DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 069 817   UD 013 019

AUTHOR   Saral, Tulsi B.
TITLE   A Content Analytic Study of Interracial
                Conflict-Producing Situations and Roles. Illinois
                Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged Series,
                Technical Report Number 9.
INSTITUTION   Illinois Univ., Urbana. Dept. of Psychology.
SPONS AGENCY   Social and Rehabilitation Service (DHEW), Washington,
                D.C.
REPORT NO   ISED-TR-9
PUB DATE   Jul 71
NOTE   84p.

EDRS PRICE   MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS   *Content Analysis; Cultural Environment; Economically
                Disadvantaged; *Interaction Process Analysis;
                Interpersonal Relationship; *Negro Literature;
                Periodicals; *Race Relations; Research Methodology;
                Role Conflict; *Role Perception; Role Theory; Short
                Stories; Social Environment; Social Relations

ABSTRACT
                This study is an exploratory attempt to discover how
blacks perceive their interactions with whites, in this country. For
this purpose it was necessary to examine materials written by black
authors and aimed at black readers. It was decided to select such
magazines appearing between 1965 and 1969 that had a wide circulation
among black readership. The study was restricted to 36 short stories
which contained some interactions between black and white characters.
Each interaction was viewed as involving an initiator (Actor) and an
object (Recipient) toward whom the interaction was directed. The
Actor and Recipient together constituted a role-pair. The results
indicate that blacks perceived whites initiating the interactions
more in general than the blacks. However further analysis revealed
that the blacks were seen as initiating more interactions when they
were in the role-pairs of female-male, employee-employer, person
helped-helping profession, citizen-police official, citizen-public
official, and female-female; whereas whites initiate more
interactions when they are in the role-pairs of male-female,
employer-employee, helping profession-person helped, police
official-citizen, public official-citizen, teacher-student, and
male-male. (Author/JM)

ED 069817

DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY

UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS AT URBANA-CHAMPAIGN

CHAMPAIGN, ILLINOIS   61820

Illinois Studies of the Economically Disadvantaged

A CONTENT ANALYTIC STUDY OF INTERRACIAL CONFLICT-PRODUCING

SITUATIONS AND ROLES

Tulsi B. Saral

University of Illinois

Technical Report No. 9

July, 1971

Harry C. Triandis
Principal Investigator

UD 013019

1

Preface

This report is part of a series concerned with the economically dis-
advantaged. We are testing the assumption that economic disadvantages create
characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment.
We call such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a
particular group. In earlier reports we showed substantial differences in
the subjective cultures of blacks and whites who differ in level of economic
advantage. We suspect that such differences in subjective culture lead to
major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his
fellow employees and his subordinates. We are currently working on training
programs which will incorporate the information about such cultural
differences and which can be used with both whites and blacks in industrial
environments. The final step of the project will include validations of the
effectiveness of such training.

The present report employs content analysis as the means of studying
subjective culture. In some significant ways the results presented here
are consistent with those of previous technical reports, suggesting that
there is concurrent validity in our findings, since different methods give
some similar results. In a later report we will review all the results of
these reports to show explicitly the points of agreement.

Harry C. Triandis

A CONTENT ANALYTIC STUDY OF INTERRACIAL CONFLICT-PRODUCING SITUATIONS AND ROLES[1]

Tulsi B. Saral

University of Illinois

Human beings organize the sensory world by a process of categorization. Categorization simplifies man's task of responding to the environment by enabling him to make a similar response to different stimulus situations. The limiting factor is the individual's capacity to recognize common denominators or similarities among ranges of physical phenomena. This capacity to infer identity from cues or signs can be facilitated, developed or retarded by a variety of factors.

In the area of social perception, Triandis (1970) has hypothesized that economic disadvantages create characteristic ways of perceiving and thinking about the social environment. He calls such characteristic perceptions the "subjective culture" of a particular group.

Subjective culture involves perceptions of roles and behavior norms. Each of us, whether he likes it or not, must interact with many different persons. In the course of these interactions, we come to know things about the other persons with whom we interact. A host of impressions vie for our attention. The other persons we meet seem helpful, ambitious, friendly, hostile, cheerful, suspicious, angry, fearful and so forth. The impressions

---

we select or register the most, depend upon a variety of factors including our experiences in the past, our future expectations and our own intentions toward others. These judgments of others, the impressions we form of them, the ways in which we categorize them, and our effort to predict their likely behavior, have important implications for our behavior toward them.

Much of what we think we know about others stems directly from the ways in which we represent their behavior. In the words of Wallace (1971), each of us possesses an interpersonal "dictionary," set of terms, concepts, etc., which we use in making sense of the behavior of other persons. Our interpersonal "dictionaries" frequently limit what we see and what we do not see in interaction with others. According to Osgood (1969), most people most of the time create sentences that are congruent with their own systems of attitudes and beliefs. "The facets of reality that are sharpened or leveled by words depend on what properties have made a difference in the past" (Osgood, 1969). As a consequence, of course, we sometimes run into the danger of attending to features of events which are now irrelevant and of assuming certain qualities in others when they may not in fact exist.

"Cultures thus differ not only in the number of categories they utilize within a particular domain of meaning, but also in the number and the kinds of critical attributes they employ" (Triandis & Malpass, 1970). As a result, when people from two different cultures share the membership of the same organization, we would expect a number of phenomena relevant to social perception to influence their behavior and experience. Such differences in subjective cultures could lead to major barriers in communication between an employee and his supervisor, his fellow employees, and his subordinates.

The question of differences among blacks and whites in the U. S. A. has received considerable attention in recent years. However, the bulk of

the work by various social scientists has centered around the study of "black" culture (Clark, 1965; Keil, 1966; Liebow, 1967; Maruyama, 1969) and no systematic attempt seems to have been made to determine the extent of dissimilarity in values, norms, and roles among blacks and whites in our society. "We have little information about the extent of disagreement, the focus of disagreement, and the heterogeneity of responses within each of the two cultural groups, or within each of the domains of concepts. It is most likely that when enough research is done, we will find a very complex pattern of results, with various parts of each social group showing dissimilarities in particular values, norms, roles and particular facilities" (Triandis, 1970).

How do we come to know another culture? How do we determine the differences in subjective cultures of two groups? One approach would be to carry out empirical studies in the field to detect cultural differences in the two groups. Triandis and Malpass (1970) have proposed a theoretical framework to collect subjective culture data in a black-white culture setting. This framework inclu'es a number of linguistic tasks and procedures which will reveal differences among the two cultures in their categorization and in their association of categories with certain other categories, as well as with affect and behavioral intentions.

Another approach to understand subjective culture would be by inference from literary sources of given cultures. The use of literary sources as spokesmen for their culture is not new in psychology and has been used profitably by a number of investigators. "If one wants to get a natural, unfractionated picture of behavior, this is one of the few sources available" (Barker & Wright, 1954). The most intensive use of written material for analyzing cultural aspirations across nations was made by McClelland (1961). Starting with the assumption that such things as the myths, folk

tales, and educational materials of a nation are representative of its collective concerns, he successfully employed the contents of school readers used in various countries as a measure of achievement motivation of the given countries.

The study of subjective culture involves, among other things, a study of perceptions of roles and behavior norms. Working in the area of interpersonal behavior, Katz (1964) developed a method of content analysis which would extract critical interactions from short stories and, based on the frequency distribution of both the role-pairs and the behaviors relating them, would reveal the culture-common and culture-specific patterns of interpersonal behavior. Short stories were selected for the purpose of analysis because "they would provide a reasonable source of interaction behaviors since they have a context which gives a highly intensive view of role-relations and are thus well adapted to obtaining feelings associated with verbal and non-verbal behaviors which might be difficult to get using other means, e.g., eliciting normative information from subjects, because of the bias associated with socially desirable behaviors" (Katz, 1964).

One limitation of Katz's approach is that it yields a very large number of interaction categories. The purpose is to obtain normative data according to role-pairs which makes it essential to have categories broken into very small units. In the content analysis of American short stories, for example, Katz (1964b) came up with 56 intention categories and 84 role pairs. Not only does this procedure necessitate a large number of categories in order to classify all of the behaviors encountered, it could also yield a different set of categories for different cultures, rendering comparisons between different cultures rather difficult.

Stimuli vary along dimensions, some of which are simple and obvious, like the dimensions of size or color, and some of which are exceedingly complex. The complex dimensions can often be analyzed into a set of simpler underlying dimensions or features. Working with interpersonal verbs, Osgood (1970b) has presented a model in which dimensions are hypothesized to operate as a simultaneous bundle of distinctive semantic features mediating the meaning of behavioral events, either perceived or intended.

Osgood suggests that the reduction of the complexities of inter-personal behaviors to sets of mediating intentions, and these in turn to a limited set of componential semantic features, would enliven the possibility of discovering universals. "The most likely constant in this domain would seem to be the dimensional feature structure of the intentions themselves. Thus we might expect all human groups to distinguish between Associative and Dissociative intentions (Helping vs. Hindering), between Supraordinate and Subordinate intentions (Dominating vs. Submitting), and so forth--simply because they are human" (Osgood, 1970a).

Osgood assumes that "in any language the words used to talk about inter-personal behaviors will be coded on the same semantic features as the perceived behaviors themselves. Thus, the interpersonal verb To Console as a linguistic sign will evoke in a listener a pattern of semantic features similar to that which the perceptual sign in the observer produces (e.g., seeing a mother stroking the face of a frightened child). This assumption--if justified--provides an entrèe to the structure of interpersonal behavior in a culture" (Osgood, 1970a).

It is suggested that a relatively small set of distinctive features can discriminate among a large number of affective intentions, expressed through interpersonal interactions. The mediation processes in interpersonal

perception serve to render many diverse overt expressions functionally
equivalent. The use of appropriate semantic features to describe these
expressions would facilitate the understanding of the underlying dimensions.
Working with subjects from Illinois, Hawaii and Japan, Osgood and his
associates have further demonstrated the applicability of such features
across diverse cultures by showing that it is possible to infer the "cultural
features" of role-pairs from the shared semantic features of interpersonal
verbs that are considered appropriate or inappropriate in association with
them in various cultures (Osgood, 1970a).

Objective of the Study

This study is an exploratory attempt to discover how blacks in the
U.S.A. perceive their interactions with whites in this country. For this
purpose it was necessary to examine materials written by black authors and
aimed at black readers. It was, therefore, decided to select such magazines
that had a wide circulation among black readership. The study was further
restricted to short stories appearing in these magazines on the assumption
that authors reflect, in their stories, sharpened perception of people in
interaction and may be regarded as spokesmen for their culture. It was
further assumed that the short stories written by members of one group, and
depicting interactions between the members of two different groups would
provide a reasonably useful source of interaction behaviors since they have
a context which gives a highly intensive view of role relations. The selection
of stories was, therefore, further restricted to only those stories which
contained some interactions between black and white characters.

