (apparent eye to eye contact) showed significant differences between frequency of behavior during the conservative and radical speeches. There is more of behavior 3 to the conservative

speech. Argyle (1965) supports the notions that less apparent eye to eye contact indicates tension in a relation. If we use the same assumption as above, i.e., a liberal S finds the conservative speech anxiety producing, then Argyle's research would be placed in doubt. But the assumption is really not too defensible. Therefore, to label either of the above two behaviors as communicating anxiety is not firmly grounded in the data.

### Boredom

To expect the majority of the Ss to be radical is asking a great deal. Many of the Ss came from small towns in the midwest or from Detroit (where recent problems may influence one's outlook). At the best, the Ss would probably show a majority of moderates with the radicals balancing out the conservatives. Therefore, the more tenable speculation is that leg tapping or foot movement and more eye to eye contact indicate boredom or disinterest. The Ss probably found the radical speech much more interesting and possibly much more arousing than the conservative one. Even if one had heard both viewpoints before, the radical speech is more likely to hold one's interest. The Ss knew they were in an experiment which was to last 30 minutes and most came to obtain credits required for introductory psychology. It is argued here that a S is more likely to become bored with the proceedings if he is listening to

what is said. The mere presence of a Negro may make him somewhat anxious but nonverbal communication about the speeches is probably reflecting a more immediate internal state of boredom.

More eye to eye contact during the conservative speech if interpreted as indicating less tension would seem to mean that the S is more bored during the conservative speech. For the above reasons this is very possible.

It must be noted that the broad speculative attempt at obtaining communicative meaning is based on the very short 7 or 8 minute interpersonal encounter. It is the E's feeling that a clearer division of communicative meaning would be obtained if nonverbal behavior was rated over a longer time period. The 7 or 8 minutes seems too short to yield anything more than a glimpse at possible differences.

From the E's contact with the Ss as well as from reports by raters and actors, the factor boredom surely seems a possibility. As for anxiety, the Negro actors did not report that their Ss were "up tight" with anymore frequency than the Caucasian actors. Of course, this does not mean that the Ss with a Negro actor were not more anxious, but to validate communicative interpretations of anxiety from nonverbal behavior requires that perhaps another dependent measure should have been used. It would have been quite easy for example, to ask each S after the experimental session, how he felt. It is the E's opinion

that many Ss could have felt anxious during the sessions, but this is based on a general feeling of what was taking place and not on actual data per se.

Our speculation leads us to conclude that nonverbal behavior is certainly a useful indicative measure and probably can be given communicative meaning. But future research would be required before nonverbal behavior could be used to predict from a specific situation the future behavior and present attitudes of an individual.

Much future research is possible. Negro and Caucasian accomplices could enter stores and deal with sales clerks and the nonverbal behavior (as well as verbal) of sales clerks recorded. Interaction of Negroes and Caucasians in social situations could be observed, and behavior recorded. Self-reports could be used in studies similar to this one. Studies could be extended to include female Ss and finally female or male accomplices. Attitudes of Negroes towards such points of view could be investigated by using all Negro Ss in a study.

The word prejudice as used here is defined as a sensitization to the race of a person with whom one finds himself. This sensitization is communicated in many ways, one of which is nonverbal behavior. While merely looking at nonverbal behavior is tunneling one's vision, to be able to find communicative meaning in nonverbal behavior would fit one small piece in a large whole of the conflicts



between Negroes and Caucasians in the United States. In the future, perhaps such knowledge will help the social scientist make everyone just a little more color blind.

## CHAPTER 5

### SUMMARY

This study was undertaken to determine if indicative measures of nonverbal behavior could be gathered in a situation where expressions of prejudice were likely.

