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ABSTRACT

Maas and Arcuri (1992) argue that biased language use predictably contributes to resistance of social stereotypes to change. Stereotype-congruent episodes tend to be described in abstract linguistic terms. Stereotype-incongruent episodes tend to be described in concrete linguistic terms that do not generalize beyond a specific event. There is empirical support for this classification system, distinguishing verbs and adjectives in the interpersonal domain (Semin & Fiedler, 1988), yet Hamilton et al. (1992) note there is no work investigating the implications of nouns for explaining the perpetuation of stereotypes. The present research investigated whether noun forms used to describe a group affected processing of language and valence of attitudes related to those noun forms. Study 1 examined a basic abstract-concrete language effect in relation to one target group. The manipulations had the predicted effect on language processing, but the opposite effect on attitude valence towards the target group. Study 2 examined the same effect in relation to two target groups to test the generalizability of the abstract-concrete effect. All but one significant effect was found in the predicted directions for both language processing and attitude valence. Results for both aspects of the studies are discussed in terms of the predictions. Future directions are discussed.
THE INFLUENCE OF NOUNS ON STEREOTYPES
The Influence of Nouns

Introduction

The interface between language and social cognition is a relatively recent trend within the field of psychology. Interest in social psychology and language can be dated back to 1860 (Semin & Fiedler, 1992). Semin and Fiedler note that the current trend has its roots in the work of Heider (1958) in *The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations*. Language is considered the medium in which social knowledge in general and knowledge about interpersonal relations in particular are mapped onto each other. Thus, language enables us to structure our present by bringing the past to bear upon it; language furnishes a medium by which bridges to the future may be built (Semin & Fiedler, 1992). The present study centers on one particular aspect of this, namely the role of language in the process of stereotyping.

Stereotypes

The manner in which stereotypes function within an information processing system has led to important questions for many researchers. Hamilton and Trolier (1986) discuss the development and perpetuation of stereotypes as a consequence of three different processes. First, motivational processes influence stereotypes by serving the intrapsychic needs of the perceiver. From this approach, perceiving group members in stereotypic terms is functional in maintaining the perceiver's self-esteem. Second, a sociocultural orientation focuses on the role of social
learning processes by which stereotypic beliefs are acquired through means of socialization and media influences, and are maintained by social reinforcements from significant others and important reference groups. The third and most pervasive approach to stereotypes, however, examines stereotypes as a cognitive process. From this approach, stereotypes are viewed as cognitive categories that are used by the social perceiver in processing information about people.

As social perceivers, responding to each person that we encounter as an individual unit would quickly overload our cognitive processing and storage capacities. Therefore, just as it is necessary to categorize objects according to function or similarity in order to reduce the complexity of the physical world, it is also necessary to use social categorization strategies in order to reduce the complexity of the social world (Devine, 1995; Fiske, 1995; Hamilton & Trolier, 1986).

When we categorize individuals into groups as a means of reducing the amount of social information that needs to be processed, categories (stereotypes) of persons whose members are considered to be equivalent in functionally important respects are formed (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986). This categorization often reflects real and legitimate differences between groups, such as gender, race, age, and nationality. Categorization of people into in-groups (the
group to which the individual belongs) and out-groups (any group other than the ingroup) leads social perceivers to differentiate between members of the in-group and members of the out-group in ways that most often favor the in-group (Devine, 1995).

The role language plays in the social cognitive process of stereotypes is very important for stereotype maintenance and transmission. Hamilton, Gibbons, Stroessner, and Sherman (1992) examined the relationship between stereotypes and language in the context of communication. They state that an implicit assumption underlying much of the research on the interface between language use and stereotypes is that the content of stereotypes is comprised of various traits. According to Hamilton et al. (1992), this assumption is inadequate. The stereotype is greater than the sum of several trait-descriptive adjectives. The cognitive structure of stereotypes also include mental representations or schemata (see Fiske, 1995) of the stereotyped group, as well as non-trait features such as physical details, occupational and socioeconomic characteristics, and likely behavior patterns (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986).

