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ABSTRACT

Much attention has been given to improving intercultural relationships. Empathy would seem to be a particularly robust construct for fostering improved intercultural relationships for several reasons. The first reason is that empathy tends to foster elements that lead to positive relationships (Strayer, 1987, Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein, and Highburger, 1997). Second, empathy is a construct comprised of affective and cognitive dimensions and intercultural interactions encompass both (Broome, 1991, Cross, 1971). Third, the empathy construct emerges in the later stages of several intercultural relationship models (Bennett, 1993, Kimmel, 1994, Christie, 1995). In addition, the models suggest an inverse relationship between ethnocentrism and empathy with decreases in ethnocentrism being associated with increases in empathy (Bennett, 1993, Kimmel, 1994, Christie, 1995). Majority culture ethnocentrism has been selected as a focus because of the ramifications due to the power differentials between majority culture individuals and minorities. The purpose of the study was to begin identifying majority culture ethnocentrism as a means of moving toward intercultural empathy.

In an attempt to identify majority culture ethnocentrism, 17 slides were shown to two focus groups, one African American and one majority culture. The responses to the slides were analyzed to determine between-group differences in affect, perceptions, or
meanings ascribed as well as accuracy of predictions of the other group’s responses. Between-group differences were readily identified in 14 of the 17 slides. In addition, African American students were accurate in their predictions twice as often as the majority culture students.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to begin identifying majority culture ethnocentrism as means toward intercultural empathy. In general, ethnocentrism refers to holding one's own group as central to everything and serving as the reference point or absolute standard by which all other groups are viewed and rated (Bennett, 1986, 1993; Brewer, 1986; Christie, 1995; Kimmel, 1994; Stewart & Bennett, 1991). For the current study ethnocentrism was defined as being entrenched in the worldview of one's group such that one is unable to recognize other worldviews or is unable correctly to identify differences in worldviews. The focus will be on majority culture ethnocentrism where majority refers to those who identify themselves as white and non-Hispanic. Non-majority culture was defined as those who identify themselves as African American. Hence, the current research was designed to identify majority culture ethnocentrism and to lay the groundwork for interventions that reduce ethnocentrism in members of the majority culture.
Statement of the Problem

The Role of Empathy in Fostering Improved Intercultural Relationships

Over the years, much attention has been given to various means of improving intercultural relationships. As long ago as 1954, Allport introduced the contact hypothesis, which emphasized bringing together individuals from different cultures under specific conditions as a means of improving intercultural relationships. More recently, emphasis has been placed on dialogue processes as a means of promoting intercultural sensitivity (Bennett, 1986, 1993), cultural awareness (Kimmel, 1994), and intergroup understanding (Christie, 1995). Implicit in all of the aforementioned research is the construct of empathy, where empathy refers to shared affective and cognitive understandings (Allport, 1954; Bennett, 1986, 1993; Christie, 1995; Kimmel, 1994).

Empathy would seem to be a particularly robust construct for fostering improved intercultural relationships for several reasons. The first reason is that, in general, empathy tends to foster elements that lead to positive relationships. Indeed, research suggests that increased levels of empathy are associated with increases in prosocial behavior (Batson, Polycarpou, Harmon-Jones, Imhoff, Mitchener, Bednar, Klein, and Highberger, 1997; Strayer, 1987) and decreases in aggression (Bennett, 1993; Feshbach, 1978).

Second, empathy would seem to be an appropriate construct for intercultural contexts because it is comprised of affective and cognitive dimensions and intercultural interactions encompass both (Broome, 1991; Cross, 1971). Whereas Western societies tend to emphasize cognitive processes, non-Western societies tend to favor affective processes (Broome, 1991; Cross, 1971). Empathy readily allows for the consideration of
both affect and cognition. The empathy construct originated in the late nineteenth century as the affective construct, einfühlung, translated as “feeling into” (Deutsch & Madle, 1975; Feshbach, 1978; Strayer, 1987) and later shifted toward a cognitive emphasis because of Mead’s (1934) work on role taking (Deutsch & Madle, 1975; Feshbach, 1978; Strayer, 1987). Since then, several debates have ensued on whether empathy is an affectively or cognitively driven construct. At present, while most researchers on empathy will agree that empathy is comprised of both affective and cognitive components, they differ on which component they view as primary to empathy (Thompson, 1987). While acknowledging the ongoing rivalry of the affective and cognitive perspectives of empathy, the current study treats empathy as consisting of both affective and cognitive dimensions and adopts a methodology that attempts to assess both dimensions.

Third, the empathy construct emerges in the later stages of several intercultural relationship models (Bennett, 1993; Christie, 1995; Kimmel, 1994). Bennett (1993) addresses empathy in the fifth of his six stages, adaptation. He defines empathy as an intentional and temporary change in one’s cultural frame of reference (Bennett, 1993). Kimmel (1994) asserts that individuals who have reached intercultural understanding, the highest level of his model, attempt to be wholly empathic toward others (Kimmel, 1994). At the relatedness level, the eighth level of nine in Christie’s (1995) model, empathy is apparent when individuals give a response pattern that relates an experience they have had that is similar, but not identical, to that of outgroup members (Christie, 1995). Although empathy is only addressed superficially in these models, the recurrent presence
of empathy in the later stages of these models indicates general agreement that empathy is associated with improved intercultural interactions. Each of these models, however, stops short of prescribing how movement occurs from one stage to another.

The Relationship between Empathy and Ethnocentrism

If empathy is conceptualized as putting aside one’s own worldview temporarily to take another’s view of the world (Stewart & Bennett, 1991), then an individual who is ethnocentric is likely to experience difficulty in empathizing with an individual belonging to a different group. Ethnocentrism can be characterized in several different ways. Each way makes reference to holding one’s own group as central to everything (Bennett, 1986, 1993; Brewer, 1986; Kimmel, 1994; Stewart & Bennett, 1991). While not trying to minimize the salience and pervasiveness of the explicitly negative forms of ethnocentrism, e.g., judging other groups as inferior to one’s own, the focus of the current study is on a more subtle form of ethnocentrism that can be manifested in several ways. One manifestation occurs when the emphasis is on the normality of one’s own group. Other cultures may be ignored in deference to one’s own (Stewart & Bennett, 1991) or an individuals’ knowledge may be restricted to one’s own reference group, and may lack the repertoire to even recognize differences, e.g., making claims that Tokyo is just like New York City (Stewart & Bennett, 1991). Another form amplifies similarities between groups using one’s own group as the reference. Statements such as “we are all the same” reflect an ethnocentric, egalitarian view (Christie, 1995; Stewart & Bennett, 1991).

Several intercultural models suggest an inverse relationship between ethnocentrism and empathy with decreases in ethnocentrism being associated with
increases in empathy. Bennett (1993) couches his six stages, denial, defense, minimization, acceptance, adaptation, and integration, within two larger stages, ethnocentrism and ethnorelativism. In ethnocentric stages, individuals perceive there to be a uniform way of viewing the world, whereas individuals in the ethnorelativistic stages rely on contextual evaluation to construct their worldview (Bennett, 1993). Empathy is not introduced in Bennett’s (1993) model until the stage of adaptation, the second stage within the stage of ethnorelativism. Whereas Bennett (1993) has identified three of his six stages as being ethnocentric stages, Christie (1995) and Kimmel (1994), on the other hand, have explicitly delineated one of their individual stages of their models as an ethnocentric stage. Each of Christie’s (1995) nine stages are subsumed within one of three orientations: deviant/deficient, equivalent, and variant. A close reading of Christie’s (1995) model brings to the fore the cultural self-centeredness of the six stages subsumed by the deviant/deficient and equivalent orientations such that these two orientations might be characterized as ethnocentric stages and the variant orientation as an ethnorelativistic stage. Empathy does not appear until the variant orientation in Christie’s (1995) model. Although both Christie (1995) and Kimmel (1994) place intercultural empathy toward the high end of awareness and understanding, neither of these models suggest how individuals might move from one stage to another. The current study is aimed at identifying majority culture ethnocentrism vis-à-vis African American individuals in order to move toward facilitating awareness and empathy in majority culture individuals. The primary problem with current models of intercultural empathy is they fail to specify thoughts and feelings that would signal empathy has occurred.
Accordingly, in the present study, attention is focused on mapping the semantic and affective domain of minority group members.

It could be argued that current studies on intercultural empathy tend to be narrow in their scope, perhaps even ethnocentric, in terms of how they define, measure, manipulate, and discuss intercultural empathy. These studies and their limitations, especially in terms of cultural applicability, will be addressed in the literature review.

Although the current study focuses on majority culture ethnocentrism, this does not imply that ethnocentrism is limited to majority culture individuals. Stewart and Bennett (1991) provide an example of a communication breakdown that resulted from the ethnocentric behavior of individuals from two different cultures, American and Japanese. On the one hand, the American perceived ambiguity because of the Japanese individual's indirect communication style. On the other hand, the Japanese individual perceived immaturity in the American's directness. Further, both individuals attempted to overcome their communication problem through ethnocentric means, accentuating the problem rather than resolving it. The American took charge and became more direct, while the Japanese individual reacted to what he considered to be an embarrassing social indiscretion by becoming even more indirect (Stewart & Bennett, 1991). Clearly, ethnocentrism is not one way. Majority culture ethnocentrism has been selected as a focus for reasons that will be explained in the next section.
The Ramifications of Majority Culture Ethnocentrism

Prejudices and stereotypes are often the product of ethnocentrism (Stewart & Bennett, 1991). To distinguish between the ethnocentrism of African American students and majority culture students is not to suggest that the former is okay while the latter is not. Both forms of ethnocentrism are problematic (Tatum, 1992). The distinction is important, however, to identify and acknowledge the power differential between both types of individuals, i.e., African American and majority culture within American society (Tatum, 1992). In addition to the forms of ethnocentrism that involve holding negative views of other groups that differ ethnically or racially from one’s own group, ethnocentrism is also linked with the term cultural racism which refers to beliefs of the nonexistence of cultural traditions and values of other groups, i.e., everyone is the same (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1998). By definition, majority culture individuals are often not even aware of their perpetuation of cultural racism. Yet cultural racism feeds into institutional racism, a system of laws, policies, political, economic, and institutional arrangements that maintain and perpetuate social roles in society (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1998). Comments such as “why can’t they forget the past” illustrate majority culture individuals’ entrenchment in cultural and institutional racism and their naivete of their current status as a result of historical racism. School systems often demonstrate the last point.

Majority culture ethnocentrism within school systems is often manifested in a color-blind approach to dealing with students, i.e., everyone is perceived to be and treated the same. School administrators and teachers may fail to recognize that differential statuses of majority and non-majority students in school (e.g., tracking, school
suspensions) may be the result of historical racism. The color-blind approach to
education that is applied within their schools in an attempt to prevent discrimination may
actually perpetuate and maintain the discriminatory status quo of students, i.e.,
institutional racism (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1998). While there may be short-term benefits to
the color-blind approach, such as an even-handed application of rules to everyone, there
are several potential negative effects (Schofield, 1995). If the color-blind approach is
taken, acceptance of policies that unknowingly discriminate against non-majority groups
may result. For example, if students are considered only as individuals, school
administrators may fail to examine discipline or placement policies that
disproportionately suspend non-majority students from school or place them into lower
ability classrooms (Schofield, 1995). Other potential negative effects of the color-blind
approach include the development or perpetuation of policies that lead to de facto
resegregation and deculturalization of non-majority students by the schools (Schofield,
1995). For example, implementation of curricula that foster assimilation rather than
promote multiculturalism often fail to engage minority students in meaningful ways,
resulting in minority students performing less well academically and being tracked into
lower ability classrooms (Schofield, 1995). As a result, the majority-centered school
climate may curb rather encourage academic performance of minority students, which
may have long term implications for quality of life of these students and accentuate the
difference between the have and have-nots in American society.
The intent of the current study is not meant to finger point and admonish, but to assist with efforts toward increasing intercultural empathy between individuals and perhaps redress historical inequities along the way.

Research Questions

Lederach (1995) distinguishes between prescriptive and elicitive methods. Current approaches to intercultural empathy involve prescriptive methods in which the researcher defines the content of the stimuli and response patterns indicative of empathy. In an effort to provide a baseline from which a culturally sensitive measure of empathy can be developed, the current study is using an elicitive approach in which the participants will assist with shaping both the stimuli and response patterns based on their cultural framework (Lederach, 1995). African American and majority culture undergraduate students will be presented with 17 pictures. They will be asked to respond to the pictures from the framework of their own culture and also asked to respond to the pictures based on their predictions of how the other group would respond. The following research questions will serve as a guide for the data analysis of the current study.

1. Are there differences between African American undergraduate students’ responses and majority culture undergraduate students’ responses to the slides?

2. Which slides, if any, elicit different responses from African American undergraduate students and majority culture undergraduate students?

3. If African American undergraduate students’ responses to the slides differ from majority culture undergraduate students’ responses, how do they differ?
4. Are there differences between African American undergraduate students' responses to the slides and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of African American undergraduate students' responses to the slides?

5. Which slides, if any, elicit differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses?

6. If there are differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the slides, what are those differences?

7. Are there differences between majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the slides and African American undergraduate students' predictions of majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the slides?

8. Which slides, if any, elicit differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and African American undergraduate students' predictions of their responses?

9. If there are differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the slides, what are those differences?

Significance of the Study

A contribution of the current study will be to gain insight into some differences between majority culture and African American culture and the identification of majority culture ethnocentrism. The intent of the current study is to illuminate differences
between the two cultures by presenting individuals from the two cultures with the same set of pictures and noting the differences between the two groups. Further, the ability of individuals from both groups to accurately predict the differences between the two groups' responses to the pictures will be assessed. All, some, or none of the pictures may elicit different responses from the two groups. The interest of the study is to not only find out if differences emerge, but also to see if participants can recognize if and when they emerge and more specifically what they think the differences are likely to be. The extent to which participants can accurately predict and specifically identify the differences will be indicative of their level of ethnocentrism.

If the study is successful in identifying some forms of majority culture ethnocentrism, the study will also have educational implications. Sometimes individuals think they know the answers when they do not. Their erroneous assumptions can often undermine relationships rather than improve them even though intentions are good. The example of the communication breakdown between the American and Japanese individual (Stewart & Bennett, 1991) is illustrative of the last point. If participants' predictions and/or identification of the differences in the others' responses are inaccurate, informing individuals of the inaccuracies, i.e., their ethnocentrism, can result in correcting perceptions. Hence relationships may be improved and individuals may be well situated to begin being empathic with individuals who are culturally different from themselves. The contribution of the current study might be a step toward eroding cultural and institutional racism (Eberhardt & Fiske, 1998).
In addition to gaining new insight into two different cultures, another contribution of the current study is to assist with broadening the scope of intercultural empathy studies, in terms of their contexts, methodologies, and measures by using an elicitive rather than prescriptive approach. The elicitive approach is well suited for participants to inform the study rather than the other way around (Lederach, 1995).

Paulo Freire (1970) paved the way for such an inquiry in his work to educate illiterate adults in Brazil. He and his coworkers used pictures to generate conversation with the Brazilian peasants to learn their words and then used their words to create a curriculum by which to teach them to read and write. The value of an elicitive approach that does not make a priori assumptions became reinforced through the responses they received from the peasants when they presented the peasants with a picture of a scene with a drunken man walking in the street and three other men talking on the corner. They had intended to generate a conversation with the peasants on the topic of alcoholism. The conversation that transpired, however, indicated that the peasants identified the drunken man as the only productive person in the picture because he must be earning wages in order to have money to buy the alcohol (Freire, 1970). Had the pictures been presented with a prefabricated set of responses from which the peasants were to choose, Freire (1970) and his colleagues may have failed to gain an authentic cultural rendering and, instead, reaffirmed their own set of assumptions about the culture. Indeed, insight into cultural differences was an unintended yet useful outcome of their work. By employing a similar elicitive approach, the current study may unfold similar unexpected outcomes.
The literature review to follow will explore the limitations of empathy studies, in terms of intercultural contexts, due to their narrowness in scope and prescriptive methods, as well as provide a rationale for the approach being taken for the current study.
CHAPTER 2

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Empathy Measures and Studies: Implications for Intercultural Contexts

A review of empathy measures and studies as well as their implications for intercultural contexts will be provided. Simply mapping current empathy measures and methods onto intercultural contexts is not sufficient for exploring and determining individuals' proclivity and capacity for being interculturally empathic (Casmir & Asuncion-Lande, 1989).

Hoffman’s (1984) Developmental Scheme of Empathy is my point of departure. Hoffman (1984) devised an empathy model that is suggestive of, but falls short of exploring intercultural contexts. He describes empathy as a vicarious sharing of emotional distress. Hoffman (1984) emphasizes the concomitant ability to increase one's scope of empathy, i.e., perspective-taking, while at the same time empathizing with an increasingly complex range of emotions. Hoffman (1984) suggests four levels of empathy: global empathy, "egocentric" empathy, empathy for another's feelings, and empathy for another's general condition (pp. 111-113). At the global level, infants experience "empathic distress" (Hoffman, 1984, p. 112), i.e., they cry when another infant cries, but they do not distinguish themselves from other infants. Children who display
"egocentric" empathy do distinguish themselves from others, but they do not realize that others’ internal state is different from their own (Hoffman, 1984, p. 113). When children are able to be empathic for another’s feelings, they have arrived at the level where they not only are able to distinguish themselves from others, but they also are cognizant that other’s feelings and perspectives may be different from their own (Hoffman, 1984, p. 113). At the third level, empathy for another’s life condition, individuals conceive of others as persons who have identities and histories; and therefore, have pleasures and pain beyond the immediate situation (Hoffman, 1987). Hoffman (1984, 1987) suggests that as individuals become able to form social concepts, his fourth level of empathy can be extended to experiencing empathy toward a whole group of people.

Hoffman’s (1984) fourth level addresses intergroup empathy in a way that may have implications for intercultural empathy. Although he suggests that individuals may be able to be empathic toward individuals, recognizing their membership in a particular group, Hoffman (1984) does not attempt to identify the different phases individuals may traverse to become interculturally empathic. Instead, Hoffman (1984) is rather equivocal about individuals’ capacity for being interculturally empathic. He states, on the one hand, that empathy may be unlikely if persons are from different cultures (Hoffman, 1984). On the other hand, he suggests that if individuals have a certain amount of familiarity with another culture, then they might be able to experience intercultural empathy (Hoffman, 1984).
The current state of knowledge with regard to empathy is not unlike the gap in knowledge that Levinson (1978) cited as a reason for creating an adult development theory:

...We could make many connections between these early periods and what happened at mid-life. It became increasingly clear, however, that we had no useful conception of early adult development from the end of adolescent to age 35. By regarding the mid-life struggles and adaptations as no more than a re-enactment of personality traits and conflicts formed in childhood, we were falling into the misleading simplicity we set out to avoid. The emphasis on childhood development helped to illuminate adult life, but it kept us from examining what is new in adulthood. It became evident, finally, that...we had to create a theory of adult development...(p. 17).

Similarly, empathy studies may help to illuminate the path toward intercultural empathy, but at the same time fail to explore elements or issues that may be requisite for empathizing with individuals from different cultures. In a theoretical sense, having a rudimentary understanding of empathy as a construct is necessary, but not sufficient for exploring intercultural empathy. Indeed, the simplicity of mapping current empathy measures onto other cultures and/or making cross-cultural comparisons, may perpetuate ethnocentrism and result in intergroup projection rather than empathy.

The distinction between projection and empathy is important. The projection of one's own thoughts and feelings onto others can masquerade as empathy. For example, several studies have examined empathy and the role of similarities between persons (Feshbach, 1978). Results from these studies indicate that individuals are more likely to be empathic with others who are the same sex, similar in race, similar in age, or similar in skill competence (Deutsch, 1975; Feshbach & Roe, 1968; Klein, 1970; Stotland & Dunn, 1963). And while similarity or familiarity of emotions and experience may be requisite
for empathy, others caution against the over emphasis of the importance of such similarities (Broome, 1991; Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987).

Hoffman (1984) cautions against egoistic drift. Egoistic drift, according to Hoffman (1984), is the effect of becoming self-absorbed and thus losing sight of the other individual or the individual's condition that initially elicited the empathic response. A similar caution might be given for ethnocentric drift. Ethnocentric drift is the effect of amplifying similarities between one's own group and the other group to the extent that the focus turns toward one's own group resulting in losing sight of the other's group condition that initially elicited an empathic response (Christie, 1995; Kimmel, 1994). Hoffman (1984) contends and others agree (Deutsch & Madle, 1975; Feshbach, 1978; Strayer, 1987) that empathy does not occur unless the focus is shifted back to the origination of the response. Thus, empathic responses are a combination of other-focused and self-focused processes (Hoffman, 1984). Strayer (1987) shares Hoffman's (1984) sentiments that empathy may involve both self-other merging and self-other differentiation. She asserts that while merging and differentiating oneself from another may seem to be paradoxical, sharing another's affect is different from experiencing it ourselves even when our own experiences are evoked as a result (Strayer, 1987). Deutsch and Madle (1975) agree that a determinant of whether or not an empathic response has been elicited is directionality; namely whether an individual projects one's own reactions onto a situation, or understands the situation from the framework of the other individual.

The current study is an attempt to provide a means for developing culturally sensitive empathy measures. In order to do so, it is instructive to review the prominent
empathy measures and studies to glean what is useful and to identify what still might be explored in intercultural contexts. Because empathy is depicted as a multidimensional construct with cognitive and affective dimensions, there are measures of empathy, which reflect these three different representations. What follows is a summary of affective, cognitive, and multidimensional empathy measures and studies. A discussion of the implications and limitations of these measures and studies, in terms of intercultural contexts, will follow the summary.

Affective Empathy Measures and Studies

The Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy

Mehrabian and Epstein's (1972) Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (QMEE) is the most highly employed affective measurement of empathy (Davis, 1996). They built the QMEE around the concept that an accurate measure of empathy involves assessing individuals' capacity for sharing emotions (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). The questionnaire consists of 33 items to which subjects respond from -4 (very strong disagreement) to +4 (very strong agreement). The items were chosen from a larger set of items that were intercorrelated with the following subscales: susceptibility to emotional contagion, appreciation of the feelings of unfamiliar and distant others, extreme emotional responsiveness, tendency to be moved by others' positive emotional experiences, tendency to be moved by others' negative emotional experiences, sympathetic tendency, and willingness to be in contact with others who have problems (Mehrabian, & Epstein, 1972). Indeed, their work is supported by subsequent research
efforts that suggest there are six adjectives that tend to reflect empathy: sympathetic, moved, compassionate, warm, soft-hearted, and tender (Toi & Batson, 1982).

**The Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents**

Bryant (1982) adapted Mehrabian and Epstein’s QMEE (1972) for use with children and adolescents. She defined empathy as a vicarious, affective response to the perceived emotional experiences of others where emotional responsiveness is emphasized over social insight (Bryant, 1982). Her instrument comprises 17 of 33 items from the QMEE. To develop an index for measuring empathy in children and adolescents, each of the 17 items were reworded to be appropriate for children (e.g., “I often find public displays of affection annoying” became “People who kiss and hug in public are silly.” Bryant, 1982, p. 415). The index consists of 22 items. Subjects respond to the measure by indicating their agreement or disagreement with the items (Bryant, 1982).

Bryant (1982) conducted two studies. Results of both studies found seventh graders to be more empathic than first and fourth graders. First and fourth graders were not found to differ in empathy. Females were found to be more empathic than males. Empathy for seventh graders correlated positively with the QMEE. In addition, correlations between empathy scores and reading achievement were found to be insignificant for all three grades. Correlations between empathy scores for fourth and seventh graders and social desirability scores were found to be insignificant. Higher empathy scores were associated with acceptance of individual differences. Increases in empathy for first and fourth grade boys were associated with decreases in aggressiveness (Bryant, 1982).
Cognitive Empathy Measures and Studies

Scale for the Measurement of Empathic Ability

Dymond (1949) developed a scale for measuring empathic ability in which empathy is considered to be synonymous with accurate prediction of how another person thinks. The scale consists of four parts. In the first part, subjects are asked to rate themselves on six items: self-confidence, superior-inferior, selfish-unselfish, friendly-unfriendly, leader-follower, and sense of humor. Subjects are asked to rate another individual on the same six items for the second part. The third part has subjects rate the other individual on the same items according to how that individual would rate himself or herself. Then in the fourth part, subjects rate themselves the way they think the other individual would rate them (Dymond, 1949). Scores were tallied using two different methods. The first method involved tallying the total discrepancy points in predictions, the Deviance Score. The second method, the Right Score, was a count of the total number of predictions that coincided exactly with the actual rating (Dymond, 1949). The number of correct predictions between the first administration of the scale and the second was greater than would have been expected if chance alone been the primary factor. No significant difference between gender was found, however, females significantly improved their predictions between the first assessment and the second, while males did not (Dymond, 1949).

The Empathic Fantasy Scale

Fantasy ability, in terms of the Emphatic Fantasy Scale (EFS), is defined as the capacity for imagining the situation of a fictional character and being able to take the
viewpoint of that person (Elms, 1966). The EFS is a 10-item scale in which individuals respond that they agree or disagree with a statement. Half of the items are scored positively for agreement and half are scored positively for disagreement (Elms, 1966). In a study, conducted by Elms (1966) using the EFS, role-playing individuals changed their attitudes more significantly than non-role-playing individuals. In addition, role-playing male scores were highly correlated with attitudinal change. Role-playing resulted in a significantly greater mean positive attitude change in males (Elms, 1966). Reliability was found for male subjects, while no reliability was found for female subjects (Elms, 1966).

Empathy Scale

Hogan's (1969) Empathy Scale (EM), is the most highly employed cognitive measures of empathy (Davis, 1996). The EM is a 64 item true-false instrument, that was developed by borrowing items from various personality instruments: 31 items from the California Psychological Inventory (CPI); 25 items from the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory (MMPI), and 8 items from the Institute of Personality Assessment and Research (IPAR). The method for constructing the scale was based on the belief that "some form of empathic disposition, role-taking, or social sensitivity is assumed by all approaches to personality which take the interpersonal situation as a major focus of concern (Hogan, 1969, p. 307)."

Two groups of individuals (one group of non-psychologists and one group of psychologists) were provided with the following definition of empathy: "The intellectual or imaginative apprehension of another's condition or state of mind without actually experiencing that person's feelings (Hogan, 1969, p.308)." In addition, they were
provided with 50 items from the 100 item California Q Sort and asked to describe a highly empathic individual. Five criteria were identified as describing a highly empathic individual: an individual who is socially perceptive of a wide range of interpersonal cues; seems to be aware of the impression he makes on others; is skilled in social techniques of imaginative play, pretending, and humor, has insight into own motives and behavior, and evaluates the motivation of others in interpreting situations (Hogan, 1969, p.309). In addition, five criteria were identified as least characteristic of an empathic individual: an individual who does not vary roles, i.e., relates to everyone in the same way; judges self and others in conventional terms like “popularity,” “the correct thing to do,” social pressures, etc.; is uncomfortable with uncertainty and complexities; extrapunitive, i.e. tends to transfer or project blame; and handles anxiety and conflict by, in effect, refusing to recognize their presence (repressive or dissociative tendencies) (Hogan, 1969, p. 309). To develop the EM scale, an item analysis was conducted mapping the responses of high, middle, and low empathic individuals to 957 true-false items from the CPI, MMPI and IPAR (Hogan, 1969).