In our experiment purporting to study student opinion on social issues, Negro or Caucasian accomplices presented either a prepared "radical" or "conservative" viewpoint to the causes and solutions of big city racial problems in the United States to Caucasian male Ss who were all from introductory psychology classes. The 80 Ss were randomly assigned to one of four experimental conditions: Negro radical, Negro conservative, Caucasian radical, and Caucasian conservative. Two raters were present for each session and the mean of their scores was used as the data for analysis. The scripts of the accomplices sounded spontaneous and were rehearsed by all the accomplices so that their vocal reflections and body movements were similar. While the subject was listening to the accomplice talk, his nonverbal behavior was rated through a one way

mirror. Ten nonverbal behaviors were rated for frequency of occurrence. They were:

1. Recrossing the legs or shifting or tapping feet, any leg movement.
2. Shifting in chair, changing trunk position.
3. Apparent eye to eye contact. Face to face contact.
4. Looking up or down.
5. Shaking or nodding the head "Yes."
6. Shaking or nodding the head "No."
7. Body congruence. The top half of the accomplice and S are in similar positions. The arms are crossed for both people or one arm is leaning on the arm of the chair, etc. The bottom half of the bodies are in similar positions. The right legs are crossed for both people or we have a mirror image: the right leg crossed for one, the left for the other. Anything like this.
8. Any mouth, eye, or eyebrow movements. Nervously wetting the lips, raising the eyebrows, etc.
9. Nervous picking or playing with clothing or part of the body. Picking the nails, etc. Playing with eyeglasses, pen, or pencil. Scratching.
10. Tenseness in arms and hands. Clenching fists. Molding hands together. Rigidity in arms. Grasping arms of chair. Kneading hands together.

Analyses of variance for the nonverbal behaviors were computed. Three behaviors showed significant differences in frequency of occurrence due to the race of the accomplice. There was more body congruence and shaking the head "Yes" to a Negro accomplice and more tenseness in arms and hands to a Caucasian accomplice. Two behaviors differed significantly depending on the speech heard. Both

leg movement or tapping the feet, and apparent eye to eye contact were more frequent during the presentation of the conservative speech. Contrary to expectations, there were no significant Race X Speech interactions on the behaviors studied.

The hypothesis that nonverbal behavior would yield indicative measures was supported. A broad speculative framework was discussed. It was argued that the three nonverbal behaviors which differed significantly due to Race all seemed to represent anxiety on the part of the subject. Likewise, the two behaviors which differed significantly due to Speech seemed to have the communicative meaning of boredom.

It was noted that the data obtained in this study was based only on a short 7 or 8 minute interpersonal encounter. However, the results led the author to conclude that if a longer time period were used, the data would reveal greater and clearer differences.

Some research which could be attempted was discussed. An interesting study would be that of the behaviors of Negroes towards other Negroes in such a situation.

## **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Argyle, M., & Dean, J. Eye-contact, distance and affiliation. Sociometry, 1965, 28, 289-304.
- Bender, I.E., & Hastorf, A.M. The perception of persons: forecasting another person's responses in 3 personality scales. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1950, 45, 556-561.
- Bettelheim & Janowitz. Prejudice. Scientific American, October, 1950, 11-13.
- Birdwhistell, R. Introduction to Kinesics. Louisville, Ky., University of Louisville, 1952.
- Byrne, D., & McGraw, C. Interpersonal attraction towards Negroes. Human Relations, 1964, 17, (3), 201-213.
- Darwin, C. The Expression of the Emotions in Men and Animals. New York. Philosophical Library, 1955.
- Deutsch, F. Analysis of postural behavior. Psychoanalytic Quarterly, 1946, 16, 195-213.
- Dittman, A.T. The relationship between body movements and moods in interviews. Journal of Consulting Psychology, 1962, 26, 480.
- Ekman, Paul. A methodological disucssion of nonverbal behavior. Journal of Psychology, 1957, 43, 141-149.
- Ekman, Paul. Body position, facial expression, and verbal behavior during interviews. Journal of Abnormal & Social Psychology, 1964, 68, (3), 295-301.
- Ekman, Paul. Communication through nonverbal behavior: A source of information about an interpersonal relation. In Tomkins, S.S., & Izard, C.E., (Eds.), Affect, Cognition and Personality. New York: Springer, 1965a, 390-442.

