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CHAPTER I

BACKGROUND

Although many students of communications have studied various aspects of changing attitudes prevalent in our society, no studies have been concerned with the effects of the oral presentation of literature which is relevant to a current issue. This study explores the effect on a specific audience listening to an expert reading of poetic literature pertinent to a controversial topic. It is felt that the experiment will broaden the field of empirical knowledge in the oral interpretation of literature; it will provide more information in the methods of attitude change under varying conditions; and it will also be related to the poetic-rhetoric distinction.

**Empirical studies in oral interpretation**

A relatively few experimental research programs have been reported from the area of oral interpretation of literature; however, a current trend toward more
involvement in these methods is noted by Martin Cobin.¹


He urges the acceptance of the reality of interpretative technique; the improvement in applying quantitative, statistical and experimental methods to research in this area; imaginativeness in formulating experimental hypotheses; and patience in methodically building an understanding and a theoretical framework. In developing the point of formulating experimental hypotheses, Cobin clearly states a framework for further study:

I am, personally, enthusiastic about what I believe to be a vital, valuable, and effective but almost ignored interpretative form to which I will give the name forensic interpretation. . . the use of interpretative reading by a speaker who has his own communicative, persuasive purposes, and who limits his extemporaneous speaking to transitional remarks between the literary selections and, possibly, an introduction and a conclusion. Interpretative reading constitutes the bulk of his presentation . . . the individual selections are presented with sensitivity and without distortion; but they are selected, arranged, interwoven, and presented to serve the persuasive objective of the interpreter. . . . I have no knowledge of the extent of its effectiveness. . . . This form may be most effective in the area of attitude and value modification but there is no clear evidence of this.²

²Ibid., 345.
Cobin has clearly indicated a need for experimental research in the area of this present study.

In recent years several research projects have sought to expand the body of empirical research in the area of oral interpretation. A brief review of published studies will indicate the trend in which this present study is based.

Some early studies of experimental nature dealt with teaching methods. A 1940 experiment by Norvelle and Smith\(^3\) studied changes in the reading ability of students of oral interpretation as revealed by variety in inflection, pause, and force; conclusions were drawn that students at the extremes approached the mean in use of pause and inflection and that extreme use of force had been replaced by use of inflection and pause. The Brooks and Wulftange\(^4\) experiment used testing scales for measuring listener involvement in oral interpretation presented by audio, television and live

\(^{3}\)Lee Norvelle and Raymond Smith, "Testing for Improvement in Oral Interpretation," Quarterly Journal of Speech, XXVI (1940), 540-545.

performances; the face-to-face method was found to
arouse the fullest aesthetic response to the literature.

The Cobin and Clevenger study tested course


content retention by students taught oral interpretation by television and those taught by inexperienced assistants; they report a positive relationship between teaching experience level and retention of specific content. In a somewhat similar experiment, Leonardo and Tiffany attempted to evaluate the relative


effectiveness of short machine programs for teaching oral reading improvement using over one hundred subjects who each read a selection four times aloud, receiving either machine-programed reinforcement or this reinforcement coupled with specific suggestions for improvement. They report that reading effectiveness was significantly greater and reading rates were slower in all programs but that the combination of making the student voice conscious and leading him to consider the meaning of
the selection effected more improvement than mere
reinforcement.

A recent study by Frandsen, Rockey and Kleinau7

7Kenneth D. Frandsen, James R. Rockey and Marion
Kleinau, "Changes in the Factorial Composition of a
Semantic Differential," Speech Monographs, XXXII (1965),
112-118.

used the semantic differential measuring device to
explore the possibility of measuring responses to readers
theatre productions. In a workshop situation of five
productions, the participants in the workshop provided
responses to the scales; these were tabulated and factor
analyses were made. The terms which gave most variance
were: general evaluation, potency, activity, content
evaluation, and intent evaluation.

The Marcoux8 research project provides some

8J. Paul Albert Marcoux, "An Analysis of Current
Trends Concerning Basic Aspects of Oral Interpretation," a
thesis abstract, Speech Monographs, XXXIII (1965),
288-289.

guidelines for current trends evident from twenty-one
textbooks, twenty-two articles in publications and
sixteen theses in the field of oral interpretation. One
of the major findings of his study was that there is a
need for better understanding of the speaker-audience
relationship in oral interpretation. He reports the trend in utilizing findings in related disciplines to implement the study of oral interpretation; furthermore, he reports the implication that educational work in the field should include linguistics, communication theory, psychology, and aesthetics.

This present study, then, may be seen as being in line with current trends of scholarly research in oral interpretation.

Several years ago, Allport reported that "evidence so far as it goes, supports project methods of intercultural education. Some slight indications also suggest that a good vestibule leading to more wholehearted participation is the strategy of vicarious experience. Films and fiction may prepare the individual for the more virile lessons of learning."

Perhaps

---


---

the oral interpretation of literature provides an experience which may be, for the listener, somewhat vicarious in nature but also one which causes a recreated experience especially valuable in reaching opinions on controversial issues of our social structure.
Aspects of current attitude research—intent of the communicator

Among the varying conditions in attitude research at the current time is the question of openly revealing the persuasive intent of the communicator or of concealing that intent from the communicatee. The earlier study of Hovland and Mandell in conclusion-drawing suggested that "in persuasive communications, other factors—involved in motivation to accept—might often operate in the opposite direction, and sometimes override the learning gain to be expected from an explicit statement of the conclusion."^10 Their research revealed that


the reactions to a communication are significantly affected by cues as to the communicator's intentions, expertness and trustworthiness; their audience, furthermore, viewed the "motivated" speaker as having done a poorer job and as having been less "fair and honest" in his presentation than the "impartial" communicator—despite the fact that the content and conclusion of the speech were identical for the two. Over twice as many subjects changed their opinions in the direction
advocated by the communicator when the conclusion was explicitly drawn as did when it was left to the audience.

One important factor might be expected to be the degree to which the issue is of primary concern to the individual. Where strong "ego-involving" issues are concerned, the individual's independence may be more vigorously asserted, and he may be more motivated to examine the arguments and implications closely. A non-directive approach, in which no conclusion is drawn, may be more effective when the communication deals with highly personal matters of the sort involved in psychotherapy, where direct suggestions are especially likely to meet with strong resistance. The suggestion was also made that with more sophisticated audiences there may be less need to have the implications of the premises spelled out and less benefit from conclusion-drawing by the communicator. However, Ewing\(^1\) study concluded that


considerable interest and information was negatively related to change of opinion.
The Berelson\textsuperscript{12} studies of "overheard" communications stated that in such exposure defenses against new ideas are presumably weaker because preconceptions are not so pervasively present. Festinger,\textsuperscript{13} in his study,

\textsuperscript{12}Bernard Berelson and Morris Janowitz, \textit{Reader in Public Opinion and Communication} (Glencoe, Ill.: Free Press, 1950), 489.

\textsuperscript{13}Leon Festinger, \textit{Theory of Cognitive Dissonance} (Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957), 263-266.

states that the avoidance and evasion of material which might produce or increase dissonance depends on anticipations (probably unverbalized ones) about the material or on preliminary assessment of the material; his study stated that a communication which argues for an opinion different from that held by the audience creates dissonance in the listeners. Since the receiver cannot attempt to influence the source in the audience listening or reading situation, two ways of reducing the dissonance are (1) to change his opinion to a position closer to the speaker's or (2) to reject and derogate the communicator and the communication. Festinger concludes that the same dissonance is created regardless of whether the person is prepared for it. The effect of preparedness
would be on the particular mechanism that the individual used to reduce the dissonance.

The Allyn and Festinger\textsuperscript{14} study expanded these ideas by using a topic that personally involved the audience and tested their acceptance of the ideas after being told of the expertness of the speaker in order to judge his opinions or his personality. There was no difference in the percentage of the two groups who felt that the communicator was biased.

Walster and Festinger\textsuperscript{15} list the following reasons for the effectiveness of overheard communications: (1) The accidental nature of the communication means that the listener is caught with his defenses down; thus, there is no resistance to the persuasive communication. (2) The listener is not supposed to hear the communication which was not addressed to him. (3) The speaker cannot possibly be seen as intending...
to influence the listener. The same researchers give no reason for why subjects, hearing a communication which advocates a position they would like to accept, still tend to impute ulterior motives to the speaker when this is possible. Their research did not test communications urging the listeners in a direction in which they do not want to move.

The later study of Mills and Aronson\(^{16}\) sought


to solve the conflicting evidence about "the-desire-to-influence" attribute of a communicator as perceived by the listeners. Their study upheld the hypothesis that an overt, frankly stated desire to influence would actually enhance the effectiveness of an attractive communicator. This type of speaker may make the audience want to please him, and thus more opinions may be changed. If he is unattractive to the listeners, the expressed desire may decrease the effectiveness of the communication.

This review of attitude research provides a background for one phase of this study--the aspect of
revealing the persuasive intent of the program of literature for some of the subjects and of concealing that intent from another part of the subjects.

The poetic-rhetoric distinction

For centuries the classifications of rhetoric and poetic have sought to divide the many communications of mankind into those acts which sought to influence men to some practical action (rhetoric) and those which sought to bring pleasure (poetic). These distinctions were presented in the treatises of Aristotle, and since that time many scholars have sought to extend and clarify them. Aristotle defined rhetoric as the rationale of informative and persuasive discourse, or, in his words more clearly, the finding of the available means of persuasion in any given situation. He clarified poetics to be the "imitation" of life, the beauty of experience.

In an article written in 1925, Wichelns

discusses the differences in the literary critic (seeking permanent values, beauty, aesthetics) and the rhetorical critic (seeking effects and methods of giving ideas). He quotes Jebb as stating that rhetoric uses language to produce a desired effect, whereas poetry is more expressive than communicative. Hudson's idea is better stated, perhaps, in that poetic deals with the subject and rhetoric deals with the audience. Finally, Baldwin is quoted as distinguishing them in this way: rhetoric moves men in their affairs while poetic expands their vision; both appeal to the imagination but the method of rhetoric is logical and the method of poetic is imaginative. Later Howell stated that rhetoric is direct symbolization and poetic is the use of symbols of symbols. This semantic approach could lead to difficulties because the distinction is not a static one.