Multidimensional Empathy Measures and Studies

Measure of Empathy

The context for Feshbach and Roe’s (1968) measure of empathy was that empathy was a vicarious affective response that may be contingent on social understanding. The measure involved showing four slide sequences, three slides per sequence. Each sequence depicted a different affect: happiness, sadness, fear, and anxiety (Feshbach & Roe, 1968).
Children were individually shown two sets of four different slide sequences (depicting a different affect). The sex of the individual in the slide sequences varied. After each slide sequence, each child was asked, “How do you feel?” (Feshbach & Roe, 1968, p. 135). Then they were shown the sequences again and asked, “How does this child feel?” (Feshbach & Roe, 1968, p. 135). Their responses were scored in two ways, exact match of the affect that was demonstrated in the slide sequence and approximate match, i.e., only matching the affect in terms of identifying whether the affect is positive or negative (Feshbach & Roe, 1968).

With the exception of responses to the fear stimulus, boys were found to empathize more with boys than girls and girls were found to empathize more with girls than boys. In the case of fear, both sexes expressed more anxiety when observing girls. Children scored significantly higher on happiness than sadness and significantly higher in sadness than anger. No significant difference was found between anger and fear (Feshbach & Roe, 1968).

The Empathy Continuum

Strayer based her measure on the premise that empathy is both an affective and cognitive construct. Influenced by the works of cognitive theorists, Piaget (1932) and Selman (1980), Strayer (1993) assumed in the organization of her model that the presence and degree of cognitive and affective match are determined by increases in age because increases in social experiences and understanding of emotional contexts enable individuals to vicariously share experiences and emotions. The Empathy Continuum (EC) is a 19-point continuum scale in which children’s affect match scores are integrated
with a score based on their cognitive attribution of their affect to yield an empathy score. The affective match scores range from 0-3 based on how children respond to questions about how they felt while watching a video (e.g., report if they feel anything; identify their predominant emotion; and identify the intensity of the predominant emotion) and how they respond to the same questions in reference to the stimulus person in the video. The cognitive attribution scores range from 0-7 and are based on the reasons children give for the emotion they report (Strayer, 1993).

Children were divided into two studies using two different sets of vignettes. After watching the vignettes, children were asked if they felt anything while they were watching them. When more than one emotion was mentioned, children were asked to identify the predominant emotion. Children were also asked to identify the intensity of the emotion. Next, children were asked to explain why they felt the emotion they identified. The same procedure was used for children’s assessment of the stimulus person’s emotion and intensity of emotion (Strayer, 1993).

Scoring included an assessment of affect match between children and the stimulus persons’ emotions which was rated on a 4-point scale (0-3, with 3 being the highest rating). Children’s empathy was also rated on a cognitive scale that assessed absence of affect match (0-1) and six different codes for the presence of affect match (2-7) which was based on children’s cognitive attribution of their emotions in response to the stimulus persons. The affect match and cognitive attribution scores are combined to yield an empathy score ranging from 0-19 (Strayer, 1993).
Affect match was found to increase significantly between the three age groups. No significant gender differences were found in either study. A significant increase by age was found in the kinds of cognitive attribution of affect. Empathy scores were found to significantly increase with age. In addition, empathy scores were found to be significantly lower when children’s intensity of emotion was greater than that of the stimulus person’s (Strayer, 1993).

The Interpersonal Reactivity Index

Davis (1983a) developed a measure that operationalizes empathy as both a cognitive and affective construct. His measure, the Interpersonal Reactivity Index (IRI), is a 28 item self-report measure consisting of one cognitive subscale, Perspective-Taking (PT), and three affective subscales: Empathic Concern (EC), Fantasy (FS), and Personal Distress (PD) (Davis, 1983a, 1983b). Each subscale contains seven items. He defines empathy in a broad way suggesting that empathy is the affective and cognitive reactions to the observed experiences of another (Davis, 1983a).

Results of a study where subjects were administered numerous psychological tests and questionnaires, including the IRI, the Hogan (1969) Empathy Scale (EM scale), and the Questionnaire Measure of Emotional Empathy (QMEE) showed that FS subscale scores were positively related to both other-oriented and self-oriented measures of sensitivity toward others. A number of other correlations also were found: higher EC subscale scores were slightly related to emotionality; EC subscale scores were positively related to other-oriented measures of sensitivity toward others; PD subscale scores were related to emotionality; PD subscale scores were positively related to self-oriented
measures of sensitivity toward others; PT subscale scores and EC subscale scores were significantly positively correlated; PT subscale scores and PD subscale scores were significantly negatively correlated; PT subscale scores were positively related to cognitive measures of empathy; PD subscale scores were negatively related to cognitive measures of empathy; EC subscale scores were positively related to affective measure of empathy; FS subscale scores were positively related to affective measure of empathy; EC subscale scores were not related to self-oriented measures of sensitivity toward others; PD subscale scores were not related to other-oriented measures of sensitivity toward others (Davis, 1983a).

Instruction Sets

A common conception of empathy is the placing of oneself imaginatively in another’s place (Stotland, 1969). Individuals who take the role of the other (Mead, 1934) tend to more accurately predict the other’s behavior (Stotland, 1969). In as much as Mead’s work on role taking is cognitively driven, the question arises as to whether or not such a process can evoke empathetic emotional responses. Stotland (1969) devised a method, instructional sets, to test whether or not empathetic emotional responses could be elicited through role taking and to test the influence the relationship between the observer and the observed have on the degree of empathizing.

In order to explore the influence that the relationship between the observer and the observed might have on the extent of role-taking and empathizing, Stotland (1969) conducted an experiment with the following three instructional sets: (1) “imagine-self” condition, (2) “imagine-him” condition, and (3) “watch-him” condition. In all three sets,
subjects were instructed to observe an individual who would be administered heat sensations in varying intensities through use of a diathermy machine. Individuals participating in the “imagine-self” set were instructed to view the experience as if they were the ones receiving the treatment. In the “imagine-him” set, individuals were instructed to imagine how the subject felt as he was administered the treatment. The instructions emphasized that they were to concentrate on the feelings of the subject and that they were to forget themselves. Participants in the “watch-him” set were instructed to watch how he physically reacted to the treatment and were explicitly told not to try to imagine how they or he would feel as a result of the treatment (Stotland, 1969).

The results of the study were that participants in the “imagine-him” instruction set elicited a more intense emotional response than the “watch-him” participants; participants in the “imagine-self” instruction set elicited a more intense emotional response than the “watch-him” participants; and participants in the “imagine-self” instruction set elicited a more intense emotional response than the “imagine-him” participants (Stotland, 1969). Although, the participants of the “imagine-self” set experienced a more negative response to the pain condition than did the “imagine-him” participants, Stotland (1969) pointed out that the response of the “imagine-him” participants more closely mirrored the response of the subject. In the pain condition, the “imagine-self” participants experienced a high level of negative response both during and after the administering of the treatment, whereas the “imagine-him” participants reported some positive affect after the machine was turned off (Stotland, 1969). Hence, while on the surface the “imagine-self” participants might be identified as the most empathic of the three instruction set groups
because they experienced the most intense emotional response, the response exhibited was more demonstrative of egoistic drift (Hoffman, 1984) and projection. The “imagine-him” participants on the other hand, responded more similarly to the target, and therefore were the most empathic of the three groups. The last point illustrates the importance of the distinction between projection and empathy.

Discussion

Empathy is defined in a variety of ways by the aforementioned investigators. The affective measures address empathy as having the capacity for sharing emotions and experiencing vicarious, affective responses to perceived emotional responses (Bryant, 1982; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972). Certainly affective measures and studies such as the ones discussed in the current study, hold value for intercultural contexts by providing a means for exploring the affective dimension of the human experience and redressing a Western cultural bias that emphasizes cognition. Simply addressing affect, however, does not constitute a culturally sensitive construct or measure. Indeed the two affective measures and studies discussed in the current study fall short of exploring implications for intercultural contexts. Neither of the two affective empathy studies (Bryant, 1982; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972) discuss, for example, the role that culture might play in determining what stimuli elicit an emotional response nor do they indicate what the response might be. Instead they ask participants to respond in agreement or disagreement to a set number of statements. Statements such as “Seeing people cry upsets me” (Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972, p. 528) may elicit different cultural responses. No discussion is offered, in terms of cultural specificity or intercultural validity of the two
measures. Rather the instruments are scored with the assumption that "correct" response scores are indicative of empathic tendency. Neither instrument was developed with the intent of being culturally sensitive. The measures, however, provide a baseline from which culturally sensitive measures that tap affect might be developed.

Indeed, emotions are complex and the same situation may elicit a different emotional response depending on an individual. For example, anger may be the emotion that is elicited for a particular individual when a loss of status is experienced. Another individual, on the other hand, may respond to a loss of status with feelings of shame, jealousy, and inadequacy (Heelas, 1986). When attempting to empathize with another individual, therefore, consideration should be given to the wide range of emotions that might be evoked from a given experience. An assumption of the current study is that emotional responses are culturally embedded and culturally determined. Emotions of pride, ambition, guilt, and remorse, for example, might not even be experienced in cultures that emphasize the group over the individual (Heelas, 1986). Similarly in the miscommunication example cited previously, an individual from one culture perceived directness as positive, assertive, and decisive, whereas an individual from another culture perceived directness as negative, immature, and embarrassing (Stewart & Bennett, 1991). Certainly being aware that individuals might feel differently about a particular situation is requisite to being interculturally empathic. Specifically, being able to see and feel beyond one's own worldview in various situational contexts is perhaps the critical link between being empathetic and being interculturally empathic.
Because individuals are products of their own culture and experiences, a certain amount of ethnocentrism or the drawing from ethnocentered experiences would be expected and perhaps would be necessary when individuals attempt to empathize with others. What becomes problematic is when “social insight” results in projection of individuals’ own cultural experiences rather than empathy with another culture. On the surface, projection may appear to be empathy because individuals are perceived to have feelings for other individuals and may even exhibit helping behaviors (Batson et al., 1997; Coke, Batson, & McDavis, 1978; Toi & Batson, 1982). A common manifestation of projection is intercultural sympathy. The key difference between projection and empathy is that projection results in framing a particular situation in the would be empathizers’ lens rather than understanding and feeling with another worldview (Hoffman, 1984, Strayer, 1987). In the case of intercultural sympathy, individuals experience sympathy and guilt about target individuals rather than feeling with target individuals (Christie & Beyer, 1999).

Similarly, Stotland’s (1969) instruction sets studies demonstrate that individuals assigned to “imagine-self” instruction sets elicit more intense emotional responses than individuals assigned to “imagine-him” instruction sets. Yet, the “imagine-him” individuals responses more closely mirrored the subject’s response (Stotland, 1969). Davis’ (1983a) research identified and explored, in detail, the affective and cognitive subscales of empathy, Empathic Concern (EC), Fantasy (FS), Personal Distress (PD), and Perspective Taking (PT). Davis found that while PT related positively to cognitive measures and EC related positively to emotionality, they both related positively to other-
oriented measures and to each other (Davis, 1983a). In addition, Davis (1983a) found that PD related positively with both emotionality and self-oriented measures, but related negatively to PT and EC, results similar to Stotland’s (1969) findings. Likewise, Strayer (1993) found significantly lower empathy scores when individuals’ intensity of emotion was greater than target individuals’. Clearly, experiencing different emotions to the same stimuli, especially if the differences are prejudicial in nature, can preempt empathy. What is less easy to ascertain, is how to accurately judge emotions to be empathic when the emotions that are elicited are the expected emotions. The issue in question is not the emotions evoked, but the expectations. The premise of the current study is that empathy studies, in particular those that address intercultural empathy, have not sufficiently examined the expectations. Without challenging ethnocentrism to gain cultural social insight, the self-other differentiation necessary to move beyond projection to empathy (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987) might not be possible. Simply experiencing simultaneous affective responses with others may not be sufficient to empathize. Attaining a certain repertoire of other cultures may be necessary to allow for processes such as role taking when others’ reactions do not mirror individuals’ own experience (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987). Indeed, the current study parallels Feshbach and Roe’s (1968) assumption, in that empathy is considered to be a vicarious sharing of emotions, which may be contingent on social understanding, whereas Bryant’s (1982) affective measure de-emphasizes social insight. In addition to emphasizing the role of social insight, the current study goes one step further to include cultural understanding as well.
The strength that cognitive empathy measures bring to intercultural contexts is the conceptualization of empathy as cognitive accuracy which is reflected in the capacity to imaginatively take on the role of another and to take on another’s viewpoint (Dymond, 1949; Elms, 1966; Hogan, 1969). An obvious drawback to cognitive measures of empathy, in terms of intercultural contexts, is the lack of attention to affect. Affect often does not receive the same attention, especially in fields such as psychology because affect is difficult to operationally define. An example of an approach to study affect and empathy is illustrated in Strayer’s (1993) handling of affect in her Empathy Continuum; here, the complexity of the affective score is determined by the complexity of the cognitive response. Hogan’s (1969) empathy measure, the EM scale is such an assessment. The measure is a rigorous assessment with strong psychometrics. Yet in intercultural contexts, the EM scale may not present the same rigor. In addition to being subject to the criticisms of the other cognitive empathy measures, the EM scale also inherits cultural biases that may be inherent in the MMPI, IPAR, and the California Q-Sort. Standardized tests have long been subject to criticisms of cultural bias (Hilliard III, 1990). The criticisms, however, are often limited to pointing out differentials in experiences of the test-takers, which often result in biases in favor of or against certain groups contingent on their experiences. A more instructive approach to the criticisms might be to examine and determine individuals’, including the test-makers’, repertoire to accurately reflect another culture. The focus of the current study is the latter approach.

Role taking is the typical framework of empathy within the cognitive context and may be requisite for empathizing when individuals’ reactions are different to a particular
stimulus (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987). The EFS scale rates individuals’ tendency to be empathic based on their adeptness at imaging themselves as being a different person or taking another person’s viewpoint (Elms, 1966). Statements which are used to assess an individual’s proclivity for role taking include: “I like to imagine myself as being various different types of person (sic)” and “I usually feel that I know exactly what mood my friends are in, even when nothing is said in words” (Elms, 1966, p. 37). Individuals respond to the statements with agreement or disagreement. Dymond (1949), too, employed role taking as a technique for measurement of empathy, but she approached role taking in a slightly different manner. Instead of having individuals respond to a set of statements, she had students participate in dyads and interact with each other for a period of several weeks. Afterwards, they were administered a rating scale of six traits to assess how accurately they took the role of their dyad partner (Dymond, 1949). In both Elms’ (1966) and Dymond’s (1949) measures, role taking was considered indicative of empathy.

Role taking, however, does not on its own constitute empathy. At the worst extreme, individuals may be adept at role taking, but rather than use role taking to empathize, individuals capitalize on their role taking skill for personal gain (Strayer, 1987). At a lesser extreme, even when individuals are genuinely attempting to empathize, they may lack the repertoire to accurately take on the roles of another culture (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987). As mentioned previously, the lack of repertoire or ethnocentrism may preempt empathy. Without the requisite self-other differentiation, projection and role taking are more likely than empathy. The current study is a step
toward identifying a means for increasing individuals' repertoire for another culture. Although ethnocentrism and thus projection is not culture-specific, i.e., individuals from all cultures have a tendency for projection rather than empathy for individuals from different cultures, the focus of the current study is majority culture ethnocentrism.

Because both affect and cognition are considered to be essential for the capacity to empathize, especially in intercultural contexts, the current study advocates a multidimensional approach to empathy. Multidimensional approaches conceptualize empathy as placing oneself imaginatively in another's place to elicit affective and cognitive reactions that are contingent on social understanding (Davis, 1983a, 1983b; Feshbach & Roe, 1968; Stotland, 1969; Strayer, 1987, 1993). Feshbach and Roe (1968) and Strayer (1993) used slide sequences and film vignettes respectively to assess children's level of affective and cognitive empathy. Feshbach and Roe (1968) used eight series of slides, three slides each, depicting seven year olds in four different emotional states: happiness (birthday party, winning a television contest), sadness (lost dog, social rejection), fear (child lost, frightening dog), and anger (toy snatcher, false accusation). Each slide sequence was accompanied by a short narration that did not contain affective labels. Upon viewing a slide sequence children were asked "How do you feel?" and "How does this child feel?" (Feshbach & Roe, 1968, p. 135). Similarly, Strayer (1993) used film vignettes depicting emotions of happiness, sadness, fear, and anger. Upon viewing the film vignettes children were asked to briefly describe what they saw to check for comprehension. Then they were asked if they had felt anything. If they responded that they did and identified more than one emotion they were asked to identify the
strongest emotion. Responses were coded happy, sad, angry, surprised good, surprised bad, and neutral. If a child offered a different term such as frustration, they were asked to identify which of the coded terms their emotion was most like (Strayer, 1993). They were then asked to identify the intensity of their emotion. And finally they were asked to explain why they felt the emotion that they reported (Strayer, 1993). The procedure was repeated for children's responses to the stimulus person's emotion (Strayer, 1993). In both Feshbach and Roe (1968) and Strayer (1993), affective and cognitive role taking were employed. Because the studies dealt with children, the depicted emotions were made simple and kept to a minimum of one or two emotions per slide sequence or vignette. Similarly, the current study employs 17 individual slides, however, in contrast to Feshbach and Roe (1968) and Strayer (1993), the responses to the slides are open-ended, i.e., the responses to the slides are not predetermined. Following an elicitive methodology, the current study is designed so participants from two different cultures provide the "answers" to the slides. Similar to Feshbach and Roe's (1968) and Strayer's (1993) studies, participants will be asked to take the role of the other. Participants from each group will be asked to predict the responses of the other group.

The technique Dymond (1949) used with her empathy scale also informs the current study. She explored empathy by assessing how accurately people could predict others' self assessments and assessments of them, in terms of six traits, by transposing themselves into the experiences of the others (Davis, 1996; Dymond, 1949). In order to address cultural contexts, the current study broadens her approach by presenting pictures to participants and asking them to respond to open-ended statements rather than ranking
responses and predictions of six different traits. While Dymond’s (1949) study emphasized cognitive accuracy, in an exploratory that was conducted, pictures were presented with open-ended questions and resulted in both cognitive and affective responses.

In addition to examining cognitive and affective responses, the current study will broaden the analysis by mapping the accuracy of predicted responses to pictures against whether or not the two groups had the same or different response to the pictures. If the two groups have a similar response and make accurate predictions of each other’s responses, projection may be what is playing out rather than empathy. If, on the other hand, they have different responses and still make accurate predictions, empathy is more likely (Hobart & Fahlberg, 1965). Indeed, a main concern of the current study is the distinction between projection and empathy. Experiencing simultaneous affective responses with others is as likely to be projection as empathy. Strayer (1993) found significantly lower empathy scores when individuals’ intensity of emotion was greater than that of the target individual’s. Likewise Stotland (1969) found that while participants assigned to the “imagine-self” instruction sets elicited more intense emotions than those assigned to the “imagine-him,” the participants assigned to the “imagine-him” sets responded more closely to the stimulus person’s response. Although participants in the current study will not be assigned to different instruction sets per se, all participants will be asked to respond to the pictures the way individuals from their cultural group would respond (“imagine-self” or “imagine-us”) and then to respond to the pictures the way individuals from the other cultural group would respond (“imagine-him” or
"imagine-them"). Of particular interest to the current study is how accurately majority culture students respond in the "imagine-them" set

While the aforementioned studies inform the current study, none of them specifically broach the topic of intercultural empathy. Indeed, while the literature on empathy is voluminous and research on intercultural relations explicitly endorses the value of the empathy construct, the two literatures have only sparingly informed one another. In large part, the cursory treatment of empathy in intercultural contexts is due to the fact the much of the empathy research has resided in the field of psychology, where the focus is on the individual and individual differences. The intercultural relations literatures, on the other hand, have as their focus cultural groups, but typically have not operationalized empathy. While a majority of the empathy research does not deal explicitly with intercultural empathy, a few attempts have been made to understand the role between empathy and culture. In the following section, four such studies will be discussed.

Intercultural Empathy Studies

The four intercultural studies that will be presented are Lindgren and Marrash's (1970) intercultural insight and empathy study, Klein's (1970) study on factors influencing empathy in African American and white children, Jagers and Mock's (1993) exploration of empathy, cultural orientations, and social outcomes in inner city African American children, and Batson et al.'s (1997) efforts toward determining if empathy expressed toward a member of a stigmatized group can be generalized to the whole group. In addition to being selected for review in the current study as a result of being
one of the few studies dealing intentionally with culture and empathy, each study was chosen on its own merit. The intercultural insight and empathy study was selected because of its similarity in nature to the current study, in which repertoire of another culture is considered to be a necessary condition for intercultural empathy (Lindgren & Marrash, 1970). Klein's (1970) study was chosen because of its similarity to the current study in that it examined factors that might distinguish between African American and white individuals. Jagers and Mock's (1993) study was chosen because it is one of the few empirical empathy studies conducted with an African American population. In addition, their study was selected because it yielded a different empathic result, in terms of gender, using Bryant's (1982) index than did Bryant. They did not find a gender difference (Jagers & Mock, 1993), whereas she did (Bryant, 1982). Batson et al.'s (1997) work is reviewed because it empirically broadens empathy from empathy towards individuals to empathy towards groups, in particular, stigmatized groups. What follows is a summary of the four studies. Afterward a discussion of the implications and limitations of the definitions, contexts, and methodologies will be provided.

**Intercultural Insight and Empathy Study**

Lindgren and Marrash's (1970) conducted a study on intercultural insight and empathy using the Intercultural Insight Questionnaire (ICIQ). The ICIQ is a forced-choice instrument on which respondents are asked to identify the American personality traits rather than the British personality traits presented in each of the forced-choice statements (Lindgren & Marrash, 1970). The items for the ICIQ are based on American and British personality traits that had been statistically measured and analyzed. The
premise of the instrument is that individuals who successfully identify which traits in the
dichotomy are the American traits, would be those individuals who are familiar and
interested in American and British people (Lindgren & Marrash, 1970). Accordingly,
Americans were expected to score the highest followed by Armenians, Arab Christians,
and Arab Moslems, respectively, based on degree of favorable disposition toward a
western orientation (Lindgren & Marrash, 1970).

Students were administered the ICIQ and the Elm’s Emphatic Fantasy Scale
(EFS). Significant differences in ICIQ scores were found between groups. Armenians
scored significantly lower than Americans and significantly higher than Arab Christians
and Arab Moslems. Americans scored significantly higher than Arab Christians and Arab
Moslems. Arab Moslems, however, did not score significantly different from Arab
Christians. Females scored higher, but not significantly higher than males on the ICIQ.
Scores on the ICIQ were not found to correlate positively with the EFS (Lindgren &

The reliability for the ICIQ was found to be low. Rationales provided for the low
reliability are indicative of the Western rather than intercultural nature of the measure.
One of the rationales provided that Mid-Eastern students were relatively unfamiliar with
objective tests, and therefore, might have been suspicious of them. A second rationale
suggested that some of the students refused to respond to the forced-choice items because
they felt they had insufficient information. As a result, the researchers had a difficult
time finding subjects who would fully participate in the study (Lindgren and Marrash,
1970).
Factors Influencing Empathy in African American and White Children

Klein's (1970) study on factors influencing empathy in African American and white children involved six and seven year olds. Participants were shown a series of slide sequences, three slides each depicting happiness (buying ice cream, going to the beach), sadness (sick in bed, social rejection), anger (false accusation, toy snatcher), and fear (chased by a dog, lost in the woods). The themes for each affect were selected based on interviews with first and second grade girls who indicated what made them feel happy, sad, angry, and afraid. Half of each race viewed slides of individuals who were of like race and half viewed slides of individuals of the opposite race. The slides depicting a different race individual were identical in content as the same race individual slides (Klein, 1970).

Prior to administering the slides, participants were administered an interest and preference questionnaire, which asked such questions as “What is your favorite game?” and included some fact-based questions such as “How many brothers and sisters do you have (Klein, 1970). Upon completion of the questionnaire, individual students were shown the slide sequences. Half of the subjects were told that the stimulus child was similar to them, based on the information that the subjects had provided the researcher and half were shown the slides without the similarity instruction set (Klein, 1970). After viewing the slides the subjects were asked “How do you feel?” (Klein, 1970).

The greatest empathic response was found with white subjects viewing white individuals, although the empathic response was not significantly greater than African American subjects viewing African American individuals (Klein, 1970). African
Americans viewing African Americans did not score significantly higher than African Americans viewing whites, but whites viewing whites did score significantly higher than whites viewing African Americans (Klein, 1970). African Americans viewing whites did not score significantly higher than whites viewing African Americans (Klein, 1970). The only significant race of subject by race of stimulus interaction was found in the anger affect, where whites were more empathic with white individuals, but African Americans did not vary significantly in empathy with white or African American (Klein, 1970). The similarity instruction set only increased empathy in the case of whites responding to the fear affect (Klein, 1970).

The focus of Klein’s (1970) study was the effect the race of the stimulus individual in comparison or contrast to the race of the subject had on the tendency to be empathic. Although her study did not explicitly address the relationship between ethnocentrism and empathy, the results did suggest that ethnocentrism might have influenced empathic responses. In each case, although a level of significance was not found across the board, individuals were more empathic with stimulus individuals who were similar in race. In addition, although the results were not significant, African Americans were more empathic with white individuals than whites were with African Americans. This last finding might suggest that African Americans are less ethnocentric with the lens that they use to view white culture than whites are with African American culture. Further, this supports research that suggest that African Americans tend to know both African American and white culture, whereas white individuals tend not to, and
therefore would be expected to be more empathic toward white culture than white individuals would be for African American culture.

