

379
N81
No. 5223

THE RELATIONSHIP OF DOGMATISM SCALE RESPONSES TO
THE DETECTION OF THE SATIRE OF TELEVISION'S
ARCHIE BUNKER AMONG AN ETHNIC MINORITY

THESIS

Presented to the Graduate Council of the
North Texas State University in Partial
Fulfillment of the Requirements

For the Degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

By

Dale W. Johnson

Denton, Texas

August, 1976

© 1976

DALE WALDREP JOHNSON

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

Johnson, Dale W., The Relationship of Dogmatism Scale Responses to the Detection of the Satire of Television's Archie Bunker among an Ethnic Minority. Master of Arts (Speech Communication and Drama), August, 1976, 53 pp., 3 tables, bibliography, 39 titles.

The purpose of this study was to test the applicability of the theories of selective perception and selective exposure among ethnic minority viewers of the satirical, ethnic humor of the television program, All in the Family. This study statistically related the Dogmatism Scale responses to selected program opinions among Jewish and non-Jewish high school students.

The results of this survey were inconclusive. None of the hypotheses presented were supported by the evidence of the study; however, unexpected data were found that suggests previously unexplored interpretations of the program.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	Page iv
Chapter	
I. INTRODUCTION.	1
Background	
Problem	
Purpose	
Hypotheses	
Scope and Limitations	
II. RELATED RESEARCH.	13
III. METHODOLOGY	23
IV. RESULTS	29
V. DISCUSSION.	39
APPENDIX	45
BIBLIOGRAPHY	51

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
I. Analysis of <u>All in the Family</u> Opinion Items and Dogmatism Scales of All Respondents	30
II. Analysis of <u>All in the Family</u> Opinion Items and Dogmatism Scales of Non- Jewish Respondents.	32
III. Analysis of <u>All in the Family</u> Opinion Items and Dogmatism Scales of Jewish Respondents.	35

CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

Background

On the night of January 12, 1971, the CBS Television Network introduced a mid-season replacement program titled All in the Family. Until that evening the Standards and Practices Departments of the major networks had largely concurred in their definition of "good taste." The principal criterion for this definition was that the networks should avoid racial or sexual comment that might offend any major segment of the broadcast audience. In the first episode of All in the Family the main character, Archie Bunker, violated the prevailing standards by using the pejorative words "spades," "spics," "hebes," and "micks" in reference to Blacks, Puerto Ricans, Jews, and Irishmen. He also referred to one of the other principal characters as "a dumb Polack meathead," who was further described as "the laziest white boy I ever met." Additionally, the episode contained at least two explicit references to the sexual activities of its characters.¹

This departure from previous standards was not without its critics. Among the first was Laura Hobson, author of the anti-prejudice novel Gentlemen's Agreement, who objected to

the alleged lovable qualities of Archie Bunker. She said, in effect, that one could not be a bigot and be lovable.² Northwestern University sociologist, Charles Moskos, wrote that viewing All in the Family "is a cheap way for tolerant upper-middle class liberals to escape their own prejudices while the bigots get their views reinforced."³ Others who voiced public criticism of All in the Family included Eugene Kusielewicz, President of the Kosciuszko,⁴ Benjamin R. Eptstein, National Director of the Anti-Defamation League of B'nai B'rith, the late Whitney Young, Jr., of the Urban League, and Alvin F. Poussaint, a Black psychiatrist at Harvard.⁵ They believed the program would serve to solidify and justify bigoted attitudes against ethnic minorities.

The defenders of the program maintained that quite the contrary was true. Indeed, at the beginning of the initial show an off-camera announcer was heard reading the following words: "This program . . . seeks to throw a humorous spotlight on our frailties, prejudices, and concerns. By making them a source of laughter we hope to show--in a mature fashion--just how absurd they are."⁶ It has been said that Sammy Davis, Jr., a popular Black Jewish entertainer who has appeared on the show, enjoys the program so much that he moved the schedule of his nightclub act up to eight-thirty from eight o'clock so that he would not miss it. Both Carroll O'Connor and Norman Lear argue that since All in the Family encourages the American viewer to face up to his prejudices, and to laugh at himself for having them, the program deserves

to be considered a landmark in broadcasting.⁷ O'Connor has stated that most of his fan mail indicated that the satirical intent of the show was perceived and appreciated by the viewers, including those of ethnic minorities.⁸ In apparent support of this contention, the Los Angeles chapter of the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People presented an award to All in the Family in 1972 for the program's efforts to promote racial harmony.⁹ The consensus of the proponents of All in the Family has seemed to be that satirical exposure of bigotry will produce catharsis and that the catharsis will reduce prejudice.

At issue in these conflicting viewpoints has been the applicability of several theories of social psychology and of mass communication which have been presented over the past four decades. Paul F. Lazarsfeld developed the panel as a research tool to study the effectiveness of political propaganda. The panel is a research method that collects data in the field from the same groups of respondents at intervals over a period of time in order to measure changing conditions. Lazarsfeld sought to "single out those members of the panel who register change, and by special interviews trace in detail how such changes in attitudes or behavior came about."¹⁰ His study of the 1940 Presidential election, published as The People's Choice,¹¹ indicated that the main accomplishments of campaign propaganda were (1) to maintain and reinforce established partisan beliefs and (2) to activate latent political beliefs. The direct propaganda message received its widest exposure among audiences

already predisposed in its favor or at least already interested in that subject. When conversion was achieved, it came about through a two-step communication process; that is, the converted person responded to the personal influence of someone else who had been more directly sensitive to the propaganda. Furthermore, the converted person was likely to be one with little initial interest or opinion. Lazarsfeld's later work, Personal Influence, further developed the validity of the two-step communication system.¹²

Nazi persecution of Jews during World War II led several researchers to attempt to determine how prejudice against ethnic minorities develops and why some people have it. T.W. Adorno and others, in researching The Authoritarian Personality,¹³ discovered patterns of viewpoints which correlated significantly with prejudice. By close investigation of these patterns, they developed the California F-Scale as a means of identifying persons with predisposition for prejudice without overtly asking for opinions about ethnic groups. This research indicated a rigidity of viewpoint on the part of authoritarian personalities which made it difficult for them to recognize the rationality of any arguments presented in contradiction to their opinions.