Variation in the use of language to describe people or events would seem to be an important determinant affecting the perceiver’s processing of such information. The salience of relevant stereotypes to the perceiver is also an
important determinant in information processing (Hamilton et al., 1992). The interpretation initially proposed by the perceiver, followed by the evaluations and inferences based on that interpretation, leads to the representation of that person or event in memory. Thus, the entire process can be affected by the salience to the perceiver of relevant stereotypes and by the language used to describe the target. Language as a means of communication is also influenced by these individual differences in information processing and stereotype relevance. In communicating the information to another, the perceiver’s description would be based on his or her representation of the relevant information in memory as well as the salience of relevant stereotypes. Accordingly, those same differences that affected the way in which the information was processed in memory will also have an effect on the language used by the perceiver to describe that information to another person (Hamilton et al., 1992). This process, then, becomes problematic when the message sender’s stereotypical language biases the person receiving information. APA style (American Psychological Association, 1994) is an example of how this process is widely acknowledged. The APA (1994) devotes an entire section to avoiding biased language (e.g., abstract language descriptions of groups) in its current publication manual, even though there is no empirical research to support this assumption.
If our thoughts and speech pertain more often to categories rather than to features of categories when thinking or communicating about groups, important linguistic effects of stereotyping may be captured in nouns differently than in verbs or adjectives. Although stereotypes consist of attributes believed to characterize a group, actual stereotype labels that refer to groups are identified by nouns (Hamilton et al., 1992). These noun categories exist in hierarchical representations whose levels differ in breadth and abstractness. Hamilton et al. (1992) note that there is little existing work investigating the social psychological implications of noun use as a linguistic option.

There is, however, empirical support for a classification system that distinguishes between verbs and adjectives in the interpersonal domain (Semin & Fiedler, 1988; Maas & Arcuri, 1992). Semin and Fiedler (1988) examined the cognitive functions of different linguistic categories used to describe persons and their behaviors. In their system, the same act can be characterized by using a descriptive action verb (George carries Susan's groceries), an interpretive action verb (George helps Susan), a subjective state verb (George likes Susan) or with an adjective (George is helpful). These distinctions are
important for both the way behavior is encoded and understood and the way its meaning is communicated.

In applying the Semin-Fiedler (1988) classification system to the interpersonal domain, Maas and Arcuri (1992) argue that biased language use contributes in predictable ways to the resistance of social stereotypes to change. Stereotype-congruent episodes tend to be described in abstract linguistic terms such as adjectives (e.g., George is stingy), whereas stereotype-incongruent behavioral episodes tend to be described in concrete linguistic terms that do not generalize beyond a specific event (e.g., George donated a thousand dollars to the library restoration committee). Maas and Arcuri (1992; Maas et al., 1989) refer to this phenomenon as the linguistic intergroup bias (LIB). Because information encoded at an abstract level is relatively resistant to disconfirmation and implies high stability over time, this language bias contributes to the persistence of preexisting ideas about social groups. In other words, existing stereotypes produce biased language use, which in turn contribute to the maintenance of existing biases. It is this maintenance of existing biases that APA (1994) guidelines against biased language use were likely established to prevent. The LIB is an example of a hypothesis confirmation bias that people are inclined to demonstrate. This inclination contributes to the
perpetuation of stereotypes and prejudice; language use may either exaggerate or minimize the LIB tendency.

The Present Research

Semin and Fiedler (1992) have established that language is a crucial factor in which social knowledge in general is mapped. However, as noted by Hamilton et al. (1992), research on the analysis of language effects on behavior has not examined noun categories as a linguistic form that influences behavior. It is unknown whether an abstract-concrete distinction applies to nouns as it does for verbs as found by Semin and Fiedler (1988) and Maas et al. (1989; 1992). In applying their theory to nouns, an abstract noun would be global in nature and would be consistent over time, whereas a concrete noun would be a more specific descriptor that is particular to certain individuals and circumstances.

Further examination of the literature indicates that another area in which social perceivers gain knowledge about groups has not been investigated: perceptions that result from written communication. People’s perceptions of groups in terms of interpersonal interactions and spoken discourse have been studied extensively, yet people’s perceptions of groups based on the sociocultural orientation view of stereotypes have been ignored. Hamilton et al. (1992) note that both the nature of the stereotypes activated by the target person’s group membership and the intergroup relationship between the perceiver and the target person can
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affect the outcome of the perceiver’s processing of behavioral information. Newspaper and magazine accounts of local, national and world events are read many Americans on a regular basis and are accessible to virtually everyone. The language with which the contents of those publications are written may be influencing the perceptions of readers in negative ways. Following Hamilton et al. (1992), written language differences that affect the way in which information was processed in memory may also have an effect on the language used by the perceiver to describe that information to another person.

