This is to certify that the

thesis entitled

The Effects of Racial Group Composition on the Potency of Racial Labels

presented by

Calvin R. Matthews

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph. D. degree in Psychology

Robert L. Ebel
Major professor

Date Aug. 1, 1978

THE EFFECTS OF RACIAL GROUP COMPOSITION ON THE POTENCY OF RACIAL LABELS

By

Calvin R. Matthews

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Psychology

1978

ABSTRACT

THE EFFECTS OF RACIAL GROUP COMPOSITION
ON THE POTENCY OF RACIAL LABELS

by

Calvin R. Matthews

The present research examined the effects of racial group composition, race of subject, race of story teller, race of experimenter, and racial label on subjects' responses to video taped recorded skits. Past research concerning labels and stereotypes was reviewed and the findings indicated that labels and stereotypes may or may not be potent depending on circumstances. The present research was an experimental study to show that the potency of a racial label may not only depend upon who is using the label, but also on the racial makeup of the group in which the label is used.

Black and White subjects participated individually in this study by responding to a short video taped skit that casted a small group of Black, White, or mixed group of graduate students. Each skit contained a Black or White leading character (the story teller) who came into a coffee lounge to greet three other colleagues who made up a racial group composition of 3 Blacks, 2 Blacks and 1 White, 1 Black and 2 Whites, or 3 Whites. All monologues were quite similar except for the story teller's use of the labels "nigger" or "hunky" and the manipulation of the racial group composition. To measure one's attitude toward the story teller each subject was asked to

rate the story teller on the appropriateness of his monologue and his general style of greeting people. Subjects were also asked to give verbal responses as to why they rated the story teller as they did.

It was hypothesized, in general, that the perception of a negative racial label would shift as a function of the label, the race of the person using the label, and the racial composition of the group in which the label was used. The researcher had specifically predicted that Black subjects would not accept the "nigger" label as socially "correct" when a Black used the label in a racially mixed small group.

The general hypothesis was confirmed. That is, both Black and White story tellers received more favorable ratings when the story teller's negative associated racial label was used among members of the story teller's race. As the proportion of Black colleagues in the sample decreased, so did ratings of the Black story teller. The White story teller received his most significant decrease in ratings when he used the label "nigger" in both the mixed and all Black racial groups conditions.

The above specific prediction that Black subjects would not accept the "nigger" label as socially "correct" when a Black used the label in a racially mixed small group was not confirmed, however, results provided some support for the hypothesis: (a) Subjects, in general, rated the Black story tellers lower when he used "nigger" in in the presence of a mixed and an all White group than when the story teller used this same label in the presence of all Blacks.

(b) Both Black and White subjects tended to rate the story teller of their associated race higher than the story teller of a different race when the story teller interacted with colleagues of his own race.

Overall, the study confirms that racial labels can be potent and that some labels are more potent than others. In this study the "nigger" label tended to be the more negative stimulus. However, the potency of a negative label, in general, can shift from negative to positive and this shift in perception may well depend on the race of the person using the label and the racial group composition of the group in which the label is used.

Approved: Robert L. Ebel
Committee Chairman

Date: August 1, 1978

DEDICATION

To my parents, Mrs. Mamie Matthews and Mr. Washington Matthews Sr. who supported me in every way all the way and to Mrs. Lizzie Havard, my first teacher, who still ranks number 1 in my book.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The author extends a special thanks to Dr. Robert L. Ebel, advisor and chairman of his thesis committee, for his support, suggestions and assistance throughout the various stages of this thesis, and to Drs. Lawrence Messe, Jeanne Gullahorn, and Andrew Barclay for their support, knowledgeable comments and advice.

Although not directly involved in this research, I would also like to thank Dr. John Schweitzer for his helpful advice and comments.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Labels have been a part of the literature of social psychology for almost 55 years, yet most of the research has centered around their derivations and some examination to determine what these labels represent. Various social scientists, e.g., Katz and Braly (1933), Razran (1936), and Allport (1954), have examined the positive and negative impact that labels may impose; however, there has been very little experimental research attempting to measure the potency of various labels and to examine specific social group interactions wherein labels may be taken as offensive. For instance, it is quite an interesting venture trying to assess the impact of being called, say, a "nigger," "hunky," or "spic." The results of the use of such labels can be quite interesting and diverse, depending in part on the interpersonal context in which the label was used.

The primary purpose of this study is to continue to explore the social conditions wherein labels tend to be potent or taken as offensive or more specifically to show how people's perception of a potent label can shift from negative to positive depending on a group's racial composition. The researcher has been interested in whether the saliency of labels, such as the above, will shift depending on circumstances (that is, who used the label or the racial makeup of an

audience listening to the use of the label). However, before taking on the above exploration, the researcher would like to start at a more basic level and note that there is still little consensus as to just what a label or stereotype is. The words, "labels" and "stereotypes," will be used interchangably since both represent overgeneralizations to some degree.

Katz and Braly (1935) proposed a view of stereotypes that is held by some researchers today. They stated: "A stereotype is a fixed impression, which conforms very little to the facts it tends to represent, and results from our defining first and observing second." This position is shared by Klineberg (1951) and Prothro and Melikian (1955).

Some researchers define stereotypes in terms of generalizations which, although usually overgeneralizations, may still describe situations that are extant, although to a lesser degree epxressed in a stereotype. Some of the authors to hold this view are Schoenfeld (1942), Zamodyki (1948), Allport (1954), Krech, Crutchfield and Ballachey (1962), Campbell (1967) and Rokeach (1968). For example, Allport defined stereotypes as exaggerated beliefs associated with a category, whether favorable or unfavorable.

More recently, attempts have been made to integrate stereotypes into a broader theoretical perspecitve (Barton, 1965; Cauthen and Robinson, 1971 and Hasling, 1969). For example, Cauthen, Robinson, and Krauss (1971) asserted that stereotypes are guides to actions, as channels for the expression of affect. They further stated that stereotypes of ethnic groups do not, therefore, initiate prejudice,

but rather act to translate the expression of prejudice into socially recognized symbols.

However, regardless of the specificity of the various definitions, they all refer to some degree to overgeneralizations that may or may not be taken as offensive, be they guides to actions, fixed impressions, or exaggerated beliefs. The present research is focused not so much on what a label is, but rather aimed at measuring the impact of the label, which may lend itself to a greater understanding of what a label is and represents. The writer is interested in examining the effects of or the impact of these labels on subjects' responses. That is, the researcher will explore conditions wherein racial offensiveness has been experienced as a result of using labels. It is hoped that such explorations will lead to contributions to theory that will help explain attitudes, prejudice, intragroup perception and conflict.

Making reference to the perception of labels and their impact, Katz and Braly (1933) and Allport (1954) recognized that pleasant and unpleasant labels existed for ethnic and racial groups. They reported, for instance, that labels such as shrewd, industrious and intelligent were utilized for Jews; and superstitious, lazy, happy-go-lucky and musical were utilized for Negroes. But, for some reason, the impact of the more potent labels such as "nigger," "spook," "spic," "wetback," "hunky," and "cracker" have received little experimental attention. This could very well be due to time factors since some of the labels such as "hunky" and "wetback" are relatively new and such language changes rapidly. Another reason could be that less salient stereotypes

are probably easier and safer for experimenters to manipulate. For whatever reason, exploring conditions wherein labels may be taken as offensive is an interesting plight as was evidenced in an unpublished Master's thesis by Matthews (1974).

In an opening vignette, the researcher noted a conversation between two black students that went like this:

> Dig it man--the niggers really got down last night. I mean the niggers really partied hard. Man, you just can't beat niggers having a good time.

In that everyday type conversation, the label "nigger" was not taken as offensive by the Black friend, yet the same words could have been stated by a White student or any member of another ethnic group attending the party and the response would probably be entirely different. As a matter of fact, one may find it difficult to test the validity of this assumption. At any rate, it was the above conversation that led the researcher to hypothesize that labels and stereotypes may or may not be taken as offensive, depending on the circumstances. That particular circumstance happens to be the race of the person using the label. Matthews (1974) tested this hypothesis by having Black and White subjects read fictitious articles that described an incident wherein a small group of Blacks or Whites were depicted as hijacking a plane. Each articles referred to the hijackers as "niggers," "hunkies," or no racial label, and was illustrated with a picture of a White or Black "authors." To measure attitudes toward the article, each subject was asked to rate it according to the quality of the report. Each subject also filled out a questionnaire which measured recall of what actually was depicted in the hijacking story.

It was hypothesized that: (a) subjects of both races would tend to respond differently to an author depending on the label used in an article and (b) comprehension and ratings would also differ as a result of the two-way interactions of the independent variables (race of subject, race of author, and racial label used).

Although the general hypothesis for comprehension was not supported, results provided some support for the hypotheses: (a) both Black and White subjects tended to remember more from articles written by an author of their own race; (b) overall, comprehension was less when an author used the associated label of members of the opposite race; (c) although just the opposite was predicted, it was found that subjects of both races tended to remember more from articles containing their associated label.

As for ratings, Black subjects rated articles higher than White subjects and overall the Black author was rated higher than the White author. The "nigger" label was a more negative stimulus.

Overall, results indicated that racial labels could be taken as offensive and some labels are more potent than others. The "nigger" label tended to be the more negative stimulus and the race of the author and the race of the subject were significant variables in that determination.

The above general findings supported Allport's (1958) assertion that labels could be taken as offensive. This may be due to their emotional tones. Allport went on to state that just the mention of "Communist," "Negro," "Jew," "England," "Democrats," will send some people into a panic of fear or a frenzy of anger. Even though results

did not confirm the predicted three-way interaction, trends went in that direction. However, one may consider that the reading of Matthew's fictitious articles was somewhat different from a real situation wherein the label "nigger" or "hunky" may have been used. That is, labels are more often spoken, not read, typically uttered around someone the speaker knows, friends of a friend, or at least someone he identifies with; on the other hand, the articles used in Matthews' experiment were written by authors who were total strangers to the subjects. However, regardless of the amount of error these conditions may or may not have accounted for, results indicated that the label "nigger" was a more negative stimulus and potent labels can result in negative and positive responses depending on who uses them.

The above notion contributed to theory by supporting Allport's (1958) assertion that labels can be taken as offensive, but also furthered this notion by examining specific conditions wherein this may or may not have been substantiated. Thus, understanding the impact of potent labels may help combat racial barriers when more explicit reasons are given for their potency. With this notion in mind, the researcher views this area as open for further research, thus leaving the writer in the process of exploring conditions wherein labels may or may not be taken as offensive. Since the "nigger" label tended to be the most offensive label for Black subjects, especially when used by a White author, it left the researcher curious as to whether there are instances where a Black person may offend another Black with the use of the label "nigger." As a matter of fact, another social incident occurred which prompted the researcher to investigate this notion.

This incident occurred among a group of Black students who were chatting after dinner in the dormitory cafeteria. One of the guys was telling a few of Richard Pryor's jokes from Richard's album "That Nigger is Crazy" and something interesting occurred. The joke teller was quoting the joke "Have your ass home by 11:00." The joke in short dramatizes how Richard's father strictly compelled him as a youngster to be home at 11 p.m. However, in the joke the label "nigger" was used quite often as was some x-rated language. But, about one quarter through the joke teller's dialogue, three White friends came over to join the group. Everyone spoke and the joke teller proceeded with the funnies, but instead, using other words such as "boy" or "dude" instead of "nigger." "Why?" is the question of interest to the experimenter. Could the use of the label "nigger" even by another Black be considered offensive depending on circumstances, say maybe the racial composition of the audience? It is this effect the experimenter will attempt to assess while further exploring conditions wherein label offensiveness may be experienced. It is hoped that such an investigation will contribute to theory in helping to explain ethnic attitudes, and intragroup perception and conflict. More specifically, the researcher hopes to show how one's perception of a label may shift depending on his group's racial composition.