- Ekman, Paul. Differential communication of affect by head and body cues. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965b, 2, (5), 726-735.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W.V. System for the classification and analysis of nonverbal behavior. Unpublished technical report, 1965, San Francisco, Langley Porter Neuropsychiatric Institute.
- Ekman, P., & Friesen, W.V. Head and body cues in the judgment of emotion: A reformulation. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 1967a, 24, 711-724.
- Ekman, Paul, & Friesen, W.V. Nonverbal behavior in psychotherapy research. In, Research in Psychotherapy, Volume III, Shlien, J. (Ed.), 1968, 179-215.
- Exline, R.V., Gray, D., & Schuette, D. Visual behavior in a dyad as affected by interview content and sex of respondent. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1965, 1, 201-209.
- Exline, R.V., & Winters, L. Affective relations and mutual glances in dyads. In, Tomkins, S.S., & Izard, C. E. (Eds.), Affect, Cognition, and Personality, New York: Springer, 1965, 319-350.
- Freud, S. Fragment of an analysis of a case of hysteria. (Orig. pub. 1905) In, The Standard Edition of the Complete Psychological Works of Sigmund Freud. Vol. 7, London: Hogarth, 1953, 3-122.
- Gibson, J.J., & Pick, A.D. Perception of another persons looking behavior. American Journal of Psychology, 76, September, 1963, 386-394.
- Hess, E.M. Attitude and pupil size. Scientific American, 212, April, 1965, 46-54.
- Krim, A. A study in nonverbal communications: Expressive movements during interviews. Smith Coll. Stud. Soc. Wk., 1953, 24, 41-8.
- Lambert, W.W., & Lambert, W.E. Social Psychology. New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, 1964.
- Leventhal, M., & Sharp, E. Facila expressions as indicators of distress. In, Tomkins, S.S., & Izard, C.E. (Eds.), Affect, Cognition, and Personality, New York: Springer, 1965, 296-318.

- Linn, W.S. Verbal attitudes and overt behavior: A study of racial discriminations. Social Forces, 1965, 43, (3), 353-364.
- Luborsky, L., Blinder, B. & Macworth, N. Eye fixation and recall of pictures as a function of GSR responsivity. Percept. Motor Skills, 1963, 16, 469-483.
- Mahl, Danet & Norton. Reflection of major personality characteristics in gestures and body movements. American Psychologist. 1959, 14, 357.
- Mahl, G.F. Gestures and body movements. In, Research in Psychotherapy, Volume III, Shlien, J. (Ed.), 295-345.
- Reich, W. Character Analysis. London: Vision Press, 1958.
- Riemer, M.D. Abnormalities of the gaze--a classification. Psychiatric Quarterly, 29, December, 1955, 659-672.
- Scheflen, A.E. The significance of posture in communication systems. Psychiatry, 1964, 27, 316-331.
- Schlosberg, M. Three dimensions of emotionl Psychological Review, 1954, 61, 81-88.
- Skinner, B.F. Some contributions of an experimental analysis of behavior to psychology as a whole. American Psychologist, 1963, 8, 69-78.



## APPENDICES

## APPENDIX A

### Scripts

## APPENDIX A

### SCRIPTS

#### Conservative Speech

O.K. I think that one of the main causes of racial disorders in the cities is a communist conspiracy. Communists organized the riots so we would look bad to other countries. That's why Stokely Carmichael is always in Cuba and North Viet Nam. There wouldn't be any riots if the policemen would just enforce the laws they have. The problem is all those damn intellectuals who have raised such a big fuss that the officers are afraid to enforce the law, because when they do, they get in trouble themselves. Now, what kind of country is this where cops get in trouble for enforcing the laws? Breaking the law by anyone must not be tolerated, because when laws are allowed to be broken, the victims are the peaceful, law abiding citizens, and the Negro in the past, I think, has not been a responsible citizen. I think he's rioted and looted and burned and deserves much of the punishment he's gotten. Now I know the white man in the past hasn't been any angel, either, but times have changed and the Negro shouldn't use

past grievances as an excuse to break the laws. Now maybe one of the reasons why integration--at least pushy integration has not worked is because there is such a cultural difference between the races. Negroes have their own world, and I think most Negroes would want to stay to themselves. They have their own world and aren't interested in white values and ideals. All they really want is to have a few middle-class comforts--a good car, a T.V., you know. And there are plenty of jobs available for Negroes who want to work.