These unresolved issues have high practical value, as subtle changes in the application of language used in commonplace media such as newspaper and magazine journalism may have a large impact on society’s perceptions of groups. The present research is designed to investigate whether different noun forms used to describe a group of people in written form will have an effect on the processing of language and attitudes related to the people. Study 1 examined the basic abstract-concrete language effect in relation to one target group. Study 2 was improved methodologically based on findings from Study 1, and was designed to explore the same language manipulation as used in Study 1 in two target groups to test the generalizability of the abstract-concrete effect across target groups.
Study 1

Study 1 was a 2 (target group membership description: abstract noun form vs. concrete noun form) X 2 (article valence: positive vs. negative) factorial design. Both manipulations were included in four variations of a recent New York Times article (DeWitt, 1994). The effect of nouns on stereotype processing was tested by manipulating target group descriptions in the articles to be either abstract, global in nature (e.g., "Haitians") or concrete, specific to the circumstances (e.g., "refugees from Haiti"), in an application of the hierarchical system of verbs and adjectives by Semin and Fiedler (1988) and Maas et al. (1989; 1992). In response to the articles, participants were asked to answer a questionnaire designed to assess their attitudes toward the target group, based upon the articles. They were also asked unexpectedly to rewrite the article from memory. The purpose of this task was to assess the extent to which participants encoded and replicated the information from each article in abstract or concrete terms. On the article reconstruction task, participants were expected to use the same type of language to describe the target group as was used in their target article.

Main effects for target group descriptions were hypothesized. Under the assumption that people hold negative views about the target group, abstract group descriptions were predicted to elicit more negative
responses than concrete group descriptions on the questionnaire items.

Since it was unknown whether this assumption was correct, article valence (positive vs. negative) was included in the experimental design as an independent variable. The target group was described in a positive fashion to half of the participants and in a negative fashion to the other half of the participants across both conditions of the target group description variable. This predicted main effect for valence is not of particular interest; in general, it is assumed that people tend to respond more favorably to positive issues than negative issues. However, valence was expected to interact with the target group description. There were two hypothesized possibilities for this interaction. First, the abstract nouns could have exaggerated the effect of target group description in opposite directions on the questionnaire items. For example, abstract nouns may have lead to "Haitians" being perceived very negatively in the negative valence condition and very positively in the positive valence condition. Secondly, the abstract-concrete manipulation might simply have had a larger effect in the negative target valence condition than in the positive valence article condition, or perhaps it may have had no effect at all. It was unclear as to which pattern would emerge. It was also unclear whether article valence would
affect the type of language used in the article reconstruction task.

Method

Participants

Nine male and 23 female students from the College of William & Mary participated in Study 1. The experiment was conducted as part of a Research Methods laboratory exercise.

Materials

Four versions of a recent newspaper article were created for the present study. The articles were adapted from an October, 1994 New York Times article. The content of the four articles was identical, referring to people from Haiti who were detained by the US Coast Guard in a Guantanamo Bay refugee camp as they tried to immigrate to the United States seeking political asylum. All four articles can be found in the Appendix.

The first independent variable was manipulated by describing the target group members throughout the article either as an abstract noun form (e.g., Haitians) or in a concrete noun form (e.g., refugees from Haiti). The valence of the target article constituted the second independent variable manipulation. There were two conditions for valence, one positive and one negative. This was done by altering the base article as it appeared in the New York Times for both conditions. The structure of the article was
maintained, however, particular phrases were adapted to provide either a positive or negative slant. Also, the target group description was changed to be consistent for each respective condition. An example phrase from the original article is "...complaints among the Haitian refugees about the food, the accommodations...." In the positive valence condition, this phrase was changed to read "...Haitians/refugees from Haiti acknowledged that the food and conditions in the refugee camps were challenging at best to deal with, but were thankful...." The same content was presented in the negative valence condition as "...Haitians/refugees from Haiti complained about the food and water in the camps...."

A questionnaire was given to participants after they completed reading each article. This dependent measure contained items that were created to assess the degree to which reading the article made the participants feel sympathy, fairness, and other positive and negative attitudes toward the target group, as well as their opinion about public policy towards the target group based upon what they read in the article. New dependent variables were constructed from these questions based on factor analysis to assess how the reading the target article affected participants' attitudes about the target group.

The second dependent measure was an unexpected article reconstruction task, in which participants were given five
minutes to rewrite the article they read from memory. A coding protocol was created to identify four type of nouns that were used to describe the target group, to assess the extent to which participants encoded and replicated the information from each article in abstract or concrete terms. The reconstruction task was unexpected by the participants, and thus was used as a measure of how they spontaneously encoded the material, not whether they could memorize the material deliberately.