The research of Eunice Cooper and Marie Jahoda produced further evidence of the evasion of propaganda. Through depth interviews they learned that prejudiced persons were inclined to circuitous processes of disidentification when exposed to subtle or satirical pro-tolerance propaganda. They avoided

the intended identification, they invalidated the message, they changed the frame of reference, or they did not understand it.¹⁴ Albert Hastorf and Hadley Cantril found more evidence of this selective perception in their case study of the different perceived events of the 1953 Dartmouth versus Princeton football game as seen by two biased audiences. Each audience perceived events in support of its bias.¹⁵

In 1960, Milton Rokeach's work, The Open and Closed Mind,¹⁶ verified the earlier research. This work, which included a renovation of the F-Scale into the more concise Dogmatism Scale, also indicated that the determinate of closed-mindedness was the inability to differentiate between information concerning the source and information concerning the message. A closed-minded response might be illustrated by the way soldiers on a parade ground base their response to a command (the message) upon their evaluation of the rank of the commander (the source). An example of open-mindedness would be a researcher reading a scientific paper in order to extract and evaluate information independent of the writer's social rank.¹⁷ Frederic Powell provided additional empirical evidence in support of this theory by studying the responses of sample audiences to selected campaign statements by the 1960 Presidential candidates. Powell found open-minded respondents able to tolerate greater incongruity between "their cognitions of the sources and the message."¹⁸

The central theme of this chain of research has been the partial effectiveness of propaganda. Lazarsfeld's research indicated that the target of overt propaganda would be inclined to avoid the message (selective exposure). The studies of Adorno, Rokeach, and Powell indicated that, even if exposed to the message, the closed-minded target audience would tend to be unable to evaluate the message independently of its evaluation of the source. Cooper and Jahoda, Hastorf and Cantril produced evidence indicating that the opinionated target audience would likely misunderstand the message as being supportive of its opinions (selective perception.) Therefore, an audience that exposes itself to a propaganda message would be mainly composed of persons who already had an interest in the subject and had formed an opinion on it. Furthermore, much of that audience would elect to expose itself to the message because it anticipated that the message would agree with its established opinions. Selective exposure, then, would be responsible for reducing the likelihood that overt propaganda would directly reach its intended recipients.

The attempt could be made to avoid selective exposure by making the propaganda more covert through the use of subtlety or satire as with All in the Family. On the other hand, such a covert could be dysfunctional, reducing the effectiveness of propaganda by making selective perception easier. The audience could more readily disidentify with the message. In this case, the audience might merge its conception of both the source and the message in such a way as to perceive of

them as being favorable to its established viewpoint, even when such was not the intent of the source.

The defense of All in the Family by CBS acknowledged the selective exposure principle by assuming that its sixty million viewers were of lower prejudice than that of the general population. However, this interpretation of the ratings was dependent upon the audience understanding the satirical intent of the program. If the selective perception principle was also operative, then at least part of the audience would have been expected to misinterpret the satire as reality. Rokeach and Neil Vidmar conducted a study in 1972 to test this alternate interpretation of the program's popularity. They proposed that if many of the "viewers do not see it as satire, it is reasonable to predict just the opposite--namely, that regular viewers of All in the Family are more likely to (a) be high prejudiced persons, (b) identify with or admire Archie more than Mike [Stivic, the character of Archie's liberal son-in-law], and (c) condone Archie's use of ethnic and racial slurs."¹⁹ These predictions were supported by the research findings of a survey made among United States adolescents and Canadian adults.

Problem

The conflicting statements of various public figures has attested to the general interest in All in the Family as protolerance propaganda. The program's producer justified

his break with previous standards of taste by stating that the satirical exposure of bigotry would serve to reduce prejudice. The leading actor has said that the opinions expressed to him by viewers from ethnic minorities indicate that they perceive the satirical intent and approve of the program. The Rokeach and Vidmar study did not support these contentions. Perhaps even more pertinent is the Simmons television viewer survey of 1972. Unlike most of the rating polls, Simmons divides viewers into ethnic groups. The 1972 survey indicated that while All in the Family ranked second in popularity among white males, it ranked twenty-ninth among non-white males. Further, ninety-five per cent of the program's viewers were white.²⁰ So far, only one study has sought to relate the perceptions of All in the Family to the tolerance or prejudice of minority group viewers, and that one found no evidence of the selective exposure model in operation among black viewers.²¹ In other words, the results were contrary to what would be expected from the theoretical base and to the evidence of the Rokeach and Vidmar study and the Simmons poll.

Purpose

The purpose of this study is to determine the statistical relationship between the open- or closed-mindedness of ethnic minority group viewers and the detection of the satirical intent of All in the Family. Effort is also made to test the effect of selective exposure and the perceived benefits

of the program as it relates to the open- or closed-mindedness of these viewers.

Hypotheses

The selective perception model indicates that the audience will tend to perceive the intent of satirical propaganda messages as supporting its established viewpoint. The selective exposure model indicates that the audience will tend to anti- anticipate that message will support its established viewpoint. Both of these phenomena are magnified in the closed-minded members of the audience. The All in the Family program style had tended to emphasize the cultural differences of ethnic groups. Therefore the following hypotheses were advanced:

(1) There will be a significant positive relationship between the open-minded ethnic minority viewers and those who are more frequent viewers of the program.

(2) There will be a significant, positive relationship between the open-minded ethnic minority viewers and those who perceive that the frank depiction of prejudice is beneficial to ethnic group harmony.

(3) There will be a significant, positive relationship between the open-minded ethnic minority viewers and those who like Archie Bunker.

(4) There will be a significant, positive relationship between the open-minded ethnic minority viewers and those that perceive that Archie is the character that the program most makes fun of.

Scope and Limitations

This study was designed to determine the general applicability of selective exposure and selective perception among minority ethnic group viewers of All in the Family. As such, the indicators used in the research instrument were broad and the resulting relationships provided only a gross directional evaluation. The fifteen item Short-Form Dogmatism Scale has an estimated reliability factor of only seventy-three per cent.²⁵ Furthermore, the survey population was not exclusively made up of members of minority ethnic groups; therefore, respondents who did not report self-identity with an ethnic group were not included in the discussion. This study accepted the assumption that All in the Family does present protolerance propaganda. No effort was made to expand this study to include other opinionated television characters.

NOTES

- ¹Louis Solomon, TV's First Family (New York: Scholastic Book Services, 1973), pp. 7-11.
- ²Laura Z. Hobson, "As I Listened to Archie say 'Hebe' . . .," New York Times, 12 September 1971, Sec. 2, p. 12.
- ³"The Team Behind Archie Bunker & Co.," Time, 25 September 1972, 49.
- ⁴"Is There Humor in Bigotry?" New York Times Magazine, 9 April 1972, 20.
- ⁵Arnold Hano, "Can Archie Bunker Give Bigotry A Bad Name?" New York Times Magazine, 12 March 1972, 33.
- ⁶Carroll Terry, "The New Trend in TV Comedies," Good Housekeeping, September 1972, 81.
- ⁷Frank Levy, "In Defense of Prejudice," New Republic, 5/12 August 1972, 25-26.
- ⁸"Carroll O'Connor: A Candid Conversation with Arch-Bigot Archie Bunker's Better Half," Playboy, January 1973, 68.
- ⁹Milton Rokeach and Neil Vidmar, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication 24 (Winter 1974), 37.
- ¹⁰Paul F. Lazarsfeld, "Panel Studies," Public Opinion Quarterly, 4 (1940), 122.
- ¹¹Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Bernard Berelson and Hazel Gaudet, The People's Choice (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944).
- ¹²Elihu Katz and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Mass Communications (Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955).
- ¹³T. W. Adorno, Else Frenkel-Brunswik, Daniel J. Levinson and R. Nevitt Sanford, The Authoritarian Personality (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).
- ¹⁴Eunice Cooperaand Marie Jahoda, "The Evasion of Propaganda," Journal of Psychology, 23 (1947), 15-25.

¹⁵Albert H. Hastorf and Hadley Contril, "They Saw a Game: A Case Study," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 49 (1954), 129-134.

¹⁶Milton Rokeach, The Open and Closed Mind (New York: Basic Books, 1960).

¹⁷Rokeach, pp. 57-59.

¹⁸Frederic A. Powell, "Open- and Closed-Mindedness and the Ability to Differentiate Source and Message," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65 (1962), 63.