Staub and Mohrmann\textsuperscript{18} are examples of recent scholars who question this dichotomy of rhetoric and poetic. They state that believers traditionally

approach rhetoric and poetic as separate and theoretically mutually exclusive categories; however, Staub and Mohrmann present the community of rhetoric, poetic and logic with the major appeals of all verbal arts being ethos, pathos, and logos. In any given piece, the relative value of the three appeals varies in an organic but abstractable pattern. They conclude that Aristotle recognized ethos as the central appeal of rhetoric and that poetic does concentrate on the product, thence on the audience. Poetics places greatest emphasis on pathos; the maker creates the product, more or less oblivious to any specific audience, and the product, once the maker has withdrawn, appeals to any given audience on the basis of its own inherent pathos.

Earlier Staub\(^1^9\) had pointed out many similarities between rhetoric and poetic, the most important of which he believed to be the concept of dramatic crisis. To see the *Rhetoric*, on one hand, as a book about doing a thing and the *Poetics*, on the other hand, as a book about a thing done is a distinction of immense importance to the rhetorician; the division implies the possibility

that in final analysis the two works are but different approaches to a common phenomenon. If the aim of speaking is to create a specific dramatic crisis—that is, a union of manners and thoughts within attenuating circumstances—in the minds of a given audience at a given time, or in a given space-time order, is there any true distinction between universality and immediate effect?

Summary

This study explores the audience effect of an expert reading of poetic literature of a controversial nature, thus broadening the empirical knowledge of the area of oral interpretation, adding information on an aspect of attitude change—the intent of the communicator—and relating to the poetic-rhetoric distinction.

Chapter II presents a review of the experimental design, including the choice of controversial issue, the dependent variable as tested by measuring devices, and the independent variable, which is a reading program of literature related to the controversial issue.

Chapter III is an analysis of the data obtained in the experiment. Chapter IV draws conclusions and summarizes the study.
CHAPTER II

EXPERIMENTAL DESIGN

In order to relate directly to the three major aspects of this study as outlined in Chapter I, an experiment was designed to test the effect of the oral interpretation of literature on a controversial issue.

The general design of the experiment, with dependent and independent variables, is found in Table 1.

TABLE 1.—The General Design of the Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subjects</strong></td>
<td>Attitude Pretest</td>
<td>Program of Literature</td>
<td>Attitude Posttest and Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td>Attitude Pretest</td>
<td>No Stimulus</td>
<td>Attitude Posttest</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The controversial issue

Among the current controversial issues of our society, one which personally involves the individual
citizen is the crisis over the social integration of the Negro. The intensive efforts during the last few summers made by various civil organizations—the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee, and others—in addition to the civil rights legislation recently passed and still pending in the Congress and the extensive news coverage afforded events related to the integration issue have forced the individual to reevaluate his position on various specific questions of the social integration of the Negro.

Pettigrew,\(^1\) in his recent comprehensive sociological study, indicates that the reactions of the Negro to the oppression in our country have been of three categories: moving \textit{toward} the oppressor, moving \textit{against} the oppressor, or moving \textit{away from} the oppressor. Of the first type, the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People, National Urban League, Congress on Racial Equality, and the Student Non-Violent Coordinating Committee move toward the oppressor

in that they strive for the social integration of their race. Those groups moving against the oppressor (opposing integration) are the Black Muslims, the Ku Klux Klan, the White Citizens' Councils. A few groups have made attempts to move away from the oppressor by forming their own cities, as in Mound Bayou, Mississippi, and Boley, Oklahoma, or in the "Back to Africa" appeals of the 1920's; however the most important aspects of this category are those individuals reacting by passivity and withdrawal, by social insulation, by passing for white and/or by extreme escapism.

The issue of the Negro's rights in our society is not a problem which is limited to the South; conversely, it is a problem which confronts all sections of our nation. The problems of riots and non-violent demonstrations in cities ranging from Los Angeles, California, to Cleveland, Ohio, and Boston, Massachusetts, have been given television coverage during recent months. Indeed, it is a sociological problem worthy of study in any part of the country. Furthermore, much literature has been written about the Negro and his struggle for equal opportunities; there is a wealth of material written about the Negro and by the Negro.
The Tumin study is based on the premise that prejudice and discrimination may not be so closely interdependent; discrimination is not practiced only by prejudiced persons.

Law, custom, conscience and informal community restraints can and have been interposed between private feeling and public action. Prejudice will not easily, if ever, yield to the blandishments of rational evidence, nor is emotional re-education a feasible public alternative.²


In order to measure the attitude toward discrimination within our society, then, one would not need to measure the attitude of prejudice directly. In other words, by measuring an individual's attitudes on specific situations in our society involving the social contact of the white and Negro, a measure could be made of attitudes toward social integration without a specific measure of prejudice.

The controversial issue of the social integration of the Negro was selected for the purposes of this study because of its current nature and because there is relevant literature available.
The dependent variable

The attitude of the individuals toward the social integration of the Negro is the dependent variable of this experiment. A sample population was chosen from the students in basic speech courses offered at The Ohio State University. Various sections of Speech 401 (Effective Speaking), 402 (Discussion), and 505 (Oral Interpretation) were selected to serve as experimental groups and the control group.

In order to test the attitude which these students held regarding the social integration of the Negro, a valid and reliable measuring device was needed. Thurstone\(^3\) defined attitudes as the sum total of a man's inclinations and feelings, prejudice or bias, preconceived notions, ideas, fears, threats, and convictions about any specified topic. An opinion is a verbal expression of an attitude and symbolizes that attitude. Thurstone further pointed out that the measurement of attitudes expressed by a man's opinions does not necessarily mean the prediction of what he will do: even if the individual is intentionally distorting

his attitude, however, an attitude scale is at least the indication of the attitude that he is trying to make people believe that he has.

Likert\textsuperscript{4} pointed out that verbal declarations of opinion and attitude are regarded as an \textit{indirect} method of measuring dispositions. Social attitudes are assumed to cluster in groups or patterns, and, thus, a series of verbal propositions are assumed statistically to have a group factor. The testing which Likert reports dealt with race relations; the five-point answers on each item served to make the individual statements become scales in themselves. The scales were easily scored and each item gave a normal distribution of answers.

Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall\textsuperscript{5} caution that it is difficult to measure or to change a person's commitment to the values of the family, to his religion, to his politics, to his stand on the virtue of his way of life. The commitments are intimately felt and


\textsuperscript{5}Carolyn Sherif, Muzaf\textit{er} Sherif, and Roger Nebergall, \textit{Attitude and Attitude Change} (Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1965), vi-xiii.
cherished in his eyes; thus, they are ego-involved attitudes. Furthermore, an attitude derived from a social norm cannot be represented properly as a single point on a continuum; it is more adequately represented as a range or latitude of acceptance, with an accompanying range of rejection or noncommitance.

The measuring scale, therefore, should include an opportunity for the individual to indicate his range of acceptance and rejection within certain situations. As Sherif and Hovland indicate, "attitude measurement, whether the indices are overt behavior or, more typically, check marks on an attitude questionnaire, is based upon evaluations and categorization of the stimuli toward which the attitude is held."  

---


---

Several attitude scales toward the Negro are available from previous experimentation. The Hinckley

---


---

study used a Thurstone-type scale with sixteen items, many of which are not currently applicable. The
Hunter's study of social attitudes included twenty items relative to the Negro; the answers were ranged on a five-point continuum for this study, but, again, the items are out-dated for the present time.

Perhaps the most widely used attitude scale for racial discrimination is the Bogardus' scale, intended for comparing various races and social groups rather than for obtaining an attitude toward any one group; however, the five specific items of the scale could have been used for this study.

The Greenberg scale on integration included twenty-nine items, many of which are acceptable at this time, but the scale was primarily intended for high school students; thus, the scale would have needed extensive revision for use with college groups.
Another available scale is the Tumin\textsuperscript{11} scale on
\textit{the Image of the Negro}. This scale is rather simple in its use of four basic questions which are general in nature. After the selection of a primary scale as the measurement for this study, it was decided to include the Tumin Scale as a check on the results of the more specific questionnaire.

The Smith\textsuperscript{12} study used a fifty-three item scale with answers spread on a five-point continuum in the manner of Likert Scales. Although the scale was initially used in 1943, the subjects at that time were graduate students at Columbia University. On face validity, most of the items of the Smith scale are still relevant for the majority of the population today. It was decided that this scale could serve as the basis for a modern revision for use in this study.

The revision was made and the scale was administered to a test section of sixteen students to ascertain whether or not the scale would discriminate
those students having an attitude opposed to the social integration of the Negro from those students having a favorable inclination toward integration. The results were favorable, with the total scores, as weighted on the five-point scale, ranging from 64 to 241. A correlation of the odd items with the even items revealed a Pearson correlation of .98. Those items which did not result in a spread of answers on all five choices were discarded or revised. The final draft of the attitude scale is found in Appendix A.

The results of the Image of the Negro Scale in the trial test section were also favorable. Individual scores ranged from 0 - 4, which was the maximum possible difference—and the scale was not altered in any way.

Attitude test scores were used to determine those subjects with pro-integration tendencies, those with seemingly neutral tendencies, and those with definite anti-integration tendencies. To make these distinctions, the mean of all scores on the pretest were used for those neutral on the subject, including the standard error of measurement on either side of the mean, which were also considered neutral. Scores falling beyond the point of standard error of measurement were
classified as either pro-integration or anti-integration scores. Thus, the reactions of individuals with varying opinions could be correlated in the different testing conditions of the experiment.