CHAPTER II

GROUPS: THE EFFECTS OF THEIR COMPOSITION

Since the researcher has proposed that the racial composition of a group could be a significant variable in determining the potency of a racial label, the writer will examine some related literature centered around groups and the impact of social influences.

Most writers have judged that it is more appropriate to specify the characteristics of small groups than to offer a single definition for a group. Thus, most social psychology tests will give sample definitions representing the various approaches to conceptualization. That is, groups have been defined in terms of one or more of the following characteristics: (1) perceptions and cognitions of group members, (2) motivation and need satisfaction, (3) group goals, (4) group organization, (5) interdependency of group members, and (6) interaction (Shaw, 1976). However, Shaw goes on to state that none of these aspects is either necessary or sufficient to define "group." Therefore, he defined a group as two or more persons who are interacting with one another in such a manner that each person influences and is influenced by each other person. A small group was defined as a group having twenty or fewer members, although in most instances he was concerned with groups having five or fewer members. Shaw's definition of a group tends to suit the writer's perception of a group with reference to the present experiment.

Since the researcher in this experiment is more concerned about group characteristics, such as group racial composition, and the interaction process, the writer will focus more on the homogeneity and hetero- of group membership and the social effects of such group composition.

Groups may be considered homogeneous or heterogeneous with respect to many factors such as needs, personality attributes, abilities, sex, and age. Homogeneity is defined in terms of a single characteristic. Therefore, in the present study homogeneity is defined in terms of race in which the impact of an all-black group of the perception of a negative racial label is compared with the impact of a racially mixed group on a negative racial label. The researcher was unable to find any study assessing the effects of such groups on the potency of a racial label, however, some related research concerning group composition and interaction may be noted.

Several social scientists have given evidence that the individuals who compose a group are highly significant determinants of group process (Knight, 1921; Gordon, 1923; and Lorge, et al., 1958). They found that the mere presence of others was sufficient to alter the behavior of individuals.

Shaw (1976) also reviewed studies of relationships among the personal characteristics of group members and the consequences of these relationships for group functioning. He cited a study of assembly effects by Rosenberg, Erlich, and Berkowitz (1955), which he considered the most convincing evidence that assembly is indeed a determinant of group behavior. The assembly effect refers to the variations in group behaviors that are a consequence of the particular

combination of persons in the group, apart from the effects produced by the specific characteristics of group members. In their study, two samples of nine persons each were drawn from a large pool of Air Force enlisted men. Each sample of nine was subdivided into three groups of three persons each. The membership of these groups was shifted from trial to trial so that each individual in the sample worked with every other individual in that sample. Hence, every triad differed in composition from every other triad, although any given arrangement included the same individuals as any other arrangement. Therefore, any differences in the functioning of triads could not be accounted for by differences among individual group members. That is, when different arrangements or assemblies of the same individuals are compared, any nonchance differences must be attributed to the effects of group composition.

The task assigned these differently assembled groups required a group version of the ball and spiral apparatus. This apparatus consisted of a hexagonal base from which a track or channel spiraled upward through five levels to a circular receptacle at the top of the channel. Six handles were attached to the base, so that it could be manipulated by the three members of the group. A golf ball was placed at the bottom of the channel, and the group's task on each trial was to manipulate the spiral in such a way as to move the golf ball to the receptacle at the top. An error was recorded for the group each time the ball fell off the track, and a performance score was recorded as the average height attained before the ball fell. The effectiveness of the triads differed on both measures, although

the difference in performance scores was minimally reliable. The results of this investigation thus verified the hypothesis that individuals contribute differently to the group product, depending upon the particular other individuals with whom they are grouped. Thus, there is scientific evidence that group composition is a significant variable in group process and differences among groups treated alike may be explained on the basis of individual characteristics alone.

Another interpersonal relationship affecting group process is cohesiveness--the degree to which the members of the group are attracted to each other, or the degree to which the members of the group are attracted to each other, or the degree to which the group coheres or "hangs together." We often interact, both verbally and nonverbally, with those others who are attractive to us. However, this relationship between interaction and interpresonal attraction is usually associated with opportunity for interaction, since we choose to join groups composed of attractive persons and to live and work in social environments composed of others who are attractive to us. Thus, it is theoretically possible that interaction is merely a byproduct of affiliation and is only indirectly influenced by attraction or cohesiveness.

Lott and Lott (1961) gave evidence that both the quantity and quality of interaction are related to the cohesiveness of the group. Also, differences in the pattern of communication within groups as a function of cohesiveness were noted by Back (1951) in a study designed to measure the effects of cohesiveness on pressures toward uniformity. In general, the conclusion drawn from the studies of cohesiveness is that cohesiveness leads to increased social influence, which in most

cases produces greater conformity of group standards. However, other variables may be sufficiently strong to negate the effects of cohesiveness.

Willis (1964) proposed a descriptive model of group social response which is basically concerned with responses to social influence. This is also called the diamond model of conformity behavior. His analysis not only described the kinds of responses that may occur but also indentified the conditions under which the various responses occur and the relationships among them. Willis believed that the usual definition of conformity in terms of agreement with a majority is inadequate for the development of a general description of social response. Instead, he proposed an approach that utilized both congruence and movement. Congruence referred to agreement between an individual's response and a response that is socially defined as "correct." Thus, congruence refers essentially to the kind of response that has traditionally been called conformity. Movement was defined as a shift in response to the social standard. Therefore, for a social response to be called conformity it not only must agree with the social ideal but must represent a change (movement) of response; that is, a change from the response that was made in the absence of the social standard. Willis referred to his approach as a model rather than a theory, since he viewed a model as descriptive whereas a theory is explanatory. Thus, what Willis called a social response in group process is relevant to the present study. That is, it was suggested that subjects (Black and White) would tend to conform to what their particular racial group considers socially correct. Therefore, when

a Black refers to another Black as "nigger" in the presence of White, it is believed that Blacks will not view this as a socially correct response. The social standard will change for a racially mixed group as opposed to an all-Black group when there is an interaction with the Black group's negative label. Thus, it is predicted that there will be movement (shift in response relative to the social standard).

Harrison, Messé and Stollak (1971) also did a study which is quite relevant to the present research. By examining the effects of racial composition and group size on interaction patterns in preschool children, they proposed that the interaction in young children would differ as a function of the racial composition of the groups to which they belong. The scientists compared two- and four-person homogeneous and racially-mixed groups of 3½ to 5 year old children on three measures: (a) initiation of social activity, (b) positive response to initiation and (c) negative response to initiation. The researchers found that the frequencies of initiations and negative response were lower in four-person racially mixed groups than in four-person homogeneous groups. From the race x group size interaction, an analysis revealed that Black subjects had higher ratios of responses to initiations in two-person groups than in four-person groups and there was no difference in ratio for White subjects. Thus, in general, their results supported the position that the racial composition of groups affects interaction patterns. That is, subjects were more inhibited in their initiation of, and responses to social contacts in racially mixed groups than in homogeneous groups. Their findings

indicated that subjects were aware of racial differences and this awareness had a negative effect on group functioning.

Although the subjects in the above study were 3½ to 5 year old children, there is little reason for the writer to not believe that such racial awareness will also influence the social behavior of college students where there is small racial group interaction, especially in the present experiment where negative racial labels are being used. Therefore, Harrison, Messé and Stollak's (1971) study is very relevant to the present study. That is, the experimenter has hypothesized that the particular social behavior to be inhibited here will be the use of an accepted ingroup racial label, for example "nigger," and the racial composition of the group, and possibly group size, will be significant factors in that determination. Thus, the researcher is basically suggesting that subjects will not appreciate the use of certain potent racial labels when they are used in the presence of members of another race. In particular, the researcher expects Black subjects to consider the use of the label "nigger" very inappropriate when a Black uses it in the presence of Whites.

Labels

If someone would call you a "nigger," "spook," "cracker," or a "spic," how would you feel? Well, depending on who used it or where it was used, your response may range from aggressive anger to high laughter. However, very little research has been done to test these type effects.

Labels exist for almost every ethnic group. If you are Black one may call you a spade, White (hunky), Italian (wop), Jewish (kike), Catholic (papist), Irish-American (harp), French-Canadian (cannuck), or White Anglo-Saxon Protestant (wasp). These labels may act as potent symbols for many. However, labels are nothing new and their use goes back to Biblical times as was evidenced during the time of Samson.

In the Bible, one finds that in the Book of Judges, just the name Philistine brought hatred from the Israelites, who had been in bondage under the Philistines for forty years. Thus, the potency of the label was due to an avalanche of stereotypes associated with the label. The Philistines were considered foreign oppressors who worshipped idols. Therefore, the label was considered representative of something unfavorable to the Israelites. This same type of resentment also occurred when a Jew was called a Samaritan. Jews saw the Samaritans as being of a different racial stock and having a different manner of worship. Thus, the potency of some labels tends to sometimes cause an overlook of important features, many of which could offer a sounder basis of judgement. Therefore, history proves that labels existed and that some were unfavorable.

Some labels, not particularly ethnic, tend to mask the potential influence of additional information or they may draw one's attention closer to its use. Allport (1958) referred to such labels as "labels of primary potency" that abstracted from concrete reality some one feature and assembled different concrete realities only with respect to that one feature. This notion was referred to in Lee's (1950) example of where a blind man was applying for a position as a typist

wherein he met job requirements that only required that an employee sit and type orders that came on the telephone. But the personnel man did not want to hire him because the "blindman" label stood out in his mind. Thus, the label "blind" had distracted his attention from concrete reality. Therefore, keeping in line with the original intention of this research, that is examining conditions wherein labels may be taken as offensive, Lee's (1950) example shows that a label's potency may depend on one's physical condition which in reality may not be a physical handicap.

Ethnic labels can have a similar impact, especially when they refer to some highly visible feature such as Oriental, Black or European.

Campbell (1967) tried to explain the impact of such labels by listing four general characteristics that he felt were wrong with stereotypes. His first point was the "phenomenological absolutism" of the ingroup member's imagery of the outgrouper or minority group members. Namely, one assumed without question that the outgroup is as one perceives it, or as the ingroup informs one about it. The second deficiency was in the amount of between-group difference perceived, the exaggerated homogeneity attributed to groups, and the nonrecognition of the amount of overlap between any two groups.

Campbell's third point suggests that the stereotyper is liable to attribute group differences to racial, rather than environmental causes. This point was very similar to Brown's (1965) summary of the objectionable aspects of stereotypes as their ethnocentrism and emphasis on cultural absolutism, the implication they convey that ethnic groups have inborn and unalterable psychological characteristics.

Campbell's fourth point was also directed toward a faulty conception of causality, this time concerning the hostility felt toward the outgroup. The stereotyper believes that it was the undesirable characteristic of the outgroup that caused his hostility, rather than recognizing that it was his pre-existing hostility that has caused all possible between-group differences to be interpreted in terms of the despicable characteristic inherent in the outgroup.

Thus, Brown and Campbell focused directly on the characteristics of the stereotyper--his unrecognized hostility, ethnocentrism, and naivete. With regard to the generalization itself, attention is given to its emphasis on racial rather than environmental causes, and the exaggerated amount of between-group differences perceived while this research tends to be focused on the stereotype or label.

For us it is hard to separate racial and environmental causes since in many places one's race tends to be a significant variable in determining a large part of his environmental associates and vice versa. For example, what is the probability of selecting someone from Harlem who is Black? Therefore, while Brown and Campbell tried to point out what was wrong with stereotypes, it should be further explained that these shortcomings of stereotypes may alter in different conditions and that this alteration may be due to the homogeneity of groups that is not exaggerated as they had suggested.