¹⁹Vidmar and Rokeach, p. 44.

²⁰Levy, p. 25.

CHAPTER II

RELATED RESEARCH

The departure of All in the Family from the prevailing standards of broadcasting caught the attention of social scientists as well as the general public. After receiving low ratings for the first few episodes, the program seemed to catch on and by the end of its first full season it was rated as America's most watched television program. The popularity of a program dealing with previously unmentioned subjects led researchers to the questions of who was watching the program and why. The broadcast industry was interested for pragmatic reasons and social scientists wondered if the public depiction of ethnic humor might be socially detrimental.

The earliest empirical study of the program's alleged harms or benefits was undertaken in the weeks immediately following the show's first appearance. It was a telephone survey of viewers initiated and financed by the CBS Television Network to ascertain audience opinion and reaction. This poll indicated that the majority of the viewers contacted, including those of ethnic minorities, thought the program was enjoyable and that they were not offended by it. This was a single survey with no follow-up and CBS acknowledged that attitude change cannot be adequately

measured by this method. Nevertheless, the implication by the network was that the satirical intent of All in the Family was being detected and therefore, if any attitude change occurred, it would be to reduce prejudice.¹

In 1972 Rokeach and Vidmar conducted a study to test hypotheses that provided altogether different interpretations of the program's popularity from that of CBS. They reasoned that if the satire of All in the Family was not being understood, due to selective perception, then viewers might be watching the show because it supported their beliefs, due to selective exposure. The researchers used two population samples for their survey; one from the United States, the other from Canada. The United States sample consisted of 237 high school students in a small mid-western town. The survey was conducted on a voluntary basis during school study hall periods. This sample was two-thirds male and all white. The ages ranged from fourteen to eighteen. The instrument was in the form of an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire. The Canadian sample consisted of 168 adults whose names had been randomly selected from voting records; 130 of them agreed to be interviewed. Approximately half of these were surveyed by face-to-face interview and the rest by telephone interview. A comparison of the two methods indicated no significant difference in responses. Two-thirds of the Canadian sample were female. For both samples, the survey instrument contained eleven items pertaining to the respondent's

reactions to All in the Family, and six items intended to measure ethnocentrism. Two of the six ethnocentric questions were modified to be more culturally relevant for Canadian viewers. These two questions referred to Canadian Indians and French Canadians instead of Negroes.

A median split of the responses to the six ethnocentric items was used to divide viewers into high prejudice and low prejudice categories. The responses to the program of these two categories were then compared by means of the chi square statistic. Little difference was found in the degree to which the groups reported the program as being "enjoyable" or "funny." However, there were some significant differences in their reactions to the characters. The high prejudice categories of both nationalities were found to be significantly more likely to "admire Archie over Mike and to perceive Archie, as winning in the end."² Although most viewers in all categories indicated that they thought that Mike made more sense than Archie, those classified as highly prejudiced were more likely to select Archie as making more sense. This finding reached an acceptable level of significance only within the American sample. The high prejudice viewers were also more likely to condone Archie's use of ethnic slurs than the low prejudice viewers. This finding reached an acceptable level of significance only within the Canadian sample. The low prejudice Canadian viewers were significantly more likely to see that the program was poking fun at Archie than the high prejudice viewers. High prejudice American viewers were

significantly more frequent viewers of All in the Family than low prejudice Americans.³

In evaluating the above data, Rokeach and Vidmar concluded that the theory of selective perception was more responsible for the program's popularity than the theory of selective exposure. That is, the high prejudice viewers first went through the misunderstanding of the satire to perceive that Archie was "telling it like it is." After having first perceived that All in the Family was supportive of their prejudice, they became frequent viewers of the program. This demonstrated the applicability of the selective exposure theory.

John Brigham and Linda Giesbrecht conducted a study in 1973 that was somewhat similar to that of Rokeach and Vidmar. They also hypothesized that prejudice would be strongly related to agreement that Archie's racial viewpoints are valid and to identification with Archie. Their survey population included Blacks, but no predictions were made concerning their responses, nor concerning possible relationships between black and white viewers' responses.

All of the survey population were adults living in the same Southern city. The respondents consisted of 118 Whites and 71 Blacks. Fifty-one of the white subjects were students in an introductory psychology class at a predominantly white university, eighteen were students at a community college, thirty-four were the members and their wives of a local service club, and fifteen were members

of a women's club. Of the black subjects, forty-one were students at a predominantly black university and twenty-five were members of a church group. The mean age of the women's club was fifty-two. The mean age of the other groups ranged from nineteen to twenty-seven.⁴

The research instrument consisted of seven-point Likert Scale items concerning frequency of viewing of All in the Family, reactions to the program and identification with its characters. A shortened form of the Multifactor Racial Attitude Inventory was used to ascertain the racial attitudes of the white subjects. This instrument was modified to be applicable for black respondents and used as a measure of racial attitudes for the black subjects. A pre-survey test indicated an acceptable degree of "internal homogeneity in both measures."⁵ The instruments were anonymous, self-administered questionnaires in all cases.

The groups were assessed concerning the degree of within-race agreement on each question by means of analyses of variance. Although there was some differences in the responses of the women's club to the rest of the white sample, and some in the responses of the church group to the rest of the black sample, there was no significant difference in the total scores of either race.⁶

Correlations were determined between the measures of prejudice and the various questionnaire items. Within the white sample, high prejudice responses were found to be

significantly related to liking Archie and agreeing with him, to the acceptance of Archie's racial views as valid, and to believing that the effect of the program would be harmful to race relations. No significant correlations were found concerning these items within the black sample. Interestingly, while the white sample agreed to a greater extent than the black sample that Archie's racial attitudes were not typical of most white, the more prejudiced blacks reported that they knew a lot of white people like Archie. When the questionnaire items were correlated to a self-evaluation of the program's enjoyment, the significance of the responses was quite different. Within the black sample, persons who most enjoyed the program were significantly more in disagreement with Archie and with the validity of Archie's opinions of blacks than those "persons who enjoyed the program less."⁷ Blacks who enjoyed the program also indicated that the effects of the program would be beneficial to race relations.

Brigham and Giesbrecht concluded that while All in the Family was widely watched and enjoyed by both races, neither enjoyment of the program nor frequency of viewing was strongly related to "racial attitudes of either whites or blacks."⁸ The second of these two findings conflicts with the Rokeach and Vidmar conclusion that high prejudice is significantly related to frequency of viewing. In 1975 Brigham and Giesbrecht replicated their 1973 study and reported similar results. That is, evidence of selective perception was found but only within the white sample. The more racially prejudiced viewers were significantly more likely to like Archie and to agree

that his racial viewpoints were valid. However, no evidence of selective exposure was found to result from racial attitudes.

Stuart Surlin conducted a survey using random sampling of adults in Athens, Georgia, in the spring of 1972 to test the relationship of program character evaluation and dogmatism. The 265 respondents were all determined to be viewers of All in the Family. The research instrument was administered by personal interview. It consisted of two sets of Likert-type scales for each of the five main characters (Mike, Archie, Edith, Gloria, and Lionel) and the Short-Form Dogmatism Scale (the ten-item form). The Likert-type responses ranged from "Strongly Agree With" to "Strongly Disagree With" and from "Strongly Like" to "Strongly Dislike." Information concerning the respondent's age, income, occupation and education was also collected.