In a similar way, the standard error of measurement was used as a minimal indication of attitude change from the pretest to the posttest scores; those individual scores failing to change more than the standard error of measurement could be disregarded.

The pretest attitude scale was administered by classroom instructors two weeks before the stimulus of the oral interpretation program; the posttest was administered immediately following the stimulus in order to measure the immediate reactions of the listeners.

The scheme for revealing the intent to some listeners and concealing it from others entailed using entire class sections for one or the other format. In the classes including the oral interpretation of literature as a regular part of the curriculum, there was no difficulty in scheduling the program as a demonstration of the technique being studied; moreover, the time lapse between the pretest attitude scale and the program was sufficient to avoid direct connection of the
two. Because the tests were administered by the classroom teacher and the program of literature was read by another person, there was even less possibility of connection. In addition, the students are accustomed to the regular oral presentation of ideas on controversial issues, and they were not prone to notice this presentation in particular. Thus, it was decided that the intent could be concealed during the program for this group and that the listeners would not know the relationship of the pretest and the program until they were asked to complete the posttest. By that time, their reactions to the program would have been formulated.

In the class sections which did not study the oral interpretation of literature, the students were told before the administration of the pretest that they were selected to participate in an experimental study, that they were taking the pretest and could expect a stimulus situation which might change their attitudes, and that a posttest would be given following the stimulus.

In this way, then, the reactions of individuals under varying conditions could be studied in relation to a predetermined and consistent independent variable.
The students were assured that their answers would be anonymous and that their reactions would in no way influence the course grade. Certain basic information about the student was pertinent to the study, and he used his fee card registration number as his identification, since all students carry the fee card for use in the library. Thus, by an indirect method, the individual scores on the pretest and the posttest could be correlated.

The independent variable

A program of the oral reading of poetic literature serves as the independent variable of this study. Much literature has been written concerning the position of the Negro in our society, and many of these writers chose to present their ideas through intense use of language. For purposes of this study, poetic literature is defined as that which uses imagery and/or symbolism for its primary effect. Imagery means that the words are literally untrue but emotionally meaningful. Symbolism may be defined as the use of language when the obvious meaning is not the intended meaning.
Perrine\textsuperscript{13} states that literature can be used as a gear for stepping up the intensity and increasing the range of our experience; this is the literary use of language. Literature communicates concentrated and organized experience. It broadens our experience by making us acquainted with a range of experience with which, in the ordinary course of events, we might have no contact; it deepens our experience by making us feel more poignantly and more understandingly those everyday experiences which all of us have.

Poetry is presented by Perrine as the most condensed and concentrated form of literature. He states that "ultimately, poetry can be recognized only by the response made to it by a good reader." The resources of poetry are connotation, imagery, metaphor, symbol, paradox, irony, allusion, sound repetition, rhythm, and pattern.

Poetry is presented by Korg\textsuperscript{14} as dealing with


the kind of experience that ordinary language cannot communicate; it works at the limits of knowledge, seeking to express the inexpressible.

Since a review of the controversies over a definition of the term poetry is outside the purpose of this study, a simple statement will suffice: language using imagery and/or symbolism for its primary impact is poetic literature.

A major consideration in the stimulus situation of this study is the choice of the specific selections of literature. A generally acceptable concept in communication theory is that highly educated audiences prefer to hear both sides of a controversy. In order to refrain from alienating the listeners by literature related to only one side of the controversial issue, it was decided to include a program of selections presenting both sides of the controversy. This decision coincides well with the consideration of the judgment of intent of the communicator as previously presented in this paper. Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall\textsuperscript{15} indicate

\footnotesize{\textsuperscript{15}Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall, xiii.}

that the judgment of a communication depends upon
the ego-involvement of the individual. Furthermore:

To the extent that the individual is ego-involved in the topic, to that extent his stand is salient in his judgment of how discrepant a communication is. And with any salient anchor, the result is displacement of the position advocated toward his stand within a range not already defined as objectionable. Proportional to the discrepancy beyond that range, the position advocated is displaced in his judgments away from his stand and he is increasingly irritated and aroused. Far from changing his own stand, he is more likely to retrench and may, when possible, shift his stand even further away from the message.16

16Ibid.

In a program of literature including positions on both sides of the controversial issue, the individual is forced to make judgments during the program. It is these judgments and the effect upon his attitude as judged by the measuring scale that this study involves.

Another problem in the choice of literature is the decision of the degree of favorableness or unfavorableness of individual selections. It was decided to base the decision on the information of the Pettigrew17 report, which classified actions of the Negro as moving

toward the oppressor (favoring integration) or away from and against the oppressor (opposing integration). In this same way, the literature was judged as favoring a position of integration or opposing the social integration of the Negro. From the available sources of literature, selections of various authors of both prose and verse were found and combined into a program of approximately thirty minutes in length.

It was decided to use several shorter works instead of one longer work to comprise the program of literature in order to present several writers' views, in order to avoid one lengthy reading which might be cumbersome for one reader to handle, and in order to provide more variety in the program.

The program included selections which were favorable to the Negro in the sense that they presented situations evoking pathos for the Negro; also included were selections which were unfavorable to the Negro through the presentation of statements opposed to the social integration of the Negro and situations showing the Negro in undesirable conditions. The authors of the works included Langston Hughes, James Baldwin, Lerone Bennett, Jr., Malcolm X, Lawrence Ferlinghetti,
Truman Capote, and Fenton Johnson. The selections are found in Appendix B.

John Ciardi circumscribes the value of analysis of poetic literature and cautions that only in the synthesis of all elements does the poetry have real meaning.

Analysis is never in any sense a substitute for the poem. The best any analysis can do is to prepare the reader to enter the poem more perceptively. By isolating for special consideration some of the many simultaneous elements of the poem, analysis makes them more visible in one sense, and less interesting in another. It is up to the reader, once the analysis is completed, to re-read the poem in a way that will restore the simultaneity and therefore the liveliness and interest of the poetic structure. The only reason for taking a poem apart is that it may then be put back together again more richly. 18


The following analysis of the selections of literature is intended as a brief justification of their poetic content for inclusion in the program.

The literature which is favorable to the Negro was readily available from the published writings of prolific Negro authors who are using the medium of poetic expression. Langston Hughes is one of the most
widely acclaimed Negro writers in America. Several of his verses were included: "Magnolia Flowers," "Trumpet Player," and "Merry-Go-Round" are representative selections with a favorable appeal. The speaker in "Magnolia Flowers" symbolizes the pathos of the Negro who, at the end of life, has not found the loveliness that men search for in life. Hughes has used a poignant image to accomplish his impact. "Trumpet Player" presents a sketch of a Negro seeking sublimation of his desires by expressing his longings through art and music; the dreamy mood of the lonely trumpet is evident through phrasing and word choice. "Merry-Go-Round" is a short but provocative selection in which the symbolic child asks for acceptance. The image of the carnival ride enlarges the basic question of the Negro concerning the reasoning of segregation.

Two other selections by Langston Hughes are not so openly related to integration; however, each of them presents a view of the Negro which is in sympathy with his lack of opportunity in our society. "Kid in the Park" is the symbolic plea for a home and security, and the image is keen and intensely drawn. "Share-Cropper" is a poetic response to the plight of those
Negroes who labor in the fields with little monetary return. Both of these selections have much appeal in sympathy with the Negro even though they are not directly dealing with integration.

Another selection by Langston Hughes is a verse which was symbolically used on many occasions of public readings as Hughes toured the South during his early career. The selection "Cross" is rich in sensitivity and has rhythm in its development. The basic idea of the selection is pertinent because it relates to miscegenation, a highly controversial subject in our society. The speaker of the selection is symbolic of those individuals who are products of racial cross-breeding.

James Baldwin is a controversial figure in modern America, and he has written some very stimulating selections that are highly poetic as well as many articles that rhetorically state his opinions. The "Letter to My Nephew on the One Hundredth Anniversary of the Emancipation" is figuratively addressed to his nephew but speaks to the Negro youth across the nation. Lerone

---

Bennett, Jr. has recently published his work *Confrontation, Black and White* which includes poetic selections set apart in the script of the book. Two of these were used as opening and closing works. The first presents a re-enactment of the original arrival of Negro slaves with symbolic controversies between the characters in the drama. The final selection presents the cry for freedom as voiced by the white man and as heard from the black man, with the tense atmosphere resulting from the experience. Both selections are poetic in the use of images and symbolism.

The selections which are unfavorable or opposed to the integration of the Negro were not so readily available, especially those selections which were poetic in content. Some verses present images of Negroes in distasteful situations, such as Lawrence Ferlinghetti's "Meet Miss Subways." The poetic description of a Negro woman as she might be observed procuring in a public place—conditions which would make her less than admirable to most citizens—creates a mood and an attitude of disgust for and disapproval of her as a Negro. By presenting this reaction to a symbolic woman,
the author provides an emotional response to her and to her race.

Langston Hughes has poetically attempted to present the Negro as he really appears, and some of his selections present an unfavorable view of the Negro. The poem "Kid Sleepy" pictures the laziness of many Negro youths who are seemingly satisfied with their pitiful condition. "Early Evening Quarrel" gives a view of the discontent and unpleasantness in a Negro home as the husband and wife openly express their disagreements. The comic relief in the phrasing and wording of ideas serves as a framework for the expression of the resentment of the Negro woman at the matriarchial society she exists in.

A common stereotypic view of the Negro is that he is unusually responsive to the supernatural or to mysticism. A representative statement of this view is a passage from Other Voices, Other Rooms by Truman Capote which describes a Negro woman. A review of this work states that it is

... set in a world where we continually move without transition or warning from the actual into the dream, from the natural into the supernatural. The theme of the supernatural,
the alter ego, is a metaphor of the world in which that other self, which we cannot ever confront in the busy social world, exists.20


The description included in the program presents a viewpoint that is not favorable for social integration.