Empathy, Cultural Orientation, and Social Outcomes

The purpose of Jagers and Mock's (1993) study was to identify cultural orientations of African American students and implications of the orientations in terms of social outcomes including empathy, Machiavellianism, delinquency, and aggression. Subjects were African American sixth graders from an inner-city African American school. The three cultural orientations that were explored were Anglocultural, Marginalized Minority, and Afrocultural. The Anglocultural orientation is aligned with middle class Anglo American culture, values, beliefs, and behaviors including effort optimism, possessive individualism, egalitarian-based-conformity, democratization of equality, material well-being, and person-object orientation (Jagers & Mock, 1993). The Marginalized Minority orientation manifests itself in expressions emerging from the legacy of racial and economic oppression (Jagers & Mock, 1993). The Afrocultural orientation is informed by traditional African cultural heritage and is expressed through such things as spirituality, communalism, and affect (Jagers & Mock, 1993). Students in two different classrooms were administered the Afrocultural Orientation Questionnaire, the Anglo-cultural Orientation Questionnaire, and the Marginalized Minority Orientation Questionnaire. A week later, the same students were administered the Index of Empathy for Children and Adolescents (Bryant, 1982), the Youth Self-Report (measure of delinquency and aggressive behavior), and the Kiddie Mach (measure of Machiavellian attitude). Higher Afrocultural Orientation was found to be positively associated with
empathy. Higher Anglo-cultural Orientation was found to be positively associated with Machiavellian attitude and delinquent and aggressive behavior. Marginality Orientation was not found to be associated with delinquent behavior. In addition, while mean empathy scores were comparable to those reported in Bryant’s (1982) study, a study conducted with European American children, no gender differences were found in the African American sample (Jagers & Mock, 1993).

**Empathy Towards Members of a Stigmatized Group**

Batson et al. (1997) defined empathy as other-oriented emotional responses that are congruent with the perception of the other’s welfare. In the case of individuals’ in need, empathic feelings include such emotional responses as sympathy, compassion, and tenderness (Batson et al., 1997). And while their study did not deal with intercultural empathy, in an ethnicity sense, the process of widening the scope of empathy from individuals to entire groups, in particular stigmatized groups, may inform efforts in working toward intercultural empathy. Specifically, they proposed a three-step model for extending empathic feelings toward stigmatized groups: (1) perspective taking with an individual belonging to a stigmatized group; (2) valuing of the individual’s welfare as a result of empathic feelings; (3) the individual’s membership in a stigmatized group is perceived to be a major contributing factor to the individual’s plight (Batson et al., 1997).

To explore the question of whether or not empathy could be extended to entire groups, Batson et al., (1997) conducted studies on three different stigmatized groups: people with AIDS, homeless people, and convicted murderers. In the case of people with AIDS, Batson et al., (1997) induced empathy for a young woman with AIDS and then
generalized the induction to people with AIDS. Empathic responses did generalize to the whole population. Because young women with AIDS are not the stereotypical AIDS victims, Batson et al., (1997) conducted another study using a more stereotypical group, homeless men. Again, empathy expressed toward a homeless man, generalized to homeless people as a whole. Because attitudes toward people with AIDS and homeless people were fairly high in subjects prior to the empathy induction, Batson et al., (1997) conducted a third study where the target individual was a member of a highly stigmatized group, convicted murderers. Empathy was induced and did generalize to the group, but it is worthy to note that the empathy means were lower than they were in the case of people with AIDS and homeless people (Batson et al., 1997). Still, a follow-up study that was conducted in conjunction with the convicted murderer study found that the empathy effect was still realized one to two weeks after the empathy induction (Batson et al, 1997).

Discussion

An irony of the intercultural insight and empathy study (Lindgren and Marrash, 1970) is that the low reliability of the assessment was due to the cultural insensitivity of the data collection methodology, i.e., using objective tests with Mid-Eastern students. Otherwise, the premise of Lindgren and Marrash’s (1970) study is instructive. The intercultural insight and empathy study (Lindgren & Marrash, 1970) aligned empathy with cultural understanding and accurate predictions. Propensity for role taking was also considered by corroborating the ICIQ with the EFS. The ICIQ involved forced-choice answers depicting American and British personality traits. For individuals who are neither American nor British, nor somewhat familiar with the two cultures, the two
cultures might be perceived to be nearly the same, i.e., outgroup homogeneity.

Perception of outgroup homogeneity entails individuals being capable of differentiating between other individuals in their own social category, yet being less capable of differentiating between individuals of another social category (Brewer & Miller, 1984).

In the case of outgroup homogeneity, forced-choice responses might be an effective approach to assess intercultural insight and empathy. If two groups, however, are easily discerned to be different, as in the case of African American and majority culture members, individuals' responses to forced-choice answers may not be indicative of intercultural insight and empathy. In fact, majority culture and minority individuals are often familiar with majority culture traits, because of its implied universalism, so that they can determine between majority culture and other cultures. The distinctions become less clear when target groups do not consist of individuals from the majority culture or the case in which individuals in all of the target groups are considered to be members of the majority culture, e.g., American and British.

The focus or concern of the current study is the implied universalism of majority culture individuals and how it may be preemptive to intercultural empathy. In particular, the study is concerned with identifying ethnocentrism, which might prevent majority culture individuals from recognizing differences in responses to slides between themselves and African Americans. Further, just as critical to the study is whether or not majority culture individuals can correctly identify differences when differences occur.

Similar to the proposed study, Klein's (1970) study also investigated distinctions in majority culture and African American individuals' responses to pictures. In her study,
Klein (1970) used Feshbach and Roe's (1968) methodology for assessing empathy, where empathy is considered to be a vicarious emotional response contingent on social understanding. African American and majority culture individuals were shown pictures where the context was identical, but the individual in the picture would either be African American or majority culture. Empathy was checked against what impact the ethnicity of the individual in the picture made on African American and majority culture individuals' responses and the differences in their responses (Klein, 1970). The current study takes a different tack on the effects of culture on empathy. Because Klein (1970) was working with young children, the pictures and affective states (buying ice cream, happiness) would be likely to elicit similar responses by individuals regardless of their cultural background. Individuals who score highly empathic on such measures may demonstrate a propensity for being interculturally empathic. An over-emphasis of a universality of responses to pictures, vignettes, situations, etc., in determining empathy and in particular intercultural empathy promotes a color-blind approach. Such an approach negates the fact that people bring their own experiences, cultural or otherwise, to a situation, and therefore, may not have the same perception and/or affective response to a particular situation. In addition, one lens is often imposed on all which may have implications that are good for a particular group and negative or results in marginalization of other groups. The current study is intent on exploring different lens.

In an empirical empathy study conducted with African American students, Jagers and Mock (1993) found higher Afro cultural Orientation to be positively associated with empathy, whereas higher Anglo cultural Orientation was positively associated with
Machiavellian attitude and delinquent and aggressive behavior. At least two possibilities present themselves as a result of these findings. The first possibility is that Afrocultural Orientation is more aligned with the traits attributed to empathy than Anglocultural Orientation. Another possibility is that assimilation of African Americans to the dominant culture, i.e., Anglocultural Orientation, is preemptive to empathy.

Another cultural implication of Jagers and Mock's (1993) study is the difference between their findings and Bryant's (1982). Jagers and Mock (1993) employed Bryant's (1982) empathy index for their study where empathy is defined as a vicarious sharing of emotions. Further, emotional responsiveness is emphasized over social insight (Bryant, 1982). In her empathy study with students, Bryant (1982) found females to be more empathic in their vicarious affective responses than males. She suggested that wording and socialization might have affected the gender differences. As an example, she posed that where a female might say, "I feel sad" a male might react to the same situation with a statement such as "It drives me up the wall" (Bryant, 1982, p. 422). Jagers and Mock (1993), however, did not find a gender difference. The difference between the Jagers and Mock's (1993) study and Bryant's (1982) might be culturally based, since her subjects were European American and Jagers and Mock's (1993) subjects were African American. Research suggests that when gender issues are considered, the frame of reference is of European American, middle class females (Gordon, 1995; Staples, 1988). Though gender would seem to be a unifying theme, sexism is of primary importance to European American females, whereas racism is primary for African American females (Gordon, 1995); therefore, one might not expect to see gender differences that appear between
majority culture males and females be reflected among African Americans. And while European females may be more empathic than European males, as Bryant (1982) suggested, females may not be anymore empathic than males, but rather the measure and or methodology being used to assess empathy may influence and suggest such a conclusion. Similarly, Jagers and Mock's (1993) study illustrates the importance of considering the possible influences culture may have on empathy and on accurately assessing empathy.

Most empathy studies have been concentrated on interpersonal empathy. In an attempt to explore whether empathy can be extended to a whole group, Batson et al., (1997) explored whether feelings for a member of a stigmatized group could be extended to the group for which the individual was a member. They defined empathy as other-oriented emotional responses, including sympathy, compassion, and tenderness, that are congruent with the perception of the other’s welfare (Batson et al., 1997). The measurement of empathic feelings toward the individual as well as the group was assessed by participants’ responses to 24 adjectives (Batson et al., 1997). The list included six adjectives, sympathetic, compassionate, soft-hearted, warm, tender, and moved, which previous research indicate are reflective of empathy (Batson, Turk, Shaw, & Klein, 1995; Toi & Batson, 1982). As a result of their study, they reported a clear pattern of empathy generalizing to the group (Batson et al., 1997).

The work of Batson and his colleagues (1997) suggests the need for further exploration of intercultural empathy. On the one hand, their definition seems more aligned with intercultural sympathy (Christie & Beyer, 1999) than empathy, i.e., their
definition seems to imply a feeling for rather than a feeling with individuals. Specifically, if individuals are experiencing a hardship, they are probably experiencing the emotions associated with the hardship rather than sympathy. Perhaps most instructive for the current study, however, is the suggestion that empathic feelings often result when individuals become aware of the plight of others (Batson et al., 1997). Indeed, if individuals take the perspective of a person who is culturally different from themselves, they may be expected to score highly on the six empathy adjectives, used in Batson’s research (Batson et al., 1997; Batson & Coke, 1981; Toi & Batson, 1982). The larger question to be addressed is whether individuals actually experience intercultural empathy. That is, have the individuals actually taken the perspective of the other persons or have they instead projected their perspective and feelings on the other person using their own, ethnocentric frame of reference. If the latter is the case, then even though individuals may have scored highly on the empathy adjectives they may not actually be experiencing intercultural empathy.

Empathy Research, Intercultural Contexts, and Ethnocentric Challenges

The underlying assumption of the current study is that the present state of empathy research is entrenched in an implied universalism assumption in regard to the measurement of empathy, i.e., certain responses, whether they be affective, cognitive, or both, are considered to be indicative of empathic tendencies. Where cultural empathy studies are devoid of discussions on their derivation, the ramification is often an implied universalism, in terms of measure. Research suggests that such implied universalism is typically grounded in white or majority culture values, beliefs, and behaviors, which
masquerade as being universal (Pillai, 1993). The current study takes its direction from such research.

Majority culture, as described in the aforementioned way, operates in the absence of knowing other cultures. Intercultural research (Bennett, 1986, 1993; Christie, 1995; Kimmel, 1994) suggests that there are majority culture individuals on either end of a intercultural relations continuum, who know a little or a lot about other cultures and do not prescribe to a universalism ideology, i.e., “we are all the same.” Couched in the middle are a group of majority culture individuals who do prescribe to such a universal outlook. Although there are no empirical studies to suggest the proportions of majority culture individuals who belong to each of the three camps, intuitively one might suspect a bell curve, in which the largest number of majority culture individuals belong to the universal camp. Indeed, research suggests that such an ideology is currently prevalent and pervasive in the United States (Frankenberg, 1997; Pillai, 1993; Schofield, 1995).

The focus of the current study is the universal ideology and the ethnocentrism embedded in such an ideology. While individuals who espouse such a view may be quite amenable toward becoming interculturally empathic, they may provide a challenge that is equal to or greater than the other two groups. In the case where individuals already exhibit cultural sensitivity, little effort, if any, might need to be expended to move them toward being interculturally empathic. On the other extreme, although individuals who exhibit cultural insensitivity may require a lot of effort to move them toward being interculturally empathic, one can usually readily identify the characteristics of such individuals, which are preemptive to being interculturally empathic. The individuals who
are proponents of universality are perhaps the most challenging group because they live within a framework of a more subtle form of ethnocentrism. Their ethnocentrism is often invisible to them. They view the world through a lens that normalizes everything according to their perspectives and experiences, so there is no acknowledgement that others may experience day-to-day situations differently. Further, by virtue of their situated position that does not require them to break out of their ethnocentrism, i.e., a position of power and privilege, there are few incentives to learn about other cultures. Minorities, on the other hand, learn about majority culture values, beliefs, and behaviors for survival (Hooks, 1997; Staples, 1988). The current study provides a means for illuminating subtle majority culture ethnocentrism for purposes of movement toward intercultural empathy.

An Elicitive Approach to Identifying Majority Culture Ethnocentrism

The current state of empathy research, including studies specifically focusing on intercultural empathy seems to be prescriptive in nature; that is, researchers bring their expertise to the project where content is to be mastered or measured and culture is conceptualized as technique (Lederbach, 1995). Prescriptive approaches assume a certain amount of universality, where knowledge and experience in one setting is assumed to be capable of being successfully transposed onto another culture (Lederbach, 1995). The assumption naively presumes a cultural neutrality and applicability across cultures (Lederbach, 1995). An elicitive approach, on the other hand, such as the one being taken by the current study, is one in which researchers serve as catalysts for subjects to impart their implicit knowledge to shape the direction of the research, i.e., culture is considered
to be the foundation (Lederbach, 1995). The primary emphasis of an elicitive approach is
discovery and identifying. In such an approach, the researcher assumes a perspective of
ignorance, whereas subjects move toward making their implicit or tacit knowledge
explicit through exploration and description of their particular contexts (Lederbach,
1995). The premise of the current study is that empathy studies to date have employed
prescriptive approaches that assume a universality that preempt rather than informs
efforts at effectively identifying and working toward intercultural empathy. The next
chapter will describe in detail the elicitive approach being taken by the current study.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

Introduction

A number of limitations are inherent in current empathy measures and studies on intercultural empathy. The conceptual, methodological, and measurement limitations noted in the literature review provided guidance for the efforts of the current study. Perhaps the overarching limitation is a subtle form of ethnocentrism (e.g., “we are all the same”), in which the focus of the research may be on the normality of majority culture, hence failing to recognize cultural differences and the implications for research. The end result is that empathy assessments are more likely to measure projections of majority culture affective and cognitive meanings or intercultural sympathy rather than intercultural empathy. Hence a second limitation of empathy studies, in regard to intercultural contexts, is the failure to challenge the expectations of what determines intercultural empathy. In particular, empathy studies, including those which focus on intercultural empathy, generally tend to use prescriptive measures such as adjective checklists or other pre-determined reactions to assess individuals’ propensity for
empathy. At present such indicators are used without discussion of cultural implications of the measures.

Another limitation to such research is the lack of attention given the cultural sensitivities to the methods used for the assessment. Lindgren and Marrash’s (1970) study, which failed to take into consideration the cultural sensitivities of Mideastern students, nicely illustrates how lack of attention to cultural sensitivities in the method of assessing empathy can undermine research efforts even when a psychometrically sound measure is use.

Currently, few empathy studies have empirically explored intercultural empathy. The present study is an attempt to provide the foundation for identifying majority culture ethnocentrism; laying the groundwork for interventions that reduce ethnocentrism in members of the majority culture and increasing individuals’ propensity for intercultural empathy. An elicitive approach is being used in an attempt to avoid the pitfalls of prescriptive measures and methods, which may be culturally insensitive. Specifically, participants will be asked to provide their own affective and cognitive responses as well as predictions of others’ responses in an attempt to identify majority culture ethnocentrism and distinguish between projection and empathy.

Research Questions

The main focus of the current study is to identify majority culture ethnocentrism. One way to approach the problem is to identify the differing perceptions between the two cultures. Accordingly, the first three research questions explore whether or not pictures that have been pre-selected for the current study are able to distinguish between the
perceptions or meanings assigned to them as a function of group membership. Although there is an expectation that individuals from two different cultures will respond differently to the pictures, it is assumed that individuals of either or both cultures might have the repertoire to reflect accurately the other culture. Research questions four through six explore the ability of majority culture undergraduate students to infer the meanings assigned by African American students. Ethnocentrism will be determined through an analysis of the accuracy of the inferences, especially where differences are shown in the first three research questions. Although African American ethnocentrism, explored through research questions seven through nine, is not a direct concern of the current study, gaining such insight might provide data that informs the other research questions. In addition, based on the literature, it is expected that African Americans will demonstrate that they are socialized to know both their own culture and the majority culture. The major research questions for the current study are:

1. Are there differences between African American undergraduate students' responses and majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the slides?

2. Which slides, if any, elicit different responses from African American undergraduate students and majority culture undergraduate students?

3. If African American undergraduate students' responses to the slides differ from majority culture undergraduate students' responses, how do they differ?

4. Are there differences between African American undergraduate students' responses to the slides and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of African American undergraduate students' responses to the slides?
5. Which slides, if any, elicit differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses?

6. If there are differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the slides, what are those differences?

7. Are there differences between majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the slides and African American undergraduate students' predictions of majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the slides?

8. Which slides, if any, elicit differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and African American undergraduate students' predictions of their responses?

9. If there are differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the slides, what are those differences?

Qualitative Inquiry

The design of inquiry for the present study takes its form from Lincoln and Guba's (1985) flow of naturalistic inquiry. The current study is focused on the conceptual problem of identifying majority culture ethnocentrism. The following is a summary of the twelve characteristics that Lincoln and Guba (1985) ascribed to naturalistic inquiry and the manifestation of these characteristics within the context of the current study.
Natural Setting

The first characteristic of Lincoln and Guba's (1985) flow of naturalistic inquiry is that the inquiry takes place in the natural setting. The focus or conceptual problem of the current study is the identification of majority culture ethnocentrism. Because majority culture ethnocentrism is pervasive in American society, nearly any setting could be chosen as a natural setting to explore the problem of the current study. In fact, two natural settings have been selected for the current study. The first is a historically black college. The second is a predominantly white, non-Hispanic University. The choice of the first setting was decided upon for several reasons. The first reason is for logistical ease of finding African American participants for the study. Another reason is the likelihood that such a setting might facilitate a group-think mentality or shared meanings in response to pictures that will be presented. Of particular interest for the study is the emergence of any patterns of responses within a group that might be contrasted to the emergence of patterned responses of the majority group. The selection of the second setting is for the same reasons as the first setting, in the context of white, non-Hispanic participants. In both cases the researcher approached the participants rather than the participants approaching the researcher.

Natural setting is considered an essential element of qualitative studies because context is considered to be determinant of individuals' actions and their constructions of their realities (Bodgan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Conducting inquiries in natural settings is especially critical when exploring issues of culture. Because one culture tends to be dominant in a given society, individuals belonging to groups other
than the dominant one tend to learn elements of their own culture and the dominant culture for survival purposes. In addition to attending to the natural setting, the researcher may need to acknowledge the "biculturalism" of individuals of the non-dominant group. In so doing, the researcher may need to specifically ask these individuals to speak from their own frame of reference to reduce the likelihood that they will provide the "correct" answers, i.e., the dominant culture answers. The latter may be especially true if the researcher is a member of the dominant group even though the study is being conducted in the subjects' natural setting. To address these concerns, rather than showing African American participants pictures and asking them to respond, they were instructed to provide an African American response to the pictures.

**Human Instrument**

In qualitative studies, "human instrument" refers to both the subjects of the study (Bodgan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985) and the researcher (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982). The subjects, within their natural setting, are the direct source of data, while the researcher's insight serves as the primary source for analysis (Bogdan & Biklen, 1982).

The decision to conduct a qualitative inquiry for the current study was two-fold: one to redress ethnocentric tendencies of current quantitative empathy research and two to identify cultural understandings that might otherwise continue to go unobserved. A qualitative inquiry, such as the approach being taken by the current study, may mitigate identification and perpetuation of false cultural similarities and differences. A case in point is Freire's (1970) work in Brazil. The original intent of showing the Brazilian peasants the picture of an alcoholic individual and three other individuals was to generate
a discussion on alcoholism. Rather than generating a discussion on the topic of alcoholism, which might have illuminated cultural differences in reference to the topic of alcoholism, a completely different conversation ensued. The “true” cultural difference was that the peasants saw a picture where there was a wage earner (i.e., the one who could buy alcohol) and loafers.

In the same vein, participants in the current study were presented with pictures to which they responded. The current focus is to illuminate cultural differences by identifying ingroup similarities and outgroup differences in response to the pictures. However, responses to the pictures might reshape the focus in a similar fashion as Freire’s (1970) work. With the current focus in mind, it is conceded that class differences often masquerade as cultural differences. Class differences, notwithstanding, the current study works with the assumption that there exists shared experiences among African Americans that might be more or less magnified and/or take on a slightly different meaning depending on personal experiences including racial mixture of neighborhood and school, quality of life, cultural grounding, and cohort group. Responses to a picture of a package of Oreo cookies illustrate the last point. Exploratory work suggests the response pattern to the picture may take on a slightly different meaning, depending on the age cohort. The older cohort was more likely to associate the picture to African Americans who have assimilated with white, non-Hispanic culture, while the younger cohort was more likely to make reference to bi-racial individuals. In either case, the picture was more likely to be associated by African Americans with racial identity, while
majority culture individuals were more likely to associate the picture with food and/or the childhood idealism of cookies and milk.

Once the data have been collected, an inductive analysis will be performed. At this point, researchers become the “human instrument” of the study. Qualitative researchers do not have statistical tests to assist them with identifying significant observations or patterns. In the end, they base their summations on a combination of their intellect, experience, and judgments (Patton, 1990). Even so, there are suggested processes that can be followed to ensure the trustworthiness of a qualitative study. The processes followed for the current study will be discussed in later sections addressing data collection, data analysis, and trustworthiness.

Tacit Knowledge

Tacit knowledge involves the discovery of what individuals have experienced, how they interpret these experiences, and how their experiences and interpretations shape their construction of their realities (Bodgan & Biklen, 1982). What individuals know often extends beyond what can be described and explained. Understanding is sometimes contingent on having shared common experiences (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Accordingly, shared tacit knowledge could be viewed as a form of empathy, where empathy is understood as shared affective and cognitive experience of a moment. Indeed, it is the tacit knowledge of two different cultural groups that the current study is attempting to tap. Specifically the current study is focused on the ways individuals from two different cultural groups make sense of their lives through the way they construct and attribute meanings to pictures they are shown. Simply put for purposes of illustration, if a
phenomenon is experienced one way, it takes on a particular meaning, if experienced another way, it takes on another meaning. The purpose of the current study is to illuminate different understandings of the same phenomena.

Qualitative Method

The qualitative method being used for the current study is, in part, an adaptation of the methodology used in developing the Profile of Nonverbal Sensitivity (PONS). The PONS, a film test, was developed to study nonverbal communication. The gap in the research that the PONS filled included providing a standard measure of individual accuracy in interpreting and conveying nonverbal cues, i.e., tacit knowledge (Rosenthal, Hall, DiMatteo, Rogers, & Archer, 1979). The researchers' interest in developing the measurement extended beyond identifying individual differences in responding to nonverbal communication. They were also interested in exploring interpersonal outcomes, including teachers' expectations of their students' performance (Rosenthal et al., 1979). Similarly, the current study is an attempt to identify and provide the information necessary to develop a culturally sensitive measure of empathy. A preliminary step is to identify majority culture ethnocentrism through the use of pictures. While the immediate goal is to gain insight into the tacit cultural knowledge of two different groups, in order to delineate majority culture ethnocentrism, the long term goal is to improve intercultural relationships.

Individuals participating in the PONS assessment are presented with 220 two-second scenes for which they are to choose between two descriptors of what they have observed (Rosenthal et al., 1979). One of the two descriptors of each scene is the
"objectively correct" answer. In order to derive an "objectively correct" answer, four criteria were employed: (1) face validity (what the person in the scene meant to portray); (2) researchers' opinion (researchers' evaluation of the effectiveness of the portrayal); (3) ratings (rating of each portrayal by a panel); and (4) self-description (the person in the scenes evaluation of her feelings). Using similar means, the intent of the current study is to identify "culturally, objectively correct" answers to the pictures being shown; hence, participants were asked to ascribe meaning to the pictures rather than interpret the pictures and choose between two choices. In addition, rather than working with individuals, a focus group interview was conducted with each of the two groups, i.e., the majority culture group and the African American group.

Focus group interviews typically bring together a group of individuals from similar backgrounds and experiences to reflect on major issues that affect them (Patton, 1990). Discussion, problem solving, decision-making, and/or reaching consensus is not the intent of focus group interviews. Rather the intent is to have individuals consider their own views in the context of others who share their background and experience (Patton, 1990). The dynamics in a focus group interview situation typically are such that the most salient topics and issues are identified (Patton, 1990). In addition, focus group interviews can provide quality control to data collection in that they foster an atmosphere where individuals provide checks and balances for each other, thus reducing the likelihood of obtaining false or extreme views (Patton, 1990). Because the intent of the current study is to identify ingroup similarities in responses to pictures, which will then be used to identify outgroup differences in response to the same pictures, focus group
interviews were considered to be an effective data collection strategy. The interviews consisted of presenting the pictures to each group, individually, and having all of the participants in each group respond verbally to each picture.

**Purposeful Sampling**

Quantitative inquiries rely on random or representative sampling in order to focus on similarities from which to form generalities (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Qualitative inquiries, on the other hand, are interested in sampling techniques that allow for identifying specifics within a given context. Further the information gleaned from these studies are used as a basis for emergent design and grounded theory (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The latter is known as purposeful sampling. Because design and theory are emergent in qualitative inquiries, subjects are selected on the bases of the belief that they will advance the developing theory (Bodgan and Biklen, 1982).

Selection of information-rich cases for in-depth study is the cornerstone of purposeful sampling (Patton, 1990).

Homogeneous sampling is an appropriate form of purposeful sampling when the evaluation purpose is to seek in-depth information about a subgroup of a larger, diverse population (Patton, 1990). In the case of the current study, in order to gain insight into cultural differences, an in-depth study was conducted with two homogeneous groups, majority culture undergraduate students and African American undergraduate students.

A research tool that is often used with homogeneous sampling groups is the focus group interview. The number of individuals that typically participate in a focus group interview is six to eight (Patton, 1990). Because two homogeneous groups were
interviewed, each consisting of eight individuals, the total number of subjects for the current study was sixteen.

**Inductive Analysis**

Simply put, inductive analysis is a process for making meaning of the data that have been collected (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Rather than using data to confirm or disprove hypotheses or research questions, as in the case of quantitative research, naturalistic inquiries use data for generating hypotheses or research questions for follow-up (Lincoln & Guba). Research questions which are identified at the beginning of a naturalistic inquiry, guide the inductive search for patterns and provide focus for how the findings are intended to be used (Patton, 1990). For the current study nine research questions were identified to help map the contour of meaning of two different cultures, i.e., majority culture and African American in an attempt to generate hypotheses on majority culture ethnocentrism. The processes followed for the data analysis of the current study will be discussed in the data analysis section in this chapter.