Selection of Magazines

The question of black/white relations have gained extra salience in
the course of the last five or six years. The selection of magazines for
the purposes of examination was therefore restricted to those published from
1965 to the summer of 1969.

8

On going through the periodical section of the University of Illinois Library, a list of magazines with a distinctive black readership was compiled for the purpose of preliminary analysis. Most of these magazines, however, were found to contain news commentaries like those in Time and Newsweek or light reading like Life and Look. Only four periodicals were found containing fiction in their reading material. These were: Tan, Negro Digest, Jive and Hep.

As was explained above, we were interested in only those stories which contained interaction between blacks and whites. Of the above four magazines, Hep did not contain any stories showing any black/white inter- action. One issue of Jive contained a story featuring a black-white couple. Out of one hundred stories reviewed in Tan, only four showed interactions between blacks and whites. The only periodical which consistently contained fiction showing interaction between blacks and whites was the Negro Digest. A total of 32 such stories were found in this magazine, which brought the total of stories used to 36. A list of stories used with the source of publication is in Appendix A.

Identifying Instances of Interaction

Interpersonal interaction is defined, in this study, as any situation in which two persons are depicted as having been involved in any form of overt behavior. Each such interaction involves an Actor (agent) who initiates the interaction, and a Pecipient (object) toward whom the interaction is directed. The Actor and the Recipient together constitute a Role-Pair. An interaction between a Role-Pair (Actor and Recipient) is indicated by occurance of an Interpersonal Verb. The Interaction Unit thus is a statement which contains a reference to behavior or intention of person A towards person B, either of whom could be an Actor or a Recipient. The focus is

an _interpersonal_ behavior and intention and statements in which a behavior or intention is not originated by or directed towards a person are excluded from the analysis.

Identifying Role Pairs

Actor and Recipient of an interaction Unit were assigned to appropriate Role-Pairs. Because of the special nature of the material under analysis (stories depicting black/white interactions only), most of the traditional role-pairs (like father-son, mother-daughter, husband-wife) involving reciprocal role-members were conspicuous by their absence, or by extremely low frequencies. Table 1 shows the list of role pairs elicited from the selected interactions.

This gave us 60 role-pairs. For the sake of organization and efficiency of analysis, these role-pairs were collapsed into broader categories. These categories with their component role-pairs are given in Table 2. Table 3 gives the distribution of interactions by these broader categories of role-pairs.

As will be seen from Table 3, out of a total of 1193 interactions, 44% (519) are initiated by blacks and directed towards whites, while 56% (674) are initiated by whites and directed towards blacks. However, within various role-pair categories, this distribution varies considerably. The role-pairs for which the percentage of black-white interactions are higher than the mean are: Female-Male; Employee-Employer; Person helped-Helping profession; Citizen-Police official; Citizen-Public Official; and Female-Female. On the other hand, the percentage of white-black interactions exceeds the mean for the following role-pairs: Male-Female; Employer-Employee; Helping profession-Person helped; Police official-Citizen; Public official-Citizen; Teacher-Student; and Male-Male.

Table 1

List of Role Pairs Elicited from the Selected Interactions

Man-Woman
Woman-Man
Child-Adult
Adult-Child
Man-Man
Client-Nurse
Nurse-Client
Employer-Employee
Employee-Employer
Boy-Boy
Woman-Woman
Applicant-Interviewer
Interviewer-Applicant
Soldier-Soldier
Child-Child
Policeman-College Student
College Student-Policeman
Waitress-Customer
Customer-Waitress
Tourist-Resort Worker
Resort Worker-Tourist
Engaged Man-Engaged Woman
Engaged Woman-Engaged Man
Father-Father (of arguing sons)
Bartender-Customer
Resident-Sheriff
Sheriff-Resident

Citizen-Policeman
Policeman-Citizen
Criminal-Victim
Passenger-Passenger
Welfare Worker-Advisee
Advisee-Welfare Worker
Student Guardian-School Principal
School Principal-Student Guardian
School Board Member-Student Guardian
Policeman-Policy Worker
Policy Worker-Policeman
Hitchiker-Driver
Driver-Hitchiker
Man-Teenage Girl
Teenage Girl-Man
Student-Student
Teacher-Student
Student-Teacher
Girlfriend-Boyfriend
Boyfriend-Girlfriend
KKK Leader-Negro Doctor
Patient-Doctor
Customer-Store Clerk
Store Clerk-Customer
Dead Child's Father-Grave Digger
KKK Member-Negroes
Governor-Resident

Table 2

Revised Categories of Role Pairs with their Components

Male-Female

1. Man-woman
2. Engaged man-engaged woman
3. Man-teenage girl
4. Boyfriend-girlfriend

Female-Male

1. Woman-man
2. Engaged woman-engaged man
3. Teenage girl-man
4. Girlfriend-boyfriend

Employer-Employee

1. Employer-employee
2. Interviewer-applicant

Employee-Employer

1. Employee-employer
2. Applicant-interviewer

Helping Profession-Person Helped

1. Nurse-client
2. Waitress-customer
3. Resort worker-tourist
4. Bartender-customer
5. Welfare worker-advisee
6. Store clerk-customer

Person Helped-Helping Profession

1. Client-nurse
2. Customer-waitress
3. Tourist-resort worker
4. Advisee-welfare worker
5. Patient-doctor
6. Customer-store clerk

Police Official-Citizen

1. Policeman-college student
2. Sheriff-resident
3. Policeman-citizen
4. Policeman-policy worker

Citizen-Police Official

1. Resident-sheriff
2. Citizen-policeman
3. Policy worker-policeman

Public Official-Citizen

1. School principal-guardian
2. Governor-resident

Citizen-Public Official

1. Guardian-school principal

Teacher-Student

1. Teacher-student
2. Adult-child

Student-Teacher

1. Student-teacher
2. Child-adult

Male-Male

1. Man-man
2. Child-child
3. Soldier-soldier
4. Father-father (or arguing sons)
5. Passenger-passenger
6. Student-student
7. Hitchiker-driver
8. Driver-hitchiker
9. KKK leader-Negro doctor
10. Dead child's father-grave digger
11. KKK member-Negroes

Female-Female

1. Woman-woman

Miscellaneous*

*Role pairs having frequency of two and less grouped together.

Table 3

Distribution of Interactions by Broad Role Pair Categories

Role Pair Category	Black-White	White-Black	Total
Male-Female	38	124	162
Female-Male	135	45	180
Employer-Employee	0	56	56
Employee-Employer	57	1	58
Helping Profession-Person Helped	3	72	75
Person Helped-Helping Profession	80	32	112
Police Official-Citizen	0	94	94
Citizen-Police Official	38	9	47
Public Official-Citizen	0	6	6
Citizen-Public Official	9	0	9
Teacher-Student	7	37	44
Student-Teacher	11	11	22
Male-Male	98	129	227
Female-Female	28	19	47
Miscellaneous	15	39	54
	519	674	1193

Of special significance is the observation that in the black-white interactions, not a single instance was found for the role pairs Employer-Employee, Police Official-Citizen, Public Official-Citizen, and only three instances (out of a total of 75) for the role-pair Helping Profession-Person Helped. Under the white-black interactions, on the other hand, no instance was found for the role-pair Citizen-Public Official, and only one instance (out of a total of 58) for the role-pair Employee-Employer.

Assigning Interactions to Interpersonal Verb Categories

Once the Actor and the Recipient of the interaction were identified, the actual verb clause indicating or referring to the interaction was recorded. A comprehensive interpersonal verb category list along the lines of "Categories for Organization of Intentions" (Katz, 1964b) was compiled to serve as a guide for assigning these interactions to appropriate categories. This preliminary category list is in Appendix B. Later for the sake of better organization and efficiency, these categories were collapsed under 17 super-categories (Table 4). Table 5 gives the distribution of interactions by these revised interpersonal verb categories.

A chi-square test was carried out between the interactions between blacks and whites and those between whites and blacks on all 17 interpersonal verb categories and the results yielded statistically significant differences (chi square of 158.92 with 16 degrees of freedom).

Direction of Differences

To determine the direction of differences, an interaction ratio was calculated using the following formula:

$$\text{Interaction Ratio} = \frac{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} - \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} + \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}$$

Table 4

Revised Interpersonal Verb Categories

I. To Show Interest In

        1.1 pays attention to
        1.2 is responsive to
        1.3 encourages
        1.4 confides in
        1.5 confesses to
        1.6 gives opinion to
        1.7 expresses feeling to
        1.8 chatters to
        1.9 greets
        1.10 calls to
        1.11 imitates
        1.12 identifies with
        1.13 shares interests
        1.14 exchange things
        1.15 shares affection for same object
        1.16 share concerns, problems
        1.17 admires possessions
        1.18 admires human qualities
        1.19 admires appearance
        1.20 to admire talent

II. To Show Affection For

        2.1 behaves affectionately to
        2.2 speaks affectionately to
        2.3 shows appreciation to
        2.4 is friendly to
        2.5 feel affection for
        2.6 does things for (goes places with)
        2.7 plays with
        2.8 socializes with
        2.9 gets alone with
        2.10 gives invitation to (or accepts)
        2.11 kids with
        2.12 teases (playfully)

III. To Show Consideration for

        3.1 does things for, serves
        3.2 protects
        3.3 waits on
        3.4 serves food or drinks
        3.5 buys clothing
        3.6 is patient with
        3.7 is forgiving to
        3.8 is sympathetic to
        3.9 is solicitous to

Table 4 (Continued)

III (Continued)

      3.10 is considerate of
      3.11 is thoughtful of
      3.12 feels compassion for
      3.13 to worry about (positive sense)
      3.14 reassures
      3.15 comforts
      3.16 does not punish for wrongdoing
      3.17 not wanting to hurt

IV. To Cooperate

      4.1 cooperates with
      4.2 accepts as equal
      4.3 says thank you
      4.4 expresses appreciation for
      4.5 wishes to thank

V. To Please/Support

      5.1 gives presents to
      5.2 promises things to
      5.3 compliments, flatters
      5.4 praises, rewards
      5.5 gives approval to
      5.6 reassures
      5.7 gives support to
      5.8 defends
      5.9 saves from danger
      5.10 does extra work for

VI. To Influence/Control

      6.1 makes suggestion to
      6.2 gives advice to
      6.3 requests
      6.4 gives instructions, directions
      6.5 teaches
      6.6 gives information to or explains to
      6.7 stimulates the interest of
      6.8 urges (pleads with)
      6.9 commands (gives orders to)
      6.10 dominates
      6.11 persuades
      6.12 punishes
      6.13 scolds, reprimands, admonishes
      6.14 is strict with

Table 4 (Continued)

VI. (Continued)

    6.15 handcuffs
    6.16 holds physically
    6.17 arrests
    6.18 disapproves maintaining a relationship with person
        of opposite sex
    6.19 advises against maintaining a relationship with
        person of opposite sex
    6.20 physically prevents entering a relationship with
        a person of opposite sex