The middle class Negro works--he doesn't riot. He stays home and is a good citizen. I think the people who riot are the ones who haven't worked their way up. They just want to get the same material things that the hard-working members of the middle class have gotten for themselves. The large and growing Negro middle class is proof that all the Negro has to do is work as hard as his white counterpart and he will get what he wants. The trouble is coming from those who don't give a damn about going through the usual channels to achieve economic and personal success. The ghetto Negro is an easy-going hedonist who wants to join the hard-working class, but unless he changes his values, he's never going to get in; and rioting is going to hurt his goals. Pause. In fact, I'm not sure he wants to get in.

Another trouble is, everybody told the Negro that if he'd just make a little trouble, the government would give him everything he wants. Now, that's like giving candy to a little boy for being bad rather than rewarding him for being good. And the government, I think, has encouraged riots, because every time the Negroes burn the town down, the government gives them a nice new one. Now the Negro thinks the solution is to destroy what he has so that the government will give him better. Why can't the lower class Negro work like everybody else to integrate himself. Many minority groups have felt persecuted by the main stream American culture. As soon as they worked a little bit and got ahead, it's funny how they stopped feeling victimized. And I think the Negro who really wants to will do the same thing. The middle class Negro--he doesn't feel victimized and go out in the street and riot and loot, because he's worked hard, and he has accomplished something --and he's integrated. And the solution to racial disorders is to enforce the laws, stop the rioting and stop giving rewards to law breakers. Stop molly-coddling people who don't appreciate this great country of ours. And find the Commies who are stirring up all this trouble, and punish them. Within the law, of course. And we, we have to support the police, because if the police are made powerless, who's going to defend us from this lawlessness. We've got communists everywhere. In fact, a lot of Negroes wouldn't

be rioting and looting if it wasn't for Communists. Most of them are pretty satisfied right where they are--on welfare or out in the streets and they weren't complaining until the communists came along.

The Negro must learn the white man's way of achieving his aims. There just aren't any shortcuts. And trying to take shortcuts results in the lawlessness which we are witnessing today. All the Negro has to do is follow the lead of his more industrious black brothers. It can be done. It's the American way. And even the black leadership is doing it. Look at the way they publish books. They're getting royalties from these books. So, you know they're being industrious and earning their way. And the people who promise the pot of gold to the Negro will have to be silenced for they are adding fuel to the flames. And I think we must be patient. Integration takes time. The Negro must learn to postpone immediate gratification for future goals. It will take time for the Negro to fit in, and we have to wait and keep this country in one piece while we wait.

Negro Radical

First of all, Whitey, you are a racist. Now, not all whites are Whiteys are racists. You've killed blacks. When you can't kill blacks directly, you do it legally, economically, and socially. Racists put blacks in the slums, charge higher prices for shitty goods, charge fucked-up rent, rape our women, pay us less at work, hire blacks last and fire us first. Racism, racism against the black ranges through unions, colleges, management, welfare, government, and everywhere.

Now politically, blacks have about as many rights as before the Civil War. Black communities are run by white carpetbaggers, right now--today. Legislation is loopholed so all the laws sound just great on paper, but you know they don't mean shit--you just have to work a little harder to fuck the black man. And the police--hell we all know the police are pigs. Capital punishment is real handy for eliminating blacks, and your generals in the Armed Forces always try to use up the blood of the black man so he doesn't lose any of his previous white boys. Of course, the situation doesn't improve. You know, we really can't vote--we can't even register down South and everywhere else everybody screws up the districts or throws our vote out.

And then there's the social structure. The middle class and its careful choice of friends, like, you know, frats, country clubs, and all that shit. Of course, now, every party has to have its black couple--the super-nigger type--sort of like a badge saying, "I like Negroes." You know, "I once had a friend who was Negro." You're getting real subtle, real subtle, but you're still a racist. You know it, we know it, so let's drop the act, man. You dig!