Fenton Johnson's provocative poem "I Am Tired of Civilization" presents a cry against the destiny of the American Negro but at the same time it states his position which is openly belligerent. The symbolic figure is an extreme representation of Negro despair at existing conditions.

Malcolm X, once an advocate of the Black Muslims, was an outspoken witness for the superiority of the Negro and for the separation of the races. His speeches were frequently highly poetic in the use of images. An example is included from one of his speeches; it is an analogy of the Negro to a watchdog. It is intensely sardonic in tone.

This collection of literature was organized and fitted into a program which could be read by one expert reader. An experienced and highly qualified interpreter, the reader was selected for her ability in courses in
oral interpretation at The Ohio State University. She assisted in the final selection of the literature so that she would be reading material which she found personally involving. Her readings in the various class sections were consistently well executed, according to the critical evaluation of this writer. She limited her speaking to simple transitions between selections.

In keeping with the aspect of listener judgments of the intent of the communicator, a questionnaire was devised to measure the listeners' reaction to the program of literature. Sherif, Sherif and Nebergall\(^2\)

\[^2\]Sherif, Sherif, and Nebergall, 226-228.

indicate that the appraisal of the communication that the individual makes as he receives the content of the message will determine his reaction to it. If the message falls well beyond the range of acceptance, the individual will appraise it as being more discrepant than it is in actuality; the greater the commitment of an individual to his stand on an issue, the greater the displacement of the discrepant message away from the bounds of his acceptance; finally, there will be a change in attitude toward the position advocated in the
communication or a reaffirmation of the individual's stand away from the communication is initially determined by the appraisal or placement of the advocated position relative to his own. In essence, attitude change or resistance to change is a function of individual categorization of the communication.

The questionnaire measured judgments of the intent of the program and of the reader. A copy is found in Appendix C.

The final design of the study, with the different variables involved, is found in Table 2.

The null hypotheses for this study are:
1. There is no significant difference in the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups nor in the posttest scores of the two groups.
2. There is no significant difference in the attitude test scores between the pretest and posttest situations of experimental and control groupings.
3. There is no significant difference in the attitude changes made by the subjects in the two experimental groups: revealed-intent and concealed-intent.
4. There are no significant differences in the attitude changes made by the three experimental groups: pro-integration, neutral, and anti-integration.
TABLE 2.—The Specific Design of the Experiment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SUBJECTS</th>
<th>Attitude in Pretest</th>
<th>Stimulus</th>
<th>Attitude in Posttest</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pro-Integration</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Anti-Integration</td>
<td>Pro-Integration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Revealed Intent</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Intent</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONTROL</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>NONE</td>
<td>X X X X</td>
<td>NONE</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. There is no significant difference in the attitude changes made by males and by females.

6. There are no significant differences in the observed and theoretical frequencies of the judgments of the intent of the program as made by the pro-integration, Neutral, and anti-integration groups.

7. There are no significant differences in the observed and theoretical frequencies of the judgments of the intent of the program as made by the revealed-intent and the concealed-intent groups.
CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS OF DATA

The intent of this chapter is to present a review of the statistical analysis made on the data received during the experiment. Chapter IV draws major conclusions for this study from the results of these tests.

A major aspect of this study is the division of subjects into those for whom the intent was revealed and those from whom that intent was concealed. The decision was made before the pretest was given; it was based on the availability of classroom groups according to the curriculum of study. It was, thus, possible to divide the pretest subjects into three groups which varied in number, sex and age as indicated in Table 3.

Analysis of pretest scores

The pretest which was administered consisted of the Social Distance Scale Toward the Negro and the Image of the Negro Scale. Each scale was scored separately. The Social Distance Scale included
TABLE 4.--Distribution of Subjects for Groups of the Experimental Pretest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>17-35</td>
<td>17-37</td>
<td>17-30</td>
<td>17-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

fifty-two items with answers ranged on a five-point continuum; the columns were weighted so that the most favorable attitude toward integration was given the score 1 and the most opposing attitude was given the score 5. In this way the total individual scores could range from 52 to 260. The Image of the Negro Scale included four items; the answers for favorable bias and for doubt were disregarded, leaving the definite statement of the inferiority of the Negro to be scored 1 for each item. The total individual score for this scale, then, could range from 0 to 4. Table 4 provides the results of the pretest in various groups.

A check was made on the validity of the pretest by scoring the even items and the odd items and by using
TABLE 4.—Central Tendency of Pretest Scores by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Scale Limits</th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance Scale</td>
<td>52-260</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 107.6 ) Md= 102.8 ( \sigma_x^2 = 41.3 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 117.8 ) Md= 108.2 ( \sigma_x^2 = 43.7 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 113.7 ) Md= 108.6 ( \sigma_x^2 = 33.2 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 114.0 ) Md= 107.1 ( \sigma_x^2 = 39.7 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Negro Scale</td>
<td>0-4</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = .88 ) Md= .90 ( \sigma_x^2 = 1.16 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 1.17 ) Md= 1.14 ( \sigma_x^2 = 1.32 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 1.09 ) Md= .96 ( \sigma_x^2 = 1.34 )</td>
<td>( \overline{x} = 1.07 ) Md= .97 ( \sigma_x^2 = 1.28 )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the Pearson Product-Moment correlation coefficient. The high results, as reported in Table 5, indicate that the scale was, indeed, measuring the attitude of the subjects on both halves of the test. In addition, the close relationship in the high scores for individuals in different groups indicates a good reliability of the measuring scale in that it consistently measures the same attitude from one testing period to the next.

TABLE 5.—Correlation of Odd and Even Items of Pretest, Social Distance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.96</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A bivariate distribution was run as a further check on the validity of the scale. The results are also in agreement with the Pearson $r$, with the scale of scores approximating a straight line.

Tumin\(^1\) reports that the Image of the Negro Scale yielded a coefficient of reproducibility of 92.51.

As a part of the experimental design, it was decided that the individual scores could be divided into further groups of pro-integration, neutral and anti-integration. This division was made using the mean score of the total pretest group on the Social Distance Scale as the center point of the neutral group; the standard error of measurement on that scale (11.1) was added above and below the mean to complete the neutral group. Scores falling above the neutral range were placed in the anti-integration category, and scores falling below the neutral group were declared in the pro-integration category. The final groupings are presented in Table 6.

During the initial planning of the study, it was feared that there would be an inadequate sample of subjects at The Ohio State University who were opposed
TABLE 6.—Distribution of Subjects by Pretest Attitude
Test Score

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(52-102)a</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(103-125)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(126-260)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Social Distance Scale scores.*

to the social integration of the Negro since the school is located in the Midwest. In order to compensate for this, a study was considered in the Southwest at a comparable school. However, after the administration of the pretest, the scores revealed a large spread of attitudes toward the issue. Figure 1 gives an indication of the relative percentages of scores declared as pro-integration, neutral and anti-integration. From this distribution, it was decided that a sufficient sample existed in each of the three categories to provide an adequate basis for this study.

The distribution of scores was relatively flat because of the wide range of possible scores. There is, however, some bunching of scores in collected groups;
a graph of the mean and standard deviations reveals a slightly skewed pattern, as shown in Figure 2.

It is interesting that the graph for the preliminary trial testing of sixteen students, which was reported in Chapter II, to determine the validity of the trial attitude scale, is very similar to that of the total sample, as Figure 3 illustrates.
FIGURE 2.—Pretest Distribution Curve Using the Mean and the Standard Deviations from the Mean

FIGURE 3.—Trial Test Distribution Curve Using the Mean and the Standard Deviations from the Mean
Analysis of posttest scores

The individual test forms of the pretest were given identifying letters to distinguish the class sections and to enable the matching of posttest scores, since the test was administered in semi-anonymity. After presenting the stimulus program and administering the same attitude scale as a posttest, it was learned that thirty-one students had been absent on one of the testing days. Their pretest scores were disregarded, but a total of one hundred and fifteen pairs of scores remained for analyses. Table 7 provides the information concerning the distribution of final subjects for paired scores of the experiment.

TABLE 7.—Distribution of Subjects for Paired Scores

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Number</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age Range</td>
<td>17-35</td>
<td>17-37</td>
<td>18-28</td>
<td>17-37</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Central tendency tests of the posttest scores are provided in Table 8.
TABLE 8.—Central Tendency Test of Posttest Scores by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control</th>
<th>Totals</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Social Distance Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 106.8$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 117.2$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 110.1$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 112.2$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md = 99.5</td>
<td>Md = 101.5</td>
<td>Md = 101.5</td>
<td>Md = 100.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 43.2$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 51.5$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 35.6$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 44.4$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Image of Negro Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\bar{X} = .72$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = 1.21$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = .72$</td>
<td>$\bar{X} = .92$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Md = .74</td>
<td>Md = .96</td>
<td>Md = .73</td>
<td>Md = .81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 1.12$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 1.50$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 1.18$</td>
<td>$\sigma_x = 1.33$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An analysis of the reliability correlation coefficient of the odd and the even items on the posttest revealed more information of a high relationship, as indicated in Table 9. Again, the consistently high scores on the successive administrations of the scales indicate the reliability of the attitude scale.

TABLE 9.—Correlation of Odd and Even Items of Posttest, Social Distance Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Total Intent</th>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>Concealed Intent</th>
<th>Control Intent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Product-Moment</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.97</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A consistent and high correlation coefficient is indicated.
The scores of the Social Distance Scale and the Image of the Negro Scale were analyzed for their correlation in both the pretest and posttest situations. The results are reported in Table 10.

**TABLE 10.--Correlation of Individual Scores on Social Distance Scale and Image of the Negro Scale by Groups**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Revealed Intent (N=25)</th>
<th>Concealed Intent (N=46)</th>
<th>Control (N=44)</th>
<th>Total (N=115)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Pretest</strong></td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posttest</strong></td>
<td>.60*</td>
<td>.58*</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.52*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at .05 level.

The raw scores on the two attitude scales and the questionnaire are provided in Appendix D with items of general information.