The data were subjected to t-tests to determine the relationships between the dogmatic groups and their "Liking" and "Agreement" for each All in the Family character. This provided significant support for both working hypotheses. That is, (1) high-dogmatic viewers tended to "Agree With" the characters they "Liked," and (2) they "Disagreed With" the characters they "Disliked." Surlin's findings were, therefore, in support of the Rokeach theory that closed-minded individuals would be less able to evaluate information independent of their evaluation of the information's source than would open-minded individuals. High-dogmatic individuals

were found to be high in both their "agreement with" and "liking of" Archie. Low-dogmatic individuals were found able to maintain both "disagreement with" and "liking of" Archie.⁹

Surlin's study was replicated and expanded in 1973 with the assistance of Eugene Tate. An adult random sample was drawn from Saskatoon, Canada, and the same survey method was used as had been employed in Athens. No significant demographic differences existed between the samples other than nationality. The findings from the Canadian sample were generally the same as those from the American sample. However, the Canadians who most strongly "agreed with" Archie Bunker were those most like him socially to a greater degree than the Americans. On the other hand, the American viewers thought that the program was more true to life than did the Canadian viewers.¹⁰

Surlin also collaborated with John Leckenby for a survey conducted in 1974 in Atlanta and Chicago. The purpose of the study was to determine the effects of race, social class, and geographic region of residence upon the perceived reality of life styles and racial attitudes presented in All in the Family and Sanford and Son and upon the perceived appropriateness of the two marriage relationships presented in All in the Family. Even though the survey was cross-racial and included All in the Family as part of the research material, it is not relevant to the present study because it was designed to test different concepts.¹¹

With the exception of the Brigham and Giesbrecht study, none of the research of the theories under consideration was concerned with the response of ethnic minority viewers. The findings from the minority group sample within this one exception were contrary to what would be expected from the theoretical base. That is, the high-dogmatic viewer's disagreement with Archie would be expected to relate to his dislike of Archie because of the closed-minded tendency to merge liking and agreement. Since closed-minded individuals also tend to misunderstand satirical protolerance messages, the high-dogmatic minority group viewer would be expected to perceive of Archie Bunker as a true representation of middle-class whites. Therefore, the high-dogmatic minority group viewer would be expected to be a less frequent viewer than low-dogmatics. Instead, the Brigham and Giesbrecht study found no relationship between racial attitudes and enjoyment of the program or frequency of viewing. Furthermore, the only adolescent sample used so far was for the American portion of the Rokeach and Vidmar study. That sample was all white and exhibited responses in support of the theoretical base. This study was the first to concentrate on the applicability of selective perception and selective exposure among minority ethnic group adolescents as viewers of All in the Family.

NOTES

¹Milton Rokeach and Neil Vidmar, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication, 24 (Winter 1974), 37.

²Rokeach and Vidmar, p. 39.

³Rokeach and Vidmar, p. 45.

⁴John C. Brigham and Linda W. Giesbrecht, "The Effects of Viewed Bigotry: Racial Attitudes on All in the Family," Journal of Communication, (in press).

⁵John C. Brigham, "Ethnic Humor on Television: Does it Reduce/Reinforce Racial Prejudice?" Paper presented to American Psychological Association meeting, Chicago, 1975.

⁶Brigham, "Ethnic Humor on Television."

⁷Brigham, "Ethnic Humor on Television."

⁸Brigham and Giesbrecht.

⁹Stuart H. Surlin, "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie Bunker Case," Public Telecommunications Review, 2 (April 1974), 34-41.

¹⁰Stuart H. Surlin and Eugene D. Tate, "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Viewers: Agreement with Opinionated Television Characters." Paper presented to International Communication Association meeting, Chicago, April 1975.

¹¹John D. Leckenby and Stuart H. Surlin, "Race and Social Class Differences in Perceived Reality of Socially Relevant Television Programs for Adults in Atlanta and Chicago." Paper presented to International Communication Association Convention, Mass Communication Division, Chicago, April 1975.

CHAPTER III

METHODOLOGY

The hypotheses were tested by a survey of American adolescent students. A sample population was sought that would meet the following conditions within one high school: it should include a usable number who are members of an ethnic minority group; and the minority group should be one that has been subjected to the derogatory remarks of All in the Family character, Archie Bunker. Such was found in a private, college preparatory academy in Dallas, Texas. The predominant socio-economic status of the students of this school is upper-middle class. The school has an extensive scholarship program that also brings in a large number of students from lower-middle class families. Therefore, the student population comes from families that range from lower-middle class to wealthy. This student body contains members of all races; however, the number of non-white students is not proportional to their percentage of the general population of the city. On the other hand, approximately one-third of the students are Jewish.¹ This subgroup was selected to test the applicability of selective perception and selective exposure among ethnic minorities because it differs from the overall student population only by a particular religious

and cultural identity. This condition meets the definition of ethnicity accepted for this study; that is, self-identity with "one's own" by reason of national origin, race, and/or social custom.² Furthermore, Archie's pejorative use of such terms as "hebe" and "breaking bread with the chosen people" brought strong protest from Jewish writers such as Hobson.³

The research instrument used in this study was an anonymous, self-administered questionnaire completed by students enrolled in a required science class. The first section of the instrument (see Appendix) consisted of fourteen items relating to the respondent's frequency of viewing All in the Family, his evaluation of its characters, and his opinion of the program. The character evaluations were those used by Surlin⁴ and the program opinions were the detection of satire items used by Rokeach.⁵ References to the character of Lionel Jefferson were eliminated because that character no longer appears on the program on a regular basis. Four of the items in the first section were directly related to the test hypotheses. The others were used to mask them and to obtain related data.

Following the program evaluation, the instrument included the Short-Form Dogmatism Scale (the fifteen-point version).⁶ Surlin used the ten-point version of this scale⁷; Rokeach and Vidmar used six items of their own design.⁸ The fifteen-point version of the scale has an estimated reliability factor of seventy-three per cent. The ten-point version has

an estimated reliability factor of only sixty-six per cent⁹ and no validation was offered by Rokeach and Vidmar for the six-item prejudice index. The fifteen-point version of the Short-Form Dogmatism Scale was selected because it has greater reliability yet was still brief enough to be administered within available class time.

The final section of the instrument consisted of five items asking for the education and occupation of the head of the household and the respondent's age, sex and religion. The last item was used to establish the test subgroup.

The survey was conducted during the week of May 17, 1976, and was completed by ninety-two students. It was recognized that a larger number of participants would have been desirable for statistical analysis; however, enrollment limitations precluded this if the demographic homogeneity was to be preserved. Thirty-three of the respondents marked "Jewish" under the religious identity item. This number was accepted as adequate to provide directional analysis significant to a less than .05 level of probability.¹⁰

Responses to the Dogmatism Scale items were assigned values of one, for "Agree Very Much," through six, for "Disagree Very Much." These responses were then summed and the sums were considered to be the measure of open- or closed-mindedness. A respondent was defined as being more open-minded than viewers having Dogmatism Scale sums less than his own. Each of the fourteen items referring to All in the Family or its characters was divided into

categories dependent upon the direction of the response, or according to the character indicated. The responses to items one through eight and item ten were classified into three categories; a positive category for the "Like," "Agree," or "Helpful" responses, a negative category for the "Dislike," "Disagree," or "Harmful" responses, and a neutral category for the "Neither" responses. Item nine was the frequency of viewing. The responses were divided into the two categories used by Rokeach and Vidmar. The responses "Every Week" and "Almost Every Week" were considered to be frequent viewers and the other responses were classified as infrequent viewers. The remaining four items were categorized directly from the responses selected. A test of the significance of the relationship of the Dogmatism Scale sums to the categories of each of the fourteen items was conducted using the Analysis of Variance statistic. The tests were applied to the item three times; once each for the Jewish respondents, for the non-Jewish respondents, and for all respondents.