**Grounded Theory**

Grounded theory is theory that is developed from the data, i.e., is theory that is developed “bottom up” not a priori by which to support or disprove the data (Bodgan & Biklen, 1982; Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The movement in the development of grounded theory is from specific observations within specific contexts toward identification of general patterns from the contexts, i.e., the theory is empirically based (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). An essential role of naturalistic research and specifically the resultant grounded theory is that understandings that would otherwise remain isolated
knowledge are pulled together into theory form (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The last statement is especially pertinent in studies such as the current one focusing on cultural understandings. Although understandings attained through such studies are only applicable to the contexts from which they are derived, they can be used to generate hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Indeed the intent of the current study is to work toward identifying general patterns by which hypotheses might be generated, in the form of “culturally, objectively correct” answers to be used in a quantitative study at a later date. Glaser and Strauss (1967), who coined the term grounded theory, ascribe two criteria to judge whether or not a theory can be considered grounded. The first is “fit,” i.e., how easily categories can be mapped onto the context under study (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). The second criterion, work, pertains to how well the theory captures the essence of the context of the study when the theory is put into use (Glaser and Strauss, 1967). While the results of the current study will not constitute a comprehensive theory, the criteria set by Glaser and Strauss (1967) for grounded theory are essential standards by which the conclusions will be measured.

**Emergent Design**

Unlike quantitative research, where the design is well-defined in advance of data collection, qualitative research dictates that the design of the inquiry remain sufficiently open to allow for exploration of what might unfold, i.e., an emergent design (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). Qualitative research necessitates such a design because meaning is contingent on context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). A distinction is made between studies in which “what is not known, is known” and “what is not known, is
unknown (Lincoln & Guba, 1985).” In the former, a blueprint can be developed to facilitate discovery. In the latter, descriptive of the current study, an open-ended approach to inquiry is in order (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Pilot work which illuminates data or perhaps even grounded theory may be used to guide the efforts of inquiries where “what is not known, is unknown.” Such is the strategy being used for the current study.

In pilot work conducted to select the initial set of pictures, African Americans were asked to identify pictures they thought might elicit different responses from majority culture individuals than would be elicited from African American individuals. African Americans were consulted to assist with the task of identifying the pictures for two reasons. The first reason is that African American individuals tend to be socialized to know both their own culture and the majority culture. The second reason is that they do know their culture and can identify pictures that would carry cultural meanings not readily available to individuals outside of their cultural group. In the process of identifying pictures, three themes seem to emerge:

1. Pictures that carry a different meaning depending on whether an individual is African American or is a member of the majority culture (e.g., picture of a dollar sign). A pilot showing of this picture indicated that African American students were more likely to express a negative response, e.g., greed, hurt, root of evil, whereas majority culture students were more likely to express a positive response, e.g., the good life, security, happiness.
(2) Pictures that carry a double meaning depending on whether an individual is African American or is a member of the majority culture (e.g., picture of the word “history”). A pilot showing of this picture indicated that African American students were more likely to see a double meaning in the word history, i.e., “his-story” rather than history” referring to “white man’s history” or a Eurocentric view of history, whereas majority culture students were more likely to view the word “history” in a more “traditional” sense e.g., American History, World History, history class.

(3) Pictures that result in African American and majority culture students attending to different elements of the same stimuli (e.g., picture of a caricature of an African American little girl wearing a yellow and green dress and sneakers who is smiling as her long curly hair is swaying while she dances). A pilot showing of this picture indicated that African American students were more likely to attend to the girl’s hair, whereas majority culture students were more likely to attend to either the smile or the dancing.

In the end, 43 pictures were identified as having potential to differentiate responses based on group membership, i.e., majority culture or African American culture. The 43 pictures were developed into slides and presented to African American and majority culture college students who were then asked to provide written responses to the following statements for each picture:

1. Describe your impressions of what you see.

2. Describe the emotions/feelings you associate with what you see.
Originally, the two statements were developed to distinguish between cognitive and affective responses. Analysis of the responses, however, demonstrated that both statements elicited similar responses, in terms of cognition and affect, such that the participants in the study viewed the statements as redundant. Another discovery illuminated during the analysis was that of point of view. Although the original intent of the two statements was to try to elicit the thoughts and feelings evoked in the participants when they viewed the pictures, other responses were provided as well. Some of the participants predicted responses of individuals' in the pictures and/or how other individuals might respond to the pictures. As a result of these illuminations, in the current study, redundancy of statements was eliminated, i.e., one statement replaced the two previous statements. In addition, statements will be asked in such a way as to encourage all participants to respond both for themselves and how they would predict others, i.e., individuals from their cultural group and the other cultural group, would respond to the pictures.

**Negotiated Outcomes**

Because naturalistic inquiry involves reconstruction of multiple constructions, the outcomes of the inquiry ought to be subject to review by the informants (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Indeed, negotiated outcomes are a result of a discovery and verification process, whereby the researcher runs the analysis by the informants for a reality check (Patton, 1990). Such an approach is essential in naturalistic inquiries in an effort to establish credibility, but is especially critical in studies such as the current one involved with cultural understandings. As part of the current study, participants received a copy of the
transcription of the focus group interview to review and provided feedback before the analysis began. Then again, after the analysis was completed, the participants received a copy of the findings to review and provided feedback on whether or not the analysis was accurate and useful (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). Without careful and deliberate implementation of this discovery and verification process, the current study would be subject to the very thing it is trying to identify, ethnocentrism.

Case Report

The data analysis is reported through use of “thick description,” detailed information to illuminate the complexities of the context embedded within the current study. The essence of the dynamics that unfolded in the focus group interviews, as well as, the dialogue that will occur, would be difficult, if not impossible to capture in a technical report; therefore, necessitating a case-reporting format. In addition, a case report provided the ambiance of tacit knowledge in a form that was recognizable to the participants of the current study when they provided their review and critique of the analysis. The latter was especially important since the crux to the current study is to tap into the tacit knowledge of two different cultural groups.

Idiographic Interpretation

Naturalistic inquiries involve interpretations of meanings held for a particular context at a particular moment of time (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). While the understandings attained through such studies are only applicable to the contexts from which they were derived (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), such a hook is important when one is considering such
elusive topics as cultural understanding. The importance of the indigenous cultural influence on the interpretation of the current study cannot be overstated.

Tentative Application

As a result of idiographic interpretation inherent in naturalistic inquiries, findings of such studies are not applicable to other contexts even if they are considered to be generalizable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Notwithstanding such limitations, the intent of the current study is to view the information gleaned from it as “now-to-be-investigated” information (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 209). The futuristic goal of the current study is to work with the information obtained to develop a quantifiable study by which the development of a culturally sensitive measure of empathy might be possible.

Definition of Terms Used in Data Analysis

Category

A grouping together of concepts having similar characteristics as defined by the researcher and confirmed by the participants of the current study (Strauss & Corbin, 1990).

External Heterogeneity

A criterion by which categories are judged. External heterogeneity is the extent to which categories are distinct from one another (Patton, 1990).

Indigenous Concepts

Key terms and phrases used by participants in the current study (Patton, 1990). Key terms and phrases will be determined by redundancy.
**Ingroup**

The cultural group in which an individual is a member. In the case of the current study, the majority cultural group is the ingroup for majority culture undergraduate students and the African American cultural group is the ingroup for African American undergraduate students.

**Internal Homogeneity**

A criterion by which categories are judged. Internal homogeneity is the extent to which categories fit together in a meaningful way (Patton, 1990).

**Outgroup**

The cultural group in which an individual is not a member. In the case of the current study, the majority cultural group is the outgroup for African American undergraduate students and the African American cultural group is the outgroup for majority culture undergraduate students.

**Theoretical Saturation**

The point at which repeated sampling results in redundancy and confirmation of previously collected data.

**Thick Description**

A detailed representation which captures the essence of the contexts of the current study in such a manner that allows a reader to readily understand the basis of the analysis (Patton, 1990).
Research Design and Methodology

Sampling and Access

Homogeneous sampling was used in the current study. Individuals belonging to two homogenous groups, i.e., majority culture and African American participated in focus group interviews. Specifically, participants in the present study were undergraduate college students from The Ohio State University at Marion and Central State University. The participation between the two schools in the current study is part of a larger Ohio State University project aimed at linking students from both institutions. The Ohio State Marion participants were majority culture undergraduate students who were currently enrolled and had been identified by faculty for participation. The Central State University participants were African American undergraduate students identified by a staff member in the Academic Affairs Office at Central State University.

Data Collection Methods

Data were collected through focus group interviews. A focus group interview was conducted with two homogeneous groups, i.e., majority culture undergraduate students and African American undergraduate students. Prior to the start of the focus group interviews, individuals were asked to complete a demographic information sheet (See Appendix A), which provided the following information: ethnicity, gender, year in college, socio-economic status, ethnicity of childhood neighborhood, and ethnicity of the schools attended. Participants were asked to select a pseudonym by which their demographic sheet and interview were identifiable to assist with follow-up and data analysis.
Focus group interviewing was explained to participants. Specifically, they were told that each person would have the opportunity to respond to each question. In addition, they were informed that the group interview was an interview and not a discussion. The purpose was not to problem solve, make decisions or reach a consensus. Rather the group interview format allowed them to hear how others responded to the same questions and allowed them to make additional comments to their own responses, but not respond to others (Patton, 1990). The interview questions were asked in a rotating, linear fashion, i.e., participants one through eight (1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8) were asked the first question, participants two through one (2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 1) were asked the second question etc. The linear, rotating mode for asking the interview questions provided everyone the opportunity to answer each question in each ordinal order with the intent to mitigate the likelihood of one person setting the tone for each interview question.

The original plan for data collection involved using the rotating linear approach in obtaining responses to the slides for both parts one (group response to the slide) and part two (group prediction of the other group's response). The approach to data collection changed slightly after the first focus group interview with the African American students was conducted. Because they provided rich, detailed responses to the 17 slides in part one, time did not permit the round-robin approach for soliciting responses to the 17 slides in part two. Instead, in part two the 17 slides were shown and participants were encouraged to make predictions as a group. The revised method, for the most part, resulted in shorter responses and fewer respondents.
In a typical focus group interview, in which participants are asked questions rather than shown pictures, the recommendation is to limit the number of questions to ten (Patton, 1990). A pilot study using 43 slides, in which written responses were solicited, led researchers to believe that 34 pictures (17 in part one and 17 in part two) presented in a focus group interview format would be an appropriate number. In hindsight, 20 slides (10 in part one and 10 in part two) is considered to be the maximum number of slides that would be recommended in a focus group interview format, in which the intent is to solicit responses from each participant for both parts.

Participants in each focus group interview were presented with the same 17 pictures. The African American participants were presented with the pictures and provided with the following instruction:

Respond to this picture the way African American individuals would respond to this picture.

The African American participants were presented with the pictures, again, and provided with the following instruction:

Respond to this picture the way that white individuals would respond to this picture.

The majority culture participants were presented with the same pictures as were presented to the African American participants and provided with the following instruction:

Respond to this picture the way that white individuals would respond to this picture.
The majority culture participants were presented with the pictures, again, and provided with the following instruction:

Respond to this picture the way African American individuals would respond to this picture.

African American undergraduate students were asked to respond as African Americans would respond to the pictures to ensure that they responded from their own frame reference rather providing majority culture responses. Although asking majority culture students to "respond to the picture" might have been implicitly asking them to respond to the picture the way that white individuals would respond, the latter was formally asked for consistency in instruction between the two groups. In addition, by asking participants in both groups to respond the way African American individuals or white individuals would, the intent to identify ingroup similarities and outgroup differences rather than individual responses might be more easily achieved. Both groups were asked to provide responses for their own group first, i.e., African Americans were asked to provide an African American response first and majority culture students were asked to provide a white response first.

The interviews were tape recorded and transcribed. The researcher met with each group, rather than sending the transcriptions to individuals, to present the transcriptions for review and to receive feedback. Again after the data was analyzed the researcher met with each group to present the findings for review and to receive feedback. The decision was made to receive feedback in a group format for several reasons. The first reason was to keep a consistent format i.e., data were collected in a group format and feedback was
collected in a group format. Another reason was to help ensure the accuracy of the transcriptions and the findings. Because data was collected in a group interview format, keeping track of what was said by whom was not as logistically easy as in individual interviews. Collective memory assisted with providing an “instant replay” of the interview both in terms of tracking who said what and of the tacit knowledge that was shared. A third reason for choosing to use a group format to solicit feedback was similar to one of the reasons for choosing to conduct focus group interviews: quality control through individuals providing a check and balance for each other, thus reducing the likelihood of obtaining false or extreme views (Patton, 1990).

Data Analysis

A constant comparative pattern analysis (Glaser & Strauss, 1967; Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990) was used to analyze the data for the current study. Data that are collected for naturalistic inquiries are the constructions offered by the participants and are reconstructed by researchers into a meaningful whole (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The research questions established for the current study served as a guide for reconstructing the meaningful whole (Patton, 1990). Without trying to force the data, i.e., attending to “fit” (Glaser & Strauss, 1967), the intent of the current study was to identify majority culture ethnocentrism by delineation of the differences between majority culture and African American culture as indicated by the two groups. Because theoretical saturation was not attained in the current study, no formal theory on majority culture ethnocentrism resulted. Hypotheses grounded in the data, however, were generated in the form of
formulating "objectively correct" answers to the pictures shown based on cultural patterns that emerged from the data.

As part of the reconstruction that facilitated the identification of majority culture ethnocentrism and the formulation of "culturally, objectively correct" answers, a major element in the analysis was to identify recurring indigenous concepts, i.e., terms and phrases used by participants (Patton, 1990). Because ethnocentrism was the research topic for the current study, indigenous renderings were especially critical. Some cultural understandings were explicit, whereas others were made explicit by the researcher's analysis of the data, resulting in sensitizing concepts or researcher-generated concepts. A delicate and blended balance of the two types of concepts was attempted in the current study. Once concepts were identified, they were sorted into categories.

At this juncture it may be helpful to make a distinction between content analysis and the constant comparative pattern analysis being used for the current study. Content analyses are conducted using an explicit set of decision rules developed a priori by which data collected are to be mapped (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). While constant comparative pattern analyses may be conducted with an intuitive sense for what the decision rules will be, they allow for the emergence of decision rules (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Attention to the research questions and emergent patterns found embedded within the context of the data guided the efforts of the current study. Any concept that was identified, even if only by one person, constituted a between-group difference for purposes of the current study, since the intention was to generate rather than to prove theory. Concepts were assigned to particular categories through an iterative process of pulling concepts from the data and
making comparisons with other concepts assigned to the categories. The soundness of
the categories were judged against two criteria: internal homogeneity, the extent to which
categories fit together in a meaningful way (Patton, 1990) and external heterogeneity, the
extent to which categories were distinct from one another (Patton, 1990). Although
category distinction was sought, relationships between categories were determined to
assist with new insight or the emergence of new patterns and the generation of
hypotheses.

Content analyses are concerned with theoretical relevance (Lincoln & Guba,
1985). The theoretical relevance sought by content analysis is in terms of pre-existing
theories, whereas constant comparative pattern analyses work toward the formulation of
grounded theory or the generation of hypotheses for follow-up (Glaser & Strauss, 1967;
Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The current study will generate hypotheses, grounded
theoretically in the data from the current study.

Another distinction between the two forms of analyses is that content analyses are
typically a quantitative form of analysis, whereas constant comparative pattern analyses
are qualitative in nature. Content analyses are often concerned with seeking exact
answers to questions (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Constant comparative pattern analyses, on
the other hand, are performed in instances such as the current study where the focus was
on identifying a question for which an answer might be approximated (Lincoln & Guba,
1985). The latter approach would seem to be especially appropriate in cultural studies. If
the former approach were taken for studies such as the current study, an exact answer
might be formulated, but the question may not be “culturally correct.” An example might
be showing and eliciting responses from African Americans and majority culture individuals to a picture of O.J. Simpson and seeking to address cultural implications of his perceived innocence or guilt. While a cultural answer may be discovered, in terms of the pronouncement of innocence or guilt, the innocence or guilt question may be a majority culture framed question, whereas an African American framed question might be redressing historical inequities regardless of verdict.

The demographic information collected from participants and provided in the next chapter was used to create a profile of individual participants as well as to illuminate any similarities and differences between the two groups being interviewed.

Trustworthiness

Whether an inquiry is quantitative or qualitative in nature, researchers are concerned with the issue of ensuring that their findings are worthy of notice. In general, four criteria (truth value, applicability, consistency, and neutrality) are held up as yardsticks for measurement of both kinds inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). In naturalistic inquiries, truth value is addressed through credibility; applicability is addressed through transferability; consistency is addressed through dependability; and neutrality is addressed through confirmability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The following is a summary of the four criteria for trustworthiness in naturalistic inquiries and a description of how the current study was judged against them.

Credibility

Credibility is the extent to which the findings of an inquiry are considered to be believable as a result of how the inquiry has been conducted and by receiving
participants' approval of the findings (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). There are several techniques that can be used to ensure the credibility of interpretation and findings. Prolonged engagement, persistent observation, triangulation, peer debriefing and member checking (Lincoln & Guba, 1985) were the techniques that will be used in the current study.

Prolonged engagement is incumbent on investing a sufficient amount of time to achieve such things as learning the culture, testing for misinformation, and building trust (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Prior to the current study, pilot work was conducted with majority culture and African American students in the same natural settings explored in the current study. In addition, the current study provided the researcher with three opportunities to interact with the participants: to collect data; to allow participants to review transcriptions; and to allow participants to review and comment on the findings. The pilot work provided the researcher with the opportunity to learn about the culture of the two groups. The learning of culture came in the form of learning about culture, in terms of ethnicity (majority culture or African American), and in terms of learning about the “culture” of the natural settings, specifically, Central State University and Ohio State Marion. The pilot work also allowed the researcher to test cultural misinformation through a discovery of emergent patterns. Much of what was learned was incorporated into the current study. The intent of the current study was to continue the learning process as well as to test cultural information through prolonged engagement with the participants. The researcher met with the participants three times. The amount of time slated for each visit was two hours, but was extended to accommodate prolonged
interactions between the participants and the researcher. The number and nature of the visits as well as the length of time of the visits hopefully facilitated trust building.

Persistent observation is another technique that lends to the credibility of naturalistic inquiry (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The focus and depth of the study was guided by persistent observation. In the pilot work, persistent observation illuminated a focus for the current study. The focus of the pilot study was to ascertain differences in responses by majority culture and African American students to the pictures that were shown. In observing the interactions, an interesting element of the interactions emerged. Majority culture students, in many cases, seemed to presume that they knew the African American frame of reference e.g., they predicted that there were no differences in responses to the pictures. Information collected from the African American participants indicated otherwise. Such insight gained from the pilot work has been incorporated into the current study in the form of research questions. Persistent observation continued to be used in the current study through observations of interactions in the focus group interviews and follow-up sessions with an eye toward affirming current and identifying additional salient influences.

Another technique that adds to the credibility of a naturalistic inquiry is triangulation (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). One form of triangulation is the use of multiple and different sources (Lincoln & Guba, 1985; Patton, 1990). A comparison was made of individual responses to the same set of pictures. In addition, another investigator was asked to read and code one of the focus group interviews and two researchers were asked to map the interview transcripts against the findings. Further, the
use of multiple literatures in intercultural relationships, ethnocentrism, African American socialization, and empathy provided different perspectives, which assisted with identifying patterns that emerged from the data.

A source for providing an external check of naturalistic inquiry is peer debriefing. Peer debriefing involves testing findings with disinterested parties or individuals not invested with the context under study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Such peers can help expose parts of the inquiry that might otherwise remain implicit in the researchers’ mind (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). They can also assist by playing devil’s advocate as well as provide ideas that may assist the researcher with the next steps (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Several colleagues served as outside readers for the current study.

A technique that is used to add credibility to naturalistic studies, which is probably the most critical for the current study, is member checking. Member checking involves the testing of findings with the individuals who served as sources for the data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The researcher met twice with each focus group, beyond the initial data collection, to provide participants with a chance to check the data. The first meeting involved participants in reviewing the transcript of their focus group interview. The second meeting involved participants in reviewing and providing feedback on the analysis. Because the current study was trying to tap into the tacit cultural knowledge of two different groups for the purpose of identifying majority culture ethnocentrism, an accurate representation of the contexts understudy was essential. Participants in the focus group interviews were key to ensuring the accuracy.
Transferability

Transferability refers to the applicability of one context to another (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Similarity of contexts largely determines the applicability (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The burden of determining whether or not one inquiry is applicable to another falls on the person interested in the transferability rather than the original researcher (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The former is the one who is in the position to assess the similarities between the context to be explored and the context that has been explored (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). The role of the original researcher is to provide sufficient detailed data to make such judgments possible (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Every effort was made to provide sufficient thick description throughout the current study to allow for such comparisons.

Dependability

Dependability refers to the stability of data (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Replicability in the sense of quantitative inquiries does not exist in the framework of naturalistic research. Because the naturalistic inquiries operate with the assumption of the constantly changing data, contexts, and designs, vis-à-vis emergent designs, results will invariably reflect differences for reasons other than careless research (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Detailed documentation of the different phases of the current study, including methodological changes, has been kept to explicate processes and influences that informed decisions.
Confirmability

Confirmability refers to the accuracy of the representation provided by the researcher of the contexts under study (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). An effort has been made to keep an audit trail. Detailed notes of pilot work and raw data have been kept. Audiotapes of the focus group interviews have been kept.

Ethics and Politics

The current study was presented, according to the University’s policies and procedures for research conducted with human subjects, to the Human Subjects Committee for consideration to be granted an exemption for review. In an effort to secure participants for the study, the study was explained to the participants and written consent (See Appendix B) was obtained from individuals prior to the focus group interviews. Because the participants were undergraduate students, participants were informed that their participation in the study was entirely voluntary and that they were free to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to them, without negative consequences, and without effecting their grades. Their consent also included granting permission for the audiotaping of the interview. The recording was transcribed and each participant was provided with the opportunity to review and provide feedback on the transcription prior to data analysis. Participants were also given an opportunity to review and provide feedback on the analysis.

Prior to beginning the focus group interviews, participants were asked to complete a demographic information sheet, which was identifiable only by participants’ self-
selected pseudonyms, which facilitated follow-up with participants and assisted with data analysis.

The transcriptions of the focus group interviews, the analysis, and the audiotape recordings have been kept in the Principle Investigator's authorized representative's files in a locked office.

Limitations

As with all naturalistic inquiries, a limitation of the current study was that the understandings attained are not applicable to other contexts even if the findings are considered to be generalizable (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Such findings, however, can be used to generate hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), which was the intent of the current study. The current study was also subject to limitations inherent with the focus group interviewing approach to inquiry. Because several individuals were interviewed at one time, the response time for each question was increased limiting the number of overall questions that could be addressed (Patton, 1990). Typically, focus group interviews are limited to ten major questions (Patton, 1990). Due to the nature of the current study, however, the participants were presented with 17 pictures and asked to respond to two questions for each. Another disadvantage to the focus group interview is that individuals might not have shared as freely as they might have in an individual interview. The advantage of quality control, i.e., individuals serving as a check and balance for each other to mitigate the offering of false or extreme views, which is gained through use of the focus group interview (Patton, 1990), was considered as an acceptable tradeoff for the latter concern. Yet another limitation was the difficulty of tracking what was said by
whom in a focus group interview (Patton, 1990). While videotaping the interviews would offset the latter concern, the possibility that a video camera might inhibit individuals even more than being interviewed in a group might already inhibit them was considered to be more of a liability than an asset. An audiotape, which offers more anonymity than videotape, was used to help ensure the accuracy of the transcriptions of the interviews. Because the current study was more concerned with group responses than individual, the disadvantage presented by the difficulty in tracking who said what was somewhat lessened. Perhaps the largest limitation to the current study was the researcher's cultural lens. Depending on the frame of reference, the researcher might be portrayed as an outsider looking in or an insider looking out. Efforts were made to provide sufficiently, thick descriptions and to involve the participants in the analysis to minimize compromising the integrity of the study as a result of the researcher's biases.
CHAPTER 4

FINDINGS

The findings of the current inquiry are presented in this chapter. Following a brief profile of the research participants, findings are organized under three major headings suggested by the research questions: 1) response differences between majority culture and African American students; 2) differences between majority culture students' predictions of African American students' responses to the slides and African American students' actual responses; and 3) differences between African American students' predictions of majority culture students' responses to the slides and majority culture students' actual responses. Within each of the major headings, findings are organized into affective and cognitive categories.

The affective categories that emerged from the data included individual/group affect reactions to a slide and affect identified within a slide. Individual/group affective responses were those where the individuals reacted for their group or themselves to the slide such as "Some black people would look at them like, excuse my French, but what the hell is this black man dating this white girl." An example of a response to that same slide categorized as affect identified within a slide is "It seems like she's upset about something just by her facial expression and maybe he's trying to console her or calm her down or reassure her or something of that sort."
The cognitive categories delineated were physical description provided for the slide (holistic or specific items targeted within a slide), meaning ascribed to a slide, and storytelling provided in response to a slide. Physical descriptions were of three types: ethnicity, holistic descriptions, and descriptions which targeted specific items. Ethnicity descriptions referred to descriptions of the ethnicity of the individual(s) in the slide: “I would say the world’s most famous basketball player despite the fact that he is African American” or descriptions of the individual(s) responding to the slide: “A big, historical document in the history of America, but as far as being a young, black person, it really don’t mean much to me.” “Gloria Steinem,” exemplified a holistic description whereas “I think she’s a hippie too, cause of the light tint on her glasses” was characterized as targeting specific items. Meanings that were ascribed to the slide included such responses as “Looks like an old picture of probably a slave or maid who’s resting.” Data were classified as storytelling if they had a narrative quality about them such as:

*The first thing I think about is violence when I see this picture because of the guns and everything. But then I see some rebels fighting for a cause, whatever the cause is. I also see they might be trying to escape yeah, trying to escape from someone and they just have protection trying to escape and they’re on a journey too, to a better place or a better time or whatever. They’re just trying to escape from whoever that is and whoever that is may be out to kill them so. They’re trying to protect themselves. But I also see a lot of pain, a lot of suffering cause of the expression on their face and the clothes that they’re wearing. And a lot of struggle. I see people ready for change. They’re prepared and ready to die for that change whatever that change whatever type of change they might want to happen. And I see people tired of living their lifestyle whatever it is because it’s not right. In their mind it’s not right. In the heart and mind, it’s not right.*

Extensive use of quotes as well as thick description allows the reader to determine the transferability of these findings to other contexts.
The Participants

The focus of the current study was to seek in-depth information from subgroups of larger, diverse populations, African American and majority culture undergraduate students. Homogeneous sampling is an appropriate form of purposeful sampling for such evaluative purposes (Patton, 1990). In an attempt to conduct focus group interviews with two homogeneous groups, participants in the current study were African American undergraduate students attending a predominantly African American University and white, non-Hispanic undergraduate students attending a predominantly white, non-Hispanic University. Each focus group consisted of eight participants of which four were male and four female.