You've seen to it that we have no past. We got lots of "White Knights" but what about some black heroes. You know, there have been lots of them. You know--or didn't you know? Like DuBois, Cleaver, Stokely Carmichael, Leroi Jones. You've heard of them? We do have a history. Black children are tired of learning about white Dick and Janes doing their thing in nice little white houses when all they see is a world which is cruel, hostile and filled with empty promises.

Now, what to do about this situation? As I see it, get rid of you Whiteys. Just get him clear the hell out of here. If it isn't done soon and peacefully, then someone is going to get ripped off, and it ain't going to be the black man. It's going to be good-bye Whitey--George Wallace, Daley, cops, college presidents, the establishment, and even some blacks. You know, some Negroes look black on the outside but they're really whiteys on the inside. Blacks must be given power--power to run our own businesses,



schools, apartments, towns, and governments. And some laws with guts have to be assessed--not this messing around with laws aimed at tokenism but at real, relevant problems. Laws are needed to protect the black man from Whitey and to protect Whitey from himself. And then there's all this shit about law and order--like old J. Edgar saying justice is only incidental to law and order and Nixon wanting to jail people before they commit a crime--we know who is going to get screwed by that kind of a deal. Economically, all the government has to do is to spend a little less money on wars and stop screwing the black man and give us some credits for a lot of blood, sweat, and grief. You owe us more than you could ever pay for in a million years. You people owe it and we're going to collect from those who wrenched us from our homeland, enslaved us, lynched us, beat and tortured us, humiliated us, stripped away our heritage, our pride, our dignity, our humanness. You're trying to keep us slaves, even today--trying to coop us up into little stinking ghettos sitting with the rats underneath the freeway. The unions have to be opened up, equal hiring laws have to be enforced, the welfare system has to be reorganized. There's got to be black controlled businesses and government for black communities and schools. We blacks must have real power over our own real problems, not this piddling shit we've been getting. And finally,

you've got to learn, one way or the other, that the black man is going to change this country, and if Whitey resists, he's going to have one hell of a fight on his hands.

Caucasian Radical

First of all, Whitey's a racist. Now, not all whites are Whiteys, but all Whiteys are racists. Whites kill blacks. Whey they can't kill blacks directly, they do it legally, economically, and socially. Racists put blacks in the slums, charge higher prices for crummy goods, charge ridiculous rent, rape black women, pay less at work, hire blacks last and fire them first. Racism, racism against the working black ranges through unions, colleges, management, welfare, government, and everywhere.

Now politically, blacks have about as many rights as before the Civil War, Black communities are run by white carpetbaggers, right now--today. Legislation is loopholed so all the laws sound just great on paper, but whitey knows they don't mean shit--he just has to work a little harder to fuck the black man. And the police--hell, we all know the police are pigs. Capital punishment is real handy for eliminating blacks, and the Whitey generals in the Armed Forces always try to use up the blood of the black man so he doesn't lose any of the precious white boys. Of course, the situation doesn't improve. You know, blacks really can't vote--they can't even register down South and everywhere else everybody screws up the districts or throws the black vote out.

And then there's the social structure. The middle class and its careful choice of friends, like, you know, frats, country clubs, and all that crap. Of course, now, every party has to have its black couple--the super-nigger type--sort of like a badge saying, "I like Negroes." You know, "I once had a friend who was Negro." Whitey's getting real subtle, real subtle--but he's still a racist. He knows it, we know it, so let's drop the act, man.

Whitey has seen to it that the blacks have no past. There are lots of "White Knights" but what about some black heroes. You know, there have been lots of them. You know--or didn't you know? Like Jimmy Brown, Stokely Carmichael, Leroi Jones. You've heard of them? Blacks have a history. Black children are tired of learning about white Dick and Janes doing their thing in nice little white houses when all they see is a world which is cruel, hostile and filled with empty promises.