The hypothesis-testing items were distributed throughout the other opinion items. They are as follows:

(1) Item nine was used to test the first hypothesis: the first hypothesis stated that a significant, positive relationship will be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and frequency of viewing on the part of ethnic minority viewers.

(2) Item ten was used to test the second hypothesis: the second hypothesis stated that a significant, positive relationship will be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and

those minority group respondents who indicated that the frank use of malevolent slang names for ethnic groups was "helpful."

(3) Item two was used to test hypothesis three: hypothesis three stated that a significant, positive relationship will be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and the indication of "liking" Archie Bunker on the part of ethnic minority respondents.

(4) Item thirteen was used to test hypothesis four: hypothesis four stated that a significant, positive relationship will be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and the indication that Archie was the character most made fun of by the program.

This study accepted the assumption presented by its producer, Norman Lear, that All in the Family has presented pro-tolerance propaganda in a satirical manner.¹¹ No effort was made to expand this study to include other opinionated television characters. These decisions, together with the broad nature of the indicators used in the research instrument, were deemed to be acceptable to provide gross directional evaluations of any resulting relationships. The study was designed to determine only the general applicability of selective exposure and selective perception among minority ethnic group viewers of All in the Family.

NOTES

¹Harry B. McCain, Head of Science Division, Greenhill School, Dallas, Texas, personal interview held on April 17, 1976.

²William Morris, ed., The American Heritage Dictionary of The English Language (New York: American Heritage Publishing Co., 1969), 450.

³Laura Z. Hobson, "As I Listened to Archie Say, 'Hebe' . . .," New York Times, 12 September 1971, Sec. 2, p. 12.

⁴Stuart H. Surlin, "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie Bunker Case," Public Telecommunication Review, 2 (April 1974), 34-41.

⁵Milton Rokeach and Neil Vidmar, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication 24 (Winter 1974), 37.

⁶Verling C. Troidahl and Frederic Powell, "A Short-Form Dogmatism Scale for Use in Field Studies," Social Forces, 44 (1965), 211-214.

⁷Surlin, p. 36.

⁸Rokeach and Vidmar, p. 41.

⁹Troidahl and Powell, p. 214.

¹⁰Hubert M. Blalock, Jr., Social Statistics (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1972), p. 293.

¹¹Frank Levy, "In Defense of Prejudice," New Republic, (5/12 August 1972), 25-26.

CHAPTER IV

RESULTS

The All in the Family response survey was completed by ninety-two adolescent students. Two of them had incomplete responses to the Dogmatism Scale which made them invalid for the present study. The remaining ninety consisted of thirty-three self-identified Jewish respondents and fifty-seven others. Automatic processing was used to compute one way analyses of variance of the pertinent data. This process was applied to test the relationship between the Dogmatism Scale sums and each of the fourteen All in the Family items. Even though the primary interest of this study was in the Jewish respondents, the tests were also applied to the non-Jewish students and to the total group. The level of significance adopted for this study was .05. In those cases where the response to a program item had been omitted or was illegible, the respondent was not included in the test for that item only.

The results of the tests are presented in Tables I through III. Each table consists of six vertical columns. The first column gives the item number of the instrument (see Appendix). The second has brief descriptions of the response categories. Column three shows the number of responses received for each category. Columns four and five consists of the Dogmatism Scale sum means and standard deviations.

for the respondents of each category respectively. The last column is the F-ratio of the analysis of variance relating all responses to that item to the Dogmatism Scale sums. Only F-ratios with a probability of less than .10 will be noted.

Table I presents the results from all respondents. They had a mean Dogmatism Scale sum of 57.40, ranging from 37 to 83. The absolute range of the Scale is 15 through 90. High sums indicate more dogmatic responses.

TABLE I
ANALYSIS OF ALL IN THE FAMILY OPINION
ITEMS AND DOGMATISM SCALE SUMS
OF ALL RESPONDENTS

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
1	Agree with Archie	7	56.29	8.36	0.368
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Archie	26	58.46	9.57	
	Disagree with Archie	55	59.18	8.30	
2	Like Archie	41	58.46	8.82	0.459
	Neither Like nor Dislike Archie	36	58.17	8.74	
	Dislike Archie	13	60.77	7.46	
3	Agree with Mike	52	58.04	8.28	0.369
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Mike	29	59.72	8.46	
	Disagree with Mike	6	58.00	12.46	
4	Like Mike	58	58.38	7.50	1.586
	Neither Like nor Dislike Mike	27	60.33	9.42	
	Dislike Mike	5	53.20	13.90	
5	Agree with Edith	32	58.06	9.15	0.467
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Edith	48	59.31	7.82	
	Disagree with Edith	8	56.50	10.68	

TABLE I--Continued

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
6	Like Edith	54	57.94	8.82	0.719
	Neither Like nor Dislike Edith	27	60.33	8.56	
	Dislike Edith	9	58.11	6.90	
7	Agree with Gloria	41	56.76	8.37	2.435*
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Gloria	39	60.69	8.18	
	Disagree with Gloria	7	56.43	9.59	
8	Like Gloria	53	58.45	7.91	4.785**
	Neither Like nor Dislike Gloria	25	61.88	7.87	
	Dislike Gloria	12	53.00	10.15	
9	Frequent Viewers	22	59.50	8.13	0.284
	Infrequent Viewers	68	58.41	8.64	
10	Frank Ethnic Labels Are Helpful	27	57.15	8.77	0.710
	Are Neither Helpful nor Harmful	29	58.79	8.43	
	Are Harmful	34	59.79	8.56	
11	Mike Makes More Sense	84	58.83	8.74	0.068
	Archie Makes More Sense	5	57.80	4.97	
12	Archie Wins	22	57.55	7.35	0.213
	Archie Loses	61	58.51	8.73	
13	Character Most Made Fun of				1.021
	Archie	34	59.09	8.05	
	Mike	8	62.50	10.62	
	Edith	47	57.91	8.55	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	
14	Character Who Is Butt of Most Jokes				0.189
	Archie	17	57.59	7.25	
	Mike	49	58.71	9.41	
	Edith	21	59.29	7.58	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	

*Tending toward significance; probability < 0.10 .

**Significant result; probability < 0.01 .

Only the F-Ratio for item eight reaches the level of significance adopted for this study. The F-Ratio for item seven indicates only a weak relationship but it is noted because of its similarity to item eight. Items thirteenth and fourteen were considered to have only three categories for the statistical calculations since no responses were recorded for "Gloria." This procedure will be followed for these two items throughout this chapter. Interestingly, the character "Gloria" is related to all four items. Items directly related to her seemed to solicit significant results but she received no responses to the latter items.

The non-Jewish respondents' Dogmatism Scale sums ranged from 37 to 82 with a mean of 56.48. These measures are approximately the same as those of all respondents. Table II presents their responses.