Not only are labels like "nigger" and "hunky" salient, but Razran (1936) did a study of ethnic dislikes and stereotypes to show that even proper names may act like ethnic symbols of primary potency.

In Razran's study, 30 photographs of college girls were shown on a screen to 150 students. The ethnic descents of the 150 subjects were: 63 Anglo-Saxon, 24 German, 15 Irish, 9 Scandinavian, 9 Slav, 6 French, 6 Jewish, 3 Dutch, 3 Spanish, 3 Hungarian, and 3 Greek. This group was so stratified to represent the ethnic composition of the white population in this country.

The subjects rated the girls on a scale from one to five for beauty, intelligence, character, ambition, and general likeability. Two months later the same subjects were asked to rate the same photographs and 15 additional ones. This time five of the original photographs were given Jewish surnames, five Italian, and five Irish, and the remaining girls were given names chosen from the signers of the Declaration of Independence from the Social Register.

When Jewish names were attached to photographs there occurred the following changes in ratings:

decrease in liking
decrease in character
decrease in beauty
increase in intelligence
increase in ambition.

For those photographs given Italian names there occurred:

decrease in liking
decrease in character
decrease in beauty
decrease in intelligence.

Thus, a mere proper name leads to prejudgments of personal attributes. The individual is fitted to the prejudiced ethnic category, and not judged in his own right.

The Irish names also brought about depreciated judgement, but not as great as the case of the Jews and the Italians. The falling likeability of the "Jewish" girls was twice as great as for "Italians" and five times as great as for "Irish." It should also be noted that the "Jewish" photographs caused higher ratings in intelligence and in ambition, findings which demonstrate that not all stereotypes of out-groups are unfavorable.

Nearly all of the researchers agree that labels may or may not be offensive, however, none has experimentally tested to show that a label's perceptions may shift from positive to negative not only because of who uses them but also because of social circumstances.

In the present study, eight video tapes were used wherein the race of the story teller, the racial composition of a group, the racial label, the race of the experimenter and the race of the subjects were manipulated. From the perspective outlined, it was hypothesized, in general, that the perception of a negative racial label would shift as a function of the label, the race of the person using the label, and the racial composition of the group in which the label was used. However, the researcher had specifically predicted that BS's would not accept the "nigger" as socially "correct" from another Black in a racially mixed small group. Several other predictions were also made:

1. Ratings of the story teller would tend to be less when a subject hears his associated racial label used by a story teller of the opposite race.

2. Ratings of the experimenter would be less when a subject hears his associated racial label used by a story teller of the opposite race.

3. Subjects would tend to rate a story teller of the same race higher than a story teller of the opposite race when the story teller interacts with a group composed of members of the same race.

4. Subjects' perceptions of the colleagues' feelings would also be more positive when a subject sees a member of his race conversing with a group composed of all members of his race.

5. Ratings of a story teller would be greater when the story teller uses his associated racial label in a group composed of all members of his race.

CHAPTER III

METHOD

Subjects

Six hundred and forty undergraduate males (320 Blacks and 320 Whites) at two large midwestern universities participated in the study by volunteering and for partial fulfillment of a research requirement in their perspective department. Half of these subjects participated in an experiment wherein the "nigger" label was used while the other half was exposed to the "hunky" label in similar situations. Each set of 320 subjects was equally divided between the different four possible racial group composition conditions. That is, subjects viewed a tape composed of either a Black or White story teller entering a room composed of either 3Ws and 0Bs (three Whites and zero Blacks), 2Ws and 1B, 1W and 2Bs, or 0Ws and 3Bs. The various experimental conditions acted as controls for each other, since groups are basically racially homogeneous or heterogeneous in the real world.

Material

Eight video tapes were used in this experiment. Each tape showed a short skit in which a Black or White graduate student came into a coffee lounge one Monday morning, greeted three of his colleagues, and proceeded to tell them about how he spent his weekend.

All monologues of the eight skits were quite similar except for a manipulation of the racial group composition, a different label use, a manipulation of the race of the experimenter, and a manipulation of the race of the story teller. Thus, on each tape, the Black student entered the room and began greeting his friends. However, he entered once where his colleagues were all Black, all White, or racially mixed. The video tapes were used in this study to help identify the race of the communicator and the groups' racial composition.

A questionnaire (Appendix C) consisting of seven rating scales was developed to assess the following:

A. Subject's attitude toward the story teller
B. Subject's attitude toward the story teller
C. Subject's rating of the story teller if subject was a colleague
D. Subject's perception of colleague's feelings toward the story teller
E. Subject's feelings while viewing the tape
F. Subject's rating of the experiment
G. Subject's rating of the experimenter

The six items on rating scale A allowed responses on each item that ranged from 1 to 5, with a low score representing a less favorable rating. Thus, the overall rating score for dependent variable A, which was the average sum of the responses to the six items, could yield a minimum of 1 point for the least possible favorable reaction and a maximum of 5 points for the most favorable reactions.

Rating scale B was a semantic differential consisting of 4 pairs of bipolar objectives. The overall rating score for this measure could yield an average sum of 1 point for the least possible favorable reaction to the story teller and a maximum of 7 points for the most favorable reaction. All seven scales were of the two above

forms (Likert or semantic differential). Thus, in summary, scores could range from 1 to 5 on scales A, D, and E and from 1 to 7 on scales B, C, F, and G. In all cases, the lower score represented the least possible favorable reaction.

Three sections of the questionnaire, which were content analyzed to help explain the ratings, were developed to address the following:

C1. Why did subjects perceive the colleagues as feeling a certain way?

C2. Why did subjects rate a story teller as they did?

C3. How would subjects have responded to a story teller had subject been one of the colleagues?

Design

A 2x2x2x2x4 factorial design was employed in which race of subject (Black or White), racial label used ("nigger" or "hunky"), race of story teller (B or W) x race of experimenter (B or W), x colleagues' racial group composition, that is, the ratio B/W (Black to White) or (3/0, 2/1, 1/2, 0/3), were the independent variables that were examined. The seven scores for each subject were used as the dependent variables. This was a random group between-subjects design with subjects nested in cells. Table 1 gives a list of labels for the identification of the various independent and dependent variables. There were ten subjects in each cell of the design.

Procedure

Each subject signed up to report at his convenience and was shown one of the eight stimulus video tapes. Upon arrival, a subject

was given the following directions:

> You are about to see a short video tape concerning individual and group interaction. The setting is a Monday morning in a coffee lounge of the psychology department. I would like for you to listen carefully and pay close attention to "Sly" or "Jerry," the fellow who will be entering the door to greet the rest of his colleagues after a long weekend. "Sly" or "Jerry" will be briefing his colleagues on how he spent his weekend. You should listen carefully to the monologue so that when the tape is finished, you may rate one of the characters on the tape according to this scale. You do not have to discuss your ratings with anyone, and all responses will be kept confidential.

The subject was then thanked for participation and excused from the session.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

Scores from seven parts of a questionnaire (A, B, C, D, E, F, and G) were used as the dependent variables to examine the hypotheses. Also, three sections of the questionnaire required a written response that was used to explain the results of the ratings. The written responses were analyzed through content analysis. The seven dependent measures basically had four major focuses. That is, A, B, C, and D were measures of subjects' attitudes toward the story teller, while E was a rating of the subjects' feeling while viewing the film. F and G were subjects' ratings of the experiment and the experimenter, respectively. The correlations between the dependent measures (Table 2) yielded a similar relationship between variables A, B, C, D, and E and a somewhat similar relationship between variables F and G. Thus, in general, subjects tended to respond similarly to all measures of attitude toward the story teller and subjects also tended to rate the experimenter and the experiment in a similar manner. The factor analysis also resulted in loading on two factors (Table 3). From Table 3, one can see that variables A, B, C, D, and E basically loaded heavier on factor 1 while variables F and G loaded heavier on factor 2. Due to the nature of the relationship among the dependent variables, the

TABLE 1.--Labels and Identification.

Subject	S
Rating of Story Teller	A
Rating of Story Teller	B
Rating of Story Teller if S was Colleague	C
Ss' Perception of Colleagues' Attitude Toward ST	D
Ss' Rating of Own Feelings While Viewing Film	E
Rating of Experiment	F
Rating of Experimenter	G
Racial Group Composition	RGC
Label	L
Race of Subject	ROS
Race of Story Teller	ROST
Race of Experimenter	ROE
Black Subject	BS
White Subject	WS
Black Experimenter	BE
White Experimenter	WE
Black Story Teller	BST
White Story Teller	WST
Nigger Label	NL
Hunky Label	HL
Story Teller	ST

TABLE 2.--Overall Correlations between the Dependent Measures.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
A	-	.85	.78	.71	.50	.22	.11
B		-	.85	.73	.50	.22	.13
C			-	.72	.47	.17	.08
D				-	.38	.14	.10
E					-	.45	.30
F						-	.63
G							-

TABLE 3.--Factor Matrix on Dependent Measures.

	Factor 1	Factor 2
A	.88	-.16
B	.93	-.18
C	.87	-.22
D	.76	-.19
E	.59	.24
F	.40	.84
G	.26	.62

researcher performed a separate multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) on variables A through E and F and G, respectively. Thus, the MANOVA consisted of five independent variables--label (nigger and hunky), race of subject (Black and White), racial group composition (3 Blacks, 2 Blacks and 1 White, 1 Black and 2 Whites, 3 Whites), race of story teller (Black and White), race of experimenter (Black and White) and seven dependent variables, A through E and F through G, respectively. Table 1 is a listing of codes identifying the various independent and dependent variables and their levels.

Therefore, in general, the result section format includes a report on the two major MANOVAs, the significant interactions from each MANOVA, and the dependent measures that contributed to these interactions. Some details of the statistical tests are found in Appendix A. Also, some of the tables are located in Appendix B.

I. MANOVA (A-E) Attitude Toward Story Teller
   - A. L x ROS x ROST
   - B. RGC x ROS x ROST
   - C. RGC x L x ROE
   - D. RGC x L x ROST

II. MANOVA (F, G) Rating of Experiment and Experimenter
   - A. L x ROS x ROST
   - B. RGC x ROS x ROE
   - C. RGC x ROS x ROST

III. Summary

IV. Succinct Summary of Findings

The overall MANOVA performed on variables A, B, C, D, and E, summarized in Table 4, yielded one significant 4-way interaction (RGC x ROS x ROST x ROE, $F = 1.74$, $p < .04$). However, none of the univariate Fs for this particular interaction were significant. Therefore, the researcher proceeded to examine the nature of the significant 3-way interactions. It should be recalled here that one of the major hypotheses put forth was a 4-way prediction (ROS x L x RGC x ROST). That is, it was predicted that subjects would respond differently to a label depending upon the race of the story teller and the racial group composition of the story teller's audience. More specifically, it was predicted that Black subjects in particular would respond differently to the label "nigger" depending upon the race of the story teller and the racial composition of the story teller's audience. The MANOVA for this particular interaction yield an F value that was marginally significant ($F = 1.54$, $p < .08$). However, again, none of the univariates for that particular interaction were significant.