Procedure

Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions. At the beginning of the experiment, participants were given an informed consent form and an experimental packet containing materials attached in the following sequence: a cover sheet with instructions, the target article, a questionnaire, and a blank sheet of paper. The experimenter explained to the participants that the study was designed to examine linguistic effects on attitudes and memory, and that they would be asked to read a newspaper article and answer some questions.

Following the completion of the informed consent form, the experimenter read aloud the directions printed on the cover sheet of the packet, which is located in the Appendix. Here it was noted that participants should read the article as they would any other newspaper article, and to answer the questions in response to what they read in the article. The
experimenter then instructed the participants to begin, and then wait for further instructions once they were finished with the questionnaire. The questionnaire can be found in the Appendix. Please note that items 4, 7, 8, 13, & 15 were not included in Study 1.

Once all of the participants completed the questionnaire, the participants were reminded that the study was designed to examine linguistic effects on attitudes and memory. The experimenter instructed the participants to turn to the next page in the packet, and to rewrite the article from memory as well as possible in a timed five minute period. It was unknown to the participants prior to the experimenter’s instructions that this task was to take place. Participants were then debriefed, thanked, and dismissed.

Results

Dependent variables were created from the questionnaire items and the article reconstruction task. From the questionnaire, two variables were created by combining questionnaire items based on factor analysis. From the article reconstruction task, four variables were created by coding the number of times four particular noun types were used to describe the target group. These four noun types ranged in nature from most abstract to most concrete. Separate two-way ANOVAs were conducted for each variable
with two independent-groups factors (target group presentation and target article valence).

Principal components factor extraction with varimax rotation was performed on the 10 questionnaire items. Two eigenvalues were greater than one, and examination of the scree plot confirmed that a two-factor solution was appropriate. In order to be included in a factor, an item had to load .5 or greater on one factor and .5 or less on every other factor. One of the 10 variables did not load on either factor. Six items (numbers 2, 3, 9, 10, 11, 12) that related to policy issues regarding the target group loaded on factor 1, Policy. These items included questions about the members of the target group being justified for seeking asylum in the US, and about the US being financially responsible for the target group. Three items (numbers 1, 5, 6) that related to being sympathetic to the plight of the target group loaded on factor 2, Plight. Sample items for Plight included feeling sympathetic towards the plight of the target group, and feeling that the conditions in the refugee camps should be improved. Reliability estimates were good for Policy (Cronbach’s alpha = .85) and moderate for Plight (Cronbach’s alpha = .68). Policy and Plight were marginally correlated, \( r = .20 \). Table 1 contains the questionnaire items and factor loadings.
Two-way ANOVAs were conducted with two independent-groups factors (target group presentation and target article valence) for both Policy and Plight. For Policy, there were no significant main effects or interactions. Inspection of group means revealed that contrary to the hypotheses, participants in the abstract condition on average responded somewhat more sympathetically (e.g., favoring policies to increase assistance and improving conditions for the Haitians) than did participants in the concrete condition on average, regardless of target article valence. This same pattern was also present for Plight. There was a significant main effect for target group description on Plight, $F(1,28) = 4.34, p < .05$. Contrary to prediction, participants in the abstract conditions ($M = 5.08, n=16$) were significantly more sympathetic to the plight of the target group than were participants in the concrete conditions ($M = 4.35, n=16$) across target article valence. Refer to Table 2 for complete sets of means and standard deviations.
Two-way ANOVAs were also computed for four article reconstruction variables. Four possible target group descriptors were identified as representations of the abstract-concrete dimension. They ranged from most abstract (Haitians) somewhat abstract (refugees), to somewhat concrete (Haitian refugees) and most concrete (refugees from Haiti). Following the work of Semin and Fiedler (1988), the abstract term (Haitians) was believed to be the most general in nature and most stable, and the most concrete term (refugees from Haiti) was believed to be the more specific to the circumstances least likely to elicit negative views about the target group. The variables consisted of the number of times participants used each noun type in their article reconstruction. Consistent with the hypothesis, only participants in the concrete condition ($M = 0.32, n=16$) described the target group as "Refugees from Haiti" (the most concrete term); no participants in the abstract condition used any concrete language to describe the target group ($M = 0.00, n=16$) (a significance test of this difference was precluded by the lack of variance in two cells). Also consistent with the hypothesis, although not significant, participants in the abstract condition ($M = 1.35, n=16$) described the target group as "Haitians" (the most abstract term) on average more than did those in the concrete condition ($M = 0.69, n=16$), $F(1,28) = 4.01, p =$
.055. There were no differences between groups on the other
two target group descriptors.