VII. To Assert Superiority

    7.1 boasts to
    7.2 boasts of material possession
    7.3 acts superior to
    7.4 considers oneself superior to
    7.5 hires
    7.6 retains as employee
    7.7 is proud of own performance
    7.8 shows financial generosity
    7.9 provides medical care
    7.10 provides employment
    7.11 displays social acceptance
    7.12 displays patronizing empathy
    7.13 expects social subordination
    7.14 expects administrative subordination
    7.15 expects educational subservience
    7.16 admires social subordination
    7.17 admires political subordination
    7.18 is vain in regard to personal relationship

VIII. To Hurt or Be Hostile To

    8.1 behaves aggressively to
    8.2 is hostile to
    8.3 speaks angrily to
    8.4 shocks
    8.5 threatens, bullies
    8.6 embarasses
    8.7 humiliates
    8.8 argues with
    8.9 disagrees with
    8.10 has fun at the expense of R
    8.11 beats with an instrument
    8.12 causes physical injury to
    8.13 tortures
    8.14 kills

Table 4 (Continued)

VIII. (Continued)

8.15 is angry at
8.16 would like to hurt
8.17 plans to kill
8.18 suppresses
8.19 wants to argue with
8.20 experiences sadistic pleasure in injuring
8.21 experiences sadistic pleasure in beating
8.22 experiences sadistic pleasure in teasing maliciously
8.23 seeks collective destruction

IX. To Discriminate

9.1 ridicules (makes fun of, mocks)
9.2 is sarcastic to
9.3 is disdainful to
9.4 criticizes
9.5 considers nonsignificant
9.6 accuses of low moral standards
9.7 is rude to
9.8 insults
9.9 swears at
9.10 feels bitterly toward
9.11 hates
9.12 does not like
9.13 considers phony
9.14 considers cowardly
9.15 considers educationally backward
9.16 sees R as hypocrit
9.17 perceives as physically repulsive
9.18 sees as burden
9.19 finds amusing (negative)
9.20 views as awkward, unappealing
9.21 gives slow service
9.22 cheats
9.23 denies educational status
9.24 denies economic status
9.25 denies professional status
9.26 denies administrative status
9.27 denies social status
9.28 exercises social discrimination
9.29 discriminates in use of public facilities
9.30 denies of police protection
9.31 disapproves moving into neighborhood
9.32 advises against moving into neighborhood
9.33 physically prevents moving into neighborhood

Table 4 (Continued)

X. To Distantiate

10.1 is unaccepting of
10.2 accuses, confronts
10.3 doubts, acts suspicious to
10.4 does not empathize
10.5 is impatient with
10.6 ignores
10.7 is unresponsive to
10.8 is reserved toward
10.9 hides feelings from
10.10 deceives, lies to
10.11 is evasive to
10.12 refuses help, present, comfort, affection from
10.13 is defensive to (makes excuses)
10.14 has superficial contact with
10.15 has noncommittal relationship
10.16 withdraws from
10.17 avoids
10.18 gets rid of, dismiss
10.19 quits employment of
10.20 quits dating
10.21 is thoughtless of
10.22 is inconsiderate of
10.23 is selfish toward
10.24 has resentment for
10.25 does things without, excludes
10.26 does not socialize with, refuse invitation from
10.27 does not recognize (familiarity)

XI. To Behave Subordinately

11.1 is influenced by
11.2 obeys command or request of
11.3 submits to (gives in to, is dominated by)
11.4 asks for favor from
11.5 asks for information, explanation from
11.6 asks for help, pleads for
11.7 seeks protection, reassurance, comfort, affection from
11.8 asks for help, direction, advice from
11.9 waits for, follows, stands beside
11.10 gives response expected by R
11.11 proves ability to pay before requesting service
11.12 feigning ignorance
11.13 does thing one does not consider self-respecting
11.14 submits sexually without feeling responsive

Table 4 (Continued)

XII. <u>To Feel Humiliated</u>

       12.1 is self-effacing to
       12.2 feels inadequate with respect to
       12.3 is embarrassed
       12.4 feel guilty
       12.5 to feel need to explain
       12.6 to apologize
       12.7 to regret
       12.8 to see others finding fault with A
       12.9 to see others accusing A
       12.10 to see others setting traps
       12.11 to see others as ridiculing A
       12.12 to see others as pretending to be affectionate
       12.13 to see R as suppressing him
       12.14 to be frightened of
       12.15 to be embarrassed
       12.16 to be uncomfortable
       12.17 is shocked by
       12.18 feels threatened by
       12.19 feels humiliated by
       12.20 is disappointed by
       12.21 feels defeated

XIII. <u>Not to Conform</u>

       13.1 rebels against, is insolent, defiant to
       13.2 protests to, contradicts
       13.3 does not take advice, suggestion of
       13.4 refuses to obey command or request of
       13.5 is not dominated by
       13.6 is not threatened by
       13.7 does not identify with

XIV. <u>To be Resentful</u>

       14.1 envies opportunity
       14.2 envies social achievement
       14.3 seeks failure of recipient
       14.4 envies affection
       14.5 resents economic achievement
       14.6 complains
       14.7 states grievance
       14.8 disapproves

Table 4 (Continued)

XV. To Avoid Unpleasantness

    15.1 is polite to
    15.2 agrees with
    15.3 refuses to argue with
    15.4 avoids discussing racial differences
    15.5 keeps cool in face of provocation
    15.6 keeps cool in face of disappointment
    15.7 protects oneself with being reserve

XVI. To Defend Oneself

    16.1 asserts equality
    16.2 accuses of lack of compassion
    16.3 accuses of job discrimination
    16.4 accuses of seeing physical repulsion
    16.5 accuses of segregation of recreation facilities
    16.6 accuses of loan facilities discrimination
    16.7 accuses of denying facilities
    16.8 accuses of overall discrimination
    16.9 claims innocence
    16.10 physically fights off

XVII. Pursue Members of Opposite Sex

    17.1 courts
    17.2 proposes marriage (accepts)
    17.3 goes steady with
    17.4 false flattery
    17.5 seeks to possess
    17.6 makes advances
    17.7 commands to submit sexually
    17.8 assaults
    17.9 offer drinks to minor
    17.10 speaks lewdly to
    17.11 attempt to persuade to promiscuity

Table 5

Distribution of Interactions by Revised
Interpersonal Verb Categories

IPV Super Categories	Black-White	White-Black
1. To Show Interest In	21	20
2. To Show Affection For	15	23
3. To Show Concern For	41	31
4. To Cooperate	3	5
5. To Please/Support	7	35
6. To Influence/Control	12	26
7. To Assert Superiority	3	8
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	55	119
9. To Discriminate	57	162
10. To Distantiate	51	62
11. To Behave Subordinately	58	27
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	81	59
13. Not to Conform	40	10
14. To Be Resentful	5	15
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	28	6
16. To Defend Oneself	22	3
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	20	63

These interaction ratios for each of the seventeen categories are given in Table 6. The mean interaction over all the categories is .13. Table 7 attempts to show separately those interpersonal verb categories in which the white-to-black interaction ratio is higher than the mean interaction ratio and also those in which black-to-white interaction exceeds the mean interaction ratio.

As will be seen from Table 7, the three categories for which white-black interactions exceed the mean maximally are: (1) to please/support, (2) to pursue members of the opposite sex and (3) to be resentful. Whereas, the three categories for which black-white interactions exceed the mean maximally are: (1) to defend oneself; (2) to avoid unpleasantness and (3) not to conform.

The distribution of interactions by IP verb categories for each role-pair is in Appendix C. It was not considered useful to calculate interaction ratios for the distribution of IPV categories under each of the role pairs because of the low frequencies on most of the IPV categories.

Coding Interactions on Semantic Features

A reference was made earlier to Osgood's attempts to reduce the complexities of interpersonal behavior to sets of mediating intentions, and these in turn to a limited set of componential semantic features. It was suggested that a relatively small set of distinctive features can discriminate among a large number of affective intentions, expressed through interpersonal interactions and that the use of appropriate semantic features can facilitate the understanding of the underlying dimensions of interpersonal perceptions and interactions.

Three graduate students in psycholinguistics at the University of Illinois were given a description of ten semantic features (Appendix D) used by Osgood

Table 6

Interaction Ratio* for 17 Interpersonal Verb Categories

IPV Categories	Interaction Ratio
1. To Show Interest In	-.02
2. To Show Affection For	.21
3. To Show Concern For	-.13
4. To Cooperate	.25
5. To Please/Support	.66
6. To Influence/Control	.36
7. To Assert Superiority	.45
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	.36
9. To Discriminate	.47
10. To Distantiate	.09
11. To Behave Subordinately	-.36
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	-.15
13. Not To Conform	-.60
14. To Be Resentful	.50
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	-.64
16. To Defend Oneself	-.76
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	.51

$$*\text{Interaction Ratio} = \frac{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} - \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}{\text{No. of W-B Interactions} + \text{No. of B-W Interactions}}$$

Table 7

The IPV Categories for Which Interaction Ratio

is Higher than the Mean (.13)

A. Categories for which W-B Interaction Ratio is Higher than the Mean

IPV Categories	IR Ratio
To show affection for	.21
To cooperate	.25
To please/support	.66
To influence/control	.36
To assert superiority	.45
To hurt/be hostile to	.36
To discriminate	.47
To be resentful	.50
To pursue members of opposite sex	.51

B. Categories for which B-W Interaction Ratio is Higher than the Mean

To show interest in	-.02
To show consideration for	-.13
To distantiate	.09
To behave subordinately	-.36
To feel inadequate and persecuted	-.15
Not to conform	-.60
To avoid unpleasantness	-.64
To defend oneself	-.76

and associates to code interpersonal verbs (Osgood, 1966a; 1968). They were
asked to rate each of the interpersonal verbs (Appendix B) occurring in the
selected interaction statements on each of the following 10 semantic features.
These interpersonal verbs were rated without any reference to Actor-Recepient
role information. The rating of "1" indicated the left side of the feature
("moral" in the case of the feature "moral-immoral"), that of "3" the right
side ("immoral" in the case of the above feature) and the rating of "2"
indicated that the feature was either inapplicable to that particular verb
or the verb could assume both the rating of "1" and "3" depending upon the
situational context.

> Moral/Immoral
> Potent/Impotent
> Active/Passive
> Associative/Dissociative
> Initiating/Reacting
> Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented
> Supraordinate/Subordinate
> Terminal/Interminal
> Future-oriented/Past-oriented
> Deliberate/Impulsive

Table 8 gives the mean ratings on ten semantic features for B-W and W-B
interactions. T-tests were carried out for the two groups (B-W interactions
and W-B interactions) and differences between the two groups were found
significant on all features.