Students from both institutions were asked to provide information on their ethnicity, gender, age, year in school, the ethnicity make-up of their childhood neighborhood and schools attended and their socio-economic status. Table I provides demographic information for the students in each focus group. With the exception of one of the African American females, who grew up in a predominantly Caucasian neighborhood, all of the African American students were raised in predominantly African American neighborhoods. All of the African American males attended predominantly African American schools as did one of the African American females. All of the Caucasian (majority culture students) grew up in neighborhoods and attended schools that were predominantly Caucasian. Due to inconsistent and incomplete information provided in regard to the socio-economic status, the socio-economic status for participants has been omitted from the current study.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Year in School</th>
<th>Ethnic Make-up of Childhood Neighborhood</th>
<th>Ethnic Make-up of Schools Attended</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cleve</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moe</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Same % of African American &amp; Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carin</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>Senior</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slick</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christina</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthew</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lady J</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Junior</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
<td>Mostly African American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Josh</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Keith</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aaron</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kramer</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kelly</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shanon</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorenne</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>Sophomore</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ben</td>
<td>Caucasian</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>Freshman</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
<td>Mostly Caucasian</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Demographics of Participants: Name, Ethnicity, Gender, Age, Year in School, Ethnic Make-up of Childhood Neighborhood, and Ethnic Make-up of Schools Attended
Response Differences between Majority Culture and African American Students

In an attempt to identify majority culture ethnocentrism, 17 slides (see Appendix C) were selected from a pilot study, which suggested the slides would elicit cultural differences. The slides were presented to individuals in a focus group interview format. One focus group was comprised of majority culture individuals, while the other was comprised of African American individuals. The slides were shown to the two focus groups in order to determine whether or not responses of the two groups were distinct in affective and cognitive responses to the slides as a function of group membership.

The first three research questions specifically address whether there were between-group response differences; which slides, if any, elicited different responses; and the nature of any identified between-group differences. Indeed, differences were readily identified in 14 of the 17 slides. Responses provided by participants for each of these 14 slides will be presented to illustrate the observed differences. Of the three remaining slides, slides 5, 13, and 14, responses were so scattered that no between-group differences could be discerned. Of the slides generating differential responses, all 14 elicited cognitive responses among both majority culture and African American students, eleven of the 14 elicited affective responses from African American students, and seven slides elicited affective responses among the majority group. Of the seven slides that elicited affective responses from both groups, between-group differences in the affect ascribed to the slide occurred in five. A further difference distinguishing the two groups was the African American students’ greater tendency to address ethnicity in response to the slides than the majority culture students. African American students addressed ethnicity in
thirteen of the fourteen slides compared to six slides for the majority culture students. In addition, of the six slides, in which both groups attributed ethnicity, three slides resulted in between-group differences in the ethnicity described. Also, African American students emphasized and were more specific in their references to ethnicity. Both groups ascribed meanings to all of the slides, however, the African American students also offered numerous stories. Slides are discussed in the order they were shown in the focus group interviews. Observed differences are summarized and exemplar quotes are provided. Tables 2, 3, and 4 provide summaries of the 14 slides that elicited differential response patterns between African American and majority culture students.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide</th>
<th>African American Students</th>
<th>Majority Culture Students</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reaction to Slide</td>
<td>Identify in Slide</td>
<td>Reaction to Slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 1</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 7</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 8</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 9</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 10</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 11</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 12</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 15</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 16</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 17</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Different affect was elicited as a function of group membership. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

Table 2: Summary of the between-group differences in affect (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>slide</th>
<th>ethnicity</th>
<th>holistic description</th>
<th>attention to detail</th>
<th>meaning ascribed to slide</th>
<th>storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>**yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>**yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>**yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
<td>yes</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although both groups ascribed meaning to each of the 14 slides, between-group differences in meaning were elicited for all 14 slides. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

*Ethnicity ascribed to slide differed as a function of group membership. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

**Detail attended to in slide differed as a function of group membership. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

Table 3: Summary of the African American students' cognitive responses (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified).
### MAJORITY CULTURE STUDENTS

#### COGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>†Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic Description</td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 1</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>**Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 2</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 3</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 5</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 6</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 7</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 8</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 9</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 10</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 11</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 12</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 13</td>
<td>*Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide 14</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

†Although both groups ascribed meaning to each of the 14 slides, between-group differences in meaning were elicited for all 14 slides. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

*Ethnicity ascribed to slide differed as a function of group membership. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

**Detail attended to in slide differed as a function of group membership. Refer to slide narratives for specific differences.

Table 4: Summary of the majority culture students' cognitive responses (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified).
**Analysis of Slide One**

Happiness and pride were the two affective responses that the African American students attributed to the first slide.

*Cleve:* Two happy black couple who look like they just got married or something.

*Lady J:* I can see a happy couple who are taking pride in their heritage, not necessarily African or Caribbean or whatever else. I just see them taking pride in their African heritage.

Majority culture students did not attribute affect to the slide, but rather interpreted the slide as reflecting royalty or a couple about to be married.

*Keith:* Maybe some kind of African Royalty. Or couple, couple king, queen, prince, princess, something like that.

*Kelly:* I think it looks like an emperor or empress of some sort.

*Shanon:* I think it's either maybe looks like royalty or maybe like they're going to get married.

In the African American group, Eric expanded on the royalty theme by providing the following story: "He's a prince and a princess. And he's just asked her to be his bride or whatever, like they're about to take up the throne. Like they're the next generation of kings and queens or tribe or something." In addition to references to royalty and marriage, the theme of unity also emerged within the African American focus group.

*Matthew:* In that what they have on, it looks like it's describing their unity that they are one in that they are dressed alike as far as their different attires. That they, signals that they are together as a couple.

*Moe:* They just look like they are symbolic of, what's that word? They're coming as one.
Both the majority culture and African American students addressed specific aspects of the picture. The majority culture students focused on clothing in general.

Kramer: *It looks like two people dressed up in some type of ceremonial clothing, outfit.*

Shanon: *Maybe they’re wearing like traditional wedding clothing.*

Lorenne: *Two African people who are dressed up in like, like costumes for some special like ceremony to attend.*

The African American students, on the other hand, honed in on specific items to assist them with their construction of meaning. Ethnicity and the affect of pride was identified through such means.

Lady J: *I can see a happy couple who are taking pride in their heritage, not necessarily African or Caribbean or whatever else. I just see them taking pride in their African heritage...* It looks like they’re just basically taking pride in their heritage, not only with the clothes and with his dreadlocks. He doesn’t even have what I would consider African features or whatever other than his dreadlocks. Her long hair and hat definitely signifies a strong, a strong belief in African heritage.

Carin: *Looking more, looking at it in more detail, it doesn’t seem like they are from Africa or anything like that. I think that they would probably be an American couple that are displaying their pride in African heritage and I say that again because of his hair. And I say that they are not from Africa because of the shoe. I don’t think, I don’t think that that is something that you would typically see in Africa, not that it is unheard of but it just doesn’t seem like the norm in Africa.*

Moe: *I would like to add the same thing. When I was looking at his shoe the first time, when I went the first time, I forget what I said. But I, they don’t look like they are from Africa or anything like that.*

In summary, the African American students, but not the majority culture students identified affect in the slide. The African American students also were more attuned to the details in the picture such as hair, hat, bottom of dress, and shoe. Clothing was the
most specific detail provided by the majority culture students. A story was provided by one of the African American students, whereas the majority culture students did not use storytelling. Another difference that distinguished the two groups was the difference in the amount of emphasis given to ethnicity. The African American students spent quite amount of time attempting to distinguish the ethnicity of the couple. In the beginning, nearly all of the African American students described the couple as African. After looking at the slide more carefully, they decided that the couple was African American rather than African or even Caribbean. The majority culture students only alluded to the couple as being African. The themes of royalty, marriage, unity and pride in heritage emerged in the African American group, whereas only the themes of royalty and marriage were elicited in the majority culture group. Tables 5 and 6 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide one. The dashes in the tables indicate that the responses provided by the majority culture group were similar to other responses provided by the African American, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>*AFFECT</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>pride, happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the tables indicate that the responses provided by the majority culture group were similar to other responses provided by the African American, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 5: Slide one between-group differences in affect.
Table 6: Slide one between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Two

Neither group attributed any affect to this slide. One observed difference in response to the second slide, however, was that five of the African American students referred to Michael Jordan by name, whereas none of the majority culture students did. Another difference is that ethnicity was not mentioned by the majority culture students, whereas it was by the African American students.

Carin: *I would say the world's most famous basketball player despite the fact that he is African American.*

Eric: *I see a role model by a person who raises a lot of humanity in the world for us different races, different cultures, different, everybody, everybody, a lot of cultures and a lot of races enjoy watching basketball and they enjoy watching good basketball and that's what he provided.*
Along the same lines as ethnicity, the African American students mentioned Michael Jordan’s picture being on the cover of Jet magazine, whereas none of the majority culture students made the reference.

*Christina:* I see Michael Jordan on the cover of a black magazine.

*Carin:* He’s on the cover of a magazine that is owned and operated by African Americans. It’s the number one African American publishing company in the country.

Both groups mentioned that they considered him to be a great athlete and role model.

Majority Culture Students:
*Keith:* Obviously, I think the best sports athlete in history in any category or anything ever.

*Kramer:* A basketball player great who was also a role model for kids. Who did a lot for kids.

*Shanon:* A great athlete and a great role model for everybody, not just kids.

*Lorenne:* A great athlete and a great role model.

African American Students:
*Eric:* I see a role model... everybody, a lot of cultures and a lot of races enjoy watching basketball and they enjoy watching good basketball and that’s what he provided.

*Matthew:* I see Michael Jordan as the best basketball player...he is an, a perfect, perfect example for any young person...

Lady J, however, stated:

*I don’t see him as being a role model because I don’t think that’s his job to be a role model, but I do see him as being good at what he does and not only is that in basketball, that is in a good entrepreneur. That’s basically it, a family man and things like that.*
In addition, the African American students extolled him as being a genuine, successful, and strong person who stood up for his beliefs.

**Slick:** I think that Michael Jordan was genuine at what he did and what he said... He can play basketball. He grew bigger than that because he was really genuine, what he said, what he did and it’s not like he knew he was going to be scrutinized so he didn’t do things that would that would be bad or good, because he’s naturally he’s the type of person he projected to the camera is what I am basically trying to say.

**Cleve:** You know as a normal person, normal black man I don’t see anyone, any race, any male or female who really took time out to find out who he really was. If you actually look up to him in his face, he’s a real man too.

**Eric:** And a lot of people see a strong black man standing up for what he believes like he never gives up spirit cause can’t nobody beat, he wouldn’t let nobody, he didn’t want to lose at all he wouldn’t allow himself to lose. So I see confidence. He was an inspiration to a lot of people.

Majority culture students did not ascribe such meanings. Finally, more details about Michael Jordan’s life were provided by the African American students such as the stories shared by Matthew and Cleve:

**Matthew:** I see Michael Jordan as the best basketball player that I know because I’m not really an athletic person or that type, but someone that is, that is well-rounded in his area. And he knows what he does, and I say this to that even in his high school years that he did not make the basketball team. He did not give up. So he had to set some goals that he had to achieve. So he is an, a perfect, perfect example for any young person that has something they really want to do but they might not meet the requirements at that time because he didn’t, but look what he is now. He can go back and buy the team, you know, basically do what he wants to do. He set goals and he reached.

**Cleve:** I see an icon, a legacy. Someone who took adversity and come over it as far as, you know, his father being killed and allegations of gambling and things that went on the past years. He didn’t lose his drive. He didn’t give up at any point.

Several between-group differences were distinguished in response to this slide including: the African American students’ provision of stories; reference to *Jet* magazine,
identification of Michael Jordan by name; the number of roles ascribed to Michael Jordan, the amount of detail provided about Michael Jordan's life and reference to ethnicity. Neither group ascribed affect to this slide. Table 7 provides a summary of the between-group differences that were identified in slide two. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>**Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>Jet magazine</td>
<td>businessman, family man, genuine person, not a role model, Michael Jordan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.

Table 7: Slide two between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Three

While a difference between the two groups was found on this slide, the difference was not pronounced in terms of the racial implications of the word Oreo. Only one student, Lady J, made any reference at all to such an interpretation of the slide:
Well, I just see a bag of Oreos. Basically they look really, really delicious right now at the time, however, stereotypically I can see how if you take anything can be a stereotype anything can be could have some undertone to it, however, if you look at this package of cookies and decide to figure out or try to make something out of it you could see the word as Oreo. And if I call someone an Oreo that would be basically be calling them like mulatto, interracial or something like that anything other than pure in, in their color. So and as far as people looking at them like that I can see that in the black and white cookie, the black on the outside and the white being in the middle you could look at that as a lot of things. You can analyze it, however, I just see a bag of cookies.

For the most part, both groups either described the slide as a package of Oreo cookies or made some kind of food reference. No affect was attributed to the slide by either group.

Majority Culture Students:
Kramer: Got milk?


African American Students:
Cleve: I see a bag of Oreos I want to crack open right now. Go over to the cafeteria and grab me a glass of milk.

Slick: I see Oreos. The first thing that I thought about is having some milk, dunking 'em in it. And the first thing that I thought about is that taste you get as soon as you bite down on the cookie and you sip back the milk. It tastes good to all people.

An unexpected difference was the attention given to a sweepstake advertisement on the package of the Oreo cookies by the African American students. Several of them mentioned the sweepstake and in particular the money that was involved.

Christina: One of the first things I see is win $20,000. I'm not worried about the cookies.

Eric: I see money cause they have a little sweepstakes going on at this time.

Moe: I see money from the sweepstake.
Only one majority culture made reference to the sweepstake.

*Kramer: Who won the contest?*

The main differences identified in this slide were the differences between the two groups in the attention given to the sweepstake advertisement on the package of cookies and the reference, by one group, to a racial association with the word Oreo. Neither group provided stories nor ascribed affect to this slide. Table 8 provides a summary of the between-group differences that were identified in slide three. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>black, white, mulatto, interracial</td>
<td>sweepstake, money</td>
<td>racial implication of word Oreo</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 8: Slide three between-group differences in cognition.
Analysis of Slide Four

This slide elicited affective responses from the African American students, but not the majority culture students. In the one case, the affect that was elicited was identified as an affective individual/group response to the slide.

Lady J: Well, how a black person would respond? There's two, there's two answers to that depending on how you feel about interracial relationships will definitely have an effect on how you will respond. Some black people would look at them like, excuse my French, but what the hell is this black man dating this white girl. Or and the white girl's taking all our men. Okay, I've heard that. Or some people would just look at like that's a nice couple.

Moe: I see an old picture and when I seen it I just said why is the white girl with the black dude.

In the other case, the identified affect was offered as a description of the affect of the individuals portrayed in the slide.

Carin: It seems like she's upset about something just by her facial expression and maybe he's trying to console her or calm her down or reassure her or something of that sort.

For the most part, the majority culture students provided a simple description of the slide.

Shanon: A young couple.

Ben: A black male and a white female who may be in love.

Keith: A young couple.

Aaron: Reminds me of a, like two friends or that were a couple in high school

African American students, on the other hand, spoke in more detail—including anecdotal description provided by Eric—and made references to such things as security of the couple and the difficulties and risk of interracial relationships.
Eric: I see two people in love. Not caring about what other people think cause their love is blind. They're not seeing each other's color. They're seeing each other's heart. Each other's mind. Each other's soul. They know what they want and they're never going to let anyone deprive them of reaching their goals, try to stop them from reaching their goals. And I see unity because there is a lot of pride because that's something very hard to do as far as interracial relationships and the world around them, in fact it's something very hard to sustain.

Christina: I see two people who want to be together no matter what other people think about their relationship.

Matthew: I see a couple that possibly could be in a relationship with each other. Secure that they both like each other. I don't know if they like each other or not. They have feelings for each other. They're not ashamed of their togetherness.

Cleve: I see a relationship and involvement with one another. It looks like they're already secure with being together.

Carin: I see two people who have made a decision to be together. Not really caring too much about the other person's ethnicity. And it does seem like, seem like they are a couple because they are standing kind of close to each other. They are in each other's personal space so you know there's some type of relationship going on. And because the picture is older, possibly from the 80's, I think they've taken a risk because honestly interracial dating in most areas could be considered dangerous just because of some of the things that could happen as a result of it.

In brief, the African American students spoke more conceptually about this slide than did the majority culture students. They also ascribed affect to the slide and provided stories, whereas the majority culture students did not do so. Both groups referred to ethnicity. Tables 9 and 10 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide four. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by the one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
### Table 9: Slide four between-group differences in affect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>upset, comfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by the one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

### Table 10: Slide four between-group differences in cognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th><strong>Storytelling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Attention to Detail</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td>risks, difficulties</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>associated with</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>inter racial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>relationships, security</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by the one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.

Table 10: Slide four between-group differences in cognition.
Analysis of Slide Six

Affective responses were elicited from both groups, but the type of affect was different. The affect identified by the majority culture students was sadness and depression, whereas anger was identified in the African American group.

Majority Culture Students:
Shanon: Looks like people in a war. They're getting ready to go fight. Looks sad.

Lorenne: Looks like they're going into battle. It looks very sad, very depressing.

African American Student:
Cleve: I see a group of Japanese or Koreans that are ready get out of how they live or going to do whatever. Obviously they got a purpose. The all look upset about something. You guys look mean. They look mad about something.

A second difference is that majority culture students tended to describe the group as a whole, in terms of what the group was and what they were doing, whereas the African American students focused on details, such as being much more detailed about the ethnicity of the group, the weapons, clothes, facial expressions, etc.

Majority Culture Students:
Ben: Mere soldiers of some sort.

Josh: Group of poor people, maybe going for target practice or rebellion maybe or ready for war.

Keith: Guerilla soldiers, that maybe trying to defend their, their own area against the high powers of their land.

Aaron: Maybe they're immigrants coming to the United States on a boat.

African American Students:
Matthew: They look Korea or Korea or something in that area Japanese or something.
Lady J: They look Japanese or Korean or something like that. They look like they’re rebelling against something. They all have on bandanas. They’re definitely not an organized group like we would consider a military or something like that. They might be a militia or something like people use to call them back in the days peasant, peasant reform or something like that. But they’re definitely aren’t organized or whatever like an organized group, however, they may have a leader. But everybody got on their regular kicking it clothes, so I guess you would call it not your everyday clothes, your go around getting into a fight, let’s, let’s go shoot ‘em up bang-bang kind of clothes.

Cleve: I see a group of Japanese or Koreans.

Moe: I see some Korean looking dudes.

Carin: They look like maybe they could be Pacific Islanders or they look like they could be Asian, but because of their darker skin tones, I think they might be Pacific Islanders.

Eric: But I also see a lot of pain, a lot of suffering cause of the expression on their face and the clothes that they’re wearing.

Slick: These guys here, in my opinion, these are African rebels and they’re fighting for a cause. No telling what the cause is. I don’t know if they’re good it’s a good cause. I don’t know if it’s a bad cause, but I know they’re ready to fight. And it just symbolizes the struggle. These people are willing to fight for whatever it is they believe in. A violent fight. That’s a machine gun. That’ll just tear you up. You might not live.

Another theme specific to the African American group was that of protection.

Eric wove an intricate story of escape and protection and other individuals also spoke in terms of protection.

Eric: The first thing I think about is violence when I see this picture because of the guns and everything. But then I see some rebels fighting for a cause, whatever the cause is. I also see they might be trying to try to escape yeah, trying to escape from someone and they just have protection trying to escape and they’re on a journey to, to a better place or a better time or whatever. They’re just trying to escape from whoever that is and whoever that is may be out to kill them so. They’re trying to protect themselves.
Christina: I see a group of young men on some type of like water vessel ship and I don't think they're going to a war cause they have a little boy on the ship. So I think they might be just carrying the guns for protection or if somebody were to come to them they would be protecting themselves and those people who are on the ship with them.

Carin: Just based on the way that they look, their clothes, they have weapons, but no uniforms. So it seems like they are from a country that has no infrastructure, by that I mean government that offers them no protection because it seems like they have to protect themselves.

In summary, the between-group differences were pronounced both in affect ascribed and in cognitive interpretation. The majority culture group identified sadness and depression, whereas anger was identified by the African American group. The African American group suggested that the individuals might be African, Korean, Japanese, and Pacific Islanders, while the majority culture group only suggested Cuban. In addition, the African American group provided a descriptive story as well as focused on the details within the picture to assist with their interpretations. They interpreted the guns as a means of protection. The majority culture students, on the other hand, did not provide stories. They tended to interpret the picture more holistically and emphasized battle, war, and fighting rather than protection. Tables 11 and 12 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide six. The dashes in the table indicate that the responses provided by the majority culture group were similar to additional responses provided by the African American group, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
Table 11: Slide six between-group differences in affect.

Table 12: Slide six between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Seven

Affect was elicited from both groups in response to this slide. In the case of the majority culture group, a sense of pride was mentioned, whereas a sense of detachment...
and meaningless in terms of the document’s applicability to African Americans was expressed in the African American group.

Majority Culture Student:

_Aaron_: I know the first thing I thought of was pride.

African American Student:

_Slick_: A big, historical document in the history of America, but as far as being a young, black person, it really don’t mean much to me. It declares freedom from England for those people who wrote it, but that’s all it is. It doesn’t have any other meaning to me.

The only reference to ethnicity by either group was Slick’s description of himself as a young, black person. Another contrast was the meaning ascribed to the Declaration of Independence. The African American group had a much more negative view associating slavery and lies with the document, whereas the majority culture group saw the document as important and as a means of providing opportunity.

African American Students:

_Carin_: I see the Declaration of Independence. I see slavery. I see freedom from slavery. I see Presidents that owned slaves. That’s what comes to mind.

_Eric_: I see a lie cause this was written to that all men be equal, but there were still slaves. The executive positions the people that held executive positions like an office like the President, Vice-President and everybody they still hold slaves. So this thing was irrelevant til all that was changed and that took awhile so I see a one big lie until everything they talked about in there was actually put into work like put into play around the world.

Majority Culture Students:

_Keith_: An important document, an old document that’s really important to the U.S..

_Aaron_: Seems important, important back then to the United States.
Shanon: A document that gave opportunity to the United States. It's really old. It's really important.

In summary, affect was elicited by both groups; however, the affect that was elicited was different depending on group membership. Pride was elicited in the majority culture group, whereas detachment or negative feelings of meaningless were attributed to the slide by the African American group. The majority group attributed importance, freedom, and opportunity to the Declaration of Independence, whereas the African American students were more likely to speak to the irrelevance of the document for African Americans due to its inconsistency with slavery and inequality. Neither group mentioned ethnicity nor provided stories for this slide. Tables 13 and 14 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide seven. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Slide Identified in Slide</th>
<th>*AFFECT</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>detachment, meaningless</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>pride</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 13: Slide seven between-group differences in affect.
The table indicates that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

### Table 14: Slide seven between-group differences in cognition.

#### Analysis of Slide Eight

An interesting difference in the response to the slide was that none of the majority culture students made any reference to ethnicity in their descriptions or constructions of meaning, whereas as the African American students did.

**Majority Culture Students:**

*Keith*: Good football player and a he'll probably obviously always be known for supposedly killing his wife and the other guy.

*Kramer*: A once great football hero that won't be anymore. He will never be thought of as a great football hero again probably because of the legal trouble he had.
African American Students:
Carin: I see somebody who for along time was accepted by the world at large no matter what your race or culture or ethnicity or whatever until he was accused of being guilty of murdering his estranged wife, Nicole Brown Simpson, and after that a lot of the support he had I think that's what the racial line divided, white people were against him, most black people were for him except those who were bitter because he dated a white woman.

Lady J: Well, I could see a how a black person would respond. A black man that was faced with a lot of adversity and how he had to prove himself innocent.

Both groups expressed that the court case had received too much media attention, however, the majority culture students were more negative about the lengthiness of the trial.

Majority Culture Students:
Ben: The longest year of my life. That's about it.

Aaron: I think the worst organized cases in U.S. history. Unorganized cases in U.S. history. A total waste of their time

Kelly: A person that I really got sick of hearing about on the t.v.

Lorenne: His court case was covered way too much on the news.

African American Student:
Slick: I see O.J. Simpson. Personally I think too much attention was paid to the, to the trial some of the things that should attract media attention than this man being on trial...

Several of the majority culture students suggested that he had gotten off with an innocent verdict because of money and power and that the case should be retried, whereas the African American students expressed that he had been through enough and/or did not care whether or not he was innocent or guilty.

Majority Culture Students:
Aaron: I think it should be retried, the case, I think the case should be retried or something.
Keith: There's definitely a lot of different people that say he probably was guilty and only he got off because of his power, popularity, and money to defend himself.

Shanon: A person who was a great athlete, which probably got an innocent verdict in his trial because his powerful image.

Lorenne: And I think that his case should be retried because I think he is so rich that it was very easy for him to get off with the murder of his wife.

Josh: I think that he ought to have another trial because I heard about it for a long period of time on t.v., but I don't think that I have an opinion about the trial because I wasn't at the trial.

African American Students:

Cleve: I see O.J. Simpson, a former great athlete, a man who has been through enough. We don't need to keep talking about him. Leave him alone.

Lady J: Maybe he killed her, maybe he didn't. I don't know and you don't know. We weren't there.

Eric: I see a lot of stress. I see struggle too, cause he had to be really strong and maintain his sane mindframe cause that's a lot of stress that's a lot of strain that's a lot of wear and tear on your body. I see a survivor. A strong person, a really strong person. No matter whether he did it or not, but if he did do it, then he's even stronger because he got to haul that to his grave for the rest of his life and that's going to kill him anyway. So I just see a lot of stress, but I see a lot of strength too.

In addition, Slick provided the following story:

Slick: Also, this is good, okay this is my humble opinion, I don't want to force this on anybody else, but black people, black males when they grow into society to think that they are equal, in the American society we live in a black man is not equal to a, a white man. And when they grow to believe that they are, then they get slapped and that's what happened to O.J.. He just got above, above it too much. He got you know. I believe that that's quote unquote a white person's society, if you too big, then you get chastised or shamed, but you're still black, you still a black man and you can't be guilty and can't get away with it just you got money. I don't really care if he did it. That's how I feel about O.J..
In addition to the implied affect of stress, hopelessness, and apathy about the result of the trial on the part of the African American students and negative feelings toward the trial and result of the trial on the part of the majority culture students, both groups targeted O.J. Simpson's smile in the slide associated happiness with it.

Majority Culture Student:
Josh: O.J. A picture of him in court. Smiling with a pen in his mouth, that makes everyone else smile.

African American Students:
Carin: I see O.J. Simpson, possibly at his trial, although you wouldn't be able to tell from the picture because he's smiling. You wouldn't think he was on trial for a double murder.

Christina: I see O.J. Simpson cause he's smiling, maybe that's when they gave him the verdict that he was free or whatever.