The pretest scores of the two experimental groups and the control group were submitted to an analysis of the observed and expected frequencies by using a Chi-Square test in order to determine if there was any significant difference in the groups. The results indicate that there is no significant difference, as indicated in Table 11.
TABLE 11.—Differences in the Observed and Theoretical Frequencies of the Pretest Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concealed</th>
<th>Revealed</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>19\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 2.25^c \]

\textsuperscript{a}Observed frequencies.
\textsuperscript{b}Expected frequencies.
\textsuperscript{c}949 needed for .05 significance.

Similarly, the posttest scores of the two experimental groups and the control group were submitted to a Chi-Square test to determine if there was any significant difference in the groups. The results approach significance, as indicated in Table 12.

The paired scores of individual subjects on the pretest and posttest were submitted to statistical analysis to determine the significance of the differences noted. Only those differences higher than the standard error of measurement were included. The t test of
TABLE 12.— Differences in the Observed and Theoretical Frequencies of the Posttest Experimental and Control Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Concealed</th>
<th>Revealed</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>24\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[\chi^2 = 7.97^c\]

\textsuperscript{a} Observed frequencies.
\textsuperscript{b} Expected frequencies.
\textsuperscript{c} 9.49 needed for .05 significance.

differences in the mean of correlated samples was used.
The results are revealed in Table 13. None of the

TABLE 13.— Differences in the Mean of Correlated Test Scores on the Pretest and Posttest Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pro-integration</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Anti-integration</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revealed Intent</td>
<td>.1148</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td>.2244</td>
<td>.4743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Intent</td>
<td>.8846</td>
<td>1.3039</td>
<td>.7968</td>
<td>1.5900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td>.9305</td>
<td>.6816</td>
<td>.3453</td>
<td>.3614</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
scores approaches significance at the .05 level. It will be noted that the concealed-intent group moved more than the other two groups in the total, neutral and anti-integration column. Among those groups receiving the stimulus, the neutral-integration group indicated more change than the other groups.

In order to analyze the results of the significant changes made by individuals in the revealed-intent and concealed-intent experimental groups, statistical tests were run on that data. First, the changes to a more favorable position or to a less favorable position were analyzed and found to be insignificant. See Table 14.

TABLE 14.—Analysis of Significant Changes for Revealed-intent and Concealed-intent Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Unfavorable</th>
<th>More Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.17^c \]

\(^a\) Observed frequencies.  
\(^b\) Expected frequencies.  
\(^c\) 3.84 needed for .05 significance.
Then, to provide further information, the separate groups were then analyzed individually in the pretest and posttest situations. Table 15 presents the

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>13(^a)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13.5(^b)</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \chi^2 = 0.10^c \]

aObserved frequencies.
bExpected frequencies.
c5.99 needed for .05 significance.

insignificant results of the revealed-intent groups, and Table 16 presents the results of the concealed-intent group, which approaches statistical significance.

Another aspect of the consideration of changes by groups involved the attitude groups. A Chi-Square test of that data revealed insignificant results, as indicated in Table 17.
TABLE 16.—Analysis of the Concealed-Intent Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Pretest</th>
<th>Posttest</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>19&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 21.5&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>24 21.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>10 6</td>
<td>2 6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>17 18.5</td>
<td>20 18.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 6.16$

<sup>a</sup>Observed frequencies.
<sup>b</sup>Expected frequencies.
<sup>c</sup>5.99 needed for .05 significance.

TABLE 17.—Analysis of the Significant Changes of the Experimental Groups: Pro-integration, Neutral, and Anti-integration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Unfavorable</th>
<th>More Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>4&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt; 3&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>4 3</td>
<td>3 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>8 8</td>
<td>8 8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$\chi^2 = 1.16$

<sup>a</sup>Observed frequencies.
<sup>b</sup>Expected frequencies.
<sup>c</sup>5.99 needed for .05 significance.
The changes of males and females were considered by statistical test, as shown in Table 18.

TABLE 18.—Analysis of the Significant Changes of the Male and Female Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>More Unfavorable</th>
<th>More Favorable</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>(10^a)</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(8^b)</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 0.38^c\)

\(^a\)Observed frequencies.
\(^b\)Expected frequencies.
\(^c\)3.84 needed for .05 significance.

Analysis of the questionnaire

In order to test the judgments of the students on the intent of the program, the questionnaire was scored as follows: each question was marked 0 for neutral bias, +1 for favorable bias toward integration, or -1 for unfavorable bias against integration. Then the totals were added. Table 19 indicates the differences in the observed and theoretical frequencies as calculated on the Chi-Square test.
TABLE 19.—Differences in the Observed and Theoretical Frequencies of Judgments of Intent by Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Judgments of Intent</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>+</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-integration</td>
<td>23&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-integration</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(\chi^2 = 3.35^c\)

<sup>a</sup>Observed frequencies.
<sup>b</sup>Expected frequencies.
<sup>c</sup>.9.49 needed for .05 significance.

In a similar way, the differences in observed and theoretical frequencies was analyzed for the judgments of intent of the program by the intent-revealed and intent-concealed groups. Table 20 gives the results.

These statistical tests have indicated the significance of the results of the testing of the several aspects of the dependent variable of the experimental design. Chapter IV draws conclusions from this data.
TABLE 20.—Differences in the Observed and Theoretical Frequencies of Judg­ments of Intent by Revealed and Concealed Groups

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Judgments of Intent</th>
<th>+</th>
<th>0</th>
<th>-</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revealed intent</td>
<td>17\textsuperscript{a}</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>20\textsuperscript{b}</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed intent</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\( \chi^2 = 5.22\textsuperscript{c} \)

\textsuperscript{a}Observed frequencies.
\textsuperscript{b}Expected frequencies.
\textsuperscript{c}Approaching significance at .05
CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

The basic consideration of this research project is to determine what audience attitude changes occur as a result of a program of the oral interpretation of poetic literature. The broader subject field is the place of oral interpretation in the study of attitude formation and change; an answer to this current question is sought by leaders in the field of oral interpretation. This select study attempts to offer some objective data for providing an answer. Certainly other studies are needed before a definitive conclusion is reached; however, a few tentative conclusions are offered here.

Chapter I reviewed the theoretical background for this study and laid the foundation for the consideration of the thesis by relating the topic to the existing empirical studies in oral interpretation of literature, to the research in attitude change from the aspect of the intent of the communicator, and to the rhetoric-poetic controversy. Chapter II presented the controversial
issue which was selected for the experiment—the social integration of the Negro—and provided the research design, including the variables under study; the dependent variable was measured by a valid measuring scale and the independent variable consisted of a program of poetic literature. Chapter III presents the results of the pretesting and posttesting situations and sets the scores in a statistical framework for objective analysis. This last chapter draws conclusions from the data.

Any experimenter studying attitude changes on an ego-involving topic must realistically admit that the possibilities of gaining decided changes as a result of the stimulus are limited. Many studies of speakers' abilities at persuasion have indicated that if a speaker changes as much as one-third of the audience he has been successful. This attempt in observing a different type of stimulus, then, should be guided by the frank admission that attitude change by any persuasive means is a difficult task. As Fotheringham defines attitude, it is "an enduring
organization of responses—motivational, perceptual, emotional, and cognitive—to some aspect of the individual's world.¹

¹Wallace C. Fotheringham, Perspectives on Persuasion (Boston: Allyn and Bacon, Inc., 1966), 254.

The basic design of this experiment involves the observation of effects of a message on an experimental group and the consideration of another group very similar in nature which acts as the control group and which does not receive the message of the experiment. The control group is important to the experiment for at least two reasons: it serves as a check of the influence of outside factors which may be related to the topic under consideration, and it serves as a check of the influence of the testing situation, per se.

Measurements of individual attitude on the controversial issue selected for consideration in this experiment were made by use of validated attitude scales. The very high correlation coefficients which were reported as indicating the reliability of the scale are not surprising in light of the attitude scaling on racial issues which was reported by Likert in his
scaling methods study. He notes the following:

The clear-cut generality of certain attitudes, such as pro-Negro, internationalism, etc., shows that it is precisely in the field of affiliation with or against certain social groups that the most definite results are obtained.²

²Likert, 13-14.

Furthermore, the significant correlation of the scores from the two scales which were used indicates the trustworthiness of the measuring devices.

The hypotheses for this study, as presented in Chapter II, will serve as a framework for the discussion of the responses indicated by the experimental group and by the control group in the pretesting and posttesting situations.

1. There is no significant difference in the pretest scores of the experimental and control groups nor in the posttest scores of the two groups.

As indicated previously in Table 3, the control group was similar to the two experimental groups in number, sex and age range. Their scores on the pretest were similar, with the mean and median very close to that of the experimental groups. A Chi-Square test
of the observed and theoretical frequencies, as reported in Table 11, resulted in a low score with no statistical significance. Thus, the conclusion is drawn that there is no difference in the frequencies of the cells—that the groups are similar.

On the posttest, even though the individuals are again similar—as shown in Table 7—and even though the scores are similar—as shown in Table 8—, the Chi-Square score comparing the groups is somewhat higher. It approaches significance, even though it is not fully significant. An explanation of the reason for this change is found in the movements of the neutral scores to the pro-integration and anti-integration groups. The movements in the control group are much less than the movements from the concealed-intent group, however, and the significance of the difference in the pretest and posttest $\chi^2$ values is not due largely to changes in the control group.

2. There is no significant difference in the attitude test scores between the pretest and posttest situations of experimental and control groupings.

Although there are many small differences in the Social Distance scores of individuals between the
pretest and posttest situations, these differences are to be expected when the possible values on the scale are ranged so high. When the smaller differences are ignored because they are not as great as the standard error of measurement, thirty scores in the experimental group are significant changes and eighteen of the scores in the control group changed.