As will be seen from this table, the interpersonal verbs used in describ-
ing white-black interactions are rated as more "moral" than black-white inter-
actions, whereas those used in describing black-white interactions are rated
more "potent" than the white-black interactions. On the Active/Passive
feature both are rated on the "passive" side--W-B interactions being rated
more passive than the B-W interactions. On the features Associative/
Dissociative, Initiating/Reacting and Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented, both groups
received the "Associative," "Initiating" and "Ego-oriented" ratings. However,
W-B interactions are rated as more associative and alter-oriented than the

Table 8

T-Test Scores on B-W and W-B Interactions Rated on Ten Features

Features	Black-White (N = 519)		White-Black (N = 674)		
	$\overline{X}$	Standard Deviation	$\overline{X}$	Standard Deviation	Difference
Moral/Immoral	2.06[1]	.74	1.78	.84	.28**
Potent/Impotent	1.92	.73	2.15	.67	-.23**
Active/Passive	2.20	.80	2.53	.71	-.33**
Associative/Dissociative	1.85	.92	1.74	.91	.11*
Initiating/Reacting	1.56	.79	1.92	.87	-.36**
Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented	1.99	.91	1.57	.80	.42**
Supra-ordinate/Subordinate	1.88	.65	2.43	.64	-.55**
Terminal/Interminal	1.71	.84	2.00	.82	-.29**
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.76	.73	1.87	.70	-.11**
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.05	.85	2.15	.86	-.10**

* Significant at .05 level
** Significant at .01 level

[1]The lower the value, the more the mean is toward the left-hand term.

B→W interactions while the black-to-white interactions are seen as more initiating than the white-to-black interactions. On the feature Supraordinate/ Subordinate black-to-white interactions are seen as supraordinate (1.88) while white-to-black interactions receive ratings on the subordinate side (2.43). Black-white interactions are seen as "terminal" on the terminal/interminal feature whereas white-black interactions received a neutral rating (2.00) on the feature. On Future/Past-orientedness, both groups are rated as future-oriented in their interactions--black-white more so than the white-black. Both groups received ratings on the impulsive side, the white-black inter-actions being seen as more impulsive than the black-white interactions.

The mean ratings on semantic features for black-to-white and white-to-black interactions for each of the role-pair categories is in Appendix F.

Distribution of Features on Role-Dimensions

Analyzing Behavioral Role Differential data, Triandis et al. (1968) discovered the following four culture-common orthogonal components:

1. giving high affect versus not giving affect

2. ambivalent intimacy versus formality

3. supraordination versus subordination

4. ambivalent friendship versus loft avoidance

Oncken (1968) demonstrated that role-space is characterized by (1) an intimacy-affect dimension which consists of high intimacy on one end and low affect, formality and hostility on the other end; and (2) a second dimension of low-high versus high-low status.

It was decided to have all role pairs (Table 1) occurring in the data rated on two dimensions discovered both in Triandis (1968) and Oncken (1968) studies, namely, Intimacy and Status dimensions. The same three graduate students who rated the interpersonal verbs on semantic features, were asked to rate these role pairs on status and intimacy dimensions. On each role-pair the judges were to indicate for each actor whether his relationship to the

recipient was one of superior, equal, or subordinate status, in the form:

The employers' relationship to the employee is one of (superior)

(equal) (subordinate) status;

and whether it was one of high, intermediate, or low intimacy, in this form:

The employers' relationship to the employee is one of (high)

(intermediate) (low) intimacy.

A score of 1 was assigned to Superior/High, 2 to Equal/Intermediate and

that of 3 to Subordinate/Low. The ratings for the three subjects were pooled

and averaged, and the resultant mean scores were categorized as follows:

Mean score of 1 to 1.5   High

Mean score of 1.5 to 2.5   Neutral/Ambiguous

Mean score of 2.5 to 3   Low

Such a distribution of role-pairs on Status and Intimacy dimensions is given

in Table 9.

As will be seen from this table, B-W interactions fall mostly under

neutral status (280 out of 519) and low status (218 out of 519) interactions,

where white-to-black interactions fall under neutral status (358 out of 674)

and high status (245 out of 674) interactions. On the intimacy dimension,

however, the distribution pattern for both black-to-white and white-to-black

interactions is similar; both fall under neutral and low intimacy cells.

Seen on both status and intimacy dimensions simultaneously, the bulk of black-

to-white interactions are in neutral status-neutral intimacy (228 out of 519)

and low status-low intimacy (177 out of 519) cells, whereas the bulk of white-

black interactions are in neutral status-neutral intimacy (256 out of 674) and

high status-low intimacy (203 out of 674) cells.

Table 9

Distribution of Role Pairs on Status

and Intimacy Dimensions

		Intimacy						Total	
		High		Neutral		Low			
		B-W	W-B	B-W	B-W	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
	High	10	29	7	13	4	203	21	245
Status	Neutral	4	3	228	256	48	99	280	358
	Low	11	7	30	33	177	31	218	71
Total		25	39	265	302	229	333	519	674

The distribution of the semantic feature ratings on the Status and Intimacy dimensions of the role pairs is given in Tables 10 and 11. As will be seen from Table 10, the prominent differences (differences of .33 and higher) in black-white and white-black interactions are revealed on three features for the High Status category, on three features for the Neutral Status category, and on six features for the Low Status category. The features concerned for High Status are: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.38 vs. W-B 1.66), Associative/Dissociative (B-W 2.12 vs. W-B 1.64) and Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.90 vs. W-B 2.48); for Neutral Status: Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 1.92 vs. W-B 1.58), Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.97 vs. W-B 2.38), and Deliberate/Impulsive (B-W 2.07 vs. W-B 1.54); and for Low Status: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.12 vs. W-B 1.66), Potent/Impotent (B-W 1.85 vs. W-B 2.29), Active/Passive (B-W 2.14 vs. W-B 2.55), Associative/Dissociative (B-W 1.84 vs. W-B 1.47), Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 2.11 vs. W-B 1.63), and Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.73 vs. W-B 2.37).

On the Intimacy dimension (Table 11), differences (of .33 and higher) are found on three features for High Intimacy, on one feature for Neutral Intimacy, and on six features for Low Intimacy. The features on which differences occur for High Intimacy are: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.44 vs. W-B 1.94), Active/Passive (B-W 2.52 vs. W-B 2.17), and Deliberate/Impulsive (B-W 2.20 vs. W-B 1.74); for Neutral Intimacy: Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.95 vs. W-B 2.33); and for Low Intimacy: Moral/Immoral (B-W 2.08 vs. W-B 1.65), Active/Passive (B-W 2.17 vs. W-B 2.65), Initiating/Reacting (B-W 1.41 vs. W-B 2.15), Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented (B-W 2.13 vs. W-B 1.47), Supraordinate/Subordinate (B-W 1.77 vs. W-B 2.53, and Terminal/Interminal (B-W 1.71 vs. W-B 2.15).

Table 10

Distribution of Semantic Feature Ratings on the Status

Dimension of the Role-Pairs

Feature	High Status		Neutral Status		Low Status	
	B-W N=21	W-B N=245	B-W N=280	W-B N=358	B-W N=218	W-B N=71
Moral/Immoral	2.38	1.66	1.98	1.86	2.12	1.66*
Potent/Impotent	1.98	2.09	1.94	2.13	1.85	2.29
Active/Passive	2.47	2.59	2.21	2.52	2.14	2.55
Associative/Dissociative	2.12	1.64	1.84	1.87	1.84	1.47
Initiating/Reacting	1.84	2.12	1.64	1.89	1.45	1.46
Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.70	1.58	1.92	1.58	2.11	1.63
Supraordinate/Subordinate	1.90	2.48	1.97	2.38	1.73	2.37
Terminal/Interminal	1.79	2.06	1.47	1.63	1.67	2.05
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.08	1.84	1.83	1.86	1.62	1.88
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.35	2.33	2.07	1.54	1.92	1.81

*The underlining indicates a difference of .33 or higher between the
B→W and W→B ratings.

Table 11

Distribution of Semantic Feature Ratings on the

Intimacy Dimension of the Role Pairs

Feature	High Intimacy		Neutral Intimacy		Low Intimacy	
	B-W N-25	W-B N=39	B-W N=265	W-B N=302	B-W N=229	W-B N=333
Moral/Immoral	2.44	1.94	2.00	1.88	2.08	1.65*
Potent/Impotent	1.92	2.02	1.93	2.11	1.86	2.18
Active/Passive	2.52	2.17	2.19	2.44	2.17	2.65
Associative/Dissociative	2.20	2.09	1.83	1.88	1.83	1.59
Initiating/Reacting	1.88	1.66	1.61	1.71	1.41	2.15
Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.72	1.66	1.90	1.66	2.13	1.47
Supraordinate/Subordinate	1.88	2.12	1.95	2.33	1.77	2.53
Terminal/Interminal	1.72	1.69	1.70	1.84	1.71	2.15
Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.72	1.66	1.83	1.83	1.68	1.95
Deliberate/Impulsive	2.20	1.74	2.07	2.56	1.98	2.26

*Underlining indicates a difference of .33 or higher between the
B→W and W→B ratings.

As is evidenced by the above description, the differences on most features are revealed for both low status and low intimacy role-pairs (six out of 10 features in each case) and on at least one feature for neutral status (2 features) and neutral intimacy (one feature). Only two features (Moral/Immoral and Supraordinate/Subordinate) discriminated across both status and intimacy dimensions of the role-pairs. The feature Moral/Immoral discriminates on both high and low continuums of both the Status and Intimacy dimensions. In all the four cells, white-black interactions are perceived more "moral" than black-white interactions. The feature Supraordinate/Subordinate discriminates across all the three levels (high, neutral and low) of the Status dimension and two levels (neutral and low) of the Intimacy dimension. In all the five cells, i.e., irrespective of the fact that interactants share high or low status, or high or low intimacy relationships, black-white interactions are consistently perceived as more supraordinate than white-black interactions. Under the low status interactions, white-black interactions are perceived more moral, less potent, more passive, more associative, more ego-oriented, and more subordinate than black-white interactions. Under the low intimacy interactions, white-black interactions are perceived as more moral, more passive, more reacting, more ego-oriented, more subordinate and more interminal than black-white interactions.

A further break-up of the feature ratings for black-white and white-black interactions under combined Status and Intimacy dimensions is in Appendix F. However, due to unusually low frequencies in many of the cells, no attempt is made to interpret those results here.