In brief, affect was elicited by both groups, but the affect elicited tended to differ based on group membership. The conclusions drawn about the slide also tended to differ based on group membership. In addition, African American students made reference to ethnicity and provided a story, whereas the majority culture students did not do so. Tables 15 and 16 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide eight. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
Table 15: Slide eight between-group differences in affect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>stress, hopelessness, apathy toward result of trial</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>negative feelings toward trial and result of trial</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 16: Slide eight between-group differences in cognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>**Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>Holistic Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>O.J.'s been through enough, do not care whether innocent or guilty</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>Holistic Description</td>
<td></td>
<td>received innocent verdict because of money and power, should be retried</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.
Analysis of Slide Nine

Pride was an affective response elicited by the African American group, whereas enjoyment, in terms of relaxing from work, was the affect identified by the majority culture group.

African American Student:
Eric: She had a lot of pride, a lot of strength.

Majority Culture Student:
Kelly: I think it's it might be of a slave, maybe enjoying her time off for break.

Both groups also referred to the home structure in the background of the slide, but the majority culture group addressed it in a more negative way, including describing it as a shack or shed, while the African American group spoke about it as a house and spoke about it as being her home.

Majority Culture Students:
Josh: An older lady sitting on a, sitting on a stairs to a run down shack

Keith: An old, old black lady sitting on the steps of looks like something that maybe all run down.

Kelly: Maybe sitting on the stairs of the shed that her so-called owners let her sleep in at night.

African American Students:
Moe: That she's family-grounded. That she is taking care of her home.

Carin: Can't really tell how old the picture is because there’s not much to go to go by, but just looking at the house.

Members of both groups also identified the slide as portraying an elderly, poor, black woman who looked tired and had probably worked hard her whole life, the majority culture group characterized her has a slave or maid while the African American group tended to make explicit references to the South and to characterize her as being strong.
Majority Culture Students:

*Keith:* Possibly, possibly a slave or a maid or something like that.

*Kelly:* I think it's it might be of a slave, maybe enjoying her time off for break.

*Shanon:* Looks like an old picture of probably a slave or a maid who's resting.

African American Students:

*Moe:* I would say that this is an old picture around the 30's & 40's and this woman is an African woman that looks like she's a very strong, individual person.

*Slick:* This picture reminds me of the South. For some reason it reminds me of an old, southern picture. She likes she's worked hard. She likes like the type of lady that really doesn't mind what she did. A strong lady. She did what she had to do.

*Matthew:* She does look like she is in the South.

*Lady J:* I see a grandma from Mississippi. Just after cooking some greens, corn bread, and everything else.

Eric expanded upon the strength theme through a story.

*Eric:* I see my grandmother. A perfect description of her. All types of struggle. Had to maintain kids, house, money, everything. Looks like she's a well-rounded person cause of the lifestyle she had to be. She had no other choice but to that or die or not continue on living or whatever. She had a lot of pride, a lot of strength.

In summary, both groups ascribed affect to the slide, but the affect ascribed differed based on group membership. Interpretation of the slide also differed based on group membership. A story was provided by the African American group, but not the majority culture group. Both groups made reference to ethnicity. Tables 17 and 18 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide nine. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
AFFECT

Reaction to Slide | Identified in Slide
---|---
African American Students | pride

Majority Culture Students | enjoying break from work

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 17: Slide nine between-group differences in affect.

COGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Holistic Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>**Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>home, strong woman, the South</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>........................</td>
<td>slave, maid, shack</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.

Table 18: Slide nine between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Ten

Both groups identified greed as an affect associated with the symbol and the African American group also identified happiness.
Majority Culture Student:
Kelly: Greed. A lot of people get greedy when they've got a lot of money.

African American Students:
Carin: I see money. Happier times.

Eric: I see a lot of things people will do for money that they would not do on a regular basis and nothing else. Greed.

While one of the African American students identified a positive affect with the dollar sign, none of the majority culture students did. The African American students, however, tended to be more negative about the symbol whereas the majority culture group tended to provide more neutral responses and related money to work.

African American Students:
Eric: Sin, lies, envy, murder, blood, sweat, tears, more problems. I see a lot of dishonesty. A lot of confusion, not knowing who to trust. I see the root of all evil. I see a lot of things people will do for money that they would not do on a regular basis and nothing else.

Slick: Money is the root of all evil. People tend to do things that they normally wouldn't do. If you've got a lot of money, the stereotype, if you've got a lot of money, you got a better life—that's wrong. More money, more problems.

Matthew: I see money and that's all it is is money. It's not an end to it. Money is not the root of evil. The love of money is the root of all evil, thought you all should know that the love of it because if you love money and somebody trying to, you can't get enough, hey so.

Majority Culture Students:
Shanon: I think of when I see the money symbol I think of what a lot of people work to get a lot of.

Lorenne: Money symbol. How people tend to try to get as much money as they can instead of doing like volunteer work.

Ben: Plain and simple money. Everybody would like to have it and everybody would have like to have ample amounts of it as well and it's a very useful item.
In short, between-group differences were identified both in the affect ascribed to the slide and the associations made with the slide. Neither group provided stories nor made reference to ethnicity. Tables 19 and 20 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide ten. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>*AFFECT</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Students</td>
<td>happiness</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 19: Slide ten between-group differences in affect.
Table 20: Slide ten between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Eleven

Both groups associated the military, military recruitment, war, protection, the draft, and taxes with the Uncle Sam slide. Whereas both groups made references to friends and relatives being in the military, the slide also elicited negative affect in African American students. No affect was elicited in majority culture students.

Majority Culture Students:

*Kelly: I think of my friend, Jamie, over in Kosovo who's over there trying to help keep the peace.*

*Keith: It reminds me of my brother who's in the marines, he's not in the army, but still in the armed forces or something.*

African American Students:

*Moe: I see somewhere that the black man should not be ever...I see a place a where the black man or woman should not be. I have a lot of family that have been into the military. I'm not saying that it is not helpful. I just do not think that the black person be in the military... I see a an ugly white man pointing that I don't like. And I know that's stereotypical, you know what I mean. I don't know exactly what it is, but that's what I see and I don't like it. I don't like it.*
Cleve: I see something I don't want.

Slick: I see Uncle Sam. I thank all the peoples that's in the military that's keeping America free, but I'm not going unless I'm an officer. Never will I be enlisted. If they commission me an officer, I'll go there. If they never do, I'll go to jail before I go to fight anybody because I don't know them.

Matthew: I see that that, when it says Uncle Sam I kind of see that it's someone who wants me of what I can do and what they need me to do, and I was in the ROTC my whole years in high school, but it wasn't for me. That it's a commitment and that whatever they say that is what you have to do brother. That's not for me. They just want you for, for their use and you don't have to, you know, be used in that area at all. I don't care if a war is coming. And if I have to go to jail or whatever it's my decision what I want to do with my life is my choice.

One of the African American students who had spent six years in the army did speak more positively about the military, but also made a distinction between white and black people in the army.

Carin: I guess because I've been to the military, I probably know more about it than the typical person would. And because I've actually been there, spent time there, had no problems, I see integrity, loyalty, selfless service, appreciation for all those who volunteer because for that reason alone there is no longer a draft. So you don't have to worry about your brothers and cousins and boyfriends and whatever else being drafted and sent away. I see a lot of opportunity because there is much of it, although I also see a lot of controversy because there are those on the outside that don't know what happens. And I see freedom provided by those who voluntarily giving their time, their lives basically to ensure the protection and the freedom that we now have... That picture kind of to go off what I said the last time, seems like, like people that go to the army most times don't have any other option. But what I've seen personally most of the white people that are there are really like patriotic. They really want to fight for their country. They really, you know, they're really like gung-ho and wanting to kill and everything else, but black people are like "Hey man, I'm here. The judge told me either this or jail or you know. For myself personally, it was because I wasn't ready to, to come to college and I didn't want to have that added pressure, have my parents support me financially and then I not do well. So I do what I had to do to get the money and support myself. And there are a lot of other people like me out there, but I think, you know, like I said before, I think that some of the white, most of the men that go are like just really trying to fight for their country and all the other good stuff.
A further difference in response to this slide was that the majority culture students made references to peace in relationship to war, whereas the African American students did not mention peace in any context.

*Lorenne: It also reminds me of like the Mennonites how they believe that we should find peaceful ways of trying to get along instead of using the army and different types of war things.*

*Kelly: I think of my friend, Jamie, over in Kosovo who's over there trying to help keep the peace.*

In summary, affect was elicited in African American students, but not in majority culture students. In addition, African American students mentioned ethnicity but majority culture students did not do so. Meanings differed according to group membership. Neither group provided stories. Tables 21 and 22 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide eleven. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
Table 21: Slide eleven between-group differences in affect.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American  Students</td>
<td>dislike for Uncle Sam poster, negative feelings toward the military, integrity, loyalty, appreciation for volunteers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>__________________   __________________</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 22: Slide eleven between-group differences in cognition.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Holistic Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>negative view of military, loss of freedom, opportunity, freedom</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>__________________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
<td>__________________</td>
<td>peace in relationship to war</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
Analysis of Slide Twelve

This slide elicited affective responses from the African American students, but not the majority culture students. In one case, the elicited affect was attributed to the individuals portrayed in the slide.

_Eric:_ I see a lot of angry people for what I don’t know.

At other times, detachment was the affective individual/group response to the slide.

_Slick:_ I see a picture of the Boston Tea Party and it doesn’t move me at all. It means nothing except for the context it’s in and it’s a picture of the Boston Tea Party.

_Carin:_ I just see a picture of the Boston Tea Party. Like a couple other people said, it doesn’t mean a whole lot to me. I’ve read about it. Nothing significant, I mean it doesn’t mean a whole lot.

Both groups identified the slide as the Boston Tea Party. The basic difference in response to the slide was the meaning ascribed to the event. The majority culture students tended to perceive the event as meaningful, whereas the African American students did not. African American students saw it as irrelevant to the African American experience.

_Majority Culture Students:_

_Kramer:_ A harbor somewhere. It looks, the Boston Tea Party. An event that was major in our history.

_Shannon:_ An important event that stood up for rights.

_Josh:_ Boston Tea Party. History. Important event in our history.

_Keith:_ Important event and how it played along with our American history.

_African American Students:_

_Eric:_ I see a lot of ignorant folks cause that was just stupid, in my opinion, what went down that day. I see a lot of wasted tea. I see a lot of wasted money. For the economy back then.
Lady J: Initially I thought it was a picture of the wrath of Medusa, I don't know if anyone is familiar with that, but once I looked at it once I looked at it a little closer just looks like the Boston Tea Party which was really pretty unnecessary, but it's the Boston Tea Party.

Moe: I see the Boston Tea Party. A bunch of white people playing with tea.

Between-group differences where identified in affect, meaning ascribed, and reference to ethnicity. Affect was elicited in African American students, but not in the majority culture students. The majority culture students attributed importance and meaningfulness to the slide, whereas the African American students did not. African Americans made an ethnicity reference, whereas the majority culture students did not. Neither group provided a story. Tables 23 and 24 provide summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide twelve. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
AFFECT

Reaction to Slide | Identified in Slide
--- | ---
African American Students | detachment, meaningless | anger

Majority Culture Students

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 23: Slide twelve between-group differences in affect.

COGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Holistic Description</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>not meaningful</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>irrelevance for African Americans</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 24: Slide twelve between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Fifteen

An affective response of the feeling of being trapped was elicited by this slide and expressed by Eric in the form of a story.
Eric: I also see a slave. No matter what race, it’s just a slave person. A slave, a very smart and intelligent because of the people and their surroundings. They can’t let all that, they can’t express their point of view or their creativity or anything because their trapped inside of whatever. Cause they’re trapped inside their society they live in. Because it’s not the world that they want that’s wrong. And I think the outside the white border that symbolizes them dreaming of being free one day. Maybe expressing whatever it is.

More so than any other slide, responses to the silhouette slide resulted in both groups talking about specific items in the slide such as heads, numbers, words, glow, etc. The meanings associated with the items, however, were very different. The African American students associated intelligence and/or the purchase of slaves with the items.

Lady J: Well I see two things. First, I could look at it and see a black man who is very smart, very educated, very, has a lot of knowledge because the whole head is full of with looks like math problems to me. So maybe he excels in math or something like that. Then again, I, once I kind of looked at it a little longer, I kind of seen a slave. I see a slave that you know how they had a book and prices, prices for their head, or prices of the slaves, what they had to pay. So the numbers at the bottom that equal something could be prices for the slaves.

Moe: Alright, I see, when I look this way it look like them are numbers and they added it up and it came it came up to 2000 something, I can’t see that far. Yeah, it looks like they added up some numbers so it look like that I agree with somebody else that they they are full that they are intelligent and that they are full of a lot of information. I can’t see the stuff around it, but is looks like it could be a smart African American male with a white outer face.

Carin: I think that because of the calculations and because of that, there’s like a yellow glow around the silhouette around the face that is something symbolizes some type of knowledge or intellect or education or something of that sort.

Further, one African American student alluded to the relationship between the year 2007 and black culture through the following story:
Matthew: I don't know, but I, I just wanted to say there's some history that I learned that the two thousand, two thousand that the year two thousand and seven is something that has something to do with the black culture as far as our race. There's supposed to be something that is happen in that year as far as when, when some bill or some right was passed that after a certain of number of years something would happen during that year that would have to do with vote or election or something like that. I don't know what it is, but I know Dr. Lewis said something about, that in that year something would happen.

The majority culture students, on the other hand, discussed the ethnicity of the writing and suggested the picture in the slide might be an advertisement, shooting target, or something from a frightening movie.

Kramer: The numbers at the bottom look like they're written in more of a French style. The way the French make their numbers.

Ben: Well, from here it kind of looks like Chinese writing.

Josh: It looks like an advertisement for something that I don't really understand.

Lorene: A shooting target The things that they have at police stations or at like shooting galleries.

Shanon: I don't know what it is, but it reminds me of something that you might see like at a scary movie when they show you really weird pictures, that's what it reminds me of.

In summation, affect was elicited in African American students, but not in majority culture students. The African American group also provided a story, whereas the majority culture group did not provide stories. Each group provided individual, idiosyncratic interpretations to this slide, yet some common themes coalesced with the African American group that did not overlap with any interpretations provided by the majority culture group. Ethnicity was mentioned by both groups, however, the African American students made reference to African American culture, while the majority culture students made reference to Chinese and French. Tables 25 and 26 provide
summaries of the between-group differences that were identified in slide fifteen. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>*AFFECT</th>
<th>Identified in Slide</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African Students</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>feeling of being trapped and unable to express themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Students</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Students</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Culture Students</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 25: Slide fifteen between-group differences in affect.
COGNITION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Physical Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th><strong>Storytelling</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td>intelligence, purchase of slaves, important date for black culture</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td>Chinese, French</td>
<td></td>
<td>writing, advertisement, shooting target, scary movie</td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.

Table 26: Slide fifteen between-group differences in cognition.

Analysis of Slide Sixteen

The affect attributed to the slide by both groups was happiness.

Majority Culture Students:
Keith: *Looks like she's having a good time.*

Kelly: *She looks really happy. She's smiling about something. I don't know. She looks happy.*

African American Students:
Christina: *I see a woman who's happy in the moment that she's in. Maybe she won something or she's getting praised for something that she's accomplished. I think her smile's genuine.*

Cleve: *I see a white woman who is smiling, enjoying whatever, whatever she is doing.*

Moe: *I guess she look to be happy.*
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Additionally, the African American students made reference to the individual’s ethnicity, whereas the majority culture students did not.

Lady J: *I see a white, hippie woman.*

Moe: *I just see a white woman.*

Eric: *I see a woman, white woman.*

Matthew: *It’s just a white woman with some glasses that look out of date.*

With the exception of one African American woman, who recognized Gloria Steinem by name (i.e., Carin: “*I see Gloria Steinem, old of Gloria Steinem. The name is, I know something about her, but right now I’m not remembering what it is*”), none of the other students from either group recognized her. The majority culture students’ comments reflected a lack of awareness of who she was. In addition, one student made reference to her sunglasses and a few of them mentioned Newsweek.

Ben: *I don’t know, but a I’ve never seen that woman before in my life and a she a. I have no idea who that is. Maybe I’m stupid, I don’t know, but a supposedly she should be famous, but again I just don’t know who it is, but those sunglasses look like Bruce Lee sunglasses of the 1970’s. So a, that’s all.*

Josh: *I have no idea either. Some lady on the front of the Newsweek, old Newsweek magazine in a book...I’d like to add that it says that it’s Gloria Steinem and I don’t know who Gloria Steinem is.*

Keith: *A lady that I don’t know who it is on the cover of Newsweek.*

Shanon: *A cover of Newsweek from like maybe the 70’s with a woman on it that I do not know.*

Lorenne: *A Newsweek from the 70’s with a woman on it that was probably famous at that time, but a.*

The African American students on the other hand made ascribed several meanings to the slide including hippie, a person hiding something, new figure woman, stress, and
drugs. In addition, not only did they make reference to her sunglasses and Newsweek, they also mentioned details such as like hair and eyes.

Lady J: I see a white, hippie woman.

Moe: She look like a hippie... She looks like she’s probably fat too. And that’s about it. Not that I’m discriminating against fat folks, cause there’s one right here, but she just looks to be kind of heavy and probably talking about the new figure woman or something. I don’t know. It could be a, it could be a good story in the book or something. Newsweek that is. It could be something good that happened to her... She it look like in the hippie days. So it look like she high to me cause you know you was allowed to smoke a lot of weed back then, so she just look high.

Eric: Looks like she has her camera face on. Not really showing who the real person is cause of the bags under her eyes, the way her hair is. Looks like she’s gone through a lot of trouble or whatever. Did a lot of drugs, maybe. Maybe trying to find, trying to cope with all the stress in her life cause she is a star or she’s an important person cause somebody put her on Newsweek and as a “new woman” so. But I think she’s putting on a front in this picture because that smile don’t look too good and her hair all messed up. And her like glasses are tinted like she’s trying to hide something on her eye. That’s it... She looks like she hiding something. She’s trying to hide.

Christina: Maybe she’s stressed.

Slick: I think she’s a hippie too, cause of the light tint on her glasses. She’s applauding something.

Matthew: Maybe she’s the new woman. Maybe she’s discovered or used a new weight loss thing or she’s written a book or something. She definitely look like she needs to wash her hair. Those glasses need to go. I don’t know what period this is in, but she, she needs some help, being a new woman or whatever it is.

In brief, both groups ascribed happiness to her mood. The African American group provided a story and made reference to ethnicity, whereas the majority culture students did not do so. In addition, the African American students attempted to attribute some kind of meaning, which was stress, use of drugs, and not looking good physically, to the slide, whereas the majority culture students basically just mentioned that they did
not know the woman. Table 27 provides a summary of the between-group differences that were identified in slide sixteen. The dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethnicity</th>
<th>Holistic Description</th>
<th>Attention to Detail</th>
<th>Meaning Ascribed to Slide</th>
<th>**Storytelling</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African American Students</td>
<td>white</td>
<td>eyes, hair</td>
<td>hippie, fat, drugs</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>hiding something, stress</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Majority Culture Students</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>no</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

**Indicates occurrence or absence of storytelling.

Table 27: Slide sixteen between-group differences in cognition.

**Analysis of Slide Seventeen**

Neither group attributed any affect toward this slide. Both groups recognized the slide as being a picture of a black hair product. The difference in responses came in the form of the additional meanings that were ascribed to the slide. In particular, six out of the eight African American students referred to Ultra Sheen as grease, whereas none of
the majority culture students did so. In addition, the African American group mentioned
the product specifically in the context of female use.

*Moe:* It just look like it just look like, like, like Blue Magic, that other hair grease
that they use to have for black people that's real thick and clumps up your hair.

*Christina:* I think of getting up in the morning. Greasing your hair curling it so
it'll shine.

*Slick:* It's a hair product and I think it was put in the grass just for this type of, I
think this picture was taken for this type of interaction between people. That's
the only purpose that this serves, to strike a nerve among people taking a survey.
That's what I see. Why else would you put grease on the grass.

*Lady J:* I see some grease. And if you got some dandruff, you can put it on there
real quick and it will take care of the problem.

*Matthew:* I see hair grease. Something that I can see women using for after they
wash their hair to oil their scalp.

*Carin:* I see hair grease. I see something that I probably just like a lot of other
black females, in particular used at some point in time. I see a distinction
between whites and blacks because whites don't use grease. Their hair texture is
different.

In summary, neither group ascribed affect to the slide or provided a story. Both
groups made reference to ethnicity. The African American students shared a common
term and meaning for the slide as well as made a gender reference, whereas the majority
culture students did not do so. Table 28 provides a summary of the between-group
differences that were identified in slide seventeen. The dashes in the table indicate that
either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided
by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category,
i.e., no between-group differences were identified.
Dashes in the table indicate that either the responses provided by one group were similar to additional responses provided by the other group or that neither group provided a response for that particular category, i.e., no between-group differences were identified.

Table 28: Slide seventeen between-group differences in cognition.

Differences between Majority Culture Students’ Predictions of African American Students’ Responses to the Slides and African American Students’ Actual Responses

While responses that distinguish between groups may herald ethnocentric tendencies, they may not be exclusively indicative of ethnocentrism. Individuals may report differing affect and cognitive experiences, yet be quite capable of accurately predicting others’ responses. Research questions four through six explored majority culture students’ accuracy in predicting the African American students’ responses.

Of the fourteen slides which were identified as eliciting different responses between the two groups, there were only five slides (slide seven, slide eight, slide twelve, slide fifteen and slide seventeen) in which the majority culture students accurately predicted the responses of the African American students. What follows are summaries of majority culture students’ predictions of the African American students’ responses to
the remaining nine slides. Table 29 provides a summary of incorrect predictions of or failure to predict affective responses. Tables 30 and 31 provide summaries of incorrect predictions of or failure to predict cognitive responses. The dashes in the table indicate that the majority culture students predicted accurately for the category.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide one:</th>
<th>Incorrect Prediction</th>
<th>Reaction to Slide: Reaction to Slide</th>
<th>Identified in Slide: Identified in Slide</th>
<th>Identified in Slide: Failure to Predict</th>
<th>Identified in Slide: Failure to Predict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide two:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide three:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide four:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide six:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide nine:</td>
<td>anger, resentment</td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide ten:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide eleven:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide sixteen:</td>
<td></td>
<td>Frage to Slide:</td>
<td>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that the majority culture students predicted accurately.

Table 29: Majority culture students' predictions about African American's affective responses to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 7, 8, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since majority culture students accurately predicted the African American students' responses to these slides).
Table 30: Majority culture students' predictions about African American's cognitive responses (physical description: ethnicity and attention to detail) to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 7, 8, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since majority culture students accurately predicted the African American students' responses to these slides).
Table 31: Majority culture students’ predictions about African American’s cognitive responses (meaning ascribed) to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 7, 8, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since majority culture students accurately predicted the African American students’ responses to these slides).

Analysis of Slide One

In the first slide, the majority culture students suggested that the African American students might know the couple in the slide, which was not the case.

_Shanon:_ They might know exactly who these people are and exactly what they’re dressed in.

In addition, the majority culture students did not predict the attention to detail that the African Americans paid to the slide such as making reference to the bottom of the woman’s dress, the man’s shoe, the man’s dredlocks, the woman’s long hair and hat.
Analysis of Slide Two

The majority culture students accurately predicted that the African American students would identify Michael Jordan as one of the best basketball players, an icon, a good role model.

*Keith:* A black person would still say that’s, just like a white person that’s a great role model, great athlete, probably one of the best, if not the best.

*Aaron:* That might say that that’s a good role model, good role model for young, black, black men and women.

*Ben:* I’d like to say that a, a one would probably suggest that he is a, a one of the most well-known icons in this society.

They did not, however, predict that the African American students would also identify him as a real, genuine person, as well as a successful businessman, family man, and might not necessarily see it as his responsibility to be a role model. The majority culture students also did not predict the amount of detail that the African American students would use in describing Michael Jordan’s life. In addition, the majority culture students did not predict that the African American students would note that Michael Jordan’s picture was on the cover of a black magazine, *Jet*

Analysis of Slide Three

The majority culture students accurately predicted that the African American students would describe Oreo cookies as being a good snack, as well as mention the racial implications for the word Oreo.

*Ben:* I think one would a also agree with me that the Oreo is, is a hell of a food and that it’s a delicious snacks.

*Aaron:* I’m not sure, but I’m sure there’s, I know I’ve heard something, but I can’t remember what it is, but it’s some sort of slang for something. I can’t think of what it is.
Kelly: I don't know if this is what he was talking about, but I know in, in our race if they see a black girl, grow up with a black girl, a biracial couple, they say if they have kids those kids would be Oreos.

Whereas the African American students did identify the slide in a manner consistent with the majority culture students' predictions, three of the African American students also commented on the sweepstake that was advertised on the package of Oreo cookies. The majority culture students did not predict the attention give to the sweepstake.

Analysis of Slide Four

While the majority culture students accurately predicted that the African American students would describe two people being in love and also accurately predicted that there might be a difference in response between men and women to the slide, they did not predict that the African American students would also speak to the difficulties and risks involved with interracial relationships.

Majority Culture Students:
Lorenne: I think they would probably say that it's two people who are in love.

Ben: I think a, I think that they'd also agree that a it's just a, a black male and a white female, who appear to be in love.

Josh: I think the a, females would a reply different than the males... The females would reply different than the males because of the color.

African American Students:
Eric: I see two people in love... And I see unity because there is a lot of pride because that's something very hard to do as far as interracial relationships and the world around them, in fact it's something very hard to sustain.
Carin: I see a picture possibly from looks like it could be from like the 80's or the early 90's and with that I see that I see two people who have made a decision to be together...And because the picture is older, possibly from the 80's, I think they've taken a risk because honestly interracial dating in most areas could be considered dangerous just because of some of the things that could happen as a result of it.

Analysis of Slide Six

With the exception of attention to race, the majority culture students did not predict that there would be a difference between their response to slide six and the African American students' responses.

Josh: No difference.

Ben: I would have to agree on that a, I agree there's no difference between my statement and their statement as well.

Josh: I think that, that a other people taking this, that the other black people would think, I can't tell, but they wouldn't be able to tell the picture like I can't tell what the picture exactly is, but it is too far, it's like too small. Like you can't tell if they're Korean or if they're a different race. You can't tell what race they are. So I think they might have might have an opinion on, a different opinion on what kind of race they are compare to what we think they are.

Indeed, the African American students did give more attention to the ethnicity of the individuals in the slide than did the majority culture students describing Koreans, Japanese, Asians, Africans, and Pacific Islanders. On the other hand, when the majority culture students were asked to provide their own responses to the slide, only one attended to ethnicity, identifying the men as Cubans. Later, when asked to predict the African American responses, another majority culture student, Josh, suggested that the individuals might be Korean or another race anticipating that the African American students would attend to the race of the individuals. Although the majority culture students only predicted a difference in response to the slide, in terms of attention to ethnicity, other
differences did emerge between the two groups. The most pronounced difference between the two groups was the majority culture students’ emphasis on soldiers, fighting, and war, whereas the African American’s construction of the slide was one of individuals protecting themselves.