Upon examining the 3-way interaction from the MANOVA, results tended to support another major hypothesis which stated that response to a story teller would differ as a function of the RGC and the ROST. But, before examining the breakdowns of this interaction and others, the researcher would like to report that the overall MANOVA, summarized in Table 4, yielded four significant 3-way interactions that were examined. They were--L x ROS x ROST, RGC x ROS x ROST, RGC x L x ROE, and RGC x L x ROST (see Appendix A for levels of significance). The researcher examined the breakdowns

TABLE 4.--Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Rating of Story Teller (A, B, C, D, E)

	F	P	
RGC	3.16	.0001	
* LABEL	4.72	.0004	
* ROS	11.33	.0001	
* ROST	19.89	.0001	
* ROE	1.07	.3760	
RGC x LABEL	1.62	.0607	
RGC x ROS	1.75	.0368	
RGC x ROST	9.72	.0001	
RGC x ROE	1.14	.3113	
* LABEL x ROS	6.60	.0001	
* LABEL x ROST	3.99	.0015	
* LABEL x ROE	2.79	.0168	
* ROS x ROST	1.54	.1741	
* ROS x ROE	1.29	.2657	
* ROST x ROE	.04	.9994	
RGC x LABEL x ROS	1.19	.2749	
RGC x LABEL x ROST	2.52	.0011	✓
RGC x LABEL x ROE	1.80	.0302	✓
RGC x ROS x ROST	2.24	.0041	✓
RGC x ROS x ROE	.80	.6831	
RGC x ROST x ROE	1.31	.1884	
* LABEL x ROS x ROST	7.43	.0001	✓
* LABEL x ROS x ROE	.99	.4221	
* LABEL x ROST x ROE	1.73	.1249	
* ROS x ROST x ROE	.40	.8460	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROST	1.54	.0834	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROE	1.06	.3880	
RGC s LABEL x ROST x ROE	.94	.5168	
RGC x ROS x ROST x ROE	1.74	.0386	✓
* LABEL x ROS x ROST x ROE	1.10	.3561	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROST x RUE	.57	.9014	

*df for these comparisons were 5/572 while the df for the remaining comparisons were 15/1579.44.

✓Significant interactions of interest.

of those four interactions separately and the univariates involved, in reporting these results. Since the overall significant 2-way interactions are contained within the significant 3-way interactions, they will not be discussed further.

Considering the first above multivariate interaction (L x ROS x ROST), the researcher found all five univariates to be significant. Thus, all five univariates contributed to this interaction. Since all five dependent variables (A, B, C, D, and E) are significantly correlated and analysis of the breakdowns for the L x ROS x ROST interaction for all five dependent measures yielded the same results, the writer examined, in detail, the breakdowns of the univariate analysis of dependent variable B (attitude toward the story teller), which had an alpha reliability coefficient of .95. However, it should be kept in mind that, for this particular interaction, these same results apply to the other four dependent measures although they are not reported. That is, for example, subjects tended to respond to the story tellers similarly to the way they felt while viewing the tape, etc.

The univariate analysis of dependent variable B yielded an F of 27.17, $p < .001$. Table 6 (see Appendix B) gives the means of the L x ROS x ROST interaction ($F = 27.18$, $\underline{df} = 1/576$, $p < .001$). Test of simple effects (Winer, 1971, pp. 347-351) and appropriate Newman-Kuels tests were performed during the breakdown of this interaction. The simple effects analysis of the 3-way interaction showed that Black subjects tended to rate the story teller

differently as a function of the race of the story teller. There were no significant main effects for L at BS. However, the simple interaction of these variables (L x ROST) for BSs were found to be significant. Breakdowns of this interaction for BSs revealed that Black subjects tended to give a higher rating when a Black story teller used the nigger label than when a White story teller used the same label. However, there were no significant difference in ratings for ROST at HL for Black subjects. Simple effects for L x BST at BSs showed that ratings did differ for the BST as a function of the label used. That is, Black subjects rated the Black story teller higher when he used the nigger label than when he used the hunky label. The ratings also differed for L x WST at BSs. That is, Black subjects, as predicted, rated the White story teller significantly lower when he used the nigger label than when he used the hunky label.

The simple effects analysis for the ROST x L at WS yielded two significant main effects. That is, analysis showed that White subjects tended to rate the story tellers differently as a function of their race and as a function of the label. More specifically, White subjects rated the Black story teller higher than the White story teller and the nigger label lower than the hunky label. There was no significant ROST x L interaction for WSs. It should be noted again that analysis of simple effects for dependent variables A, C, D, and E also yielded similar results for this particular interaction, therefore, the researcher only reported the breakdowns of dependent variable B for this particular interaction.

Therefore, to summarize results of this interaction (L x ROS x ROST), the breakdowns, in part, supported hypothesis 1, which stated that ratings of a story teller would tend to be less when a subject heard his associated racial label used by a story teller of a different race. More specifically, these results were found to be true for Black subjects only. That is, Black subjects rated the WST lower than the BST when the NL was used. There was no interaction of L x ROST at WS, but results showed that WSs rated the BST higher than the WST. White subjects also rated the ST lower when the NL was used than when the HL was used.

The next significant 3-way interaction, taken from the MANOVA (Table 4), was RGC x ROS x ROST ($F = 2.24$, $p < .004$). There were four univariates that contributed to this interaction. They were dependent variables A, B, C, and D ($F = 6.10$, 5.38, 4.90, and 4.16, $p < .0005$, .001, .002, and .006, respectively). The researcher reported on the breakdowns of dependent variable A for this interaction since it was the most significant, however, one is to assume the same direction of interaction for the other three univariates that contributed to this interaction since simple effects analysis yielded the same results for all four dependent measures.

The RGC x ROS x ROST interaction for dependent variable A was highly significant ($F = 6.11$, $\underline{df} = 3/576$, $p < .001$). These results supported the hypothesis that subjects would respond differently to a story teller depending upon the racial composition

of a group. Table 7 (Appendix B) presents the means of this interaction. The simple effects analysis of the above 3-way interaction showed that Black subjects tended to rate the Black story teller higher than the White story teller. However, the main effects, ROST and RGC for Black subjects, are included in the ROST x RGC at BS, therefore, it is appropriate to further examine the effects with reference to the ROST x RGC interaction for BSs. Upon examining this interaction, the researcher found that for ROST x (3B and 0W) at BSs, results showed that BSs tended to rate the BST higher than the WST when there was an all Black racial group composition. For ROST x (2B and 1W) at BSs and ROST x (1B and 2W) at BSs, similar results were found. That is, BSs still rates the BST higher than the WST. As a matter of fact, this happened in all racial group compositions except when the story teller's audience was all White. That is, for ROST x (0B and 3W) at BSs, results reversed and showed that BSs rated the WST higher than the BST when the RGC was all White. When simple effects were analyzed across RGC for each ROST, interesting results were also found. For RGC x BST at BSs, results showed that BSs rated the BST differently as a function of the RGC of his audience. The Newman-Kuels tests were performed on the various means of the levels of RGC. Newman-Kuels tests on the mean difference between BST at 3Bs and 0Ws versus BST at 0Bs and 3Ws ($q = 13.17$, $p < .01$) showed that BSs rated the BST significantly higher when his audience was all Black rather than all White. The BST was also rated higher in

the all Black group than in the mixed group ($q = 10$ and 7.92, $p < .01$ and $.01$, respectively). However, there was no difference in the rating of the BST when his audience was mixed. The BST was also rated significantly higher when his audience was mixed rather than all White ($q = 5.25$ and 3.17, $p < .01$ and $.05$, respectively).

For the interaction RGC x WST at BS, results indicated that BSs tended to respond differently to a WST as a function of the RGC of the story teller's audience. Newman-Kuels analysis revealed that BSs rated the WST significantly higher when the audience was all White than when the RGC of the audience was mixed or all Black ($q = 5.08$, 5, 4.75, $p < .01$, $.01$, and $.01$ respectively). However, BSs did not rate the WST differently when his audience was mixed or all Black.

Computing the simple effects for ROST x RGC at WSs, results yielded main effects for ROST and RGC, but due to the significant ROST x RGC interaction for WSs, the main effects will not be discussed. The interaction of ROST x RGC at WSs yielded an F of 8.89, $\underline{df}$ - $3/576$, $p < .01$. Thus, WSs also tended to rate a story teller differently as a function of the story teller race and the RGC of the story teller's audience. When ROST x (3Bs and OWs) for WSs, results showed that WSs rated the BST significantly higher than the WST when their audiences were all Black. Similarly, WSs also rated the BST higher than the WST in both mixed RGC conditions. But again, WSs, just as BSs, reversed trends and rated the WST higher than the BST when the RGC of the audience was all White.

When simple effects analysis were performed for this same interaction across RGC for each ROST, interesting results were also found. For instance, when RGC x BST at WSs, findings indicated that WSs also rated a BST differently as a function of the RGC of his audience. More specifically, Newman-Kuels analysis revealed that it was only in the all Black RGC that the BST was rated significantly higher than in the all White group ($q = 3.83$, $p < .05$). However, WSs did not rate the BST differently in neither of the other three group comparisons. Furthermore, when RGC x WST for WSs, somewhat similar results were found. Newman-Kuel analysis showed that the WST was rated significantly higher in the all White RGC than in the all Black or mixed RGC ($q = 4.50$, 6.83, and 7.42, p .01, .01, and .01, respectively). White subjects did not rate the WST any different from the mixed or all Black RGC.

From the overall MANOVA on dependent variables A, B, C, D, and F, the researcher examined the next significant 3-way interaction. That is, as was pointed out earlier, the RGC x L x ROE interaction yielded an F of 1.80 which was significant at $p < .0302$ level. However, upon examining the univariates for this particular interaction, the researcher found all five dependent variables to be only marginally significant, therefore, an examination of the breakdowns of this interaction was unnecessary.

The next and final significant 3-way interaction from the MANOVA on dependent variables A, B, C, D, and E was the RGC x L x ROST interaction ($F = 2.52$, $p < .001$). Upon examining the univariates, the writer found that two of the five dependent

variables contributed significantly. The univariate Fs for dependent variables A and D yielded values of 4.33 and 10.20, $p < .005$ and .0001, respectively. The correlation between variable A (attitude toward the story teller) and D (perceptions of the colleagues' feelings) was .71 which was significant at the .001 level. Although the correlation coefficient and results from simple effects analysis of these two dependent variables showed that subjects responded quite similarly to these measures, the researcher will report the simple effects analysis of both measures due to slight differences in results.

Considering first, dependent variable A and the RGC x L x ROST interaction ($F = 4.33$, $\underline{df} = 3/576$, $p < .005$), the researcher presents a diagram of this interaction in Table 8. Once again, this interaction supports the hypothesis that the perception of a label may depend upon the race of the person using it, as well as the racial composition of the group wherein the label is being used. Thus, the simple effect was analyzed, as diagramed, by divising the 3-way interaction into two parts, RGC x L at BST and RGC x L at WST. For the interaction of BST, the simple effects analysis yielded no main effect for L, however the main effect for RGC was found to be very significant. The L x RGC interaction at BST was not significant. Newman-Kuel tests were performed on the means of the four levels of RGC at BST. Results revealed that there was a much more positive attitude toward the BST when his audience was all Black as opposed to when his audience was mixed or all

White ($q = 8.25$, 8.50, and 12.75, $p < .01$, .01, and .01, respectively). There was no difference between the two mixed groups ($q = .25$, ns). Analysis also revealed that there was a more positive attitude toward the BST when his colleagues were racially mixed rather than all White ($q = 4.25$ and 4.50, $p < .01$, and .01, respectively).

Simple effects analysis were also performed on the other half of the RGC x L x ROST interaction for dependent variable A. That is, the writer investigated subjects' rating of the story teller when there was a RGC x L x WST interaction. Results yielded both main effects for L and RGC, however, they will not be discussed since they are contained in the significant L x RGC at WST interaction. Further examining this interaction for L x (3Bs and OW), the researcher found that the HL, used in an all Black setting by a White story teller, was considered more appropriate than the NL used under these same circumstances. The HL also received a more positive response than the NL in both mixed racial group conditions. However, there were no differences in response to the NL or HL when a White story teller used the labels in the presence of an all White group. The RGC x L interaction at WST was also analyzed across RGC at each level of label. Upon performing this analysis, the researcher found the RGC x NL interaction at WST to be significant. Results showed that the White story teller is considered more appropriate using the NL in the presence of an all White group than in the presence of a mixed or all Black group ($q = 7.58$, 8.67, and 9.08, $p < .01$, .01, and .01, respectively). There was no

difference in the rating of the WST when he used the NL in the presence of both mixed and the all Black group. The RGC x HL interaction for WST also yielded significant results. Newman-Kuels test revealed that the only difference between the four means of RGC x HL interaction occurred between the all White condition and the (2Bs and 1W) racial group condition ($q = 3.75$, $p < .05$), thereby indicating that it was considered more appropriate for a WST to use the HL in the presence of three Whites than to use this same label in the presence of 2Bs and 1W.