TABLE II

ANALYSIS OF ALL IN THE FAMILY OPINION
ITEMS AND DOGMATISM SCALE SUMS AMONG
NON-JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Devia-Tion	F-Ratio
1	Agree with Archie	5	54.80	9.73	0.179
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Archie	16	55.81	10.48	
	Disagree with Archie	35	56.91	7.75	
2	Like Archie	28	56.89	9.66	0.273
	Neither Like nor Dislike Archie	24	55.45	7.26	
	Dislike Archie	6	57.83	8.26	

TABLE II--Continued

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
3	Agree with Mike	35	56.14	8.37	0.927
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Mike	17	57.24	8.09	
	Disagree with Mike	3	50.00	12.53	
4	Like Mike	41	57.37	8.21	2.225
	Neither Like nor Dislike Mike	13	58.85	8.31	
	Dislike Mike	4	48.25	9.71	
5	Agree with Edith	24	55.67	8.85	1.099
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Edith	28	57.39	7.92	
	Disagree with Edith	4	51.00	8.83	
6	Like Edith	38	56.55	9.43	0.021
	Neither Like nor Dislike Edith	14	56.00	6.49	
	Dislike Edith	6	56.33	7.39	
7	Agree with Gloria	32	55.38	8.34	1.142
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Gloria	20	58.25	7.89	
	Disagree with Gloria	4	52.50	11.39	
8	Like Gloria	39	56.82	8.08	2.873*
	Neither Like nor Dislike Gloria	10	59.70	8.08	
	Dislike Gloria	9	50.89	9.03	
9	Frequent Viewers	13	55.54	5.65	0.040
	Infrequent Viewers	44	56.61	9.15	
10	Frank Ethnic Labels Are Helpful	17	56.29	10.48	0.041
	Are Neither Helpful nor Harmful	20	56.05	7.92	
	Are Harmful	21	56.81	7.61	
11	Mike Makes More Sense	55	56.62	8.65	0.255
	Archie Makes More Sense	2	53.50	3.54	
12	Archie Wins	13	55.54	6.98	0.111
	Archie Loses	42	56.45	9.06	

TABLE II--Continued

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
13	Character Most Made Fun of				0.355
	Archie	23	57.52	8.14	
	Mike	6	57.33	4.46	
	Edith	28	55.50	9.54	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	
14	Character Who Is Butt of Most Jokes				0.019
	Archie	13	56.85	7.89	
	Mike	32	56.44	9.28	
	Edith	12	56.33	7.70	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	

*Tending toward significance; probability <0.10 .

None of the relationships presented in Table II reach the .05 level of significance. Item eight approaches significance and is noted because the same item in Table I was found to be significant. All items of noteworthy significance have related to the character "Gloria" in some way. However, none of the rather prolific number of articles on All in the Family have treated Gloria as anything but a background character to the antics and symbolic characterizations of Archie, Edith, and Mike. These results concerning Gloria perhaps indicate sympathetic dimensions of the character that not even the series producer has realized.

The Dogmatism Scale sums of the Jewish respondents ranged from 48 to 83. The means of their sums was 62.67 which is noticeably higher than that of the other respondents. This result had not been anticipated. It may suggest a cultural condition of the ethnic group under consideration,

but it does not affect the testing of the hypotheses. The Dogmatism Scale sums and program opinions of this group are presented in Table III.

TABLE III
ANALYSIS OF ALL IN THE FAMILY OPINION
ITEMS AND DOGMATISM SCALE SUMS
AMONG JEWISH RESPONDENTS

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
1	Agree with Archie	2	60.00	7.77	0.148
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Archie	10	62.70	6.25	
	Disagree with Archie	21	62.90	1.41	
2	Like Archie	13	61.85	5.55	0.139
	Neither Like nor Dislike Archie	13	63.15	8.95	
	Dislike Archie	7	63.29	6.21	
3	Agree With Mike	18	61.72	6.62	0.526
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Mike	12	63.25	7.98	
	Disagree with Mike	3	66.00	6.25	
4	Like Mike	18	60.67	4.72	Not Tested*
	Neither Like nor Dislike Mike	14	64.50	8.65	
	Dislike Mike	1	73.00	0.00	
5	Agree with Edith	9	64.44	5.98	0.381
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Edith	20	62.00	6.99	
	Disagree with Edith	4	62.00	10.36	
6	Like Edith	16	61.25	6.26	0.824
	Neither Like nor Dislike Edith	14	64.50	8.12	
	Dislike Edith	3	61.67	5.03	

TABLE III--Continued

Item	Response	Number	Scale Means	Stand. Deviation	F-Ratio
7	Agree with Gloria	10	61.30	6.53	0.263
	Neither Agree nor Disagree with Gloria	19	63.26	7.88	
	Disagree with Gloria	3	61.67	3.06	
8	Like Gloria	15	62.67	5.33	0.390
	Neither Like nor Dislike Gloria	15	63.33	7.65	
	Dislike Gloria	3	59.33	12.66	
9	Frequent Viewers	9	65.22	7.74	1.667
	Infrequent Viewers	24	61.71	6.31	
10	Frank Ethnic Labels Are Helpful	10	58.60	4.90	2.696**
	Are Neither Helpful nor Harmful	9	64.89	6.25	
	Are Harmful	14	64.14	7.88	
11	Mike Makes More Sense	30	62.87	7.29	0.262
	Archie Makes More Sense	3	60.67	3.51	
12	Archie Wins	10	60.20	6.89	1.352
	Archie Loses	19	63.05	5.95	
13	Character Most Made Fun of				2.864**
	Archie	11	62.36	7.13	
	Mike	3	71.33	12.58	
	Edith	10	61.47	5.26	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	
14	Character Who Is Butt of Most Jokes				0.294
	Archie	4	60.00	4.55	
	Mike	18	62.72	8.13	
	Edith	9	63.22	5.61	
	Gloria	0	00.00	0.00	

*The Analysis of Variance statistic is inappropriate since one category received only one response.

**Tending toward significance; probability < 0.10 .

Table III contains the items used to test the four hypotheses presented in this study. None of the F-Ratios presented in the table are high enough to be statistically significant at the .05 level. Hypothesis one stated that a significant, positive relationship would be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and frequency of viewing on the part of ethnic minority viewers. Item nine tested this hypothesis and the results did not indicate a rejection of the null hypothesis. Hypothesis two stated that a significant, positive relationship would be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and those minority group respondents who indicated that the frank use of malevolent slang names for ethnic groups was "helpful." Item ten tested this hypothesis and the results did not indicate a rejection of the null hypothesis. Hypothesis three stated that a significant, positive relationship would be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and the indication of "liking" Archie Bunker on the part of the ethnic minority respondents. Item two tested this hypothesis and the results did not indicate a rejection of the null hypothesis. Hypothesis four stated that a significant, positive relationship would be found between Dogmatism Scale sums and the indication by minority group respondents that Archie was the character most made fun of by the program. Item thirteen tested this hypothesis and the results did not indicate a rejection of the null hypothesis. It should be noted that hypothesis two received supportive results but not at a usually accepted level of significance. The results of

the test of hypothesis four actually tended in a direction contrary to what had been predicted.