Analysis of Slide Nine

The majority culture students’ predicted that the African American students would feel anger and resentment in response to the slide. In addition, the majority culture students predicted that the African American students would portray the woman as being a slave or a very poor woman who lived in a shack. They also predicted that women would respond differently to the slide than would men.

Shanon: I think they would probably see her as a slave and they’d probably feel a lot more anger than I know I would as a white person. I think a black person would feel a lot more anger and resentment when they see this picture.

Lorenne: I think they would probably look at this person and either say she was a slave or say that she was very, very poor and lived like in a shack.

Josh: I think the women would have a different opinion than the men because we have different opinions because it wasn’t our a racial background. We wouldn’t have like their insight. They would have more insight with family stories and the women would have even more because of they have the same sex and the same race and so they would have more input on this cause than we would and they would, I would think that since that time has past over time that they would have a similar opinion to the topic than we did.

While the African American students did indicate that the woman in the picture might be poor, they did not, in fact, portray her as a slave living in a shack nor did they express any resentment or anger in response to the slide. In addition, there were no gender differences found among the African American students in response to the slide. However, gender differences were found among the majority culture students.
The majority culture women tended to describe the woman as someone who had worked hard, whereas the majority culture men tended to only provide a general description of the woman.

*Kramer: An older person who is has probably worked very hard for everything she has in life.*

*Lorenne: She looks like she's had a hard day at work like working on like the farm or something like that. She's looks tired and she's relaxing.*

Keith: An old, old black lady sitting on the steps of looks like something that maybe all run down. Possibly, possibly a slave or a maid or something like that.

*Ben: Photograph of an old, black female, which appears to be possibly early 1900's.*

**Analysis of Slide Ten**

In reference to the slide of the dollar sign, the majority culture students indicated that they did not think that there would be any difference between their response to the slide and the African American students'.

*Shanon: I think they would be the same.*

*Ben: I believe they're synonymous.*

Although success and opportunity were associated with the dollar sign by the African American students, they tended to be much more negative about the slide than the majority culture students. One majority culture student did mention greed, but that was the extent of the negativism on the part of the majority students.

**African American Students:**

*Eric: Sin, lies, envy, murder, blood, sweat, tears, more problems. I see a lot of dishonesty. A lot of confusion, not knowing who to trust. I see the root of all evil. I see a lot of things people will do for money that they would not do on a regular basis and nothing else. Greed. Power. I see sex. I see movies. I see the world. That's what the world revolves around, money.*
Slick: Money is the root of all evil. People tend to do things that they normally wouldn't do. If you've got a lot of money, the stereotype, if you've got a lot of money, you got a better life—that's wrong. More money, more problems.

Matthew: I see money and that's all it is is money. It's not a an end to it. Money is not the root of evil. The love of money is the root of all evil, thought you all should know that the love of it because if you love money and somebody trying to, you can't get enough, hey so. It's something that we need on earth, so you can never have too much of it. It's what you need. If you don't have it you can't pay tuition.

Lady J: I say Amen to Matthew. When I look at that dollar sign, I see graduation, I see my law degree, I see opportunity, I see jobs available, I see success in every kind of way. People tend to measure success by the amount of money that they have. So I see graduation, I see a degree, I see my opportunity, I see five years down the line after I've graduated and have settled into a career.

Analysis of Slide Eleven

One of the majority culture students, Kramer, suggested that the African American students would ask, "Who is Uncle Sam and why is he white?" Although the African American students did not inquire about Uncle Sam and his whiteness, one of them, Moe, stated, "I see a an ugly white man pointing and I don't like." Beyond the comment offered by Kramer, the majority culture students predicted that there would not be a difference in response between the two groups to the slide. Differences, however, did emerge. The primary differences included a more negative attitude about the military on the part of the African American students, their view of keeping their freedom and not being used by the military (e.g., in the military, individuals lose their freedom), and their reference to ethnicity in relation to the military. In contrast, the majority culture students emphasized taxes and the draft and did not speak negatively about the military.
African American Students:

Slick: Never will I be enlisted. If they commission me an officer, I'll go there. If they never do, I'll go to jail before I go to fight anybody because I don't know them. That's all I have to say.

Matthew: I see that that, when it says Uncle Sam I kind of see that it's someone who wants me of what I can do and what they need me to do, and I was in the ROTC my whole years in high school, but it wasn't for me. That it's a commitment and that whatever they say that is what you have to do brother. That's not for me. They just want you for, for their use and you don't have to, you know, be used in that area at all. I don't care if a war is coming. And if I have to go to jail or whatever it's my decision what I want to do with my life is my choice.

Lady J: Well, see it be taken with the slogan, be all that you can be. I see people falling into all of the opportunities that they, they, they advertise as far as like free education, the GI Bill, they pay for you to go to school, they show you all the good things then once you get there, you get smacked, you get told when to go to bed, when to get up, when to run, if you want to lay out and chill, there's none of that. You do what I say or get out.

Cleve: I see something I don't want.

Moe: I see somewhere that the black man should not be ever. I see taxes, a lot of taxes wasted. I see a an ugly white man pointing that I don't like. And I know that's stereotypical, you know what I mean. I don't know exactly what it is, but that's what I see and I don't like it. I don't like it...I see a place a where the black man or woman should not be. I have a lot of family that have been into the military. I'm not saying that it is not helpful. I just do not think that the black person be in the military.

Majority Culture Students:

Aaron: I think of the draft.

Shanon: I think of the draft and I think of taxes. That's what it reminds me of.

Keith: It reminds me of the draft and wars that we've, we've had the draft in... Like she said taxes also.

Ben: ...But it also reminds me of the draft and I believe they did that in the early 40's as well the 70's to recruit 18-45 year old men.
Analysis of Slide Sixteen

The majority culture students predicted correctly that the African American students wouldn’t know Gloria Steinem, however, they did not accurately predict the adjectives and meanings the African American students would ascribe to the slide. Several students referred to her as a white woman and/or hippie. A couple of students made reference to her glasses, hair, and weight.

Lady J: I see a white, hippie woman.

Cleve: I see a white woman....

Moe: I just see a white woman. She look like a hippie. She looks like she’s probably fat too.

Eric: I see a woman, white woman. Looks like she has her camera face on. Not really showing who the real person is cause of the bags under her eyes, the way her hair is.

Slick: I think she’s a hippie too, cause of the light tint on her glasses.

Matthew: It's just a white woman with some glasses that look out of date. Maybe she's the new woman. Maybe she's discovered or used a new weight loss thing or she's written a book or something. She definitely look like she needs to wash her hair. Those glasses need to go

Differences between African American Students' Predictions of Majority Culture Students' Responses to the Slides and Majority Culture Students' Actual Responses

In the preceding section, responses to the slides were analyzed to identify any differences that might have emerged between the majority culture students' predictions of the African American students' responses and the African American students' actual responses. Research questions seven through nine explored differences between the African American students' predictions of the majority culture students' responses and
the majority culture students' actual responses. Specifically, these questions inquire about the existence of differences between majority culture students' responses to the slides and African American students' predictions of the majority culture student's responses; which slides, if any result in inaccurate predictions; and the nature of an inaccuracy of predictions that occur.

Of the fourteen slides which where identified as eliciting different responses between the two groups, the African American students accurately predicted the majority culture students' responses to ten slides (slide three, slide four, slide seven, slide eight, slide nine, slide ten, slide eleven, slide twelve, slide fifteen and slide seventeen). What follows are summaries of African American students' predictions of the majority culture students' responses to the remaining four slides. Table 32 provides a summary of incorrect predictions of or failure to predict affective responses. Tables 33 and 34 provide summaries of incorrect predictions of or failure to predict cognitive responses. The dashes in the table indicate that the African American students predicted accurately for the category.
Table 32: African American students' predictions about majority culture students' affective responses to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since African American students accurately predicted the majority culture students' responses to these slides).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide one:</th>
<th>Incorrect Prediction</th>
<th>Reaction to Slide: Failure to Predict</th>
<th>Identified in Slide: Incorrect Prediction</th>
<th>Identified in Slide: Failure to Predict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide two:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide six:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>sadness, depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide sixteen:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>happiness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that the African American students predicted accurately.

Table 33: African American students' predictions about majority culture students' cognitive responses (physical description: ethnicity and attention to detail) to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since African American students accurately predicted the majority culture students' responses to these slides).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Slide one:</th>
<th>Incorrect Prediction</th>
<th>Attention to Detail: Incorrect Prediction</th>
<th>Attention to Detail: Failure to Predict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide two:</td>
<td>did not mention ethnicity</td>
<td>did not go into detail about Michael Jordan's life, did not refer to Jet magazine</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide six:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slide sixteen:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Dashes in the table indicate that the African American students predicted accurately.
Table 34: African American students’ predictions about majority culture students’ cognitive responses (meaning ascribed) to the slides. (Note: Slides 5, 13, and 14 are not listed since between-group differences were not identified and slides 3, 4, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 15, and 17 are not listed since African American students accurately predicted the majority culture students’ responses to these slides).

### Analysis of Slide One

While the African American students predicted correctly that the majority culture students would view the two individuals in the slide as Africans and that they would not go into as much detail describing and analyzing the slide, their prediction that the majority culture students would not know what was occuring on in the slide was inaccurate. As Carin stated: "I don’t think they’d have a clue as to what is going on that picture." In general, however, the majority culture students ascribed the same meanings as the African American students did to the slide, namely that the couple were royalty and/or getting married.

Majority Culture Students:

*Keith: Maybe some kind of African Royalty. Or a couple, couple king, queen, prince, princess, something like that. That’s it.*
Kelly: I think it looks like an emperor or empress of some sort.

Shanon: I think it’s either maybe looks like royalty or maybe like they’re going to get married. Maybe they’re wearing like traditional wedding clothing.

African American Students:
Moe: I really don't know. It looks like two black people dressed up for a, for something. I guess I can see a wedding cause I’m looking at the bottom of her dress. Some kind of African Authentic wedding I would say, maybe.

Eric: He's a prince and a princess. And he's just asked her to be his bride or whatever, like they're about to take up the throne. Like for their place in their heritage or family. Like they're the next generation of kings and queens or tribe or something.

Christina: Newlywed African couple.

Slick: I also believe that they are some type of royalty, and could be from Africa, Caribbean.

Analysis of Slide Two

The African American students predicted that there would not be a difference between the two groups in response to the Michael Jordan slide as illustrated by Slick’s comment:

That’s the same Michael Jordan that. Mike, Mike crossed color lines. That's Slick. Slick says Mike crossed all color lines and Michael Jordan is Michael Jordan. He's a phenom even in Indonesia. Mike is Mike.

In fact, both groups did extol Michael Jordan as one of the greatest basketball players ever and a role model. The majority culture students did not, however, provide a detailed description of and information about Michael Jordan and his many accomplishments outside of basketball nor did they refer to Jet magazine.
Analysis of Slide Six

The only prediction that the African American students' made about the majority culture students' responses to slide six was that they might perceive a group of black people or Koreans and not make any other distinction on ethnicity.

Lady J: I think, I think that if they see it as being black people, they might look at it different, but if they see as being Korean, they're not going to look at it any different than us. If they see it as being black people, they, they might look at it as black people rebelling against something or. I don't think that they're going to see it as white people cause they don't look white to no one.

Slick: I think that they're going to see them as people of color with pigment. Obviously, to the, you know, Anglo-Saxon, being different from black Americans as far as all those third world countries, I believe they just ram all us together. A poor African nation is the same thing as a poor Oriental nation.

In fact, Aaron was the only one who made any reference to ethnicity at all referring to the individuals as possibly Cuban: They, they kind of look like, like a Cuban Mafia or militia. Maybe they're immigrants coming to the United States on a boat.

Analysis of Slide Sixteen

The African American students' incorrect prediction that the majority culture students would know Gloria Steinem is illustrated nicely by Ben's comment: I don't know, but a I've never seen that woman before in my life and a she a. I have no idea who that is. Maybe I'm stupid, I don't know, but a supposedly she should be famous, but again I just don't know who it is...

Summary

Extensive use of student quotes were used throughout this chapter to illustrate response differences between majority culture and African American students; differences between majority culture students' predictions of African American students' responses
and African American students' actual responses; and differences between African American students' predictions of majority culture students' responses and majority culture students' actual responses. In addition to the aforementioned differences, a perusal of the transcripts of the two focus group interviews showed that the African American students' responses were nearly twice the length of the responses provided by the majority cultures students. Conclusions about this difference as well as the differences identified in relation to each of the nine research questions will be drawn and implications for future research will be considered in the next chapter.
CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Introduction

The purpose of the study was to begin identifying majority culture ethnocentrism and redress the same ethnocentric tendencies inherent in current empathy methods and measures. The inquiry was guided by the following research questions in reference to seventeen slides that were presented to two focus groups (one African American focus group and one majority culture focus group): Are there differences between African American undergraduate students' responses and majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the pictures; which pictures, if any, elicit different responses from African American undergraduate students and majority culture undergraduate students; if African American undergraduate students' responses to the pictures differ from majority culture undergraduate students' responses, how do they differ? Are there differences between African American undergraduate students' responses to the pictures and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of African American undergraduate students' responses to the pictures; which pictures, if any, elicit differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate
students' predictions of their responses? If there are differences between African American undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the pictures, what are those differences? Are there differences between majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the pictures and African American undergraduate students' predictions of majority culture undergraduate students' responses to the pictures? Which pictures, if any, elicit differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and African American undergraduate students' predictions of their responses? If there are differences between majority culture undergraduate students' actual responses and majority culture undergraduate students' predictions of their responses to the pictures, what are those differences?

The purpose of this chapter is to generate some tentative hypotheses on majority culture ethnocentrism, grounded in the data, from which quantified measures might be developed and to offer conclusions and implications of the study. A discussion of the findings in relation to research questions that guided the inquiry is presented first followed by a discussion mapping the data collection and findings against current empathy methods and measures. Afterward, grounded hypotheses, in the form of objectively correct answers, are presented followed by a section suggesting implications of the current study for future research. The chapter concludes with a discussion of some strengths and weaknesses of the study.
Discussion of Results in Relation to Research Questions

Between-Group Differences in Response to the Slides

In the previous chapter, the transcripts of the focus group interviews conducted with majority culture and African American undergraduate students were analyzed within the context of the nine research questions guiding the present study. The first three research questions explored the existence of differences in responses between majority culture and African American participants. Which slides, if any, elicited different responses? What was the nature of any differences identified? Of the seventeen slides presented to participants, differences in responses were readily identified for fourteen. Further, differences were identified in the areas of affect and cognition, including physical description, meaning ascribed, and storytelling.

While the purpose of the study was to identify if and when differences in responses between groups occurred and the nature of any differences that were discerned, speculations offered to address the differences may suggest direction for future research efforts. The findings of the current study are the result of a naturalistic inquiry; and therefore, not generalizeable beyond the current study. Although understandings attained from the current study are only applicable to the present context (Lincoln & Guba, 1985), some generalizations which may have implications for future research will now be presented.

Affect. An initial between-group difference that was identified in the study was the number of times that affect was elicited: eleven out of the fourteen slides for African American students compared to seven out of fourteen slides for the majority culture.
students. Of the five slides where affect was elicited from the African American group, but not the majority culture group, slides one and fifteen may have resonated more personally for the African Americans because they associated the slides with cultural or historical contexts. Slide one portrayed a black woman and man standing together. The African American students attributed the feelings of happiness and pride of heritage to the slide, whereas the slide did not elicit an affective response from majority culture students. In terms of slide fifteen, several of the African American students constructed an African American meaning to the silhouette, e.g. "a black man who is very smart, very educated," "something to do with the black culture as far as our race," and "I also see a slave." The majority culture students did not construct a similar cultural meaning nor provided an affective response to the slide. Similarly, between-group differences were identified with the slides depicting the Declaration of Independence and the Boston Tea Party, in which the majority culture students spoke of importance and pride. The African American students, on the other hand, expressed detachment and meaningless to both and did not attribute importance to either referring to the irrelevance of the two due to inconsistency of the slides with the realities of slavery and inequalities.

Both groups, on the other hand, related some personal connection to slide eleven, the picture of Uncle Sam, in terms of family or friends serving in the military, yet the slide only elicited affective responses in the African American group. One affective response was a dislike of "an ugly white man pointing." The other affective response was a negative affective response to the military, in general: "somewhere that a black man should not be ever." The association of ethnicity to the slide seemed to be the
influencing factor on the affective response on the part of the African American students and lack of affective response on the part of the majority culture students. The majority culture students did not refer to ethnicity in reference to the Uncle Sam slide.

Two other instances where affect was elicited in the African American group, but not the majority group were slide four, a picture of a black male and a white female, and slide twelve, a picture of the Boston Tea Party. The slides elicited personal, affective responses. The African American students also suggested the affect of the individuals in the slide. For example, a personal response to slide four was "What the hell is this black man dating this white girl," whereas a suggested affective response was illustrated through the following response, "It seems like she is upset about something...maybe he is trying to console her or calm her down or reassure her." Similarly, a personal response to slide twelve was "I just see a picture of the Boston Tea Party...it doesn't mean a whole lot to me," whereas a suggested affected response was "I see a lot of angry people." The personal affective responses might more easily be attributed to the history that African Americans bring with them while viewing such slides that is not the same history shared by the majority culture students.

Estimations as to why the five slides elicited affective responses from the African American students, but not the majority culture students include personalization of the slides due to the cultural and historical contexts the African American students brought to the study and a more affective orientation within African American culture, in general (Cross, 1971). Indeed, the between-group differences in the number of affective responses, which emerged in the findings, corroborates assertions that while Western
societies tend to emphasize cognitive processes, some cultural groups favor affective process (Broome, 1991; Cross, 1971). Further, the finding lends support to endorsements of the effectiveness in intercultural contexts of constructs, such as empathy, which have both affective and cognitive dimensions (Davis 1996; Strayer, 1987).

In addition to the African Americans providing affective responses nearly twice as often as the majority culture students, the seven slides that elicited affective responses from both groups resulted in between-group differences in five out of the seven slides. The following is a summary of the between-group differences in affect for the five slides: African American students identified anger in slide six, men walking together with guns, whereas the majority culture students identified sadness and depression; African American students attributed feelings of detachment and meaninglessness to slide seven, The Declaration of Independence, whereas majority culture students attached a sense of pride to the slide; African American students expressed stress, hopelessness, and apathy toward the result of the trial in response to slide eight, O.J Simpson, whereas majority culture students expressed negative feelings toward the trial and the result of the trial; African American students identified pride in response to the ninth slide, an elderly African American woman, whereas majority culture students identified enjoying a break from work; and African Americans identified greed and happiness in response to slide ten, dollar sign, whereas the majority culture students only identified greed.

Perhaps, similar to the communication breakdown example between the American and Japanese individuals provided by Stewart and Bennett (1991), cultural specificity of affect and group histories distinguished the affect elicited from the African American and
majority culture students. Moreover, the result of finding that the different affect elicited to particular slides based on group membership demonstrates the limitations of current empathy measures that assume specific, fixed responses are indicative of a propensity for empathy without regard to cultural context. Such findings illuminate the reality that cultural specificity of affect and histories that individuals bring to specific contexts may determine the affect elicited.

**Detail.** A second between-group difference, which may have implications for future research, was that while both groups focused on specific items within nearly all fourteen of the slides, the African American students provided considerably more detail (e.g., shoe, hat, bottom of dress compared to clothing) and used their detailed description to assist them with their construction of meaning e.g., "I guess I can see a wedding cause I’m looking at the bottom of her dress." Hooks (1997) suggests that attention to detail is a technique that African Americans acquired for survival and coping purposes as early as the colonial era in America. Further, ingroup attention to particular details (e.g. the African American group’s attention to the shoe in slide one and hair in slides one and sixteen, which assisted with their constructions of meaning) might constitute tacit knowledge of the group and be similar in nature to indigenous concepts.

**Storytelling.** A third difference that distinguished the two groups, which might have implications for future research, was storytelling. The African American students provided stories for eight of the fourteen slides, whereas the majority culture students did not. In some cases, the stories were about the slides. In other cases, the stories reflected back on the storyteller. In both cases, the stories took on a tone of psychoanalyzing what
was being portrayed in the slide. Two examples illustrate such storytelling. The first quote exemplifies the former type of story, while the second is an example of the latter.

Matthew: I see Michael Jordan as the best basketball player that I know because I’m not really an athletic person or that type, but someone that is, that is well-rounded in his area. And he knows what he does, and I say this to that even in his high school years that he did not make the basketball team. He did not give up. So he had to set some goals that he had to achieve. So he is an, a perfect, perfect example for any young person that has something they really want to do but they might not meet the requirements at that time because he didn’t, but look what he is now. He can go back and buy the team, you know, basically do what he wants to do. He set goals and he reached.

Slick: I see O.J. Simpson. Personally I think too much attention was paid to the, to the trial some of the things that should attract media attention than this man being on trial, but as far as, as far as something that I agree with Carin saying that where his support generally came from what type of people O.J. associated with you know not trying to make it a racial thing or whatever, but he generally dealt with white people, but when the time came for overall support that’s not where he received his support. Also, this is good, okay this is my humble opinion, I don’t want to force this on anybody else, but black people, black males when they grow into society to think that they are equal, in the American society we live in a black man is not equal to a, a white man. And when they grow to believe that they are, then they get slapped and that’s what happened to O.J.. He just got above, above it too much. He got you know. I believe that that’s quote unquote a white person’s society, if you too big, then you get chastised or shamed, but you’re still black, you still a black man and you can’t get away with it just you got money. I don’t really care if he did it. That’s how I feel about O.J..

One speculation as to why the African American students might have supplemented their responses to the slides with stories, is the oral tradition of the African American culture (Asante, 1988; Hill, 1999; Nobles, 1980). The tradition has been strengthened over generations in America through situational constraints such as prohibiting slaves to read and write. Further, Hooks (1997) suggests as early as the colonial era in America, African Americans have and continue to psychoanalyze situations for purposes of survival and coping.
Meaning. The fourth between-group distinction found in the study, which may have implications for future research, was the cognitive meanings attributed to each of the fourteen slides based on group membership. While between-group differences in the meanings attributed were found for all fourteen slides, four major categories emerged: 1) slides which elicited indigenous concepts; 2) slides in which an ingroup was able to differentiate roles, whereas the outgroup did not; 3) slides which elicited intercultural sympathy; and 4) slides which elicited between-group differences in response to an historical event or document.

Indigenous concepts are key terms and phrases used by subjects participating in the study, usually determined by redundancy. One of the slides in the study, in which an indigenous concept was elicited, was the slide of the jar of ultra sheen. The word “grease” was used by six of the African American students in reference to the ultra sheen, whereas none of the majority culture students used the term.

Another slide in which an indigenous concept was elicited was the slide of men walking together with guns. All of the men in the slide were members of a minority group. Protection was a unifying theme that was mentioned several times in the African American group. The meaning constructed by many of the African American students was that the men had guns in order to protect themselves. The idea of protection was never mentioned in the majority group. The frame of reference to the slide by the majority group was offense, whereas the frame of reference attributed by the African American included defense.
Yet another slide which elicited an indigenous concept was the slide of a bag of Oreo cookies. Although, the word “Oreo” was discussed in a racial context by only one individual in the African American group, knowledge that the researcher brings to the current study includes an awareness of the racial implications with the African American community for the word “Oreo.” None of the majority culture students made reference to the racial implications of the word until the prediction part of the study. When queried, only some of the majority culture participants had heard of racial implications for the word, whereas all of the African American students indicated that they had. The results from the current study and the knowledge that the researcher brought to the study would suggest that “Oreo,” used in a racial context is an indigenous concept.

Ingroup differentiation of roles was elicited by the Michael Jordan slide. While the majority culture students only identified Michael Jordan as great athlete, basketball player, role model, and icon, the African American students saw him in additional roles and recognized his accomplishments outside of basketball including genuine person, family man, and businessman. Further, the African American students cited some of Michael Jordan’s personal life issues. None of the majority culture students did so. Research would suggest that the difference in responses between the African American and majority culture students might be due to ingroup heterogeneity and outgroup homogeneity, respectively. Ingroup heterogeneity refers to the ability of individuals within a particular social category to be able to discern dimensions of variability within their group (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Tajfel & Turner 1986).
The slide which depicted an elderly, African American woman elicited an intercultural sympathy response from the majority culture students. A common manifestation of projection is intercultural sympathy in which the response is framed in the would be empathizers' lens rather than understanding and feeling with another worldview (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987). In the case of intercultural sympathy, individuals experience sympathy and guilt about target individuals rather than feeling with target individuals (Christie & Beyer, 1999). The majority culture students characterized the woman in the picture as a slave and suggested that she was enjoying a break from work. Further, they predicted that the African American students would respond with anger and resentment to the slide. The African American response to the slide was completely different. They did not describe the woman as either a slave or maid. They instead described her as a strong woman with a lot of pride. They did not express anger or resentment toward the slide. One might suggest that the majority culture students were operating from a stereotype by classifying the woman as a slave or maid and further were operating from “white guilt” in their prediction that the African Americans would respond with anger and resentment toward the slide.

The slides of The Declaration of Independence and the Boston Tea Party elicited similar between-group differences. For both slides, the majority culture students mentioned that the events depicted by the slides were important, whereas the African American students did not. Also, African American students expressed apathy toward both slides. On the other hand, majority culture students spoke about pride in connections with the Declaration of Independence, but no affect was elicited from them.
in response the Boston Tea Party. The differences in responses based on group membership are hardly surprising because African Americans bring with them a view of history that is not shared by the majority culture students. In particular, the African American students do not find that either applies to the African American experience due to inconsistencies with slavery and inequality, whereas these are salient issues for majority culture students.

Seeing race or being color-blind. Finally, a fifth difference that further distinguished the two groups was the African American students’ greater tendency to address ethnicity in response to the slides than the majority culture students. African American students addressed ethnicity in thirteen of the fourteen slides compared to only six slides for the majority culture students. In addition, of the six slides, in which both groups attributed ethnicity, three slides resulted in between-group differences in the ethnicity described. Also, African American students emphasized and were more specific in their references to ethnicity. A perusal of the references to ethnicity illuminated three distinct categories: 1) ethnicity in reference to an African American individual portrayed in the slides; 2) ethnicity in reference to white individual(s) portrayed in the slides; and 3) distinction of ethnicity.

In response to slides two and eight, the African American students referred to Michael Jordan and O.J. Simpson as African American or black men, whereas the majority culture students did not make any references to ethnicity. Research suggests that such a distinction may be the result of racial socialization (Staples, 1988; Thorton, 1997). Many African American parents infuse racial socialization into their childrearing.
practices, believing that they are raising children who are African American rather than
American (Thorton, 1997). They teach them to be black in a white society (Staples, 1988; Thorton, 1997). As a result of such upbringing and personal experiences, African American individuals may be more readily willing and able to make ethnic distinctions.