Now, what to do about this situation? As I see it, get rid of Whitey. Just get him clear the hell out of here. If it isn't done soon and peacefully, then someone is going to get wiped off the face of the earth, and it ain't going to be the black man. It's going to be good-bye Whitey--George Wallace, Daley, cops, college presidents, the establishment, and even some blacks. You know, some Negroes look black on the outside but they're really whiteys on the inside. Blacks must be given power--power

to run their own businesses, schools, apartments, towns, and governments. And some laws with guts have to be passed --not this messing around with laws aimed at tokenism but at real relevant problems. Laws are needed to protect the black man from Whitey and to protect whitey from himself. And then there's all this shit about law and order--like old J. Edgar saying justice is only incidental to law and order and Nixon wanting to jail people before they commit a crime--we know who is going to get screwed by that kind of a deal. Economically, all the government has to do is to spend a little less money on wars and stop screwing the black man and give him the due share of money he has paid in--and give some credit for a lot of blood, sweat, and grief. The white man owes more than he could ever pay for in a million years. Whitey owes it and they're going to collect from those who wrenched them from their homeland, enslaved them, lynched them, beat and tortured them, humiliated them, stripped away their heritage, their pride, their dignity, their humanness, and he's trying to keep them slaves, even today--trying to coop them up into little stinking ghettos sitting with the rats underneath the freeway. The unions have to be opened up, equal hiring laws have to be enforced, and the welfare system has to be re-organized. There's got to be some black controlled business and government for black communities and schools. Blacks must have real power over their own real problems,

not this piddling shit they've been getting. And finally, whitey's got to learn, one way or the other, that the black man is going to change this country, and if Whitey resists, he's going to have one hell of a fight on his hands.

## **APPENDIX B**

### **Instructions**

## APPENDIX B

### INSTRUCTIONS

The purpose of this study is to obtain undergraduate opinions concerning certain social issues in the United States. To determine which social issue you will discuss, will one of you pick a piece of paper from this box. According to the letter picked, you two will discuss the causes and solutions to racial disorders in the United States, specifically in the big city. You will speak first (point to the accomplice). You will speak for up to ten minutes concerning your viewpoints as to the causes of racial disorders and solutions to the problem. After you speak, the other subject will speak for up to ten minutes. While one of you is speaking we would appreciate no interruptions from the other person. Immediately after the second person is done speaking, you will have ten minutes to discuss your opinions between yourselves.

Feel free to offer your opinion no matter what it is. The purpose of this study is to gain YOUR opinions to certain social issues. You can use any language, comparisons, or examples you like if it helps you in expressing



your view. This session is being tape recorded. All that is said here is confidential and will be known only to the experimenters.

To give you a chance to organize your thoughts, you will have about 3 minutes to think about what you will say. When you are done, please leave the room. One of the experimenters will meet you in the hallway.

If you have any questions, please ask them now.

## APPENDIX C

### Reliability of Raters Using Product Moment Correlations

# APPENDIX C

## TABLE 3

RELIABILITY OF RATERS USING PRODUCT MOMENT CORRELATIONS<sup>1</sup>

	Behavior									
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
A & B	.921	.907	.797	.935	.963	.852	.384	.854	.946	.880
C & D	.793	.779	.513	.755	.909	1.00	.373	.498	.692	.972
Raters C & E	.474	.452	.269	.308	.905	.885	0.00	.272	.727	.262
D & E	.939	.930	.734	.638	.930	1.00	.305	.749	.725	.790
A & D	.980	1.00	.765	.864	.932	1.00	.612	.255	.863	.812

<sup>1</sup>It should be noted that for those behaviors where the analysis of variance indicates significant differences, the reliabilities tend to be higher.

## **APPENDIX D**

**Mean Frequency of Occurrence, Standard  
Deviations, and Mean Totals for 10  
Nonverbal Behaviors**

# APPENDIX D

## TABLE 4

MEAN FREQUENCY OF OCCURRENCE, STANDARD DEVIATIONS,  
AND MEAN TOTALS FOR 10 NONVERBAL BEHAVIORS

Behavior	Speech	Race		Mean Totals of Speech
		Negro	Caucasian	
1 leg movement	Radical	5.97= $\bar{X}$ 4.15=S.D.	4.55	5.26
	Conservative	7.83 6.06	9.18 6.91	8.51
	Mean Totals of Race	6.90	7.37	
-----				
2 shifting	Radical	1.85= $\bar{X}$ 1.52=S.D.	1.60 1.98	1.73
	Conservative	3.08 2.72	1.78 1.82	2.43
	Mean Totals of Race	2.47	1.69	
-----				
3 eye to eye	Radical	4.68= $\bar{X}$ 1.56=S.D.	4.10 4.18	4.39
	Conservative	7.15 4.27	5.35 3.53	6.25
	Mean Totals of Race	5.93	4.73	
-----				