As the writer previously mentioned, dependent variable D (subjects' perceptions of the colleagues' feelings in the skit) also contributed to the RGC x L x ROST interaction. Test of simple effects were performed on the measure because results differed somewhat from the breakdowns of dependent variable A (attitude toward the story teller). Thus, upon examining the interaction for dependent variable D, the RGC x L x ROST was again divided, as presented in Table 9, into RGC x L at BST and RGC x L at WST. Tests of simple effects yielded no significant main effect for L, but there was a main effect for RGC at BST. However, due to the RGC x L interaction at BST, main effects were not examined further and the researcher proceeded to investigate the L x RGC interaction at BST. This was where results differed from the results of dependent variable A. Dependent variable A yielded no L x RGC interaction at BST. Tests of simple effects on the L x (3Bs and 0Ws) at BST yielded significant results. Thus, findings revealed that

subjects perceived the colleagues as being more comfortable when a BST used the label "nigger" in the presence of three Blacks than when he used the label "Hunky" in this same condition. There were no differences in the perception of the NL or HL in the other three RGC conditions. Analysis of this same interaction at BST was performed for RGC at each level of L at the BST. These results indicated that at the interaction, RGC x NL at BST, subjects perceived the colleagues as feeling more comfortable when a BST used the NL in the presence of three Blacks than in any of the other RGC conditions ($q = 8.78$, 9.07, and 11.43, $p < .01$, .01, and .01, respectively). There were no differences in the perception of colleagues' feelings between both the mixed and all White RGC conditions at BST ($q = 2.36$, .28, and 2.64, ns, ns, ns). For the RGC x HL interaction at BST, results were identical to the findings of the RGC x NL for BST. That is, when the BST used the HL in the presence of three Blacks, subjects still perceived the colleagues as feeling more comfortable than in either of the other RGC conditions ($q = 3.00$, 4.28, and 6.00, $p < .05$, .01, and .01, respectively). Again, there were no differences in the perception of colleagues' feelings between both the mixed and all White RGC conditions when the BST used the HL ($q = 1.71$, 1.28, and 3.00, ns, ns, ns).

For the second half of the RGC x L x ROST interaction tests of simple effects were performed on the RGC x L interaction at WST. There was no main effect for L, but the main effect for RGC at WST was significant a $p < .01$ level. However, due to the L x RGC

interaction for WST, the main effects will not be discussed further. Upon examining the interaction, the writer found that for L x (3Bs and 0Ws) at WST, results revealed that subjects perceived the colleagues as feeling more comfortable when the WST used the HL in the presence of three Blacks than when he used the NL in this same RGC condition. There were no differences in the perception of the labels for both mixed group condition, but there was a significant difference in ratings in the all White RGC condition. As a matter of fact, results reversed. That is, analysis revealed that for L x (0Bs and 3Ws) at WST subjects perceived the colleagues as feeling more comfortable when the WST used the NL in the presence of three Whites than when he used the HL in this same RGC condition. The interaction of RGC x L at WST was also analyzed for RGC at each level of label. For the RGC x NL interaction at WST findings reveal that subjects did respond differently to the WST as a function of RGC x NL. Newman-Kuels tests were performed on the four means of the RGC x NL interaction at WST. Results revealed that of the four racial group composition conditions wherein a WST used the NL, subjects perceived the all White RGC condition as being the most comfortable group of colleagues. The mean of the all White group was significantly higher than the mean of the all Black or mixed RGC condition ($q = 12.14$, 8.07, and 7.36, $p < .01$, .01, and .01, respectively). The means of the mixed conditions were also greater than the mean of the all Black RGC condition ($q = 4.78$ and 4.07, $p < .01$ and .01). However, subjects perceived

the colleagues as feeling about the same in both of the mixed RGC conditions (q = .71, ns).

When tests of simple effects were performed for RGC at HL for the WST, results were found to be insignificant (F = .78, df = 3/576, ns). Thus, subjects did not perceive the colleagues as feeling any different when a WST used the HL in the four different RGC conditions.

Variables (F and G) Rating of Experiment + Experimenter

Recalling from the beginning of the results section, the writer pointed out that a separate MANOVA was performed on variables F and G (ratings of the experiment and the experimenter, respectively). These results are summarized in Table 5. For the most part, subjects rated the experiment and the experimenter quite similarly. The correlation between the true measures (F and G) was .63 which was significant at $p < .001$ level (see Table 2). The factor matrix (Table 3) also showed that variables F and G loaded on factor 2 (rating of the experiment and experimenter). The overall overall MANOVA yielded no 5-way or 4-way interactions, however, there were three significant 3-way interactions. They were-- L x ROS x ROST (F = 4.78, $p < .0088$), RGC x ROS x ROE (F = 3.20, $p < .0041$), and RGC x ROS x ROST (F = 3.77, $p < .0011$). The researcher examined the breakdowns of these three interactions separately and the univariates involved in reporting this section of the results. Since the overall significant 2-way interactions

TABLE 5.--Summary of Multivariate Analysis of Variance of Rating of Experiment and Experimenter (F, G).

	F	P	
RGC	1.15	.3316	
* LABEL	4.38	.0130	
* ROS	1.33	.2659	
* ROST	3.62	.0274	
* ROE	5.60	.0039	
RGC x LABEL	2.78	.0113	
RGC x ROS	1.54	.1609	
RGC x ROST	3.05	.0058	
RGC x ROE	.52	.7938	
* LABEL x ROS	3.79	.0232	
* LABEL x ROST	1.12	.3272	
* LABEL x ROE	.62	.5398	
* ROS x ROST	1.31	.2702	
* ROS x ROE	.37	.6924	
* ROST x ROE	2.86	.0580	
RGC x LABEL x ROS	.51	.7998	
RGC x LABEL x ROST	1.47	.1858	
RGC x LABEL x ROE	1.08	.3712	
RGC x ROS x ROST	3.77	.0011	✓
RGC x ROS x ROE	3.20	.0041	✓
RGC x ROST x ROE	.80	.5692	
* LABEL x ROS x ROST	4.78	.0088	✓
* LABEL x ROS x ROE	.28	.7524	
* LABEL x ROST x ROE	2.53	.0804	
* ROS x ROST x ROE	1.63	.1962	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROST	1.97	.0665	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROE	1.92	.0742	
RGC x LABEL x ROST x ROE	1.06	.3880	
RGC x ROS x ROST x ROE	.18	.9810	
* LABEL x ROS x ROST x ROE	.55	.5753	
RGC x LABEL x ROS x ROST x ROE	1.02	.4100	

*df for these comparisons were 5/572 while the df for the remaining comparisons were 15/1579.44.

✓Significant interactions of interest.

are contained within the significant 3-way interactions, they will not be discussed further.

Upon examining the first multivariate interaction (L x ROS x ROST, $F = 4.78$, $p < .0088$), the researcher found dependent variable F (rating of the experiment) to be the only univariate that contributed significantly to this particular interaction ($F = 7.86$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .0053$). Therefore, the researcher proceeded to examine the breakdowns of dependent variable F. Tests of simple effects and appropriate Newman-Kuels tests were performed during the breakdown of this interaction. Tests of simple effects showed that ratings of the experiment differed as a function of the race of the subject, the race of the story teller and the racial label used. The three-way interaction was divided into two parts (ROST x L at BSs and ROST x L at WSs) as presented in Table 10.

For the ROST x L at BSs, tests of simple effects revealed a significant main effect for ROST, but no main effect for L. However, due to the ROST x L interaction at BSs, the main effects will not be discussed. To examine this interaction at BSs, tests of simple effects were performed on the ROST at each level of L and on L at each level of ROST. For the ROST x NL interaction at BSs results showed that BSs tended to rate the experiment higher when a BST used the NL as opposed to a WST using this same label. There were no differences in ratings of the experiment when the HL was used by each ROST. When analysis was performed on L at each level of ROST at BSs, results showed that no differences existed between the ratings of the experiment when the HL was used by each

ROST. When analysis was performed on L at each level of ROST at BSs, results showed that no difference existed between the ratings of the experiment when a BST used the NL as opposed to his using the HL. However, for L x WST at BSs results showed that BSs tended to rate the experiment higher when a WST used the HL than when he used the NL.

Simple effects were also performed on the other half of the interaction (ROST x L at WS). There was no significant ROST x L interaction at WSs nor was there a main effect for ROST. However, analysis did yield a significant main effect for L at WST. The mean differences for L showed that WSs rated the experiment higher when the NL was used than when the HL was used.

The next significant 3-way interaction, taken from the MANOVA, was RGC x ROS x ROE ($F = 3.20$, $p < .0041$). The univariate G (rating of the experimenter) was the only dependent variable to contribute significantly to this interaction. The RGC x ROS x ROE interaction for dependent variable G was highly significant ($F = 3.77$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .011$). These results, in general, revealed that ratings of the experimenter tended to vary as a function of the ROS, the ROE, and the RGC of the group. The interaction was divided into two parts (RGC x ROE at BSs and RGC x ROE at Wss) as presented in Table 11. For RGC x ROE at BSs, tests of simple effects yielded a main effect for ROE but no main effect for RGC. However, since the interaction between ROE x RGC for BSs was significant, the main effects will not be discussed further.

Thus, to examine the ROE x RGC interaction at BSs, the researcher performed tests of simple effects for ROE at each level of RGC and for RGC at each level of ROE. Results yielded no differences in the rating of the experimenter for the ROE x (3Bs and 0Ws) RGC condition and also no difference for the ROE x (1B and 2Ws) RGC condition. Thus the only conditions wherein differences occurred were the ROE x (2Bs and 1W) at BSs and ROE x (0Bs and 3Ws) at BSs. These results indicated that Black subjects tended to rate the Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter when the racial group consisted of 2Bs and 1W and when the racial group was all White. Test of simple effects were also performed on this interaction across RGC conditions at each level of ROE. These results showed that Black subjects did not rate either of the RGC conditions differently as a function of the Black experimenter nor the White experimenter.

For the other half of the RGC x ROE x ROS interaction, tests of simple effects were performed on the RGC x ROE at WSs. There was no interaction of RGC x ROE at WSs, but there was a main effect for ROE at Ws. Mean differences for ROE at WSs revealed that White subjects tended to rate the Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter. There was no main effect for RGC at WSs.

From the overall MANOVA on dependent variables F and G, the researcher examined the final singificant 3-way interaction. This was the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction ($F = 3.77$, $p < .0011$). Upon examining the univariates, the writer found that both F and G contributed significantly to this interaction. The univariates Fs

for dependent variables F and G yielded values of 4.71 and 4.35, $p < .003$ and .005, respectively). However, the breakdown of this interaction was performed only on variable F since simple effects analysis of F and G yielded the same results for this particular interaction. Means of this interaction are presented in Table 12. It should be kept in mind that with reference to the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction, subjects rated the experiment and the experimenter the same way.