Discussion

It is unclear why the results from the questionnaire
item variables came out consistently in the opposite
direction of the hypotheses. The first explanation is that
the hypotheses were wrong. There are, however, a number of
other possible explanations concerning the methodology and
sampling that are relevant to the findings.

It is possible that something particular to the
specific target group was consciously sympathy-eliciting,
and affecting the results of the questions. People’s views
of Haitians may not have been negative, as was assumed.
Rather, the views towards the Haitians could have been that
they are sympathy-deserving people in unfortunate
circumstances. The participants may have reacted to the
fact that the target group members were unable to attain
freedom as they tried to leave their troubled country. A
second study that included both the present target group and
another group may explain this possibility.

 Reactivity and self-report biases may also be a
possible problem for these variables, especially in light of
the fact that the experimenter was the laboratory instructor
for two-thirds of the sample. Participants may have been
trying to "help" the experimenter get the results she was
predicting, yet they were unaware of the hypotheses. In
guessing about those predictions, they may have had
different ideas in mind as they answered the attitude
measure items.

Moreover, the language used in the questionnaires was
confounded with the target group description independent
variable. All participants' questionnaires were identical
in content. However, participants in the abstract
conditions answered questions that described the target
group with abstract language, and participants in the
concrete conditions answered questions using concrete
language. It is possible that this may have had an effect
on the results, but intuitively one would expect this to
exaggerate hypothesized effects due to extra exposure to the
manipulation, which did not occur. Nevertheless, it seems
important to eliminate this confound.

Results from the article reconstruction support the
hypotheses. Based on their LIB theory, Maas and Arcuri
(1992) proposed that abstract information is resistant to
disconfirmation and relatively stable over time.
Conversely, concrete information should be interpreted as
situationally and temporally bound and unstable over time.
The purpose of this task was to measure the underlying
encoding process; that is, to see if people encode
information in the same manner that they later use to
reproduce that same information. On average, this was
indeed the case. People were more likely to describe the
target group in the same form in which the target group was presented to them. It is not clear at all, however, whether the confounded questions influenced the findings related to the reconstruction.

In order to answer these questions more clearly, several aspects of Study 1 need to be modified. First, the confounded questionnaire measure needs to be collapsed into one form for all participants, to rule out any effects the multiple versions may have had in Study 1. Second, as the present results may have something to do with Haitians in particular interacting with an effect of the language manipulation, including a second target group could be useful in examining this possibility. Finally, it seems important to see whether the same pattern of results would be replicated. Study 2 was designed to address these issues.

Study 2

Study 2 was a 2 (target group membership description: abstract noun form vs. concrete noun form) X 2 (article valence: positive vs. negative) X 2 (target group: Haitians vs. Cubans) independent groups factorial design. As in Study 1, all of the manipulations were included in 8 versions of the same New York Times article from Study 1. The first two independent variables were identical to those in Study 1. The third independent variable, target group, was used in the articles to see if the effects found in
Study 1 were specific to the plight of Haitians. Cuba was chosen as the alternate target group nation for several reasons. Since both nations are in geographically similar locations, the content of the article about Haiti would not be suspect if the target group was changed to Cubans, whereas changing the target group to say, Belgians, would. Moreover, people's perceptions of Cuba as a communist country may be different than their perceptions of Haiti, providing a clear opportunity to test the interpretation of Study 1 results as being particular to Haitians.

**Hypotheses**

For the dependent variables from both the questionnaire items and article recall task, the predictions were the same as in Study 1. On the article reconstruction task, participants were expected to use the same type of language to describe the target group as was used in their target article.

Abstract group descriptions were predicted to elicit more negative responses than concrete group descriptions on the questionnaire items. However, the influence of article valence (positive vs. negative) was, as in Study 1, still uncertain. The issues around this variable are the same as in Study 1, however, it seems more important in Study 2 relative to the third independent variable. The target group independent variable (Haitians vs. Cubans) was exploratory; it was unknown whether the other findings will
generalize across the different target groups. Also of interest was a target group by article valence interaction for the questionnaire items and for the article reconstruction task. Because participants' attitudes about Cubans may be initially more negative than their attitudes about Haitians, it is possible that there will be interactions with the target group variable.

Method

Participants

Participants were 45 male and 91 female students from the College of William & Mary. They participated in partial fulfillment of their introductory psychology course requirements.