TABLE 4--continued

Behavior	Speech	Race		Mean Totals of Speech
		Negro	Caucasian	
4 looking up or down	Radical	5.60= $\bar{X}$ 2.49=S.D.	5.03 4.85	5.32
	Conservative	7.68 4.56	5.43 3.47	6.56
	Mean Totals of Race	6.64	5.23	
5 nodding head yes	Radical	3.18= $\bar{X}$ 4.24=S.D.	1.40 2.26	2.79
	Conservative	4.78 4.51	2.03 3.71	3.41
	Mean Totals of Race	3.98	1.72	
6 nodding head no	Radical	0.15= $\bar{X}$ 0.56=S.D.	0.08 0.08	0.12
	Conservative	0.15 0.67	0.20 0.69	0.18
	Mean Totals of Race	0.15	0.14	
7 Congruence	Radical	0.68= $\bar{X}$ 0.66=S.D.	0.25 0.47	0.47
	Conservative	0.53 0.54	0.28 0.41	0.41
	Mean Totals of Race	0.61	0.27	

TABLE 4--continued

Behavior	Speech	Race		Mean Totals of Speech
		Negro	Caucasian	
8  mouth, eye, eyebrow movements, etc.	Radical	8.03= $\bar{X}$ 6.16=S.D.	11.1 7.01	9.57
	Conservative	7.68 5.84	9.30 6.42	8.49
	Mean Totals of Race	7.86	10.2	
9  Nervous Picking etc.	Radical	10.5= $\bar{X}$ 4.74=S.D.	8.98 5.66	9.74
	Conservative	12.9 6.90	11.4 6.91	12.2
	Mean Totals of Race	11.7	10.2	
10  Tenseness	Radical	1.13= $\bar{X}$ 1.73=S.D.	3.25 5.05	2.19
	Conservative	1.73 1.98	2.73 2.72	
	Mean Totals of Race	1.43	2.99	

## APPENDIX E

### Analyses of Variance



# APPENDIX E

TABLE 5  
ANALYSES OF VARIANCE

## Behavior 1

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	0.03	0.001
Speech (B)	1	209.63	7.69 **
A X B	1	38.49	1.41
Error (w)	76	27.78	

\*\*p < .01.

## Behavior 2

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	12.02	2.92
Speech (B)	1	9.80	2.38
A X B	1	5.50	1.34
Error (w)	76	4.12	

TABLE 5--continued

## Behavior 3

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	28.20	2.23
Speech (B)	1	69.38	5.48*
A X B	1	7.50	0.59
Error (w)	76	12.67	

\*p < .05.

## Behavior 4

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	39.90	2.55
Speech (B)	1	30.63	1.96
A X B	1	14.03	0.90
Error (w)	76	15.65	

TABLE 5--continued

## Behavior 5

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	102.38	7.16**
Speech (B)	1	24.76	1.73
A X B	1	4.75	0.33
Error (w)	76	14.30	

\*\*p &lt; .01.

## Behavior 7

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	2.28	8.14**
Speech (B)	1	0.08	0.29
A X B	1	0.15	0.54
Error (w)	76	0.28	

\*\*p &lt; .01.

TABLE 5--continued

## Behavior 8

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	110.45	2.72
Speech (B)	1	23.14	0.57
A X B	1	10.49	0.26
Error (w)	76	40.61	

## Behavior 9

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	44.26	1.15
Speech (B)	1	116.41	3.03
A X B	1	0.02	0.00
Error (w)	76	38.45	

TABLE 5--continued

Behavior 10

Source	df	MS	F
Race (A)	1	48.83	4.90*
Speech (B)	1	0.03	0.00
A X B	1	6.33	0.64
Error (w)	76	9.96	

\*p &lt; .05.

JUN 4 1969

MICHIGAN STATE UNIV. LIBRARIES



31293101795759