Conclusions

This study was an attempt to explore how black-white and white-black
interactions were perceived by blacks in this country. The results indicate
that as far as the initiation of interactions is concerned, blacks perceived
whites initiating the interactions more than the blacks (W-B 674 vs. B-W
519). The break-up under role-pair categories, however, revealed that the
blacks initiate more interactions when they are in the role-pairs of Female-
male, Employee-employer, Person helped-helping profession, Citizen-police
official, Citizen-public official and Female-female; whereas whites initiate
more interactions when they are in the role-pairs of Male-female, Employer-
employee, Helping profession-person helped, Police official-citizen, Public
official-citizen, Teacher-student and Male-male. The results further show
that (from black authors' perception), in their interactions with whites,
blacks indulged more (than whites) in the following activities:

> To show interest in
> To show consideration for
> To distantiate
> To behave subordinately
> To feel inadequate and persecuted
> Not to conform
> To avoid unpleasantness
> To defend oneself;

whereas, whites are seen, in their interactions with blacks, to indulge
more in the activities:

> To show affection for
> To cooperate
> To please/support
> To influence/control
> To assert superiority
> To hurt, be hostile to
> To discriminate
> To be resentful
> To pursue members of opposite sex.

This view of the world as depicted by black writers in their stories reflects the dominance pattern prevaling in the society today. The whites, in their interactions with blacks, are shown as patronizing and pleasant when they elicit from blacks the kinds of behaviors they like (e.g., sub-ordination) and as hostile and resentful when they elicit the behaviors they do not like (e.g., distantiation, defiance, etc.). The blacks, on the other hand, are shown as putting on a kind of mask of interest, pleasantness and, to a degree, seemingly subordination behind which they attempt to hide their true intent of maintaining their identity and not conforming to the standards of the white world.

When the results were analyzed on semantic features of interpersonal behavior, white-to-black interactions were perceived significantly higher (than black-white interactions) in the direction of the moral, associative, ego-oriented, future-oriented and deliberate ends of the relevant features; whereas, black-to-white interactions were seen significantly higher in the direction of the potent, active, initiating, supraordinate and terminal ends of the features concerned. The rating pattern on subordinate-supraordinate feature deserves special consideration. The interaction ratio (Table 6) showed that frequency of subordinate behaviors was much higher for B→W interactions than those for W→B interactions. However, the feature analysis shows B→W interactions higher on the superordination feature than W→B interactions. In other words, whereas whites, in their interactions with blacks, are seen as engaging in a larger number of slightly superordinate behaviors, blacks in their interactions with whites are shown engaging in behaviors which though low in frequency, rate very high on quality and intensity of superordination.

From the methodological point of view, the Katz approach did indeed yield an unusually large number of interpersonal verb (96) and role-pair (54) categories, which necessitated collapsing them, somewhat arbitarily, into broader "super categories." The application of semantic features for analyzing interpersonal interactions, on the other hand, proved more efficient in discriminating among a large number of interpersonal inter-actions between members of two cultures, and highlighted certain basic dimensions around which most differences among blacks and whites are clustered.

References

Barker, R. G., & Wright, H. F. Midwest and its children. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson and Co., 1954.

Clark, K. B. Dark ghetto: Dilemmas of social power. New York: Harper and Row, 1967.

Katz, E. W. A content analytic method for studying interpersonal behavior. ONR Technical Report No. 19. Urbana, Ill.: Department of Psychology and Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1964a.

Katz, E. W. A study of verbal and nonverbal behaviors associated with social roles. ONR Technical Report No. 20. Urbana, Ill.: Department of Psychology and Institute of Communications Research, University of Illinois, 1964b.

Keil, C. Urban blues. Chicago, Ill.: Chicago University Press, 1966.

Liebow, E. Tally's corner: A study of Negro street corner men. Boston: Little, Brown, 1967.

Maruyama, M. The ghetto logic, 1969. (Mimeo)

McClelland, D. C. The achieving society. New York: D. Van Nostrand Co., 1961.

Osgood, C. E. Conservative words and radical sentences in the semantics of international politics. Urbana, Ill.: Center for Comparative Psycholinguistics, University of Illinois, 1969.

Osgood, C. E. Interpersonal verbs and interpersonal behavior. In J. Cohen (Ed.), Studies in thought and language. Tucson, Ariz.: University of Arizona Press, 1970a.

Osgood, C. E. Speculation on the structure of interpersonal intentions. Behavioral Science, 1970b, 15, No. 3.

Triandis, H. C. Person perception: A review of the literature and implications. Report No. 3, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., & Malpass, R. S. Field guide for the study of aspects of subjective culture. Report No. 4, SRS No. 12-P-55175/5. Champaign, Ill.: Department of Psychology, University of Illinois, 1970.

Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., & Nassiakou, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology Monograph Supplement, 1968, 8, No. 4, 1-42.

Wallace, J. Psychology: A social science. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders Company, 1971.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX A

Stories Selected for Analysis

Title of Story	Source	Date	Author
1. The Top Hat Hotel	Negro Digest	June, 1969	
2. Not Your Singing, Dancing Spade	Negro Digest	February, 1967	Julia Fields
3. Health Service	Negro Digest	November, 1965	
4. Yes, We Can Sing	Negro Digest	December, 1965	
5. Karen's Spring	Negro Digest	January, 1966	Eloise Greenfield
6. Judah's a Two-Way Street Running Out	Negro Digest	January, 1966	Jack Burris
7. The Sign	Negro Digest	February, 1966	Sam Greenlee
8. Iced Tea	Negro Digest	March, 1966	Azrin Adams
9. United States Congressman	Negro Digest	March, 1966	Hamilton Bims
10. Ten Minutes at the Bus Stop	Negro Digest	January, 1965	Ruth Burke
11. Walker in the Dust	Negro Digest	February, 1965	Elizabeth Sweet
12. The Blackberry Pit	Negro Digest	March, 1965	Bobb Hamilton
13. The Satin-Back Crepe Dress	Negro Digest	March, 1965	
14. Jacob's Dilemma	Negro Digest	April, 1965	Louie Robinson
15. The Gift	Negro Digest	May, 1965	Benjamin Bluitt
16. The Rope on the Steps	Negro Digest	May, 1965	Anita Cronwell
17. James Washburn	Negro Digest	June, 1965	B. Charles Simmons
18. To the Fair	Negro Digest	July, 1965	H. R. Wolf
19. Incident on the Bus	Negro Digest	August, 1965	Dudley Randall
20. Both My Girls	Negro Digest	October, 1965	Jeff Deggs

Title of Story	Source	Date	Author
21. "On" The Charm of Harry Jones	Negro Digest	August, 1967	Norman de Joie
22. The Willie Bob Letters	Negro Digest	January, 1969	Fredde Welson
23. Moma	Negro Digest	February, 1969	Audrey Lee
24. There Is No Other Way	Negro Digest	May, 1967	Addison Gayle
25. Bright Morning Star	Negro Digest		
26. Support Your Local Police	Negro Digest	November, 1967	Ed Bullin
27. Ain't No Use in Crying	Negro Digest	December, 1967	Ann Aleen Shockley
28. Strong Horse Tea	Negro Digest	June, 1968	Alice Walker
29. The House Next Door	Tan	July, 1969	
30. The Living	Negro Digest	Sept/Oct, 1968	Paula Fox
31. And Save a Round for Jamie Brown	Negro Digest	April, 1966	Anita Cornwell
32. Bus No. 51	Negro Digest	May, 1966	Ben Bluitt
33. A Day's Living	Negro Digest	June, 1966	Dolores Armstead
34. From Two Worlds	Tan	April, 1969	
35. The Miracle Ahead	Tan	March, 1969	
36. Three Kings Night	Tan	December, 1968	

Categories for Organizing Interpersonal Interactions

1. To show affection for   1.1 behaves affectionately to   _____

                              1.2 speaks affectionately to   _____

                              1.3 shows appreciation of   _____

                              1.4 is friendly to   _____

                              1.5 feel affection for   _____

                                       Total 1   _____

2. To show interest in   2.1 pays attention to   _____

                              2.2 is responsive to   _____

                              2.3 encourages   _____

                              2.4 courts   _____

                                       Total 2   _____

3. To deflate   3.1 ridicules (makes fun of, mocks)   _____

                              3.2 is sarcastic to   _____

                              3.3 is disdainful to   _____

                              3.4 criticizes   _____

                              3.5 considers nonsignificant   _____

                              3.6 accuses of low moral standards   _____

                                       Total 3   _____

4. To influence   4.1 makes suggestion to   _____

                              4.2 gives advice to   _____

                              4.3 requests   _____

                              4.4 gives instructions, directions   _____

                                       Total 4   _____

5. To hurt   5.1 behaves aggressively to   _____

                              5.2 is cold (hostile or brusque) to   _____

                              5.3 speaks angrily to   _____

                                       Total 5   _____

6. To communicate with	6.1 confides in	_____
	6.2 confesses to	_____
	6.3 gives opinion to	_____
	6.4 expresses feeling to	_____
	6.5 chatters to	_____
	Total 6	_____
7. To educate, enlighten, inform	7.1 teaches	_____
	7.2 gives information or explanation to	_____
	7.3 tries to bring up successfully	_____
	7.4 stimulates the interest of	_____
	Total 7	_____
8. To control	8.1 urges (pleads with)	_____
	8.2 commands (gives orders to)	_____
	8.3 dominates	_____
	8.4 persuades	_____
	Total 8	_____
9. To conform to	9.1 is influenced by	_____
	9.2 takes the advice, suggestion of	_____
	9.3 obeys command or request of	_____
	9.4 submits to (gives in to, is dominated by)	_____
	Total 9	_____
10. To obtain something from	10.1 asks for favor from	_____
	10.2 asks for permission from	_____
	10.3 asks for information, explanation from	_____
	10.4 asks for help, pleads for	_____
	Total 10	_____

·3

11. To please

11.1 gives presents to _____

11.2 entertains _____

11.3 promises things to _____

Total 11 _____

12. To build other up

12.1 compliments, flatters _____

12.2 praises, rewards _____

12.3 gives approval to _____

12.4 reassures _____

Total 12 _____

13. Not to be understanding to

13.1 is unaccepting of _____

13.2 is not forgiving, sympathetic to _____

13.3 accuses, confronts _____

13.4 doubts, acts suspicious to _____

13.5 does not empathize _____

13.6 is impatient _____

Total 13 _____

14. To take care of

14.1 does things for, serves _____

14.2 protects _____

14.3 waits on _____

14.4 serves food or drinks _____

14.5 buys clothing _____

Total 14 _____

15. to maintain relationship with

15.1 does things with (goes places with _____

15.2 plays with _____

15.3 socializes with _____

15.4 gets along with _____

15.5 gives invitation to (or accepts) _____

Total 15 _____

44

4.