Materials

The materials were identical to those used in Study 1, with several modifications. To include the third independent variable manipulation, four new versions of the article were added in Study 2, replacing Haitians with Cubans as the target group. The content of these four articles did not differ from the original four articles beyond the target group change. These four articles can be found in the appendix. The multiple versions of the questionnaire from Study 1 were collapsed into one form for all participants, which is located in the appendix. Finally, five additional items based on the Modern Racism Scale (MRS; McConahay, 1986) were included in the
questionnaire (numbers 4, 7, 8, 13, & 15) in an attempt to improve reliabilities of the Plight scale by increasing the number of items. Given the nature of the MRS, these items seemed likely to load with the Plight scale.

Participants' pretested level of prejudice was included for potential use as a covariate in the present study, as assessed by individual responses to the college student-normed MRS. The MRS was administered in the mass testing questionnaire administered to all introductory psychology students at the beginning of the Spring 1996 semester. Based on the theory that modern racists rationalize their ambivalence towards policies designed to promote racial equality in terms of abstract social and political issues, the MRS is intended to measure a dimension of the cognitive component of racial attitudes. Because participants' MRS scores were expected to correlate with the dependent variables as measured on the questionnaire, inclusion of the covariate was expected to be effective in reducing error variance and thereby increasing statistical power. MRS scores were collected for 620 individuals at the time of mass testing, and had good reliability (Cronbach's alpha = .86).

Procedure

The procedure was identical to Study 1, with the following additions. Participants were tested in groups of eight, and were randomly assigned to one of the eight
experimental conditions. When time was called for the article reconstruction task, the experimenter gave each participant a 3" x 5" index card. Participants were told that in order to match their experimental responses with their responses from the mass testing questionnaire from the beginning of the semester, their name and experimental code number were needed. The cards were kept separately from the other data and were destroyed once the appropriate data were matched, to ensure the participants' confidentiality. Participants were then debriefed, thanked, and dismissed.

Results

Dependent variables were created following the same procedure outlined for Study 1. In order to analyze participant responses for Study 2, three-way ANOVAs were conducted for the new variables with three independent-groups factors (target group presentation, target article valence, and target group). In addition, these ANOVAs were repeated using MRS mass-testing scores as a covariate. A preliminary analysis of the three independent variables was conducted based on sex. No significant differences were found between men and women's response patterns; therefore, sex was not included as a factor in any of the analyses.

Principal components factor extraction with varimax rotation was performed on the 15 questionnaire items. A three factor solution was suggested by examination of the scree plot, although there were four eigenvalues greater
than 1. The fourth eigenvalue was only 1.03, and when four factors were extracted, only one item loaded on the fourth factor. In order to be included in a factor, an item had to load .5 or greater on one factor and .5 or less on every other factor. Based on a three factor solution, five items loaded approximately equally on 2 or more factors and were discarded. Six questionnaire items (numbers 2, 3, 5, 11, 13, & 15) loaded on factor 1 that related to policy issues regarding the target group. Three of the five factors were identical to those in the Policy factor from Study 1. Because this present factor is conceptually similar to the Policy factor from Study 1, it will also be referred to as Policy. Two questionnaire items (numbers 1 & 8) loaded on factor 2 that related to being sympathetic to the plight of the target group. Although item 1 appears to cross load on factors 1 and 2, it is conceptually identical to item 8, which is the only clear item on factor 2. Therefore, it seemed important to include item 1 on factor 2. As with the Policy items, this second factor is conceptually similar to the Study 1 Plight factor; consequently it will continue to be referred to as Plight. Two items (numbers 10 & 14) loaded on factor 3 that were related to intervention in the refugees' immigration, US Intervention. Reliability estimates were good for Policy (Cronbach’s alpha = .86), moderate for Plight (Cronbach’s alpha = .62) and low for US Intervention (Cronbach’s alpha = .46). There was a moderate
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correlation between Policy and Plight, \( r = .44 \). See table 3 for questionnaire item factor loadings.

Insert Table 3 About Here

The same coding plan was assigned to participants' writing samples from the article reconstruction task as described in Study 1. Four dependent variables were created based on frequency of responses that represent the abstract-concrete domain: most abstract, somewhat abstract, somewhat concrete, and most concrete.