The series of t tests for differences in the mean of correlated samples which are reported in Table 13 indicate that the changes are not statistically significant; however, it is noted that the highest t values are located in the concealed-intent group and in the neutral attitude on social integration. The implications of these positions will be explored in the next hypothesis.

The changes in the experimental group are expected, but the changes in the control group are somewhat surprising. The two explanations which seem plausible are: (1) that some outside event influenced the scores or (2) that the experience of taking the test twice had some influence on the posttest score. In the first explanation, it should be noted that considerable publicity was afforded the rioting in sections
of Cleveland, Ohio, and other areas of the nation during the span of the testing period. The racial unrest during the last few summers has caused considerable shifting of opinions and attitudes by all types of individuals, including the idealistic college student. The second explanation is a puzzling one; the experience of taking the same attitude scale twice without specific knowledge of the reasoning behind it might cause some students to "play" with the experimenter. There seems cause to doubt that a person's considered attitude would fluctuate as decidedly as did that of some individuals in the control group unless some outside factor had been involved. However, it may be that the testing situations assisted the individuals in crystallizing their attitudes toward the social integration of the Negro.

The testing situation has been noted as an important consideration in the authenticity of the attitudes expressed by individuals. There are so many interpersonal variables present in any testing situation that it is difficult to attempt to equalize the testing period environments. Since all of the attitude scales were completed by individuals in the classroom
setting it is supposed that the students were accustomed to their own situations and, thus, would not have any marked outside factors influencing them. However, the influence of the time within the class hour, the related class assignments of the day, the different friends who were nearby, and countless other minor factors could have influenced the completion of the scales. It is doubtful if any one of these factors caused the attitude fluctuations; on the other hand, a combination of them could certainly contribute to much change in expressed attitudes.

3. There is no significant difference in the attitude changes made by the subjects in the two experimental groups; revealed-intent and concealed-intent.

To evaluate the results of the significant changes made by the revealed-intent and concealed-intent experimental groups, it is necessary to review the Chi-Square test reported in Table 14. The positive and negative changes occurred in both the revealed and concealed groups with such a chance mixture that the \( \chi^2 \) value is very low. Thus, there were no significant directions of change for either group.

Another way of analyzing these changes would be in comparing the pretest and posttest attitude groupings
for the revealed-intent and concealed-intent subjects. Table 15 reports the evidence for the pretest and posttest groups of the revealed-intent subjects. Because the cells of the test are so similar, there is a very low $\chi^2$ value reported. Conversely, the analysis of the concealed-intent subjects as revealed in Table 16 shows much change in the cell frequencies; the marked change from the neutral group to the anti-integration and to the pro-integration groups causes the $\chi^2$ value to be significant at the .05 level of confidence.

One observation which might be made is that the concealed-intent group did not know the nature of the reading program which they were listening to and, therefore, responded with more spontaneity and with less reserve. There could be speculation that the concealed group had not been told specifically what type of experiment they were involved in, besides the lack of knowledge of what the program of literature would involve, and that they were not defensive about the expression of their attitudes in relation to the specific program which they received. At any rate, the responses of this concealed group do indicate a change of attitude, disproving that aspect of the null hypothesis.
4. There are no significant differences in the attitude changes made by the three experimental groups: pro-integration, neutral, and anti-integration.

Another aspect of the consideration of changes by groups involves the divisions by attitude: the pro-integration group, the neutral group and the anti-integration group. A Chi-Square test of the observed and theoretical frequencies of these cell-groups reveals a low value, found in Table 17. Changes to positions higher and lower on the scale occurred almost by chance in all three of the attitudinal groupings. The null hypothesis still stands.

A discussion of the relationship of the intent of the program and attitude groups will be presented later in the report.

5. There is no significant difference in the attitude changes made by males and by females.

The attitude changes which were made by males and females show no significant difference, according to the $\chi^2$ value reported in Table 18. The cell frequencies are so similar that they could have easily occurred by chance, and, therefore, there is no basis for rejecting the null hypothesis. The reaction to the
program of literature and to the testing sessions, then, are similar for both male and female.

6. There are no significant differences in the observed and theoretical frequencies of the judgments of the intent of the program as made by the pro-integration, neutral, and anti-integration groups.

Not all of the subjects who completed the post-test scores provided the judgments of intent because the questionnaire was administered on a separate date. This discussion is based on the data observed and omits a consideration of the seven ratings not obtained.

In order to test the significance of the differences in judgments of the intent of the literature program, the subjects were first analyzed by their attitude group scores. Table 19 provides the \( \chi^2 \) values which are not significant although they are not extremely low scores. Some indication is present that should be noted. The neutral attitude subjects all declared the program as favorable to the integration of the Negro, causing some discrepancy in the expected frequencies for those cells.

The judgments of the intent of the program of literature were basically the same for the pro-integration
and anti-integration groups. More than the majority of persons in the experimental groups judged the program as being favorable to the Negro's viewpoint. The question might well be asked why so many persons made that judgment when the program included literature which was both favorable and unfavorable to the issue. One answer might be that the selections which were favorable were more intense in form, more memorable, or more involving for the individual; however, the answer of the degree of involvement with each selection was not sought in the questionnaire and any conjecture must remain precisely that. From the presentation of the racial discussion at this time of national attention to the issue and in a classroom setting, the subjects may have expected to be persuaded to a position more favorable than the one which they held; likewise, the program might have included ideas which were more favorable to the issue than the ideas of most individual subjects and thus they reacted with the stated judgment. Because there was no openly derogatory or obscene situation involved in the literature, the individuals may have felt that, in relation to comments which they had observed outside the testing situation, the situations presented were, in comparison, somewhat favorable.
If the study were replicated, more forceful literature of an unfavorable nature should be included, and, perhaps, the judgments would be more equalized. Furthermore, the questionnaire should be expanded to obtain information of the aesthetic responses of the listeners to specific selections. If these items had been obtained in this project, perhaps comparisons of the persuasive ability of poetic segments could have been made.

7. There are no significant differences in the observed and theoretical frequencies of the judgments of the intent of the program as made by the revealed-intent and concealed-intent groups.

It should be made clear that the persuasive nature of the program was revealed to the subjects of the revealed-intent group without stating that the program was presenting a favorable bias or an unfavorable bias regarding integration. The subjects were told the intent of the experimentation rather than the intent of the literature; so, they were making a somewhat free judgment of the intent of the communicator and of the literature program.

The Chi-Square test reported in Table 20 was used to analyze the data from the viewpoint of
hypothesis seven, and the results are slightly below significance. The cause of the higher score can be related to judgments of the neutrality of the program. The judgments of the revealed-intent group show a higher percentage of indications of neutrality.

This empirical study of audience effects from a program of oral interpretation has provided more information on the aspect of the listener. This element of the oral reading scheme is currently under observation, and the conclusions of this study indicate that more attitude change seems to come from subjects who reacted to the literature without being told its persuasive nature. From this observation, it would seem likely that oral interpretation programs have had more influence on attitude formation and change than has been thought previously.

As related to attitude research on communicator intent, this study corroborates the findings of previous projects in concluding that more change is evident in groups which do not know the persuasive intent of the communicator. The receivers seem to have less built-in defense under these conditions. In addition, the nature of this design allows the receiver to separate
the intent of the literature from the intent of the reader. The unexpected message, then, is a source of attitude change.

The implications of this study for the poetic-rhetoric distinction, although limited, are worthy of note. If poetic literature can be used to change attitudes on a current issue, then it must be viewed as more than an expression of an experience or a diversion in beauty. It has merit in considerations of attitude formation and change.
APPENDIX A

ATTITUDE SCALES

1. (registration no.)  2. (sex)  3. (age)  
4. (class section)    5. (blank)  6. (blank)

A Social Distance Scale
toward the Negro

Directions: Negroes in America are associated in a
diverse variety of ways with different individuals and groups
in the life around them. The following statements
cover a wide range of these relationships. Certain
of the relationships stated may be acceptable to many
people, others perhaps to a few or none. In each
case consider your own attitude toward the relation­
ship stated and encircle that response which most
nearly represents the condition which would be
personally acceptable to you. Bear in mind differ­
ences in color, education, or social position if
these affect your decision.

There are no "right" answers. Each person will answer
differently. Do not delay too long over any one item.
Be sure to answer each item.

Example:

If under most conditions/willing to admit encircle (most)
a Negro to residence in your community

If under many conditions " encircle (many)
If under some conditions " encircle (some)
If under few conditions " encircle (few)
If under no conditions " encircle (no)
I am personally willing to admit a Negro to the following relationships to myself under most, many, some, few or no conditions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relationship</th>
<th>Conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Resident</td>
<td>same community</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>same street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>next door</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>same apartment house</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>as house guest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>room mate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Traveler</td>
<td>adjoining seat on train</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>same sleeping car</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>adjoining seat on plane</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>adjoining seat on bus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>same restaurant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>same table</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Worker</td>
<td>fellow &quot;white collar&quot; employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>my personal servant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>my receptionist</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>member of my professional club</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>my business partner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>my superior on the job</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>my barber or beautician</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>my doctor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>author of literature I read</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Fellow Student</td>
<td>adjoining seat in classroom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>my study circle</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>elected a leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>participant in student parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>member of my sorority or fraternity</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I am personally willing to admit a Negro to the following relationships to myself under most, many, some, few or no conditions:

27. School teacher in class I attend

28. member of club I sponsor

29. fellow teacher

30. my principal

31. Church my denomination

32. my local church

33. my social group at church

34. adjoining seat at church

35. my clergyman

36. Citizen my fellow juryman

37. my policeman

38. my city judge

39. my state congressman

40. governor

41. U. S. congressman

42. U. S. President

43. Friend cordial public contacts

44. my guest at home

45. my guest at theater

46. couple for double-dating

47. my host at Negro home

48. my swimming companion

49. my escort at theater

50. my intimate chum

51. my kin in marriage

52. husband or wife
Image of the Negro Scale

A. So far as intelligence is concerned, would you say that compared to whites, Negroes are by nature:

- superior to whites
- the same as whites
- inferior to whites
- don't know

B. So far as responsibility is concerned, would you say that compared to whites, Negroes are by nature:

- superior to whites
- the same as whites
- inferior to whites
- don't know

C. So far as morality is concerned, would you say that compared to whites, Negroes are by nature:

- superior to whites
- the same as whites
- inferior to whites
- don't know

D. So far as ambition is concerned, would you say that compared to whites, Negroes are by nature:

- superior to whites
- the same as whites
- inferior to whites
- don't know
APPENDIX B

PROGRAM OF POETIC LITERATURE

Magnolia Flowers
--Langston Hughes

The quiet fading out of life
In a corner full of ugliness.