For the first half of the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction, tests of simple effects were performed for ROST x RGC at BSs. Results yielded a main effect for ROST at BSs, but no significant main effect for RGC at BSs. However, the main effects will not be discussed further because of the significant ROST x RGC interaction at BSs. Thus, these results indicated that Black subjects tended to rate the experiment differently as a function of the ROST x RGC. To examine this interaction further, tests of simple effects were performed on the ROST at each level of RGC and for RGC at each level of ROST. When ROST x (3Bs and 0Ws) at BSs, mean differences revealed that Black subjects tended to rate the experiment higher when the Black story teller interacted with an all Black RGC, than when a White story teller interacted with this same RGC. However, results reversed significantly when the ROST x (2Bs and 1W) at BSs. That is, Black subjects rated the experiment higher when the White story teller interacted with 2Bs and 1W than when a Black story teller interacted with this same group. There was no difference in the rating of the experiment when ROST x (1B and 2Ws) at BSs. For

the ROST x (OBs and 3Ws) interaction at BSs, results showed that Black subjects tended to rate the experiment much higher when the Black story teller interacted with an all White group than when a WST interacted with this same group.

Tests of simple effects were also performed across RGC for each level of ROST at BSs. Thus, when RGC x BST at BSs, results revealed that Black subjects tended to rate the experiment differently as a function of the BST interacting with RGC. Newman-Kuels test on the means of the various RGC conditions at BST indicated that Black subjects tended to rate the experiment higher when the Black story teller interacted with three Blacks than when a Black story teller interacted with 2Bs and 1W ($q = 5.06$, $p < .01$). Black subjects also rated the experiment higher when a BST interacted with three Whites than when a BST interacted with 2Bs and 1W ($q = 4.41$, $p < .01$). There were no differences in ratings of the experiment for any of the other RGC conditions at BST.

Test of simple effects on RGC x WST at BSs showed that BSs also tended to rate the experiment differently as a function of RGC x WST. Newman-Kuels on the means revealed that BSs rated the experiments higher when a WST interacted with 2Bs and 1W than when a WST interacted with any of the other RGC conditions ($q = 2.94$, 3.41, and 3.88, $p < .05$, .05, and .05, respectively). There were no differences in the ratings when a WST interacted with either of the other three RGC conditions.

Test of simple effects were also performed on the other half of the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction. That is, the breakdowns of

ROST x RGC at WSs were examined. However, results yielded no main effect for ROST nor RGC and there was no ROST x RGC interaction. Thus, these results revealed that White subjects ratings of the experiment was not affected by the ROST, the RGC, nor the interaction of the two.

Summary

Due to the significant RGC x L x ROST interaction (Table 8) the general hypothesis was confirmed. That is ratings of a story teller did differ as a function of the label used, the race of the person using the label, and the racial makeup of the group in which the label was used. The results of this interaction applied to dependent variable A (ratings of the story teller), and dependent variable D (subjects' perception of colleagues' attitude toward story teller). Basically the findings of the above interaction showed that ratings of the WST depended upon the label he used interacting with the racial makeup of the group in which the label was used, but ratings of the BST only depended upon the racial makeup of his audience, irregardless to the label used. More specifically, ratings of the BST decreased as the number of Blacks in the four RGC conditions decreased. The all Black RGC condition was the only condition rated as an acceptable condition for a BST to use either label (mean = 3.64). Furthermore, a BST using labels in the presence of an all white group received an even less favorable rating than the BST in both mixed groups. The only condition rated as acceptable for a WST to use nigger or hunky was the all White RGC condition. Both

of the mixed groups and the all Black group was considered inappropriate conditions for a WST to use "nigger" and neither of these three conditions were rated as less favorable than the other. A WST using the HL received his most negative rating when the colleagues were 2Bs and 1W and his most positive rating when the colleagues were all White. Also, the WST was considered more inappropriate using N than H in mixed and all Black groups, but the WST was considered just as appropriate using N as H when the RGC condition was all White.

Thus, in general, both Black and White story tellers received acceptable ratings when the colleagues were members of their own race (supporting hypothesis 5), however, the ratings decreased as the colleagues became a mixed group or a group composed of members of the story teller's opposite race. Furthermore, when this decrease in rating occurred for the WST, it was not only due to the racial make up of the group of colleagues, but also to the label used by the WST.

The results from dependent variable D showed that Ss' perception of colleagues' feelings toward the ST also varied as a function of the ROST, RGC, and the label used. When a BST used labels, Ss perceived the all Black group of colleagues as being more comfortable than both mixed and all White group with the all White group being perceived as the most uncomfortable. When the colleagues and the ST were all Black, Ss perceived the colleagues as being more comfortable with the NL than the HL. However, when the

colleagues were mixed and all White, Ss perceived the colleagues as being just as uncomfortable with the NL as they were with the HL.

When a WST used the NL, Ss perceived the all White group of colleagues as being more comfortable than both mixed and all Black group, with the all Black group being perceived as the most uncomfortable group. However, when a WST used the HL there was no difference in the perception of colleagues feeling toward the ST between the four RGC conditions. When the colleagues and the ST were all White, Ss, again, perceived the colleagues as being more comfortable with the use of the label N than H. When the RGC condition became mixed, there was no difference in preference for either label. However, when the colleagues were all Black with a WST, ratings reversed to show that Ss perceived the colleagues as being more uncomfortable with the NL than the HL.

Thus in general, according to dependent variable D, Ss perceived colleagues as being more comfortable with and having a better attitude toward the ST when the colleagues and the ST were all the same race. The all Black group tended to be more comfortable with the NL when there was a BST, and more uncomfortable with the NL when there was a WST. The all White group tended to be more comfortable with the NL than the HL when there was a WST, however, this same group considered one label just as inappropriate as the other when the ST was Black. The rating of the mixed groups fell between the all Black and all White groups, however, no differences existed between Ss perceptions of colleagues feeling toward the ST between the two mixed groups.

For the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction, results showed that dependent variables, A, B, C, D, F, and G contributed significantly to the interaction. The first part of the summary for this interaction will apply only to variables A, B, C, and D and the last part will apply to variables F and G. The results (Table 7) basically showed that ratings of a ST did differ as a function of the story teller's race, the race of the subject, and the racial group composition of the colleagues. The results supported hypothesis 3 which stated that subjects would tend to rate a ST of the same race higher when this particular ST was interacting with a group composed of all members of the S's race. More specifically, BSs rated the WST lower than the BST when the colleagues were all Black or mixed. However, when the colleagues were all White, BSs rated the BST lower than the WST. Hence, Black subjects' ratings of the BST decreased as the number of Blacks in each group decreased. That is, BSs rated the BST significantly higher when the colleagues were all Black than when the groups were mixed or all White. Also, the all White group was rated lower than both mixed groups. Black subjects also rated the WST lower when he interacted with an all Black or mixed group rather than an all White group.

White subjects, just as BSs rated the WST lower than the BST when the colleagues were all Black or mixed. Furthermore, WSs, just as BSs, rated the BST lower than the WST when the group was all White. Across RGC conditions, WSs rated the BST higher in the all Black RGC than in the all White condition. WSs also rated the WST

higher in the all White RGC condition than in the mixed for all Black RGC condition.

Thus, in general, both Black and White subjects tended to rate the ST of their associated race higher than the ST of the different race when the ST interacted with a group composed of all members of their particular race. Furthermore, both Black and White subjects tended to rate the WST lower than the BST in mixed and all Black RGC conditions, however, when the RGC conditions became all White, subjects rated the BST lower than the WST.

Ratings of the experiment (see Table 12) also differed as a function of the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction. Basically, the findings showed that BSs rated the experiment higher when the BST x (3Bs and 0Ws), WST x (2Bs and 1W) and BST x (0Bs and 3Ws). This was probably due to condition one being an acceptable interaction while condition three was a somewhat unusual interaction. Both could possibly result in inflated ratings.

White subjects' ratings of the experiment were not affected by the RGC, the ROST, nor their interaction.

Ratings of the experimenter (Table 11) differed as a function of the RGC x ROS x ROE interaction. The findings showed that WSs rated the experimenters differently as a function of their race. Basically, WSs rated the BE higher than the WE. However, BSs rated the BE higher than the WE only in the (2Bs and 1Ws) and (0Bs and 3Ws) racial group composition condition.

The last significant 3-way interacted (L x ROS x ROST) applies to dependent variables A, B, C, D, E, and F. Thus, Table 6

showed that ratings of the ST varied as a function of his race, the label used, and the race of the subject. In general, BSs' ratings of the ST depended upon the interaction of the ST's race and the label used, whereas WSs' ratings depended only on the ST's race and the label used--not their interaction. More specifically, the findings showed that BSs rated the BST higher than the WST when nigger was used and WSs rated the BST higher than the WST regardless of the label used. Black subjects rated the BST lower when he used the HL and rated the WST lower when he used the NL. White subjects rated the ST lower when N was used rather than when H was used. The reader should also be reminded that the results here apply to dependent measures A, B, C, D, and E.

Table 10 showed that ratings of the experiment also differed as a function of the L x ROST x ROS interaction. Results indicated that WSs rated the experiment differently as a function of the label used, whereas BSs rated the experiment differently as a function of the L x ROST interaction. In general, WSs rated the experiment higher when N was used rather than when H was used. Black subjects rated the experiment higher when a BST used N than when a WST used N and BSs also rated the experiment higher when a WST used the HL rather than the NL.

In conclusion, all seven dependent variables were affected by the five independent variables (L, ROS, ROST, RGC, and ROE) and the nature of these effects has been summarized in the four significant 3-way interactions listed below.

		Dependent Variables of Interest
1.	RGC x L x ROST	A, D
2.	RGC x ROS x ROST	A, B, C, D, F, G
3.	RGC x ROS x ROE	G
4.	L x ROS x ROST	A, B, C, D, E, F

Succinct Summary of Findings

Racial group composition x Label x Race of story teller

See Table 8:

1. Both Black and White story tellers received acceptable ratings when the colleagues were members of their own race.

2. Regardless of the label used, attitudes torward the Black story teller became less favorable as the number of Blacks in the racial group composition decreased.

3. Attitudes toward the White story teller were more negative when he used "nigger" rather than "hunky" in both the mixed and all Black racial group conditions.

See Table 9:

4. In general, subjects perceived colleagues as being more comfortable when the colleagues and the story teller were all the same race.

5. The all Black group tended to be more comfortable with the nigger label when the story teller was Black and more uncomfortable with this same label when the story teller was White.

6. When a Black story teller used "nigger" or "hunky," subjects perceived the all Black group as being more comfortable than both the mixed or all White group.

7. When the story teller was White, subjects perceived the all Black group as being more uncomfortable with the nigger habel and the all White group as being more comfortable with this same label.

8. The all White group also tended to be more comfortable with the label nigger than both the mixed and all Black groups.

Racial group composition x Race of subject x Race of story teller

See Table 7:

1. Both Black and White subjects tended to rate the story teller of their associated race higher than the story teller of a different race when the story teller interacted with colleagues of his own race.

2. Both Black and White subjects tended to rate the White story teller lower than the Black story teller in mixed and all Black racial group conditions, however, when the group was all White, subjects rated the Black story teller lower than the White story teller.

See Table 12:

3. In general, subjects had a positive attitude toward the experiment and the experimenter.

4. Basically, Blacks rated the experiment higher when the Black story teller interacted with all Blacks and all Whites.

5. Black subjects also rated the experiment higher when a White story teller interacted with (2Bs and 1W).

6. White subjects' ratings of the experiment were not affected by the racial group composition, the race of story teller, nor their interaction.

Racial group composition x Race of subject x Race of experimenter

See Table 11:

1. Overall, subjects gave the experimenters good ratings.

2. Black subjects rated the Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter in the (2Bs and 1W) racial group condition and the all White racial group condition.

3. White subjects rated the Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter.

Label x Race of subject x Race of story teller

See Table 6:

1. Black subjects rated the Black story teller higher than the White story teller when "nigger" was used, but White subjects rated the Black story teller higher than the White story teller regardless of the label used.