In addition to referring to Michael Jordan and O.J. Simpson as being African American or black, the African American students also made reference to white individuals on three separate occasions in which the majority culture students did not: 1) the slide of Uncle Sam, "an ugly white man pointing;" 2) the slide of the Boston Tea Party, "a bunch of white people playing with tea;" and 3) the slide of Gloria Steinem, "I see a white, hippie woman." African American individuals frequently referred to white individuals as being white and referred to African American individuals as being black. In contrast, white individuals referred to African Americans, at times, as being black, but did not refer to white individuals as being white. The latter is a consequence of a society where whiteness has attained a status of invisibility and at the same time the norm, i.e., an unmarked norm (Frankenberg, 1997). Dominance is maintained by the invisibility and not standing out as anything in particular (Aanerud, 1997). Further, whiteness as a racial category operates from a privileged position in which individuals are assumed to be white unless otherwise described (Aanerud, 1997).

In regard to making distinctions in ethnicity, the African American students placed more emphasis on and were more specific in their references to ethnicity than were the majority culture students. In the first slide, which portrayed an African American man and woman, the African American students suggested the couple might be African,
Caribbean, or African Americans. The majority culture students just described the couple as being African. Similarly, in response to the sixth slide, which depicted men walking together with guns, the African American students suggested that the men might be Africans, Koreans, Japanese, or Pacific Islanders. The majority group only suggested Cuban as a possible ethnic classification. The difference in responses between the African American and majority culture students might be attributed to ingroup heterogeneity and outgroup homogeneity, respectively (Brewer & Miller, 1984; Tajfel & Turner 1986).

Between-Group Differences in Accuracy of Predictions

Research questions four through nine explored the accuracy for which each group was able to predict the other groups’ responses. At times, both groups were hesitant to make predictions of the other groups’ responses as indicated in the following quotes.

Majority Culture Student:
Shanon: I don’t know what they would think.

African American Student:
Slick: I don’t know. I’m not white person.

Most of the time, however, there was no hesitancy on the part of either group to make predictions. Because of the time constraint issue of the focus group interviews, data collected on the predictions made by both groups were not as in-depth as were the data for the between-group differences in responses to the slides, and therefore, few conclusions can be drawn. Even so, one thing seemed worthy of note, the between-group differences in the number of accurate predictions.
Research questions four through six specifically explored the existence of differences between African American students’ responses to the slides and majority culture students’ predictions of the African American student’s responses; which slides, if any resulted in inaccurate predictions; and the nature of an inaccuracy of predictions that occurred. Of the fourteen slides that were identified as eliciting different response sets, majority culture students were inaccurate in their predictions of African American responses for nine of the slides. In contrast, research questions seven through nine specifically explored the existence of differences between majority culture students’ responses to the slides and African American students’ predictions of the majority culture student’s responses; which slides, if any resulted in inaccurate predictions; and the nature of an inaccuracy of predictions that occurred. Of the fourteen slides eliciting different response sets, African American students were inaccurate in their predictions of majority culture responses for four of the slides. In short, the African American students were accurate in their predictions twice as often as the majority culture students. Research suggests that such a distinction might be attributed to assimilation (McAdoo, 1993; Schaefer, 1995) or biculturalism. Assimilation entails the gradual relinquishment of one set of cultural characteristics and the acquisition of a new set (McAdoo, 1993; Schaefer, 1995). Typically minority groups, including African Americans, assimilate to majority culture; therefore, they are knowledgeable of majority culture and would be able to accurately predict majority culture responses. Biculturalism, on the other hand, involves developing and maintaining two, shifting identities (Hecht, Collier, Ribeau, 1993). Because African Americans live in a society that is entrenched in majority culture, they
often become bicultural, knowing both the characteristics of their culture and majority culture, again accounting for accuracy in predicting majority culture responses.

Mapping Data Collection and Results Against Current Empathy Methods and Measures

The current study conceptualizes empathy as a multidimensional construct in which individuals’ imaginatively place themselves in another’s role to elicit affective and cognitive reactions that are contingent on social and cultural understanding. The results suggest that the method used in the current study was effective in eliciting both affective and cognitive reactions. Indeed, in the fourteen slides in which between group differences were identified, cognitive responses were elicited in all fourteen and affective responses were elicited in eleven. Of the eleven slides that elicited affective responses, the African American group responded with affect to all eleven compared to seven by the majority culture group. Further, of the seven slides in which affect was elicited from both groups, the affect that was elicited was different for five of the slides. Overall, these findings support research which underscores the importance of using multidimensional constructs such as empathy to explore cultural differences. Two important dimensions of empathy are affect and cognition.

Affective Dimension

Affective empathy measures fall into one of two categories: 1) measures that have subjects respond to items which correlate with empathy (Bryant, 1982; Jagers & Mock, 1993; Mehrabian & Epstein, 1972; Toi & Batson, 1982); and 2) measures that assess the degree to which the subjects are able to accurately name and label the affect associated with a stimulus (Feshbach & Roe, 1968; Klein, 1970). Measures which fall into the
former category may be helpful in identifying individuals’ propensity for empathy, in
general, but fail to assess whether or not individuals are vicariously sharing emotions and
experiences. For example, the majority culture students’ responses to slide nine, the
elderly African American woman, might be characterized as empathic according to such
affective measures of empathy. Responses such as the following might be assessed as
being sympathetic, compassionate, warm, tender, and soft-hearted, i.e., empathic:

Majority Culture Students:
Kramer: An older person who is has probably worked very hard for everything she has in life.

Kelly: I think it’s it might be of a slave, maybe enjoying her time off for break. Maybe sitting on the stairs of the shed that her so-called owners let her sleep in at night.

Shanon: Looks like an old picture of probably a slave or a maid who’s resting.

Lorenne: She looks like she’s had a hard day at work like working on like the farm or something like that. She’s looks tired and she’s relaxing.

Kramer: Somebody’s mother or possibly their grandmother.

Yet when the majority culture students’ responses are compared to the African
American students’ responses, the affect associated with the slides is markedly different,
i.e., the two groups are not sharing a vicarious emotional response to the slide. So while
the majority culture students might have demonstrated the ability to be empathic toward
African American individuals, they were not empathic with their African American
counterparts with regard to their response to slide. Affective measures, which do assess
empathy through match of affect, might redress the aforementioned problem. Currently
such measures, however, have not explored the effect of cultural contexts on affect
match. Instead, existing affective match measures tend to be limited and fixed in the
range of emotions they explore. The current state of empathy research, however, does not allow for such between-group differences either in number or nature. The intent of the current study is to encourage the linkage between empathy and intercultural research.

In the current study, two between-group differences were identified in regard to affect: 1) number of slides that elicited affect; and 2) nature of affect elicited. Research suggests that the number of affective responses might differ according to group membership, with non-Western groups expressing affect more often than Western groups (Broome, 1991; Cross, 1971). African American students; therefore, might have been expected to express affect more often than majority culture students.

In addition, research suggests there are between-group differences in the nature of affect expressed, both contextually and in general. The example of the communication breakdown between the Japanese and American individuals (Stewart & Bennett, 1991), which is alluded to in Chapter One, is illustrative of a contextual affect difference. An example of a general affect difference is the case in which emotions of pride, ambition, guilt, or remorse might not be experienced in cultures that emphasize the group over the individual (Heelas, 1986).

Cognitive Dimension

Cognitive empathy measures assess empathy by calling on individuals to do role-taking (Dymond, 1949; Elms 1966; Stotland, 1969; Strayer, 1993). Yet even when individuals genuinely attempt to empathize, they may lack the repertoire to take on accurately the roles of another culture (Hoffman, 1984; Strayer, 1987). Their lack of repertoire or ethnocentrism may prevent individuals from achieving the self-other
differentiation necessary for empathy to occur. Instead the result is often projection, e.g.,
"my response to the slide was this; therefore others' response will be similar."

Similar to Dymond's (1949) methodology, the current study assessed individuals’ responses and also had individuals make predictions of others’ responses to the same stimuli. Because individuals may report differing affect and cognitive experiences, yet have the repertoire to be interculturally empathic, the prediction part of the methodology is essential. An accurate prediction, however, cannot be assumed to be indicative of empathy. In the case in which groups’ responses to the slides are the same and they accurately predict the other group’s response, the accurate prediction may be reflective of projection. In the current study, between-group differences were identified in response to all of the slides except for three slides that were disregarded because responses were so scattered that no between-group difference or similarities could be discerned. Accurate predictions in the current study; therefore, might be reflective of intercultural empathy or empathic tendencies and not projection. Interestingly, however, both groups had a tendency to fall into egoistic or ethnocentric drift during the process of making predictions of the other group’s responses, i.e., they lost sight of the goal to make predictions of the other group’s responses and instead provided their own reactions.

Majority Culture Students:

Josh: I think it's a religion. Yeah, and it their religion from Africa. (A response provided as a prediction of how the African American students would respond to slide one).

Ben: Ah, yeah, ah, I think you can I think one could see that you can see both a white person and a black person there so I don’t know, that's, that's weird now I never saw the white head before. I wasn’t looking at it. But I just saw the white head now and yeah, you can see both. (A response provided as a prediction of how the African American students would respond to slide fifteen).
African American Students:

Carin: I honestly think it depends on for whites, blacks, whoever, it depends on where you come from. Because some people's cultures or subcultures or neighborhoods or wherever they're from, this might be acceptable. They might not have a problem with it. They might even, may not even recognize, well they're going notice that it's a black man and a white female, but that, that might be the extent of it. It might not make that big of difference. I don't care that there's a black man with a white woman. I don't care. (A response provided as a prediction of how the majority culture students would respond to slide four).

Lady J: The whole group, we don’t care. You may have some that are highly upset by this picture. You may find some who see, see this being perfectly normal. I think it always, all depends on the person. (A response provided as a prediction of how the majority culture students would respond to slide four).

In contrast to most empathy measures, the current study approached data collection with an elicitive approach. Participants in the current study were not provided with statements for which they were to respond in agreement or disagreement or respond to open-ended questions to which “correct” answers had been identified against which their responses would be compared. Rather, the reactions provided by the participants in response to open-ended questions were used to generate “culturally correct” responses to the slides that were presented. The next section addresses hypotheses that were generated from the data, i.e., the “culturally correct” responses to the slides.

Hypotheses Generated from the Data

Although the findings that emerged from the data in the current study are not generalizeable to other contexts, they can be used to generate hypotheses (Lincoln & Guba, 1985). Indeed, the intent of the current study was to work toward identifying general patterns that could guide hypothesis construction and provide insight into "culturally, objectively correct" answers which will be used in a quantitative study at a
later date. Results of the current study illuminate data that can be used for future cultural studies. In particular, some response patterns that emerged from the data that might warrant further inquiry include between-group differences in the mention of ethnicity, detail of description provided, number of times and nature of affect identified, and meaning attributed to the slides.

To identify “culturally, objectively correct” answers, recurring indigenous concepts (i.e., terms and phrases used by participants) (Patton, 1990) were analyzed. Concepts were assigned to particular categories through an iterative process of pulling concepts from the data and making comparisons with other concepts assigned to the categories. The soundness of the categories were judged against two criteria: internal homogeneity or the extent to which categories fit together in a meaningful way (Patton, 1990) and external heterogeneity or the extent to which categories were distinct from one another (Patton, 1990).

Although category distinction was sought, relationships between categories were determined to assist with new insight or the emergence of new patterns and the generation of hypotheses. General patterns that emerged from the data have been used to generate hypotheses in the form of “culturally, objectively correct” answers to the slides. Tables 35-48, provided at the end of this section, are rating charts of the fourteen slides in which between-group differences were identified, i.e., the “culturally, objectively correct” answers to each of the fourteen slides. Responses listed in the rating charts have been categorized as either an affective or cognitive response. In addition, because the between-group difference in reference to ethnicity was so salient, ethnicity has been assigned to a
category separate from cognition on the rating charts. For purposes of scoring, responses
to the slides were assigned to three different scoring categories: 1) a response received a
score of one, if it was a response that was only provided by the African American
students; 2) a response received a score of zero, if it was a response that was provided by
both African American and majority culture students; and 3) a response received a score
of negative one, if was a response that was only provided by the majority culture students.

The results indicate that often individuals provide more than one response to a
slide; therefore, a response to the slide may result in a composite score rather than an
individual score. A composite score is the sum of the scores of all of the responses
provided for a slide. For example, using the table as a guide, an individual who provided
the following responses to slide one, “happy, Caribbean, royalty, marriage, and clothing,
in general,” would have a composite score of one for that particular slide. Omissions
were not scored, e.g., a response provided by one group, but not the other. For example,
“happy” appears under the “Add One” scoring category on the chart, but does not appear
on the “Subtract One” scoring category as an omission. If one individual were to identify
the affect of happiness in response to the first slide, whereas another individual did not,
the former would receive a score of one, whereas the latter would not have any additional
points added to the composite score. Therefore, the two individuals’ scores would
already be differentiated and not necessitate the scoring of omissions. A dash in the “Add
One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific
response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or
they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score
0" category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category. Individuals may report differing affective and cognitive experiences, yet be quite capable of accurately predicting others' responses. Therefore, another method used to identify majority culture ethnocentrism was to have majority culture students make predictions of the African American students' responses to the slides. Due to the limitations of the current study, however, not enough data were generated, with regard to the predictions made by both groups, to develop rating charts similar to the rating charts that were developed for the between-group differences in response to the slides. Such efforts are encouraged for future research.
Rating charts of the between-group differences in response to the fourteen slides.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>pride</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition</strong></td>
<td>heritage</td>
<td>royalty</td>
<td>clothing, in general</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>unity</td>
<td>marriage</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>shoe</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>hat</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>bottom of dress</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td>African</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Caribbean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 35: Rating chart for slide one.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition</strong></td>
<td>refer to Michael Jordan by name</td>
<td>role model</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jet magazine</td>
<td>great basketball player</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>story about Michael Jordan not making his</td>
<td>great athlete</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>high school basketball team</td>
<td>actor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>father’s death</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>gambling allegations genuine</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>real person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>family man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>business man</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>not his responsibility to be a role model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>African American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>all races, cultures response to him</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 36: Rating chart for slide two.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>sweepstake</td>
<td>hungry</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>money</td>
<td>milk and cookies</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>racial implications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>for the word Oreo</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 37: Rating chart for slide three.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>anger, upset, comfort</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>risks, difficulties</td>
<td>couple, friends,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>associated with</td>
<td>two people in love</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>interracial</td>
<td>holistic description</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>relationships,</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>black, white</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 38: Rating chart for slide four.
### Table 39: Rating chart for slide six.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>anger</td>
<td>sadness, depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>protection, clothing,</td>
<td>soldiers, war, fight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>weapons, facial expressions</td>
<td>holistic description of slide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African, Korean,</td>
<td>Cuban</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese, Pacific Islanders</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

### Table 40: Rating chart for slide seven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>detachment, meaningless</td>
<td>pride</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>not important, irrelevant</td>
<td>old, document,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>To African Americans,</td>
<td>Declaration of Independence,</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>inconsistency with slavery</td>
<td>Constitution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>and inequality</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
<td>stress, hopelessness,</td>
<td>happy</td>
<td>negative feelings toward</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>apathy toward result</td>
<td></td>
<td>trial and result of trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>of trial</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition</strong></td>
<td>O.J.'s been through</td>
<td>trial, overexposure</td>
<td>received innocent verdict</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>enough, do not care</td>
<td>football, athlete,actor</td>
<td>because of money and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>whether innocent or</td>
<td>murder, killing</td>
<td>power, should be retried</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>guilty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td>African American, black</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 41: Rating chart for slide eight.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Affect</strong></td>
<td>pride</td>
<td></td>
<td>enjoying break from work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Cognition</strong></td>
<td>home, strong woman,</td>
<td>poor, old woman,</td>
<td>slave, maid, shack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>the South</td>
<td>grandmother, tired,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>worked hard whole life</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>African American,</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 42: Rating chart for slide nine.
### Table 43: Rating chart for slide ten.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>happiness, greed</td>
<td></td>
<td>work for money, work for pay rather than volunteer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>root of evil, lies, sin, dishonesty</td>
<td></td>
<td>money, useful</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

### Table 44: Rating chart for slide eleven.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>dislike for Uncle Sam poster, negative feelings toward military, integrity, loyalty, appreciation for volunteers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>negative view of military, loss of freedom, opportunity, freedom</td>
<td>military, recruitment, war, protection, draft, taxes, relatives, friends</td>
<td>peace in relationship to war</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American, black, white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 44: Rating chart for slide eleven.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Add One</th>
<th>Score 0</th>
<th>Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>anger, detachment meaningless</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>not meaningful, irrelevance for African Americans</td>
<td>Boston Tea Party</td>
<td>important, meaningful</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 45: Rating chart for slide twelve.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Add One</th>
<th>Score 0</th>
<th>Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td>feeling of being trapped and unable to express themselves</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>intelligence, purchase of slaves, important date for black culture</td>
<td>heads, numbers, words, marital arts, glow, figurines</td>
<td>writing, advertisement, shooting target, scary movie</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>African American, black</td>
<td></td>
<td>Chinese, French</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 46: Rating chart for slide fifteen.
A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Table 47: Rating chart for slide sixteen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Affect</td>
<td></td>
<td>happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>hippie, fat, drugs, hiding something, stress, eyes, hair</td>
<td>woman, sunglasses, Gloria Steinem, do not know Gloria Steinem</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td>white</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 48: Rating chart for slide seventeen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>*Add One</th>
<th>*Score 0</th>
<th>*Subtract One</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cognition</td>
<td>grease, gender difference</td>
<td>hair product, conditioner shampoo, dye, relaxant, mousse, haircut, barber, weave, extensions.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td>African American, black</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*A dash in the “Add One” or “Subtract One” category indicates that there was not a culturally specific response to that category, i.e., the group did not provide a response to that category or they provided a response that was also provided by the other group. A dash in the “Score 0” category indicates that either neither group provided a response for the category or that only culturally specific responses were provided for the category.

Implications of the Study

Although between-group differences were identified in the current study, the results are not generalizable to other contexts. The hypotheses generated from the data, however, could be used for research that is generalizable. Clearly, the current research was a necessary methodological step designed to identify between-group differences and the nature of the differences. While speculations were made in this chapter as to what
may have contributed to specific between-group differences, future research could rigorously test rival hypotheses. Some potentially fruitful areas of inquiry suggested by the current research includes: affect differences due to non-Western and Western perspectives; differences in personalization of slides in relation to some of the slides depicting African American individuals; influence of identified ethnicity on affect elicited; differences in the histories individuals bring to the context; attention to detail and attribution of detail to construction of meaning as an acquired skill for coping and survival purposes; between-group differences in the use of storytelling due to African oral traditions; further exploration of indigenous concepts; ingroup differentiation of roles; intercultural sympathy, racial socialization; invisibility of whiteness; and internal heterogeneity/outgroup homogeneity.

In addition, future research could focus on the prediction part of the current study. Due to the overly ambitious agenda during the focus group interviews, data collected for the prediction part of the study were not as extensive as they were for the between-group differences in the response part of the study. Even with the limited data collected in the current study, one observation was made: the African American students were accurate in their predictions twice as often as the majority culture students. Therefore, one immediate speculation that could be examined in future studies might be to determine if assimilation or biculturalism played a role in the between-group differences in the accuracy of predictions.

A third recommendation for future research is to administer the slides to a larger audience (e.g., 100 African American individuals in one setting and 100 majority culture
students in another) and have participants respond in writing rather than in a focus group format. The rating charts developed in the current study could be used as a starting point and new response data could be used to fine tune the rating charts. Some responses that were originally scored as being elicited by only one group might find their way to the “Score 0” category. Other responses might not appear on the initial rating charts and could be added to the charts. In addition, by administering the slides to large groups a more highly calibrated scoring system could be developed. For example if a response is only elicited by African American individuals, and 75 out of 100 individuals provide the response, perhaps that response becomes an “Add Two” rather than “Add One.” If on the other hand, a response is only elicited by African American individuals, but only 25 out of 100 of the individuals provide the response, the response may stay “Add One.”

Other research possibilities include administering the slides and eliciting responses to other audiences within the African American and majority culture populations. Such populations might include different college populations from the colleges that were explored in the current study; non-college populations; populations identified for socio-economic status; and age cohorts. Between-group gender differences might also be an area of interest, especially since previous research suggests that one might not see gender differences that appear between majority culture males and females replicated among African Americans.

Finally, future research might assess individuals’ racial identity status to examine the influence the status might have on responses and/or predictions to slides. Further, these response patterns could be used to generate new rating charts contingent on racial
identity status. Future studies could use the new rating charts for purposes of intercultural empathy model development.

Strengths and Weaknesses of the Study

An inherent weakness of the study was the lack of generalizeability of the data due to the qualitatively nature of the methodology. The intent of the study, however, was not to end up with data that could be generalized, but rather to guide future research efforts because the empathy literature has only sparingly addressed intercultural contexts.

In addition to the inherent weaknesses of naturalistic inquiries, the current study was also subject to the limitations of focus group interviewing, including small sample size. Due to the small sample size of the focus group interviews, theoretical saturation was not attained in the current study. Another setback due to the focus group interview approach for the current study was the length of the interviews. In a typical focus group interview, in which participants are asked questions rather than asked to respond to slides, the recommendation is to limit the number of questions to ten (Patton, 1990). A pilot study using 43 slides, in which written responses were solicited, led researchers to believe that 34 pictures (17 in part one and 17 in part two) presented in a focus group interview format would be an appropriate number. In hindsight, 20 slides (10 in part one and 10 in part two) would be the recommended maximum. The original plan for data collection involved using the rotating linear approach in obtaining responses to the slides for both parts one (group response to the slide) and part two (group prediction of the other group's response). The approach to data collection changed slightly when the first focus group interview with the African American students was conducted. Because they provided
rich, detailed responses to the 17 slides in part one, time did not permit the round-robin approach for soliciting their predictions of the majority culture students' responses. Instead, participants were encouraged to make predictions as a group. The revised method, for the most part, resulted in fewer respondents and shorter responses, thus decreasing the effectiveness of the prediction part of the study. For consistency, the same approach was used with the majority culture students.

Weaknesses notwithstanding, one of the strengths of the study was the recognition of the importance of addressing both cognition and affect in intercultural contexts. The methodology that was used in the current study drew out both affective and cognitive responses. Another strength of the study was the method in which data were collected, an elicitive approach. The primary emphasis of an elicitive approach is discovery and identifying (Lederbach, 1995). The current study was designed with the intent of generating hypotheses in the form of "objectively correct" answers to the slides based on cultural patterns that emerged from the data. The elicitive approach in the current study contrasts with more prescriptive approaches of other empathy measures, in which responses are mapped against predetermined answers.

Another strength of the study that also contrasts with current empathy studies was that the current study identified if and when participants experienced a vicarious sharing of emotions and meanings in response to the slides as well as the nature of those experiences. In particular, having participants predict the other group's responses in addition to providing their own responses made a distinction between ethnocentric projections and empathic tendencies. Such an approach contrasts with approaches that
suggest individuals have been interculturally empathic when they have had feelings for the stimuli without regard to the cultural implications of the feelings. The failure to explore responses in a cultural context may lead to mislabeling projection as empathy, i.e., projecting one’s own feelings rather than feeling with another.

Perhaps the greatest potential strength of the current study is the possibility it presents of illuminating for individuals, especially majority culture individuals that racism has not yet been eradicated, in part because many people feel like they are in the know about cultural differences. Another prevalent belief among college students is that if they just keep an open mind, they can’t be biased. The current study illuminates subtle forms of ethnocentrism. One such form is not recognizing when differences exist. Another form is not having awareness of inaccurately identifying differences. By enlarging our understanding of subtle majority culture ethnocentrism, we can hope for greater movement toward intercultural empathy.
BIBLIOGRAPHY


APPENDIX A

Demographic Information Sheet

We would like to request some general information needed to help interpret the results of the study.

1. Gender? (circle the letter)
   a. Male
   b. Female

2. Which of the following best describes your racial or ethnic identification? (circle the letter)
   a. African American
   b. Caucasian
   c. Other (specify) ______________________________________________________

3. What year in college are you? (circle the letter)
   a. Freshman
   b. Sophomore
   c. Junior
   d. Senior
   e. Other (specify) ______________________________________________________

4. Which of the following best describes the employment status of your parents? (circle the letter), Hollingshead, 1957

   **Mother**
   a. Executive, owner of large business, major professional
   b. Manager and owner of medium business, minor professional
   c. Administrator in large business, small business owner, semi-professional
   d. Owner of little businesses, clerical, sales, technicians
   e. Skilled workers
   f. Semi-skilled workers
   g. Unskilled workers

   **Father**
   a. Executive, owner of large business, major professional
   b. Manager and owner of medium business, minor professional
   c. Administrator in large business, small business owner, semi-professional
   d. Owner of little businesses, clerical, sales, technicians
   e. Skilled workers
   f. Semi-skilled workers
   g. Unskilled workers
5. What are the education levels of your parents? (circle the letter), Hollingshead, 1957

Mother
a. Graduate, professional degree
b. Standard college degree (4 year)
c. Partial college training (at least 1 year, less than 4 years)
d. High school graduate
e. Ten or eleven years completed
f. Seven, eight, or nine years completed
g. Less than seven years

Father
a. Graduate, professional degree
b. Standard college degree (4 year)
c. Partial college training (at least 1 year, less than 4 years)
d. High school graduate
e. Ten or eleven years completed
f. Seven, eight, or nine years completed
g. Less than seven years

6. Which best describes the racial or ethnic diversity of your childhood neighborhood? (circle the letter)

a. Mostly African American
b. Mostly Caucasian
c. Approximately the same percentage of African American and Caucasian
d. Other (specify) ____________________________________________________

7. Which best describes the racial or ethnic diversity of the schools you have attended? (circle the letter)

a. Mostly African American
b. Mostly Caucasian
c. Approximately the same percentage of African American and Caucasian
d. Other (specify) ____________________________________________________
APPENDIX B

CONSENT FOR PARTICIPATION IN SOCIAL AND BEHAVIORAL RESEARCH

I consent to participating in research entitled:

Mapping the Semantic Contour of Cultures: Identifying Majority Culture Ethnocentrism as a Means Toward Intercultural Empathy

Dr. Robert F. Rodgers or his authorized representative has explained the purpose of the study, the procedures to be followed, including audiotaping the focus group interview, and the expected duration of my participation. Possible benefits of the study have been described, as have alternative procedures, if such procedures are applicable and available.

I acknowledge that I have had the opportunity to obtain additional information regarding the study and that any questions I have raised have been answered to my full satisfaction. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to withdraw consent at any time and to discontinue participation in the study without prejudice to me.

Finally, I acknowledge that I have read and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A copy has been given to me.

Date:___________________________ Signed:___________________________

(Participant) (Principal Investigator or his/her authorized representative) (Person authorized to consent for participant, if required)

Witness:___________________________

HS-027 (Rev. 12/97) - (To be used only in connection with social and behavioral research.)
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SLIDES
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Slide Two
Slide Three
Slide Four
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