I went lookin' for magnolia flowers
But I didn't find 'em.
I went lookin' for magnolia flowers in the dusk
And there was only this corner
Full of ugliness.

'Scuse me,
I didn't mean to stump ma toe on you, lady.

There ought to be magnolias
Somewhere in this dusk.

'Scuse me,
I didn't mean to stump ma toe on you.
Trumpet Player
--Langston Hughes

The Negro
With the trumpet at his lips
Has dark moons of weariness
Beneath his eyes
Where the smoldering memory
Of slave ships
Blazed to the crack of whips
About his thighs.

The Negro
With the trumpet at his lips
Has a head of vibrant hair
Tamed down,
Patent-leathered now
Until it gleams
Like jet--
Were jet a crown.

The music
From the trumpet at his lips
Is honey
Mixed with liquid fire.
The rhythm
From the trumpet at his lips
Is ecstacy
Distilled from old desire--

Desire
That is longing for the moon
Where the moonlight's but a spotlight
In his eyes,
Desire
That is longing for the sea
Where the sea's a bar-glass
Sucker size.

The Negro
With the trumpet at his lips
Whose jacket
Has a fine one-button roll,
Does not know
Upon what riff the music slips
Its hypodermic needle
To his soul--
But softly
As the tune comes from his throat
Trouble
Mellows to a golden note.
Merry-Go-Round
— Langston Hughes

Colored child at carnival:

Where is the Jim Crow section
On this merry-go-round,
Mister, cause I want to ride?
Down South where I come from
White and colored
Can't sit side by side.
Down South on the train
There's a Jim Crow car.
On the bus we're put in the back--
But there ain't no back
To a merry-go-round!
Where's the horse
For a kid that's black?
Kid in the Park
---Langston Hughes

Lonely little question mark
on a bench in the park:

See the people passing by?
See the airplanes in the sky?
See the birds
flying home
before
dark?

Home's just around the corner
there---
but not really
anywhere.
Just a herd of Negroes
Driven to the field,
Plowing, planting, hoeing,
To make the cotton yield.

When the cotton's picked
And the work is done
Boss man takes the money
And we get none,

Leaves us hungry, ragged
As we were before.
Year by year goes by
And we are nothing more

Than a herd of Negroes
Driven to the field—
Plowing life away
To make the cotton yield.
Cross
— Langston Hughes

My old man's a white old man
And my old mother's black.
If ever I cursed my white old man
I take my curses back.

If ever I cursed my black old mother
And wished she were in hell,
I'm sorry for that evil wish
And now I wish her well.

My old man died in a fine big house.
My ma died in a shack.
I wonder where I'm gonna die,
Being neither white nor black?
Dear James:

I have begun this letter five times and torn it up five times. I keep seeing your face, which is also the face of your father and my brother. Like him, you are tough, dark, vulnerable, moody—with a very definite tendency to sound truculent because you want no one to think you are soft. You may be like your grandfather in this, I don't know, but certainly both you and your father resemble him very much physically. Well, he is dead, he never saw you, and he had a terrible life; he was defeated long before he died because, at the bottom of his heart, he really believed what white people said about him.

Now, my dear namesake, these innocent and well-meaning people, your country, have caused you to be born under conditions not very far removed from those described for us by Charles Dickens in the London of more than a hundred years ago.

Well, you were born, here you came, something like fifteen years ago; and though your father and mother and grandmother, looking about the streets through which they were carrying you, staring at the walls into which they brought you, had every reason to be heavyhearted, yet they were not. For here you were, Big James, named for me—you were a big baby, I was not—here you were: to be loved. To be loved, baby, hard, at once, and forever, to strengthen you against the loveless world. Remember that: I know how black it looks today, for you. It looked bad that day, too, yes, we were trembling. We have not stopped trembling yet, but if we had not loved each other none of us would have survived. And now you must survive because we love you, and for the sake of your children and your children's children.

This innocent country set you down in a ghetto in which, in fact, it intended that you should perish. Let me spell out precisely what I mean by that, for the heart of the matter is here, and the root of my dispute.
with my country. You were born where you were born and faced the future that you faced because you were black and for no other reason. The limits of your ambition were, thus, expected to be set forever. You were born into a society which spelled out with brutal clarity, and in as many ways as possible, that you were a worthless human being. You were not expected to aspire to excellence; you were expected to make peace with mediocrity. Wherever you have turned, James, in your short time on this earth, you have been told where you could go and what you could do (and how you could do it) and where you could live and whom you could marry. I know your countrymen do not agree with me about this, and I hear them saying, "You exaggerate." They do not know Harlem, and I do. So do you. Take no one's word for anything, including mine—but trust your experience. Know whence you came. If you know whence you came, there is really no limit to where you can go. The details and symbols of your life have been deliberately constructed to make you believe what white people say about you. Please try to remember that what they believe, as well as what they do and cause you to endure, does not testify to your inferiority but to their inhumanity and fear. Please try to be clear, dear James, through the storm which rages about your youthful head today, about the reality which lies behind the words acceptance and integration. There is no reason for you to try to become like white people and there is no basis whatever for their impertinent assumption that they must accept you. The really terrible thing, old buddy, is that you must accept them. And I mean that very seriously. You must accept them and accept them with love. For these innocent people have no other hope. They are, in effect, still trapped in a history which they do not understand; and until they understand it, they cannot be released from it. . . . If the word integration means anything, this is what it means: that we, with love, shall force our brothers to see themselves as they are, to cease fleeing from reality and begin to change it. For this is your home, my friend, do not be driven from it. . . . You come from a long line of great poets, some of the greatest poets since Homer. One of them said, "The very time I thought I was lost, my dungeon shook and my chains fell off." . . . You know, and I know, that
the country is celebrating one hundred years of freedom one hundred years too soon. We cannot be free until they are free. God bless you, James, and Godspeed.

Your uncle,

James
from: _Confrontation_
--Lerone Bennett, Jr.

It is about to begin. Black men and white men are going to meet for the first time in the womb of an American setting.

Far off on the horizon is a tiny speck. The speck grows larger, turns, lists and bobbles on the Atlantic waves. There is a cry ("A ship! A ship!"), and men dash to the waterfront and peer through the late summer haze. To the bored and homesick settlers of Jamestown, Virginia, the approaching ship is a godsent. Jamestown, the first English settlement in America, is a miserable little hole with a handful of huts and almost no diversion. The ship, heaving into view, promises excitement and adventure; but there is no way for the men on shore to know how much excitement the ship really contains. For in the hold of this ship, is the whole vibrant panorama of Negro America: the blues and the spirituals, the bloody anger of Gettysburg and the nagging promise of the Fourteenth Amendment.

The ship, as befitting a messenger of fate, is nameless. There is an air of intrigue, of danger even, about the captain, one Mr. Jope, who comes ashore with an elegant lie on his lips. He has just robbed a Spanish vessel of a cargo of Africans bound for the West Indies, but he does not mention that. He "ptends," John Rolfe notes with suspicion, that he is in great need of food and he offers to exchange his cargo for "victualle." The deal is arranged. Antonion, Isabella, Pedro and seventeen other Africans with Spanish names debark, and an argument begins.

It is August, 1619: 245 years before Emancipation, and 346 years before the long hot summer of 1965.
The Patriot, attended by a "faithful" Negro slave, climbed a steep mountain and tempted fate with a cry for FREEDOM! The words bounced off the craggy rocks and came back in a resounding echo: FREEDOM! FREEDOM! The echo was so close, so menacing, that the Patriot turned quickly to see if the slave had spoken. But the slave was silent or seemed to be silent. The Patriot lifted his head and shouted again: FREEDOM! And an echo came back: FREEDOM! FREEDOM! The Patriot drew back in fear. Was he imagining things? Or did the slave speak? In desperation, the Patriot railed at the rocks and commanded the words to stop. But the words echoed and re-echoed in the mountain air. The words swelled and swallowed the original sound, assuming a texture and life of their own, reverberating from peak to peak in a continuous curtain of sound. In mounting fear, the Patriot shut his ears against the words of his own mouth. He stood thus, ears stopped and eyes closed, unable to climb to the peak or go down to the valley, a tragic figure paralyzed by the cry he had raised and the reality he had made. Shadows gathered in the crevices and, at length, darkness fell on the high and dangerous ledge where two men—one white and one colored, one slave and one free—stood face to face, uneasily watching and measuring each other, listening with bated breath to the sounds of freedom reverberating in the thin dry air.
Meet Miss Subways
—Lawrence Ferlinghetti

Meet Miss Subways
of 1957
See Miss Subways
of 1957
riding the Times Square Shuttle
back and forth
at four in the morning

Meet Miss Subways
of 1957
with fiftycentsize cotton plugs
in her flat black nose
shuttling back and forth
on the Times Square Shuttle
at four in the morning
and hanging on
to heaven's iron rings
with cut-up golden arms
a black weed in a black hand

You can meet Miss Subways
You can see Miss Subways
of 1957
wearing sad slacks
and matching handbag
and cruising thru the cars
and hanging on
with beat black arms
a black butt in a black hand

And the iron cars
shunting on forever
into death and darkness

o lost Ubangi

staggering thru
the 'successive ogives' of Hell
down Dante's final
fire escape
Kid Sleepy
--Langston Hughes

Listen, Kid Sleepy,
Don't you want to run around
To the other side of the house
Where the shade is?
It's sunny here
And your skin'll turn
A reddish-purple in the sun.