Three-way ANOVAs were computed for Policy, Plight, & US Intervention. There was a significant target group description by target group interaction for Plight, \( F (1,128) = 5.22, p < .05 \). As hypothesized, participants in the target group = Haitians conditions had higher ratings in the concrete (Refugees from Haiti) condition (\( M = 5.40, n=34 \)) than in the abstract (Haitians) condition (\( M = 4.79, n=34 \)). The test for simple effects showed that there was a significant main effect for target group description among those in the Haitians conditions, \( F (1,128) = 6.74, p < .05 \). (Note that the full MS error from the three way analysis was used to provide a more accurate test of the simple effect.) Conversely, participants in the target group = Cubans had slightly, but not significantly higher ratings in the abstract (Cubans) condition (\( M = 5.04, n=34 \)) than in the
concrete (Refugees from Cuba) condition (M = 4.90, n=34). The means and standard deviations illustrating this interaction are located in Table 4. There were no significant main effects or interactions for Policy or US Intervention.

Three-way ANOVAs were also computed for the four dependent variables from the article reconstruction task. For the most abstract variable, there was a significant main effect for target group description, F (1,128) = 15.35, p < .001. As predicted, participants in the four abstract conditions (M = 1.68, n=68) described the target group on average as "Haitians" or "Cubans" significantly more than did participants in the four concrete conditions (M = 0.76, n=68) on average. There was also a significant target group description by target group interaction, F (1,128) = 4.09, p < .05. The frequency of "Haitian" use by participants in both abstract (M = 1.29, n=17) and concrete (M = 1.35, n=17) positive article valence conditions was on average similar, whereas the frequency of "Cuban" use by participants in the abstract (Cubans) condition (M = 2.0, n=17) was higher than in the concrete (Refugees from Cuba) condition (M = 0.65, n=17). See Table 5 for complete sets of means and standard deviations.
There was a significant main effect for target group description on the "Refugees" variable, \( F(1,128) = 6.06, p < .05 \). Contrary to prediction, participants in the four concrete conditions (\( M = 1.59, n=68 \)) used the term "refugees" to describe the target group significantly more than participants in the four abstract conditions (\( M = 1.06, n=68 \)). Refer to Table 6 for complete sets of means and standard deviations. There were no significant main effects or interactions for the "Refugees from Haiti/Cuba" or "Haitian/Cuban refugees" dependent variables.

Three-way ANCOVAs were also computed for the seven dependent variables. However, when the covariate data were retrieved from the mass testing database, it was discovered that no data were available for 26 participants. None of the effects discussed above were significant in these ANCOVAs. Since participants were randomly assigned to conditions, the groups would be expected to be equivalent with respect to level of prejudice. A three way analysis of variance based on total MRS scores did not, in fact, reveal any significant differences. Therefore, the nonsignificant
The results in these analyses do not appear to be due to the effects of statistically controlling pretested differences among groups. Instead, it appears that the decrease in statistical power from losing those cases outweighed the potential benefits of including the covariate.

Discussion

The results from Study 2 provide support for some hypotheses. All of the significant findings pertaining to the target group description manipulation for Haitians were in the hypothesized direction; those in the concrete (refugees from...) conditions gave more sympathetic responses than those in the abstract (Haitians) conditions. For the article reconstruction task, participants used noun forms to describe their respective target group that were consistent with the forms the target group was described with in the article. However, participants in the concrete target group description condition were more likely to use the somewhat abstract noun, "refugees," to describe their respective target group than were participants in the abstract target group description condition, contrary to the hypothesis.

The inclusion of the target group independent variable was to assess the generalizability of results across groups. In Study 2, there was a significant target group description by target group interaction. For the Haitians, participants in the abstract condition (Haitians) had significantly lower
ratings than did those in the concrete condition (Refugees from Haiti). This effect was not found for Cubans. It is important to note that just prior to the administration of Study 2, there was a highly publicized incident regarding several private US planes en route to Cuba being shot down by the Cuban military. This incident most likely heightened participants’ awareness of political unrest in Cuba, as well as increased anti-Cuban government sentiments. There was not a main effect for target group, which argues against the idea that subjects regard Cubans more negatively than they do Haitians. Nevertheless, this ill-timed historical event might have had any number of odd and unpredictable effects on the Cuban condition.

General Discussion

In these studies, two aspects of how nouns influence the stereotyping process have been explored. One is the extent to which different noun forms influence people’s attitudes towards groups, and the other is the extent to which different noun forms influence the way people encode and reconstruct information about groups.

Results from Study 1 and Study 2 are ambiguous as to how the target group description manipulation influences attitudes toward the target group. In Study 1, the results were contrary to prediction. Participants in the abstract target group description condition responded somewhat more sympathetically than did those in the concrete target group.
description condition for one of the dependent variables. In Study 2, however, the obtained results at least partly supported the predictions and did not replicate findings obtained in Study 1. Looking only at participants in the "Haitians" conditions, those in the abstract target group description condition responded significantly less sympathetically than those in the concrete target group description condition, as hypothesized. It was unclear whether attitudes towards Cubans would be the same as a result of the manipulation; in fact, they did not differ across target group description conditions. How to interpret the "Cuban" data is difficult, given the highly publicized event just prior to the administration of Study 2.