16. Not to conform to

16.1 rebels against, is insolent, defiant to _____

16.2 protests to, contradicts _____

16.3 does not take advice, suggestion of _____

16.4 refuses to obey command or request of _____

16.5 is not dominated by _____

16.6 is not threatened by _____

Total 16 _____

17. To be understanding to

17.1 is patient with _____

17.2 is accepting of _____

17.3 is forgiving to _____

17.4 is sympathetic to _____

Total 17 _____

18. To be indifferent to

18.1 ignores _____

18.2 is unresponsive to _____

18.3 discourages _____

18.4 is reserved toward _____

Total 18 _____

19. To be dependent on

19.1 seeks protection, reassurance, comfort, affection from _____

19.2 expects others to do things for _____

19.3 asks for help, direction, advice from _____

19.4 waits for, follows, stands beside _____

Total 19 _____

20. To discipline

20.1 punishes _____

20.2 scolds, reprimands, admonishes _____

20.3 is strict with _____

Total 20 _____

S

21. To treat with respect	21.1 is polite to	___
	21.2 takes seriously	___
	Total 21	___
22. To deceive	22.1 hides feelings from	___
	22.2 deceives, lies to	___
	22.3 does not confide in	___
	22.4 is evasive to	___
	Total 22	___
23. To help	23.1 gives support to	___
	23.2 defends	___
	23.3 helps with	___
	23.4 saves from danger	___
	Total 23	___
24. To show concern for	24.1 is solicitous of	___
	24.2 is considerate of	___
	24.3 is thoughtful of	___
	24.4 feels compassion for	___
	24.5 to worry about (positive sense)	___
	Total 24	___
25. To treat with disrespect	25.1 is rude to	___
	25.2 insults	___
	25.3 swears at	___
	Total 25	___
26. To upset	26.1 shocks	___
	26.2 frightens	___
	26.3 threatens, bullies	___
	26.4 does not comfort	___
	26.5 embarasses	___
	26.6 humiliates	___
	Total 26	___

27. To establish relationship with   27.1 initiates conversation with   ____

27.2 greets   ____

27.3 proposes marriage (accepts)   ____

27.4 goes stead with   ____

             Total 27   ____

28. To improve relationship with   28.1 makes up with   ____

28.2 tries to reason with   ____

28.3 asks forgiveness of
(apologizes to)   ____

             Total 28   ____

29. To dispute with   29.1 argues with   ____

29.2 fights with   ____

29.3 disagrees with   ____

             Total 29   ____

30. To keep in touch with   30.1 writes to   ____

30.2 phones   ____

30.3 visits   ____

             Total 30   ____

31. To be independent of   31.1 refuses help, present, comfort,
affection from   ____

31.2 does not seek advice of   ____

             Total 31   ____

32. To relate well to   32.1 kids with   ____

32.2 teases (playfully)   ____

             Total 32   ____

33. To calm down   33.1 reassures   ____

33.2 comforts   ____

33.3 consoles   ____

             Total 33   ____

34. Not to improve relationship with
34.1 does not try to make up with ___
34.2 is defensive to (makes excuses) ___
34.3 does not apologize to ___

Total 34 ___

35. Not to relate well to
35.1 has superficial contact with ___
35.2 has fun at the expense of R ___
35.3 teases in a coarse manner ___
35.4 has noncommittal relationship ___

Total 35 ___

36. To approach
36.1 calls to ___
36.2 approaches ___

Total 36 ___

37. To avoid
37.1 withdraws from ___
37.2 avoids ___

Total 37 ___

38. To impress
38.1 boasts to ___
38.2 boasts of material possession ___

Total 38 ___

39. To avoid unpleasantness with
39.1 agrees with ___
39.2 refuses to argue with ___
39.3 avoid discussing racial differences ___

Total 39 ___

8

40. To terminate relationship with	40.1 gets rid of, dismiss	_____
	40.2 abandons	_____
	40.3 divorces	_____
	40.4 quits employment of	_____
	40.5 quits dating	_____
	Total 40	_____
41. To compete with	41.1 competes with	_____
	41.2 acts superior to	_____
	41.3 takes advantage of	_____
	Total 41	_____
42. To feel inferior	42.1 is self-effacing to	_____
	42.2 feels inadequate with respect to	_____
	42.3 is embarassed	_____
	Total 42	_____
43. To displease	43.1 annoys, irritates	_____
	43.2 frustrates	_____
	43.3 denies things to	_____
	Total 43	_____
44. To relate equally to	44.1 cooperates with	_____
	44.2 does business with	_____
	44.3 accepts as equal	_____
	44.4 asserts equality	_____
	Total 44	_____
45. To be permissive with	45.1 is permissive, lenient to	_____
	45.2 does not punish for wrongdoing	_____
	45.3 gives permission to	_____
	Total 45	_____

49

46. To show lack of concern for   46.1 is thoughtless of   _____

                                      46.2 is inconsiderate of   _____

                                      46.3 is selfish toward   _____

                                      46.4 has resentment for   _____

                                                 Total 46   _____

47. To distantiate   47.1 does things without, excludes   _____

                                      47.2 does not socialize with, refuse invitation from   _____

                                      47.3 does not get along with   _____

                                                 Total 47   _____

48. To be like other   48.1 imitates   _____

                                      48.2 identifies with   _____

                                                 Total 48   _____

49. To neglect   49.1 neglects   _____

                                      49.2 refuses to care for   _____

                                      49.3 spends little time with   _____

                                                 Total 49   _____

50. Not to help   50.1 gives no support to   _____

                                      50.2 does not defend   _____

                                                 Total 50   _____

51. Not to teach   51.1 does not teach   _____

                                      51.2 does not try to bring up successfully   _____

                                                 Total 51   _____

52. To lose contact with   52.1 refuses to write to   _____

                                      52.2 does not get in touch with   _____

                                      52.3 does not phone, visit   _____

                                                 Total 52   _____

53. To be different from   53.1 does not identify with ____

          53.2 does not recognize (familiarity) ____

          53.3 considers oneself superior to R ____

                Total 53 ____

54. Tries not to influence   54.1 is objective to ____

                Total 54 ____

55. Tries to make independent 55.1 lets make own decisions ____

                Total 55 ____

56. Does not try to get some- 56.1 does not ask for information
thing from   from ____

                Total 56 ____

57. To inflict injuries   57.1 beats with an instrument ____

          57.2 causes physical injury to ____

          57.3 tortures ____

          57.4 kills ____

                Total 57 ____

58. To restrict physically 58.1 handcuff ____

          58.2 hold physicially ____

          58.3 arrest ____

                Total 58 ____

59. Not to show affection 59.1 is unfriendly to ____

          59.2 feels bitterly toward ____

          59.3 hates ____

          59.4 does not like ____

                Total 59 ____

60. Pursues member of opposite sex	60.1 false flattery	_____
	60.2 seeks to possess	_____
	60.3 makes advances	_____
	60.4 commands to submit sexually	_____
	60.5 assaults	_____
	Total 60	_____
61. Feels aggressive toward	61.1 is angry at	_____
	61.2 would like to hurt	_____
	61.3 plans to kill	_____
	61.4 suppresses	_____
	61.5 wants to argue with	_____
	Total 61	_____
62. Accepts as employee	62.1 hires	_____
	62.2 retains as employee	_____
	Total 62	_____
63. Sharing	63.1 share interests	_____
	63.2 exchange ideas	_____
	63.3 exchange things	_____
	63.4 shares affection for same object	_____
	63.5 share concerns, problems	_____
	Total 63	_____
64. Feels envy for	64.1 envies opportunity	_____
	64.2 envies social achievement	_____
	64.3 seeks failure of recipient	_____
	64.4 envies affection	_____
	64.5 envies economic achievement	_____
	Total 64	_____

65. Not to hurt   65.1 not wanting to hurt   _____

                        Total 65   _____

66. To feel apologetic   66.1 feel guilty   _____

                        66.2 to feel need to explain   _____

                        66.3 to apologize   _____

                        66.4 to regret   _____

                        Total 66   _____

67. To express gratitude   67.1 to say thank you   _____

                        67.2 to speak of appreciation for   _____

                        67.3 to wish to thank you   _____

                        Total 67   _____

68. To accuse of discriminatory behavior   68.1 lack of compassion   _____

                        68.2 job discrimination   _____

                        68.3 physical repulsion   _____

                        68.4 segregation of recreation facilities   _____

                        68.5 loan facilities discrimination   _____

                        68.6 patronizing discrimination   _____

                        68.7 denying facilities   _____

                        68.8 overall discrimination   _____

                        Total 68   _____

69. To lower one's self   69.1 gives response expected by R   _____

                        69.2 proves ability to pay before requesting service   _____

                        69.3 feigning ignorance   _____

                        69.4 does thing one does not consider self-respecting   _____

                        69.5 submits sexually without feeling responsive   _____

                        Total 69   _____

70. To possess persecution complex

70.1 to see others finding fault with A ____

70.2 to see others as accusing A ____

70.3 to see others as setting traps ____

70.4 to see others as ridiculing A ____

70.5 to see others as pretending to be affectionate ____

70.6 sees R as taking advantage of A ____

70.7 to see others as not giving just compensation ____

70.8 to see R as suppressing him ____

Total 70 ____

71. To find fault with

71.1 considers phony ____

71.2 considers cowardly ____

71.3 considers educationally backward ____

71.4 sees R as hypocrit ____

71.5 to perceive as physically repulsive ____

71.6 to see as burden ____

71.7 to find amusing (negative) ____

71.8 to view as awkward, unappealing ____

Total 71 ____

72. To admire

72.1 to admire possessions ____

72.2 to admire status ____

72.3 to admire human qualities ____

72.4 to admire appearance ____

62.5 to admire talent ____

Total 72 ____

73. Not to become upset   73.1 to keep cool in face of provocation   _____

                                     73.2 keeps cool in face of disappointment   _____

                                                         Total 73   _____

74. To be upset   74.1 to be frightened of   _____

                                     74.2 to be embarassed   _____

                                     74.3 to be uncomfortable   _____

                                     74.4 is shocked by

                                     74.5 feels threatened by   _____

                                     74.6 feels humiliated by   _____

                                     74.7 is disappointed by   _____

                                     74.8 feels defeated   _____

                                                         Total 74   _____

75. Gives inadequate service   75.1 gives slow service   _____

                                     75.2 cheats   _____

                                                         Total 75   _____

76. Denies status   76.1 denies educational status   _____

                                     76.2 denies economic status   _____

                                     76.3 denies professional status   _____

                                     76.4 denies administrative status   _____

                                     76.5 denies social status   _____

                                                         Total 76   _____

77. To prevent from entering or maintaining a relationship with person of opposite sex   77.1 to disapprove   _____

                                     77.2 to advise against   _____

                                     77.3 to physically prevent   _____

                                                         Total 77   _____

15

78.1 Gives adequate service to	78.1 does extra work for	___
	78.2 is proud of own performance for	___
	Total 78	___
79. To be patronizing	79.1 financial generosity	___
	79.2 provides medical care	___
	79.3 provides education	___
	79.4 provides employment	___
	79.5 social acceptance	___
	79.6 patronizing empathy	___
	Total 79	___
80. To commit theft	80.1 small theft of usable item (needed)	___
	80.2 theft of money	___
	80.3 major theft	___
	Total 80	___
81. To express dissatisfaction	81.1 complains	___
	81.2 states grievance	___
	81.3 disapprove	___
	Total 81	___
82. Expects subordination	82.1 expects social subordination	___
	82.2 expects administrative subordination	___
	82.3 expects educational subservience	___
	Total 82	___
83. Approves and admires subordination	83.1 admires social subordination	___
	83.2 admires political subordination	___
	Total 83	___