Kid Sleepy said,
I don't care.

Listen, Kid Sleepy,
Don't you want to get up
And go to work down-
Town somewhere
To earn enough
For lunches and car fare?

Kid Sleepy said,
I don't care.

Or would you rather,
Kid Sleepy, just
Stay here?

Rather just
Stay here.
Early Evening Quarrel
--Langston Hughes

Where is that sugar, Hammond,
I sent you this morning to buy?
I say, where is that sugar
I sent you this morning to buy?
Coffee without sugar
Makes a good woman cry.

I ain't got no sugar, Hattie,
I gambled your dime away.
Ain't got no sugar, I
Done gambled that dime away.
If you's a wise woman, Hattie,
You ain't gonna have nothin' to say.

I ain't no wise woman, Hammond.
I am evil and mad.
Ain't no sense in a good woman
Bein' treated so bad.

I don't treat you bad, Hattie,
Neither does I treat you good.
But I reckon I could treat you
Worser if I would.

Lawd, these things we women
Have to stand!
I wonder is there nowhere a
Do-right man?
from: Other Voices, Other Rooms
—Truman Capote

Tall, powerful, barefoot, graceful, soundless, Missouri Fever was like a supple black cat as she paraded serenely about the kitchen, the casual flow of her walk beautifully sensuous and haughty. She was slant-eyed, and darker than the charred stove; her crooked hair stood straight on end, as if she'd seen a ghost, and her lips were thick and purple. The length of her neck was something to ponder upon, for she was almost a freak, a human giraffe, and Joel recalled photos, which he'd scissored once from the pages of a National Geographic, of curious African ladies with countless silver chokers stretching their necks to improbable heights. Though she wore no silver bands, naturally, there was a sweat-stained blue polka-dot bandanna wrapped round the middle of her soaring neck. "Papadaddy and me's countin' on you for our Service," she said, after filling two coffee cups and mannishly straddling a chair at the table. "We got our own little place backa the garden, so you scoot over later on, and we'll have us a real good ol' time."

"I'll come if I can, but this being my first day and all, Dad will most likely expect me to visit with him," said Joel hopefully.

Missouri emptied her coffee into a saucer, blew on it, dumped it back into the cup, sucked up a swallow, and smacked her lips. "This here's the Lord's day," she announced. "You believe in Him? You got faith in His healin' power?"

Joel said: "I go to church."

"Now that ain't what I'm speakin' of. Take for instance, when you thinks bout the Lord, what is it passes in your mind?"

"Oh, stuff," he said, though actually, whenever he had occasion to remember that a God in heaven supposedly kept his record, one thing he thought of was money: quarters his mother had given him for each Bible stanza memorized, dimes diverted from the Sunday School collection plate to Gabaldoni's Soda Fountain, the tinkling
rain of coins as the cashiers of the church solicited among the congregation. But Joel didn't much like God, for He had betrayed him too many times. "Just stuff like saying my prayers."

"When I thinks bout Him, I thinks bout what I'm gonna do when Papadaddy goes to his rest," said Missouri, and rinsed her mouth with a big swallow of coffee. "Well, I'm gonna spread my wings and fly way to some swell city up north like Washington, D.C."

"Aren't you happy here?"

"Honey, there's things you too young to understand."

"I'm thirteen," he declared. "And you'd be surprised how much I know."

"Shoot, boy, the country's just fulla folks what knows everythin, and don't unnerstand nothin, just fullofem," she said, and began to prod her upper teeth: she had a flashy gold tooth, and it occurred to Joel that the prodding was designed for attracting his attention to it. "Now one reason is, I get lonesome: what I all the time say is, you ain't got no notion what lonesome is till you stayed a spell at the Landin. And there ain't no mens round here I'm innersted in, leastwise not at the present: one time there was this mean buzzard name of Keg, but he did a crime to me and landed hisself on the chain gang, which is sweet justice considerin the lowdown kinda trash he was. I'm only a girl of fourteen when he did this bad thing to me."

A fist-like knot of flies, hovering over a sugar jar, dispersed every whichaway as she swung an irritated hand. "Yessir, Keg Brown, that's the name he go by." With a fingertip she shined her gold tooth to a brighter luster while her slanted eyes scrutinized Joel; these eyes were like wild foxgrapes, or two discs of black porcelain, and they looked out intelligently from their almond slits. "I gotta longin for city life poisonin my blood cause I was brung up in St. Louis till Papadaddy fetched me here for to nurse him in his dyin days. Papadaddy was past ninety then, and they say he ain't long for this world, so I come. That be thirteen year
ago, and now it look to me like Papadaddy gonna outlive Methuselah. Make no mistake, I love Papadaddy, but when he gone I sure amin to light out for Washington, D.C., or Boston, Coneckikut, and that's what I thinks bout when I thinks bout God."
I am tired of work; I am tired of building up somebody else's civilization.
Let us take a rest, Melissy Jane;
I will go down to the Last Chance Saloon,
   drink a gallon or two of gin,
   shoot a game or two of dice
   and sleep the rest of the night
on one of Mike's barrels.
You will let the old shanty go to rot, the
white people's clothes turn to dust, and the
Calvary Baptist Church sink to the bottomless pit.
You will spend your days forgetting you married me
   and your nights hunting the warm gin Mike serves
the ladies in the rear of the Last Chance Saloon.
Throw the children into the river; civilization has
given us too many. It is better to die than
to grow up and find that you are colored.
Pluck the stars out of the heavens. The stars mark
our destiny. The stars marked my destiny.
I am tired of civilization.
The Negro has not been educated: he has been trained. He is like a dog—a watchdog. You don't give him credit for intelligence, you give him credit for being well-trained. You sic him on the Japanese and tell him to bite them, and he will run out and bite the Japanese. You tell him to bite, and he will bite the Germans, the Koreans. He will bite anyone you say bite. Now you don't give him any credit for having done a good job. You give yourself credit for having trained him so well. Now when he comes back from biting the Germans and the Japanese, you can hang his mother on a tree and have his wife before his eyes and he will stand there whimpering with his knees knocking and his tail between his legs. Why? Because he's waiting for you to say "sic 'em!" That's what he's been trained to do.
APPENDIX C

QUESTIONNAIRE

Registration Number Age Sex

This questionnaire is related to the previous attitude scales dealing with the social integration of the Negro.

Please circle the number of the answer which best typifies your opinion on each question. (If not present for the program, check here _________.)

A. In my judgment the reading program of literature dealing with the Negro was:

1. Mostly favorable to the Negro
2. Somewhat favorable to the Negro
3. Neutral
4. Somewhat unfavorable to the Negro
5. Mostly unfavorable to the Negro

B. In my judgment the reader revealed that her feelings were:

1. Favorably biased toward the Negro
2. Slightly biased toward the Negro
3. Unbiased
4. Slightly biased against the Negro
5. Unfavorably biased against the Negro

Thank you for your cooperation in this experiment.

Remarks:
## APPENDIX D

**GENERAL INFORMATION AND RAW SCORES FOR INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS BY GROUPS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>General Info.</th>
<th>Social Distance Scale</th>
<th>Image of the Negro Scale</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- a=pro-integration; A=anti-integration; N=neutral.
- bThe difference is listed only if it is more than the standard error (11.1) on protest analysis.
- cThe letters are arbitrarily assigned to pair the scores of the same individual.
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GENERAL INFORMATION AND RAW SCORES FOR INDIVIDUAL SUBJECTS BY GROUPS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revealed Intent</th>
<th>General Info.</th>
<th>Social Distance Scale</th>
<th>Image of the Negro Scale</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.*</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KK**</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>102</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>116</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UU</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VV</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>223</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P=pro-integration; A=anti-integration; N=neutral.

bThe difference is listed only if it is more than the standard error (11.1) on pretest analysis.

cThe letters are arbitrarily assigned to pair the scores of the same individual.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Info.</th>
<th>Social Distance Scale</th>
<th>Image of the Negro Scale</th>
<th>Questionnaire</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Revealed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 P</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29 P</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 N</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EJ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22 P</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GB</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GE</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 N</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19 N</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GK</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>162</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Concealed Intent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XX</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17 P</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YY</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 P</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AAA</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BBB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>29 P</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19 P</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DDD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 P</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEE1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 N</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EEE2</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 N</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FFF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>32 N</td>
<td>124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GGG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HHH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22 A</td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22 A</td>
<td>158</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JJJ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>178</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KKK</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20 A</td>
<td>198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LLL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17 A</td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24 P</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CJ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21 P</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20 P</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CN</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 P</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 N</td>
<td>108</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CP</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CQ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21 A</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 A</td>
<td>156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CS</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>187</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DA</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18 P</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DB</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 P</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18 P</td>
<td>73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DF</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19 P</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22 P</td>
<td>98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22 P</td>
<td>103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37 N</td>
<td>107</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DJ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 N</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DK</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20 N</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21 N</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32 N</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19 N</td>
<td>120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DQ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24 A</td>
<td>126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DR</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>25 A</td>
<td>133</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21 A</td>
<td>152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DT</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18 A</td>
<td>166</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DU</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19 A</td>
<td>167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DW</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>36 A</td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DX</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22 A</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Info.</td>
<td>Social Distance Scale</td>
<td>Image of the Negro Scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>O</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BD</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BF</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BG</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BH</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BK</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BM</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BO</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BQ</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FB</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FC</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Info.</td>
<td>Social Distance Scale</td>
<td>Image of the Negro Scale</td>
<td>Questionnaire</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>Attit. Grp.</td>
<td>Pretest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Control)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FE</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FG</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FH</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FI</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FJ</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FM</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FN</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FO</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FP</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FR</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FS</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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