In summary, fourteen items concerning opinions of All in the Family and its characters were analyzed to determine possible relationships with the respondents' Dogmatism Scale sums. The tests were conducted using the data from all respondents and using the data from two subgroupings of the respondents. One of the subgroups consisted of the Jewish students and was used to test the hypotheses of this study. None of the hypotheses were supported and only one of the forty-two relationships presented reach the .05 level of statistical significance adopted for this study. This one found a relationship between open-mindedness and "liking" of Gloria among all respondents.

CHAPTER V

DISCUSSION

When All in the Family made its debut on the night of January 12, 1971, it immediately departed from traditional standards of "good taste" in broadcasting. This departure from the traditional received both praise and condemnation from various public figures. The basic issue seemed to be whether the satirical depiction of bigotry would provide a learning process to reduce prejudice, or a modeling process than would reinforce it. Two related models of mass communication, selective exposure and selective perception, suggested that reinforcement of attitudes would be the probable result of a satirical presentation. Selective exposure is the tendency of an audience to elect to attend to material that is expected to be favorable to existing attitudes. Thus, the viewers of All in the Family would tend to expect the program material to be supportive of their established viewpoints. Selective perception, on the other hand, is the tendency of some audience members to misunderstand satirical material. This often occurs in such a way as to lead them to believe that the material is irrelevant or even supportive of their established opinions. Thus, the prejudiced viewers of All in the Family would not understand its satirical intent and would accept Archie Bunker

as a champion of middle-class, white Americans. If the prejudiced viewer is also a member of an ethnic minority, this selective perception of Archie would be expected to produce negative selective exposure; that is, he would be a less frequent viewer than more open-minded members of his ethnic group. Several researchers tested the possible relevance of these theories to All in the Family. They all found evidence supporting selective perception among the general populations surveyed. Their results also tended to support selective exposure but not as uniformly as selective perception. The present study was intended to pursue the earlier research by extending it to ethnic minority viewers.

This study expected to find evidence of both selective exposure and selective perception among an identifiable ethnic minority group. A group was selected that has been subjected to the derogatory comments of the program's main character, Archie Bunker. The survey was conducted among high school students. Of the ninety respondents, thirty-three were Jewish. This distribution permitted the replication of the earlier research among non-Jewish populations as well as testing the hypotheses concerning minority group audiences. The conditions approximated those of the Rokeach study and some of the research instrument items were the same as those used by him.

Four hypotheses were advanced than anticipated that the theories would be found operating within this group. The test consisted of comparing Dogmatism Scale responses to

program opinion items. None of the hypotheses were supported and no significant relationships were found between the Dogmatism Scale and any of the opinion items. Only one statistically significant result was obtained and, upon examination of it and the other responses, the conclusion is that it is a chance relationship.

The results were not consistent with those reported by Rokeach and Vidmar¹ or Surlin and Tate.² The Brigham and Giesbrecht³ study found support for the other researchers among white viewers but found no relationship between prejudice and program evaluation among Blacks.

Three possible explanations may be offered for the differences between the results of this study and those reported by the earlier researchers. First, All in the Family has now been on the air for over five years. With the exception of the Brigham and Giesbrecht replication in 1975, the earlier studies were conducted in 1972 and 1973, three years ago. Since that time the program has been rescheduled from Saturday night to Monday night and several of the characters featured then no longer appear on the show. More to the point, All in the Family and its "spin-offs" have established ethnic humor as standard fare for television broadcasting and it may be assumed that some of the shock value has faded. Secondly, even though this study was largely a replication of earlier research, there were some methodological differences. The reliability factor of the fifteen-item form of the Dogmatism Scale selected for this study is

higher than the ten-item form used by Surlin and Tate.⁴ No validation was offered by Rokeach and Vidmar⁵ for their six-item test of prejudice. The relatively low reliability of their measures may have caused spurious relationships to appear. Finally, the survey population selected for the present study may have been atypical. However, the research instrument used in this survey was also used in a study of another high school not reported in this paper and the results were similar. Furthermore, this population was similar to the one used by Rokeach⁶ with far different results.

The following recommendations are offered to future researchers in this area.

(1) A larger survey population should be tested so that the extreme Dogmatism Scale sums could be considered separately. Considering respondents with fifteen-point Dogmatism Scale sums of sixty or more as "open-minded" and those with sums of forty-five or less as "dogmatic" would intensify the effect of this measure on the test results.

(2) Opinion items should be expanded to include more than one television program. There are now several ethnic-situation comedies on television. They should be used in the instrument to determine if there is an ethnic influence on selective perception and exposure.

(3) Additional research should be conducted on possible relationships between the character Gloria and the attitudes of the audience. This study found unexpected evidence of a

correlation of some degree between opinions concerning Gloria and Dogmatism Scale sums.

(4) A content analysis should be conducted comparing the frequency of the use of ethnic slang names in the first year of the program to more recent shows. Casual observation seems to indicate that Archie is less abrasive and more mellow than he when when the program first appeared.

In conclusion, the present study found no significant relationship between the Short-Form Dogmatism Scale and opinions concerning All in the Family and its characters. Selective exposure and selective perception seem to be valid principles of mass communication; however, both were established by continued research of panel respondents. Future researchers may find similar methods better suited to test the applicability of these principles to a particular program than the methods of a single survey.

NOTES

¹Milton Rokeach and Neil Vidmar, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication, 24 (Winter 1974), 36-47.

²Stuart H. Surlin, "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie Bunker Case," Public Telecommunications Review, 2 (April 1974), 34-41.

³John C. Brigham and Linda W. Giesbrecht, "The Effects of Viewed Bigotry: Racial Attitudes on All in the Family," Journal of Communication, (in press).

⁴Surlin, p. 36.

⁵Rokeach and Vidmar, p. 41.

APPENDIX

ALL IN THE FAMILY RESPONSE SURVEY

Below indicate how you personally rate each individual character in All in the Family. Please circle the statement which most closely states your feelings. Please read each statement carefully.

Archie (the father)

	strongly	agree	neither	disagree	strongly
A)	agree with	with	agree nor disagree with	with	disagree with
B)	strongly dislike	dislike	neither like nor dislike	like	strongly like

Mike (the son-in-law)

	strongly	disagree	neither	agree	strongly
A)	disagree with	with	agree nor disagree with	with	agree with
B)	strongly like	like	neither like nor dislike	dislike	strongly dislike

Edith (the mother)

	strongly	agree	neither	disagree	strongly
A)	agree with	with	agree nor disagree with	with	disagree with
B)	strongly dislike	dislike	neither like nor dislike	like	strongly like

Gloria (the daughter)

	strongly	disagree	neither	agree	strongly
A)	disagree with	with	agree nor disagree with	with	agree with
B)	strongly like	like	neither like nor dislike	dislike	strongly dislike

How often do you watch All in the Family?

every	almost	only	almost	never
week	every week	occasionally	never	

If you have a reason for not watching it more often, please write that reason.

Archie often refers to member of various minority groups as "spics, hebes, spades," etc. Do you believe that the open use of these names on television is helpful or harmful in getting different groups of people to understand each other?

strongly		neither		strongly
helpful	helpful	helpful nor harmful	harmful	harmful

Archie and Mike often disagree with one another about various issues. In your opinion which of these two men usually makes better sense? Circle one.

Mike

Archie

Generally speaking, at the end of the program does Archie win or lose? Circle one.

wins

loses

Which of the main characters in the show does the program make the most fun of? Circle one.