84. To defend oneself	84.1 to claim innocence	___
	84.2 to physically fight off	___
	84.3 to protect oneself with being reserve	___
	Total 84	___
85. Has trust in	85.1 trusts one's willingness to help	___
	Total 85	___
86. Sadistic pleasure in hurting	86.1 injuring	___
	86.2 beating	___
	86.3 killing for revenge	___
	86.4 teasing maliciously	___
	Total 86	___
87. Demands equality	87.1 demands equality in eating facilities	___
	87.2 demands equality	___
	Total 87	
88. To discriminate	88.1 social discrimination	___
	88.2 talent recognition	___
	88.3 public facilities	___
	88.4 denial of police protection	___
	Total 88	___
89. To destroy	89.1 seeks collective destruction	___
	89.2 takes physical action for collective destruction	___
	Total 89	___
90. To flee	90.1 runs from	___
	90.2 hides from	___
	Total 90	___

91. To lure into loose behavior

91.1 offer drinks to minor _____

91.2 speaks lewdly to _____

91.3 attempt to persuade to
promiscuity _____

Total 91 _____

92. Refuses to be lured into
loose behavior

92.1 refuses drinks _____

92.2 refuses sex advances _____

Total 92 _____

93. To feel superior

93.1 is vain in regard to personal
relationship _____

Total 93 _____

94. To expect adequate service

94.1 to expect good service _____

Total 94 _____

95. Not to trust

95.1 to doubt _____

95.2 to have suspicions about _____

95.3 not to believe _____

Total 95 _____

96. Prevent from moving into
neighborhood

96.1 disapprove _____

96.2 advise against _____

96.3 to physically prevent _____

Total 96 _____

APPENDIX C

Distribution of Interactions by Interpersonal
Verb Categories for Each Role Pair

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	1. Male-Female		11. Female-Male	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	1	3	5	2
2. To Show Affection For	3	4	3	4
3. To Show Concern For	4	2	8	1
4. To Cooperate	0	1	1	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	3	1
6. To Influence/Control	0	9	1	1
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	13	10	9	12
9. To Discriminate	1	21	23	5
10. To Distantiate	0	23	22	3
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	6	20	4
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	2	9	28	4
13. Not To Conform	0	0	3	2
14. To be Discontented	0	0	0	1
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	2	2	2	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	5	3
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	12	31	1	2
	38	124	135	45

IPV Super Categories   Role Pair

	2. Employer-Employee		12. Employee-Employer	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	1	4	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	3	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	3	2	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	1	1
6. To Influence/Control	0	1	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	3	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	12	4	0
9. To Discriminate	0	4	6	0
10. To Distantiate	0	7	4	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	5	3	0
12. To Feel Inadequare and Persecuted	0	5	10	0
13. Not To Conform	0	1	7	0
14. To be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	3	5	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	7	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	2	2	0
	0	56	57	1

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	3. Helping Profession-Beneficiary		13. Beneficiary-Helping Profession	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	4	2
2. To Show Affection For	0	1	1	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	19	8
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	3	0	6
6. To Influence/Control	0	2	2	3
7. To Assert Superiority	0 0	1	0	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	16	5	3
9. To Discriminate	0	27	4	1
10. To Distantiate	1	2	7	3
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	3	17	4
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	1	5	12	2
13. Not To Conform	0	0	3	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	1	1	6	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	0	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	11	0	0
	3	72	80	32

IPV Super Categories	4. Police Official-Citizen		Role Pair 14. Citizen-Police Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	1	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	0	1	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	0	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	0	0	0
6. To Influence/Control	0	4	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	0	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	37	1	3
9. To Discriminate	0	34	6	4
10. To Distantiate	0	7	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	0	1	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	2	7	1
13. Not To Conform	0	1	12	1
14. To Be Discontented	0	9	2	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	4	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	1	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	0	1	0
	0	94	38	9

IPV Super Categories

Role Pair

	5. Public Official-Citizen		15. Citizen-Public Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	0	1	0
2. To Show Affection For	0	0	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	0	0	0	0
4. To Cooperate	0	0	0	0
5. To Please/Support	0	0	0	0
6. To Influence/Control	0	0	1	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	1	0
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	0	2	0
9. To Discriminate	0	0	0	0
10. To Distantiate	0	1	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	2	0	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	0	1	0
13. Not To Conform	0	0	2	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	0	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	0	0
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	1	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	0	3	0	0
	0	6	9	0

IPV Super Categories	Role Pair			
	6. Teacher-Student		16. Student-Teacher	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	0	3	0	2
2. To Show Affection For	1	1	0	0
3. To Show Concern For	2	8	1	3
4. To Cooperate	1	1	0	1
5. To Please/Support	0	5	1	3
6. To Influence/Control	0	1	0	0
7. To Assert Superiority	0	0	0	1
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	0	3	1	0
9. To Discriminate	0	0	0	1
10. To Distantiate	0	2	0	0
11. To Behave Subordinately	0	2	3	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	0	6	3	0
13. Not To Conform	0	0	1	0
14. To Be Discontented	0	1	0	0
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	1	0
16. To Defend Oneself	1	0	0	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	2	4	0	0
	7	37	11	11

IPV Super Categories   Role Pair

7. Male-Male

	B-W	W-B
1. To Show Interest In	3	4
2. To Show Affection For	4	10
3. To Show Concern For	2	3
4. To Cooperate	1	1
5. To Please/Support	1	10
6. To Influence/Control	6	2
7. To Assert Superiority	0	2
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	13	18
9. To Discriminate	14	45
10. To Distantiate	11	5
11. To Behave Subordinately	12	0
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	11	18
13. Not To Conform	10	4
14. To Be Discontented	0	1
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	7	0
16. To Defend Oneself	2	0
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	1	6
	98	129

IPV Super Categories			Role Pair
	8. Female-Female		
	B-W	W-B	
1. To Show Interest In	2	3	
2. To Show Affection For	2	0	
3. To Show Concern For	3	1	
4. To Cooperate	0	1	
5. To Please/Support	1	0	
6. To Influence/Control	0	0	
7. To Assert Superiority	0	1	
8. To Hurt/Be Hostile To	6	1	
9. To Discriminate	1	4	
10. To Distantiate	4	1	
11. To Behave Subordinately	2	2	
12. To Feel Inadequate and Persecuted	3	3	
13. Not To Conform	0	1	
14. To Be Discontented	3	1	
15. To Avoid Unpleasantness	0	0	
16. To Defend Oneself	0	0	
17. To Pursue Members of Opposite Sex	1	1	
	28	19	

Instructions for Rating Interpersonal Verbs on Semantic Features

In everyday life, we use interpersonal verbs to describe the behavior of people toward each other. These interpersonal verbs have certain features which carry implications about the intentions of the Actor (A) toward the object (B). In our research so far, we have isolated a number of features which appear to characterize interpersonal verbs. A brief description of each of these features is in the attached sheets. In the present task, we want to see if you are able to use these features discriminately. Your judgments are to be based on what you know about people in general. They are not to be based on your own personal behavior. Neither are they to be based on how you think people ought to behave. You are simply to report, as objectively as possible, what you have learned about the nature of people's intentions toward one another.

On the pages which follow you will be presented with a set of inter-personal verbs, each followed by a series of 10 scales representing the hypothesized semantic features. Putting yourself in the role of the Actor, e.g., in the sentence "A helps B," you are to describe the nature of the intention to help by checking appropriate locations along the seven-step scales. In general, the scale positions have the following meanings.

X____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____	: ____Y
extremely X	quite X	slightly X	neither or equally	slightly Y	quite Y	extremely Y

Now we give definitions of the 10 features as we have used them our-selves along with our own differentiation of the intention to help as a general illustration. Of course, you may disagree with some of our judgments, but that is your privilege as an independent native speaker of English.

I. DELIBERATE vs. IMPULSIVE feature: If the intent of person A is calculated, planned and voluntary with respect to behaving toward person B, it is to some degree Deliberate; if it is uncalculated, unplanned and involuntary, then it is to some degree Impulsive. (EXAMPLES: guide/inspire, assist/pay homage to, borrow from/beg.)

to help

Deliberate____ : ____ : ____ : X : ____ : ____ : ____Impulsive

II. MORAL vs. IMMORAL feature: If the intent of person A toward person B would be judged ethical by an impartial observer, then it is to some degree Moral; if it would be judged unethical by an impartial observer, then it is to some degree Immoral. (EXAMPLES: exalt/humiliate, reason with/dictate to, protect/deceive.)

to help

Moral____:____:__X__:____:____:____:____Immoral

III. SUPRAORDINATE vs. SUBORDINATE feature: If the intent of person A is to express superior status with respect to person B, then it is to some degree Supraordinate; if it is to express inferior status with respect to person B, it is to some degree Subordinate. (EXAMPLES: protect/assist, demand/comply, lead/follow.)

to help

Supraordinate____:____:__X__:____:____:____:____Subordinate

IV. FUTURE vs. PAST ORIENTATION feature: If the intent of person A with respect to person B is concerned with some future condition or event, it is to some degree Future Oriented; if it is concerned with some past condition or event, it is to some degree Past Oriented. (EXAMPLES: pledge/apologize, persuade/remind, enlist the support of/reciprocate.)

to help

Future   Past
Oriented____:__X__:____:____:____:____:____Oriented

V. POTENT vs. IMPOTENT feature: If the intent of person A toward person B implies large amounts of energy or effort or potential energy or effort on the part of A, then it is to some degree Potent; if it implies small amounts of energy or effort on A's part, it is to some degree Impotent. (EXAMPLES: support/apologize, punish/rebuke, challenge/question.)

to help

Potent____:____:____:____:__X__:____:____Impotent

VI. INITIATING vs. REACTING feature. If the intent of person A is to elicit some response from person B, then it is to some degree Initiating; if it is to respond to some prior behavior of B, then it is to some degree Reacting. (EXAMPLES: cheer up/congratulate, persuade/disuade, provoke/frustrate.)

to help

Initiating____:____:____:____:____: X :____Reacting

VII. ASSOCIATIVE vs. DISSOCIATIVE feature: If the intent of person A is to decrease tension with respect to B, then it is to some degree Associative; if it is to increase tension with respect to B, it is to some degree Dissociative. (EXAMPLES: support/blame, invite/reject, compliment/insult.)

to help

Associative X :____:____:____:____:____:____Dissociative

VIII. TERMINAL vs. INTERMINAL feature. If the intention of person A with respect to person B has a clear-cut beginning or ending in time and is reasonably brief, then it is Terminal; if it has no clear-cut beginning or ending in time and is reasonably prolonged, it is Interminal. (EXAMPLES: unite with/associate with, praise/admire, inform/supervise.)

to help

Terminal____:____:____: X :____:____:____Interminal

IX. EGO vs. ALTER-ORIENTED feature. If the intent of person A is to change his own state of affairs via his behavior toward person B, then it is Ego-oriented; if it is to change B's state of affairs vis his behavior toward B, then it is Alter-oriented. (EXAMPLES: enlist support of/cheer up, impress/inform, exploit/corrupt.)

to help

Ego-
oriented____:____:____:____:____:____: X Alter-
                                          oriented

X.   ACTIVE vs. PASSIVE feature: If the intent of person A toward person B implies a high rate or variety of actions on the part of A, then it is Active; if it implies a low rate or variety of actions on the part of A, then it is Passive. (EXAMPLES: retaliate/resist, manipulate/profit from, take care of/be responsible for.)