2. Black subjects rated the Black story teller lower when he used "hunky" rather than "nigger," however, Black subjects rated the White story teller lower when he used "nigger" rather than "hunky."

3. White subjects rated the story teller lower when "nigger" was used rather than "hunky" regardless of the story teller's race.

See Table 10:

4. Overall, subjects rated the experiment as good.

5. Black subjects rated the experiment higher when a Black story teller used "nigger" rather than when a White story teller used "nigger."

6. Black subjects rated the experiment higher when a White story teller used "hunky" rather than "nigger."

7. White subjects rated the experiment higher when "nigger" was used rather than when "hunky" was used.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS OF CONTENT ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

In general, it was predicted that the perception of a negative racial label would be received more favorable when one uses the label among members of his own race. The rationale behind the statement was based on general observations made by the researcher. That is, the writer had observed that Black subjects, in particular, use the label "nigger" in all-Black settings quite frequently without the appearance of offending anyone. However, the perception of this same label tends to shift from positive, or at least neutral, to negative when it is used in the presence of Whites. From the results of this experiment (Table 8), the above prediction was confirmed for both Black and White story tellers. However, for the White story, the decrease in ratings depended not only on the racial makeup of his group of colleagues, but also on which particular negative racial label he was using. More specifically, regardless of the label used, the Black story teller's ratings decreased as the proportion of Black colleagues decreased. However, there was no difference in the ratings between the mixed racial group conditions. A content analysis based on the three questions from the questionnaire (Appendix C) was performed to help explain why Ss rated the story tellers as they did. Due to the vast similarity in responses to the first two content

questions, the researcher did a summary while tallying their frequencies. The analysis revealed that ratings of the Black story teller could be attributed to several factors. First, when a Black story teller ("Sly") interacted with all Black colleagues, the most frequent reasons given as to why subjects rated the story teller as they did were:

1. They could identify with Sly
2. They enjoyed Sly
3. Similar cultural experiences
4. Sly's colleagues were all Black
5. Sly was being himself

When this same story teller interacted with a racially mixed group of colleagues, the most frequent responses were:

1. I did not enjoy him
2. His language was inappropriate
3. He was among a mixed group
4. Sly showed disrespect

Finally, when Sly interacted with an all White group of colleagues, the most frequent responses were:

1. Sly was speaking to the wrong group
2. I did not enjoy him
3. Sly's language was inappropriate

Also, accross all four racial group composition conditions, subjects, in general, indicated that their response to the Black story teller would have been about the same as the colleagues in

in the film. The colleagues in the film were told to act as if no labels were used.

When a White story teller ("Jerry") used a negative racial label, ratings also shifted from favorable to unfavorable. However, this shift in ratings depended upon the racial composition as well as the label used. More specifically, when a White story teller used the label "higger," the all White racial group condition was the only condition wherein the story teller received a favorable rating. There was no difference in the ratings of the White story teller between both mixed and all-Black racial group conditions. The most frequent reasons given as to why subjects rated Jerry the way they did in the all-White racial group condition were:

1. I enjoyed him
2. Jerry was humorous
3. Jerry's colleagues were all friends
4. Similar cultural experiences

When the White story teller used the label "nigger" among a mixed and an all-Black group, the most frequent responses were:

1. Jerry used inappropriate language
2. I could not identify with Jerry
3. Jerry was not being himself
4. Jerry showed disrespect

When the White story teller used the label "hunky" again, the all-White racial group condition was the only condition wherein the story teller received a favorable rating. The reasons given were:

1. Similar cultural experiences

2. I enjoyed Jerry
3. I could not identify with Jerry
4. Jerry's language was inappropriate

An examination of these responses shows that the most frequent responses are both favorable and unfavorable. The means also revealed that the White story teller was not rated as favorable as the Black story teller in this same condition.

The (2Bs and 1W) racial group condition was considered the most negative situation for a White story teller to use "hunky." Content indicated:

1. Jerry's language was inappropriate
2. Jerry was being himself
3. They were all friends
4. Jerry was a jerk

There was no difference in the rating of the White story teller for the other three racial group conditions. There is no clear explanation for the above negative rating in the (2Bs and 1W) racial group condition except that its possible subjects felt that the one White in the above group of colleagues was probably more offended than if it had been two White colleagues present. Such a perception would thereby cause a decrease in rating for this condition.

Subjects also indicated that their response to Jerry would have been about the same as the colleagues in the film for all of the above conditions, except when the White story teller used "nigger" in the presence of all Blacks. Subjects instead most frequently gave the following responses:

1. I would have responded in a negative manner
2. With anger
3. I would have confronted Jerry

These responses relate directly to Harrison, Messé, and Stollack (1971) study in which the three researchers found that subjects were more inhibited in their initiation of, and responses to social contacts in racially mixed groups than in homogeneous groups. Their findings also indicated that subjects were more aware of racial differences and this awareness had a negative effect on group function. Thus, in the present study, one can see that not only did the ratings of the White story teller decrease when he used "nigger" in the presence of all Blacks, but subjects were also less inhibited in giving negative responses to Jerry's behavior.

Thus, the shift in ratings of both story tellers and the obvious variation in content responses gives pretty sound evidence that the perception of a negative racial label can shift from favorable to unfavorable depending, at least, in part on the race of the person using the label and the racial composition of the group in which the label is used.

From the result we found that dependent variable D also contributed to this interaction. That is, subject perceived the colleagues as feeling quite similar to the way they rated the story teller. Basically, subjects perceived colleagues as being more comfortable when the story teller and the colleagues were all members of the same race. This was especially true when the label "nigger" was used. Subjects also perceived colleagues as becoming more

uncomfortable as the racial groups became more heterogeneous. Subjects also perceived the two most uncomfortable conditions for colleagues as being:

1. The all-White group wherein a BST used "nigger"
2. The all-Black group wherein a WST used "nigger"

These findings tend to suggest that the label "nigger" is a more negative stimulus than the label "hunky." This is especially true when either story teller used the label among mixed groups or groups composed of all members of a different race. The content response given earlier also apply to these findings.

The general findings from the RGC x ROS x ROST interaction confirmed hypothesis 3, which stated that subjects would tend to rate a story teller higher when the story teller and the colleagues were all members of the subjects' race. That was exactly what happened. Both Black and White subjects tended to rate the story teller of their associated race higher than the story teller of a different race when the subject, story teller, and the colleagues were all members of the same race. Content analysis revealed that Black subjects rate the White story teller lower in the mixed and all-Black group because:

1. Jerry's language was inappropriate
2. Name calling

It should also be pointed out here that content analysis revealed that many Black subjects perceived Sly, the Black story teller, as basically talking to his Black colleagues, even when the groups were mixed.

White subjects rated the White story teller lower for similar reasons:

1. Jerry's language was inappropriate
2. Jerry was being himself

However, since both story tellers used the same labels in the various conditions, the researcher must conclude here, again, that the story tellers' race and the racial composition of the groups caused the various favorable and unfavorable responses. These findings also parallel general observations made by the researcher. That is, subjects are still more likely to accept the use of these labels by a Black story teller than a White story teller in mixed and all-Black groups. This may, in part be due to the historical implications of the lable "nigger" coupled with the fact that "hunky" is a relative new label in comparison to "nigger." Also, the term "nigger" has not been recently used by Blacks as a label to look down on or degrade Blacks. As a matter of fact, many Blacks feel that the use of the label "nigger" among all Blacks is more or less communicating in Black terms. Thus, the label would not in such a case be considered as offensive.

The RGC x ROS x ROE interaction (Table 11) showed that White subjects rated the Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter. Such a finding was probably due to the nature of the experiment, itself. That is, since the label "nigger," the negative associated label of the Black experimenter, tended to be the more negative stimulus, White subjects were probably less likely to give a negative rating to the Black experimenter. Thus, when Black subjects rated the

Black experimenter higher than the White experimenter in the (2Bs and 1W) and (0Bs and 3Ws) racial group condition, it was probably because Black subjects were, overall, more comfortable than White subjects in this type situation and therefore more likely to reveal their true feelings toward the experimenter.

The L x ROS x ROST interaction (Table 6) followed the same trend of previous label and group effects. That is, both Black and White subjects rated the Black story teller higher than the White story teller when the subjects' associated racial label was used. Thus, subjects still appeared to be more tolerant of a negative racial label when a Black uses it rather than a White.

Overall, the study confirms that some labels are more potent than others and in this instance, it was the "nigger" label. However, the potency of a negative label in general can shift from negative to positive depending on the race of the person using it and the racial composition of the group in which it was used. The present research project was designed in such a way that the content of the written responses aided in explaining why this is so.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL RESULTS OF VARIOUS INTERACTIONS

APPENDIX A

STATISTICAL RESULTS OF VARIOUS INTERACTIONS

I. MANOVA (A-E)
RGC x ROS x ROST x ROE, $F = 1.74$, $p < .01$
L x ROS x ROST, $F = 7.43$, $p < .001$
RGC x ROS x ROST, $F = 2.24$, $p < .004$
RGC x L x ROE, $F = 1.80$, $p < .03$
RGC x L x ROST, $F = 2.52$, $p < .001$

A. L x ROS x ROST for dependent variable B

1. L x ROST at BSs
ROST, $F = 46.70$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
L, ns
L x ROST, $F = 32.51$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x NL, $F = 79.14$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x HL, $F = .86$, $df = 1/576$, ns
L x BST, $F = 12.97$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
L x WST, $F = 20.32$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$

2. L x ROST at WSs
ROST, $F = 29.40$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
L, $F = 7.78$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x L, ns

B. RGC x ROS x ROST for dependent variable A

1. RGC x ROST at BSs
ROST, $F = 53.33$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
RGC, $F = 10.76$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x RGC, $F = 26.43$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (3B and 0W), $F = 96.84$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (2B and 1W), $F = 18.95$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (1B and 2W), $F = 8.42$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (0B and 3W), $F = 8.42$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
RGC x BST, $F = 31.81$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
RGC x WST, $F = 6.20$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$

2. RGC x ROST at WSa
   ROST, F = 19.65, df = 1/576, p < .01
   RGC, F = 5.15, df = 3/576, p < .01
   ROST x RGC, F = 8.89, df = 3/576, p < .01
      ROST x (3B and 0W), F = 11.93, df = 1/576, p < .01
      ROST x (2B and 1W), F = 10.53, df = 1/576, p < .01
      ROST x (1B and 2W), F = 18.24, df = 1/576, p < .01
      ROST x (0B and 3W), F = 5.61, df = 1/576, p < .05
      RGC x BST, F = 3.04, df = 3/576, p < .05
      RGC x WST, F = 11.46, df = 3/576, p < .01

C. RGC x L x ROE--none of the univariates contributed significantly to this interaction

D. RGC x L x ROST for dependent variable A

1. RGC x L at BST
   L, ns
   RGC, F = 25.54, df = 3/576, p < .01
   L x RGC, ns

2. RGC x L at WST
   L, F = 28.07, df = 1/576, p < .01
   RGC, F = 17.32, df = 3/576, p < .01
   L x RGC, F = 3.74, df = 3/576, p < .05
      L x (3B and 0W), F = 14.74, df = 1/576, p < .01
      L x (2B and 1W), F = 9.12, df = 1/576, p < .01
      L x (1B and 2W), F = 16.14, df = 1/576, p < .01
      L x (0B and 3W), F = .18, ns
      RGC x NL, F = 18.48, df = 3/576, p < .01
      RGC x HL, F = 2.81, df = 3/576, p < .05

E. RGC x L x ROST for dependent variable D

1. RGC x L at BST
   L, ns
   RGC, F = 26.34, df = 3/576, p < .01
   L x RGC, F = 4.01, df = 3/576, p < .01
      L x (3B and 0W), F = 6.83, df = 1/576, p < .01
      RGC x NL, F = 24.06, df = 3/576, p < .01
      RGC x HL, F = 6.18, df = 3/576, p < .01