Archie

Mike

Edith

Gloria

Which of the main characters in the show is the butt of the most jokes? Circle one.

Archie

Mike

Edith

Gloria

Now we would like to ask you some general types of questions. Please be as honest as possible in answering the questions and answer with the first response that comes to your mind.

First, decide whether you agree or disagree with the statement, and then decide how strongly you agree or disagree and circle that responses.

1. In this complicated world of ours the only way we can know what's going on is to rely on leaders or experts who can be trusted.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

2. My blood boils whenever a person stubbornly refuses to admit he's wrong.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

3. There are two kinds of people in this world: those who are for the truth and those who are against the truth.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

4. Most people just don't know what's good for them.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

5. Of all the different philosophies which exist in this world, there is probably only one which is correct.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

6. The highest form of government is democracy and the highest form of democracy is a government run by those who are most intelligent.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

7. The main thing in life is for a person to want to do something important.

- | | | |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| Agree | or | Disagree |
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

8. I'd like it if I could find someone who would tell me how to solve my personal problems.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

9. Most of the ideas which get printed nowadays aren't worth the paper they are printed on.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

10. Man on his own is a helpless and miserable creature.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

11. It is only when a person devotes himself to an idea or cause that life becomes meaningful.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

12. Most people just don't give a "damn" for others.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

13. To compromise with our political opponents is dangerous because it usually leads to the betrayal of our own side.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

14. It is often desirable to reserve judgment about what's going on until one had had a chance to hear the opinions of those one respects.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

15. The present is all too often full of unhappiness. It is only the future that counts.

- | Agree | or | Disagree |
|-----------------------|----|--------------------------|
| 1. Agree a little | | 4. Disagree a little |
| 2. Agree on the whole | | 5. Disagree on the whole |
| 3. Agree very much | | 6. Disagree very much |

Now we'd like to ask you a few final questions about yourself. Remember, your answers will remain anonymous and are confidential.

What is your age? _____

What is your sex? Circle one. MALE FEMALE

Education of head of household: Circle highest level completed.

- a. less than high school
- b. high school graduate and/or technical school
- c. some college or college graduate
- d. post-graduate

Occupation of head of household: _____

Please circle the name of any of the following religious groups to which you belong.

- a. Catholic
- b. Jewish
- c. Protestant
- d. Other (which one) _____

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Books

- Allport, Gordon W., The Nature of Prejudice, Boston, Beacon Press, 1954.
- Adorno, T.W., et al, The Authoritarian Personality, New York, Harper & Brothers, 1950.
- Blalock, Hubert M., Jr., Social Statistics, New York, McGraw-Hill, 1972.
- Katz, Elihu and Paul F. Lazarsfeld, Personal Influence: The Part Played by People in the Flow of Communications, Glencoe, Illinois, The Free Press, 1955.
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., et al, The People's Choice, New York, Basic Books, 1960.
- Rokeach, Milton, The Open and Closed Mind, New York, Basic Books, 1960.
- Solomon, Louis, TV's First Family, New York, Scholastic Book Services, 1973.

Articles

- "Another Blast by Brown," Broadcasting, 29 May 1973, 41.
- Brigham, John C. and Linda W. Giesbrecht, "The Effects of Viewed Bigotry: Racial Attitudes and All in the Family," Journal of Communication, in press.
- "Carroll O'Connor: A Candid Conversation with Arch-Bigot Archie Bunker's Better Half," Playboy (January 1973), 63.
- Cooper, Eunice and Marie Jahoda, "The Evasion of Propaganda," 23 (
- "Family Fun: CBS's Irreverent New Situation Comedy," Newsweek 15 March 1971, 68.
- Gross, Leonard, "Do the Bigots Miss the Message?" TV Guide, 8/14 November 1975, 14-18.

- Hano, Arnold, "Can Archie Bunker Give Bigotry a Bad Name?" New York Times Magazine, 12 March 1972, 32-33, 119, 124-126, 129.
- Harvey, John and Daniel Hays, "Effect of Dogmatism and Authority of the Source of Communication upon Persuasion," Psychological Reports, 30 (
- Hastorf, Albert H. and Hadley Cantril, "They Saw a Game: A Case Study," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 64 (January 1954), 129-134.
- Hobson, Laura Z., "As I Listened to Archie Say 'Hebe' . . .," New York Times, 12 September 1971, 1, 12, 27.
- "Is There Humor in Bigotry?" New York Times Magazine, 9 April 1972, 20-22.
- Kleck, R. and J. Wheaton, "Dogmatism and Responses to Opinion-Inconsistent Information," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 5 (
- Lazarsfeld, Paul F., "Panel Studies," Public Opinion Quarterly (March 1940), 122-128.
- Lear, Norman, "As I Read How Laura Saw Archie . . .," New York Times, 10 October 1971,
- Levy, Frank, "In Defense of Prejudice," New Republic (August 5/12, 1972), 25-26.
- Manis, M., "Interpretation of Opinion Statements as a Function of Recipient Attitudes and Source Prestige," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 63 (
- Powell, Frederic A., "Open- And Closed-Mindedness and the Ability to Differentiate Source and Message," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 65 (July 1962), 61-64.
- Sanders, Charles L., "Is Archie Bunker the Real White America/" Ebony, (June 1972), 186-192.
- Slawson, John, "How Funny Can Bigotry Be?" Educational Broadcasting Review, 6 (April 1972), 79-82.
- Statland, Ezra and Martin Patchen, "Identification and Changes in Prejudice and in Authoritarianism," Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 62 (March 1961), 265.
- Stein, H. F., "All in the Family as a Mirror of Contemporary American Culture," Family Process, 13 (

- Surlin, Stuart H., "Bigotry on Air and in Life: The Archie Bunker Case," Public Telecommunications Review, 2 (April 1974), 34-41.
- "The Team Behind Archie Bunker & Co.," Time, 25 September 1972, 48-58.
- Terry, Carroll, "The New Trend in TV Comedies," Good Housekeeping, (September 1972), 78-81.
- Troldahl, Verling C. and Frederic Powell, "A Short-Form Dogmatism Scale for Use in Field Studies," Social Forces, 44 (December 1965), 211-214.
- "TV: Speaking about the Unspeakable," Newsweek, 29 November 1971, 52-60.
- Vidmar, Neil and Milton Rokeach, "Archie Bunker's Bigotry: A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure," Journal of Communication, 24 (Winter 1974), 36-47.
- Woodmansee, John J. and Stuart W. Cook, "Dimensions of Verbal Attitudes: Their Identification and Measurement," Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7 (November 1967), 240-250.
- Woods, C., "Bunkerism," New Republic, 22 December 1973, 29-30.

Unpublished Materials

- Brigham, John C., "Ethnic Humor on Television: Does It Reduce/ Reinforce Racial Prejudice?" paper presented to the American Psychological Association meeting, Chicago, January 1975.
- Surlin, Stuart H. and Eugene D. Tate, "A Cross-Cultural Comparison of Viewers: Agreement with Opinionated Television Characters," paper presented to the International Communication Association meeting, Chicago, April 1975.
- Leckenby, John D. and Stuart H. Surlin, "Race and Social Class Differences in Perceived Reality of Socially Relevant Television Programs for Adults in Atlanta and Chicago," paper presented to the International Communications Association, Chicago, April 1975.