<u>to help</u>

Active_____:_____:__X__:_____:_____:_____:_____Passive

You may wish to refer back to these definitions and examples as you proceed with the task.

A Seeks Approval of B

Deliberate ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Impulsive
            1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Moral ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Immoral
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Supraordinate ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Subordinate
       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Future Oriented ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Past Oriented
       1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Potent ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Impotent
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Initiating ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Reacting
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Associative ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Dissociative
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Terminal ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Interminal
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Ego-oriented ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Alter-oriented
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

Active ___:___:___:___:___:___:___ Passive
     1   2   3   4   5   6   7

APPENDIX E

Mean Ratings on Semantic Features for Black-to-White and
White-to-Black Interaction for Various Role Pair Categories

Features	Role Pair			
	1. Male-Female		11. Female-Male	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.42	1.83	2.14	2.17
2. Potent/Impotent	2.07	1.83	1.80	2.02
3. Active/Passive	2.68	2.60	2.00	2.51
4. Associative/Dissociative	2.47	1.75	1.77	2.11
5. Initiating/Reacting	2.44	2.12	1.36	1.84
6. Ego-oriented/ alter/oriented	1.47	1.85	2.28	1.80
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	2.13	2.29	1.81	2.00
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.68	2.01	1.79	1.68
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.02	2.14	1.80	1.77
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.15	2.48	1.91	1.91
N =	38	124	135	45

Features				Role Pair		
	2. Employer-Employee			12. Employee-Employer		
	B-W	W-B		B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	2.07		1.98	3.0
2. Potent/Impotent	0	2.03		2.01	2.0
3. Active/Passive	0	2.57		2.21	3.0
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	2.00		1.77	3.0
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	2.09		1.52	1.0
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	0	1.48		1.92	1.0
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.40		1.92	2.0
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	2.18		1.70	3.0
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	2.00		1.75	1.0
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	2.38		1.96	3.0
N =		56		57	1

APPENDIX E
3

Features	Role Pair			
	3. Helping Profession-Beneficiary		13. Beneficiary-Helping Profession	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.33	1.54	2.35	2.56
2. Potent/Impotent	1.33	2.22	1.77	2.09
3. Active/Passive	1.66	2.83	2.18	2.68
4. Associative/Dissociative	1.33	1.68	2.25	2.43
5. Initiating/Reacting	1.33	2.18	1.57	2.50
6. Ego-oriented/Alter-oriented	2.33	1.38	1.97	1.50
7. Supraordinate/Subordinate	1.66	2.55	1.71	2.00
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.00	2.33	1.72	2.03
9. Future-oriented/Past-oriented	1.33	1.83	1.90	2.12
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.33	2.04	2.01	2.37
N =	3	72	80	32

Features	Role Pair			
	4. Police Official-Citizen		14. Citizen-Police Official	
	B-W	W-B	B=W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	1.12	1.83	1.55
2. Potent/Impotent	0	2.47	2.05	2.22
3. Active/Passive	0	2.68	2.37	2.00
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	1.06	1.45	1.33
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	2.19	1.40	1.88
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	0	1.25	2.43	1.77
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.89	1.86	2.77
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	1.96	1.43	1.44
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	1.75	1.35	2.11
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	2.21	2.00	2.33
N =		94	38	9

Features	Role Pair			
	5. Public Official-Citizen		15. Citizen-Public Official	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	0	2.50	1.88	0
2. Potent/Impotent	0	1.50	2.22	0
3. Active/Passive	0	1.33	2.33	0
4. Associative/Dissociative	0	2.66	1.77	0
5. Initiating/Reacting	0	1.00	1.55	0
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter/oriented	0	1.16	2.11	0
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	0	2.16	2.33	0
8. Terminal/Interminal	0	1.33	1.66	0
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	0	1.66	1.88	0
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	0	3.00	2.22	0
N =		6	9	

Features	Role Pair				
	6. Teacher-Student			16. Student-Teacher	
	B-W	W-B		B-W	W-B
1. Moral/Immoral	2.71	2.35		2.27	2.45
2. Potent/Impotent	2.14	1.83		1.72	2.18
3. Active/Passive	3.00	2.10		2.00	2.00
4. Associative/Dissociative	2.71	2.24		2.27	2.63
5. Initiating/Reacting	2.28	1.62		1.90	1.18
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.28	1.72		2.45	1.54
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	2.14	2.08		1.72	2.09
8. Terminal/Interminal	2.14	1.83		2.00	1.36
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	2.14	1.67		1.72	1.81
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.57	2.00		2.45	1.45
N =	7	37		11	11

Features			Role Pair
	7. Male-Male		
	B-W	**W-B**	
1. Moral/Immoral	1.83	1.47	
2. Potent/Impotent	1.98	2.31	
3. Active/Passive	2.24	2.47	
4. Associative/Dissociative	1.62	1.81	
5. Initiating/Reacting	1.54	1.71	
6. Ego-oriented/ Alter-oriented	1.44	1.58	
7. Supraordinate/ Subordinate	1.94	2.52	
8. Terminal/Interminal	1.69	1.91	
9. Future-oriented/ Past-oriented	1.70	1.89	
10. Deliberate/Impulsive	2.14	1.90	
N =	98	129	

Features   Role Pair

                        8. Female-Female

                           B-W   W-B

1. Moral/Immoral   1.92   1.78

2. Potent/Impotent   1.96   2.10

3. Active/Passive   2.10   2.36

4. Associative/Dissociative 1.92   1.73

5. Initiating/Reacting   1.46   1.31

6. Ego-oriented/
   Alter-oriented   1.64   1.84

7. Supraordinate/
   Subordinate   2.03   2.26

8. Terminal/Interminal   1.82   1.84

9. Future-oriented/
   Past-oriented   1.53   1.67

10. Deliberate/Impulsive   2.07   2.00

                    N =   28   19

APPENDIX F

Three-Way Frequency Tables Showing Role Dimension Distribution on Ten Semantic Features

MORAL/IMMORAL

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.70	1.96	2.00	1.96	2.25	1.60	2.38	1.66
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.75	2.00	2.01	1.90	1.83	1.78	1.98	1.86
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	2.09	1.87	1.98	1.72	2.15	1.57	2.12	1.66
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.44	1.94	2.00	1.88	2.08	1.65		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

POTENT/IMPOTENT

Status	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.10	1.93	2.10	1.86	1.50	2.13	1.98	2.09
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.75	1.66	1.94	2.11	1.93	2.21	1.94	2.13
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	2.42	1.90	2.21	1.84	2.35	1.85	2.29
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.92	2.02	1.93	2.11	1.86	2.18		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

ACTIVE/PASSIVE

Status	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	3.00	2.03	2.15	2.07	1.75	2.65	2.47	2.54
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	3.00	3.00	2.21	2.44	2.20	2.71	2.21	2.52
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	2.42	2.05	2.66	2.18	2.48	2.14	2.55
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=171
Mean	2.52	2.17	2.19	2.44	2.17	2.65		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

(Column group header above: Intimacy)

ASSOCIATIVE/DISSOCIATIVE

Status	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
High	2.60	2.06	1.95	2.07	1.25	1.56	2.12	1.64
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	3.00	3.00	1.84	1.91	1.72	1.74	1.84	1.87
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.54	1.87	1.76	1.61	1.88	1.25	1.84	1.47
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.20	2.09	1.83	1.88	1.83	1.59		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

INITIATING/REACTING

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.20	1.62	1.68	1.69	1.25	2.22	1.84	2.12
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.75	2.66	1.64	1.75	1.50	2.22	1.64	1.89
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.27	1.42	1.37	1.45	1.40	1.48	1.45	1.46
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.88	1.66	1.61	1.71	1.41	2.15		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

EGO-ORIENTED/ALTER-ORIENTED

	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
High	1.20	1.72	1.96	1.31	2.50	1.52	1.70	1.58
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.00	1.00	1.92	1.69	2.44	1.32	1.92	1.58
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	2.45	1.71	1.75	1.58	2.15	1.67	2.11	1.63
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.66	1.90	1.66	2.13	1.47		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

SUPRAORDINATE/SUBORDINATE

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
.High	2.10	2.17	2.00	2.08	1.25	2.56	1.90	2.48
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	1.75	1.66	1.97	2.35	1.97	2.49	1.97	2.38
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.72	2.14	1.83	2.35	1.72	2.45	1.73	2.37
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.88	2.12	1.95	2.33	1.77	2.53		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

TERMINAL/INTERMINAL

Status	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.20	1.68	1.66	1.77	1.00	2.14	1.79	2.06
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=24	N=245
Neutral	1.25	1.33	1.73	1.83	1.77	2.15	1.47	1.63
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.45	1.85	1.56	1.97	1.71	2.19	1.67	2.05
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.69	1.70	1.84	1.71	2.15		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

FUTURE-ORIENTED/PAST-ORIENTED

Status	Intimacy							
	High		Neutral		Low		Mean	
	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B	B-W	W-B
High	2.20	1.62	2.25	1.62	1.50	1.95	2.08	1.84
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.00	2.00	1.85	1.85	1.75	1.86	1.83	1.86
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.18	1.71	1.60	1.76	1.66	2.06	1.62	1.88
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	1.72	1.66	1.83	1.83	1.68	1.95		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		

DELIBERATE/IMPULSIVE

Status								
High	2.60	1.75	2.20	2.61	2.00	2.40	2.35	2.33
	N=10	N=29	N=7	N=13	N=4	N=203	N=21	N=245
Neutral	2.00	2.00	2.10	2.07	2.14	2.10	2.07	1.54
	N=4	N=3	N=228	N=256	N=48	N=99	N=280	N=358
Low	1.90	1.57	1.87	1.82	1.93	1.87	1.92	1.81
	N=11	N=7	N=30	N=33	N=177	N=31	N=218	N=71
Mean	2.20	1.74	2.07	2.06	1.98	2.26		
	N=25	N=39	N=265	N=302	N=229	N=333		