2. RGC x L at WST
   L, ns
   RGC, F = 16.02, df = 3/576, p < .01
   L x RGC, F = 9.19, df = 3/576, p < .01
      L x (3B and 0W), F = 13.66, df = 1/576, p < .01
      L x (0B and 3W), F = 12.68, df = 1/576, p < .01
      RGC x NL, F = 24.55, df = 3/576, p < .01
      RGC x HL, F = .78, df = 3/576, ns

II. MANOVA (F-G)
L x ROS x ROST, $F = 4.78$, $p < .008$
RGC x ROS x ROE, $F = 3.20$, $p < .004$
RGC x ROS x ROST, $F = 3.77$, $p < .001$

A. L x ROS x ROST for dependent variable F

1. L x ROST at BSs
ROST, $F = 9.33$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
L, $F = 1.33$, $df = 1/576$, ns
ROST x L, $F = 6$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x NL, $F = 16$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x HL, ns
L x BST, ns
L x WST, $F = 6$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$

2. L x ROST at WSs
ROST, ns
L, $F = 4.0$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .05$
ROST x L, ns

B. RGC x ROS x ROE for dependent variable G

1. RGC x ROE at BSs
ROE, $F = 5.38$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .05$
RGC, ns
ROE x RGC, $F = 3.38$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .05$
ROE x (3B and 0W), ns
ROE x (1B and 2W), ns
ROE x (2B and 1W), $F = 5.52$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .05$
ROE x (0B and 3W), $F = 7.59$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
RGC x BE, ns
RGC x WE, ns

2. RGC x ROE at WSs
ROE, $F = 4.14$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .05$
RGC, $F = .92$, ns
ROE x RGC, $F = 1.49$, $df = 3/576$, ns

C. RGC x ROS x ROST for dependent variable F

1. ROST x RGC at BSs
ROST, $F = 9.33$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
RGC, $F = .22$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x RGC, $F = 7.22$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (3B and 0W), $F = 14$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
ROST x (2B and 1W), $F = 6$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .05$
ROST x (1B and 2W), $F = 2$, $df = 1/576$, ns
ROST x (0B and 3W), $F = 8.67$, $df = 1/576$, $p < .01$
RGC x BST, $F = 5$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .01$
RGC x WST, $F = 3$, $df = 3/576$, $p < .05$

2. ROST x RGC at WSs
   ROST, F = 1.33, df = 1/576, ns
   RGC, F = .67, df = 3/576, ns
   ROST x RGC, F = .22, df = 3/576, ns

APPENDIX B

TABLES

TABLE 6.--L x ROS x ROST for Dependent Variable B.

	L x ROST at BS				L x ROST at Ws		
	Label				Label		
	NL	HL			NL	HL	
BST	4.17	3.39	3.78	BST	3.88	4.56	4.22
(ROST)							
WST	2.26	3.23	2.74	WST	3.31	3.48	3.40
	3.22	3.31			3.60	4.02	

TABLE 7.--RGC x ROS x ROST for Dependent Variable A.

RGC x ROST at BS

(ROST)	RGC 3/0	RGC 2/1	RGC 1/2	RGC 0/3	
BST	3.94	2.99	2.74	2.36	3.01
WST	2.28	2.25	2.24	2.85	2.40
	3.11	2.62	2.49	2.60	

RGC x ROST at WS

(ROST)	RGC 3/0	RGC 2/1	RGC 1/2	RGC 0/3	
BST	3.34	2.96	3.20	2.88	3.10
WST	2.76	2.41	2.48	3.30	2.74
	3.05	2.68	2.68	3.09	

TABLE 8.--RGC x L x ROST for Dependent Variable A.

RGC x L at BST

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0.3	
L	NL	3.80	2.88	2.92	2.55	3.04
	HL	3.48	3.07	3.01	2.70	3.06
		3.64	2.98	2.96	2.62	

RGC x L at WST

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
L	NL	2.20	2.07	2.02	3.11	2.35
	HL	2.85	2.59	2.70	3.04	2.80
		2.52	2.33	2.36	3.08	

TABLE 9.--RGC x L x ROST for Dependent Variable D.

RGC x L at BST

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
L	NL	4.35	3.08	3.12	2.75	3.32
	HL	3.82	3.40	3.22	2.98	3.36
		4.08	3.24	3.17	2.86	

RGC x L at WST

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
L	NL	2.05	2.72	2.62	3.75	2.78
	HL	2.80	2.95	2.75	3.02	2.88
		2.42	2.84	2.68	3.38	

TABLE 10.--L x ROS x ROST for Dependent Variable F.

	L x ROST at BS				L x ROST at WS		
	Label				Label		
	NL	HL			NL	HL	
	BST 5.61	5.33	5.47	BST	5.53	5.42	5.48
(ROST)							
	WST 4.92	5.33	5.12	WST	5.55	5.17	5.36
	5.26	5.33			5.54	5.30	

TABLE 11.--RGC x ROE x ROS for Dependent Variable G.

RGC x ROE at BS

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
(ROE)	BE	5.74	6.31	6.25	6.15	6.11
	WE	6.05	5.73	6.05	5.49	5.83
		5.90	6.02	6.15	5.82	

RGC x ROE x WS

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
(ROE)	BE	6.24	6.02	5.96	6.24	6.12
	WE	5.60	5.78	5.99	6.09	5.86
		5.92	5.90	5.98	6.16	

TABLE 12.--RGC x ROS x ROST for Dependent Variable F.

RGC x ROST at BS

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
(ROST)	BST	5.82	4.96	5.39	5.71	5.47
	WST	4.90	5.56	5.06	4.98	5.12
		5.36	5.26	5.22	5.34	

RGC x ROST at WS

		RGC				
		3/0	2/1	1/2	0/3	
(ROST)	BST	5.48	5.42	5.38	5.62	5.48
	WST	5.37	5.16	5.48	5.43	5.36
		5.42	5.29	5.43	5.52	

APPENDIX C

DEPENDENT MEASURES

RATING

Would you please rate the character "Sly" in the film you've just seen with respect to the following. Check one of the ratings for each of the questions.

1. How clear and effective do you feel Sly was in addressing his colleagues?

    a. _____ Exceptionally clear
    b. _____ Moderately clear
    c. _____ Average
    d. _____ Moderately unclear
    e. _____ Extremely unclear

2. How appropriate do you feel Sly was in talking to his colleagues?

    a. _____ Very appropriate
    b. _____ Somewhat appropriate
    c. _____ Average
    d. _____ Somewhat inappropriate
    e. _____ Very inappropriate

3. How respectful do you feel Sly was in talking to his colleagues?

    a. _____ Very respectful
    b. _____ Somewhat respectful
    c. _____ Average
    d. _____ Somewhat disrespectful
    e. _____ Very disrespectful

4. How would you rate Sly on his style and ability to meet various groups of people in general?

    a. _____ Exceptionally good
    b. _____ Moderately good
    c. _____ Average
    d. _____ Moderately poor
    e. _____ Extremely poor

5. How would you rate Sly on his manner of greeting people?

   a. _____ Exceptionally good
   b. _____ Moderately good
   c. _____ Average
   d. _____ Moderately poor
   e. _____ Extremely poor

6. How would you rate Sly on his language usage?

   a. _____ Exceptionally good
   b. _____ Moderately good
   c. _____ Average
   d. _____ Moderately poor
   e. _____ Extremely poor

RATE SLY

1.

appropriate	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	inappropriate
delightful	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	irritating
provocative	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	enjoyable
proper	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	improper

2. If you were one of Sly's colleagues, how would you rate Sly's behavior?

appropriate	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	inappropriate
suitable	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	unsuitable
improper	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	proper
becoming	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	unbecoming
unfitting	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	fitting
good	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	bad

3. How do you think Sly's colleagues feel toward Sly's behavior?

__ Very good
__ Somewhat good
__ Average
__ Somewhat bad
__ Very bad

Why?

Please give a brief response to the following questions.

1. Why did you rate Sly the way you did?

2. How would you have responded to Sly had you been one of the colleagues?

1. Which of the items below best represent the way you felt while viewing the film?

   a. _____ Very good

   b. _____ Somewhat good

   c. _____ Average

   d. _____ Somewhat bad

   e. _____ Very bad

2. Overall, how would you rate the experiment?

good	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	bad
provocative	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	enjoyable
pleasant	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	unpleasant

3. How would you describe your feeling toward the experimenter?

good	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	bad
unpleasant	__	__	__	__	__	__	__	pleasant

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

Allport, G. W. The nature of prejudice. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.

Back, K. W. Influence through social communication. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1951, 46, 9=23.

Barton, J. B. A study of attitudes toward Jews, and Mormons at a Southern university. Unpublished Master's theses, University of Georgia, 1965.

Brown, R. Social pyschology. New York: The Free Press, 1965.

Campbell, D. T. Stereotypes and the perception of group differences. American Psychologist, 1967, 22, 817-829.

Cauthen, N. R., & Robinson, I. E. Stereotypes: A review of the literature: 1926-1968. Journal of Social Psychology, 1971.

Cauthen, N. R., Robinson, I. E. & Krauss, H. H. Stereotypes as contexts of meaning. Proceedings from 79th Annual Convention, A.P.A., 1971.

Gordon, K. A study of aesthetic judgments. Jounral of Experimental Psychology, 1923, 6, 36-43.

Harrison, M. G., Messé, L. A., & Stollak, G. E. The effects of racial composition and group size on interaction patterns in preschool children. Proceedings from 79th Annual Convention, A.P.A., 1971.

Hasling, D. T. A study of attitudes intensity among dogmatic students. Unpublished Master's thesis, University of Georgia, 1969.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. W. Racial stereotypes of 100 college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1933, 28, 280-290.

Katz, D., & Braly, K. W. Racial prejudice and racial stereotypes. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1935, 30, 175-193.

King James Version, The Holy Bible, John 4:1-47; Judges 14-15.

Klineberg, D. The scientific study of national stereotypes. International Social Science Bulletin, 1951, 3, 505-515.

Knight, H. C. A comparison of the reliability of group and individual judgments. Unpublished Master's theses, Columbia University, 1921.

Krech, D., Crutchfield, R. S., & Ballachez, E. L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1962.

Lee, I. J. How do you talk about people. Freedom Pamphlet, New York: Anti-Defamation League, 1950.

Lott, A. J., & Lott, B. E. Group cohesiveness, communication level, and conformity. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 408-412.

Lorge, J., Fox, D., Davitz, J., & Brenner, M. A survey of studies contrasting the quality of group performance and individual performance. Psychological Bulletin, 1958, 55, 337-372.

Matthews, C. R. Biased reporting styles as a test for the potency of racial labels. Unpublished Master's thesis, Michigan State University, 1974.

Prothro, E. T., & Melikian, L. H. Studies in stereotypes: V. familiarity and the kernel of truth hypotheses. Journal of Social Psychology, 1955, 41, 3-10.

Razran, G. Ethnic dislikes and stereotypes: A laboratory study. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1950.

Rokeach, M. Beliefs, attitudes and values. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc., 1968.

Rosenberg, S., Erlick, D. E., & Berkowita, L. Some effects of varying combinations of group members on group performance measures and leadership behaviors. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 195-203.

Schoenfeld, N. An experimental study of some problems relating to stereotypes. Archives of Psychology, 1942, 38, (270).

Shaw, M. E. Group Dynamics. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1976.

Willis, R. H. Descriptive models of social response. Technical Report, Nonr-Contract 816 (12), Washington University, 1964.

Zawadzki, B. Limitations in the scapegoat theory of prejudice. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1948, 43, 127-141.