The data from the present studies provide some support for the idea that people process group relevant information in the linguistic form in which the information was presented, and subsequently use the same linguistic form to recount that information. In Study 1, it was found that participants in the concrete target group description condition used the most concrete noun term to describe the target group significantly more than did participants in the abstract condition. Alternatively, for both Study 1 and Study 2, participants in the abstract target group description were on average more likely to use the most abstract noun term to describe the target group than were
those in the concrete condition. These results fully support the predictions.

One significant result from the article reconstruction task, however, was opposite of the predictions in Study 2. It was predicted that participants would use the same noun forms in the article reconstruction task as were used in the article. Therefore, people in the abstract (Haitians/Cubans) conditions would be expected to use abstract terms such as Haitians/Cubans or refugees, on average, more than those in the concrete (refugees from Haiti/Cuba) conditions. With regards to the somewhat abstract term, "Refugees," people in the concrete conditions were significantly more likely to use that term than those in the abstract conditions who were predicted to use the term.

Although this is opposite of the predictions, there is an explanation as to why this may have occurred. In the questionnaire, the target group members were ambiguously referred to as "refugees" in approximately half of the items. The participants in the concrete conditions (Refugees from Haiti/Cuba) were not exposed to an abstract term to describe the target group (e.g., "Haitians" or "Cubans") in their article. Given the time constraint for rewriting the target article, participants needed a cognitively efficient term to complete the task. People in the concrete conditions then simply dropped the "from
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Haiti/Cuba" from the complete description of "refugees from Haiti/Cuba" under the time pressure to reconstruct the article. The term "refugee" was presented to the participants in eight questionnaire items just prior to the article reconstruction task, and it is likely that it was the influence of those questionnaire items that influenced the concrete participants to abbreviate the concrete phrase and use the term "refugees" at a higher incidence than the abstract condition participants. Those in the abstract conditions were hypothesized to (and did) use the target group description, a cognitively efficient term, in their article reconstructions. It is unclear, then, if those in the concrete condition would have provided the same findings if they had no exposure to a comparably efficient cognitive term such as "refugees" and had no time pressure for their responses.

In the concrete conditions, the target groups were described as "Refugees from Haiti/Cuba". This may not represent the most concrete description possible; that is, what impact, if any, does the term "refugee" have on people? "Refugee" could elicit a stereotype just as salient as the given abstract descriptors of "Haitian" and "Cuban". If refugee does create a mental image that is stable over time, the results obtained may not adequately be explained as an abstract-concrete noun difference.
Stereotyping has not been directly studied in the present studies. We do not know what, if any, stereotypes the participants in the present studies had towards the target groups; nor do we know how the manipulations did or did not affect those stereotypes. The attitudes that were measured and the reconstruction of the article were designed to assess aspects of the stereotyping process, not to quantify actual stereotypes. The attitudes people have towards others shape how they perceive others. How people describe others also shapes perceptions. These perceptions are directly related to stereotypes. If language is encoded similar to the way in which it is presented, it may then be possible to change the way others are perceived on the basis of altering the language used to describe them. Investigation of the underlying processes that are related to stereotyping can then lead to changes in influential places such as the media.

Future Directions

Teasing apart the ambiguous findings from Study 1 and Study 2 on people's perceptions of the target groups is a primary area that needs to be explored. The question of whether the language manipulation has a direct impact on valence of attitudes towards the target group yielded two different answers. How to interpret the differences in attitudes towards the target group as a result of the group description manipulation will require further refinement of
the questionnaire. Since both factors from the attitude scale have only moderate reliability, there is not necessarily a great deal of validity in the findings. Specifically, the scale that produced the significant results had low reliability. Low reliability cannot be blamed for the non-results on factor 1, Policy. Moreover, the items that created the factors in Study 1 and Study 2 are not completely identical, so comparison of results across the two studies must be done with caution. Therefore, further investigation of the effect language has on attitudes towards groups is needed to firmly establish an abstract-concrete dimension for nouns.

As it has been determined that there are differences in the way people encode and replicate information about groups on the basis of the nouns used to describe them, the task now is to explain the underlying reasons for those differences. The findings related to the article reconstruction task could be part of a social-cognitive explanation of the stereotyping process. This could mean that we process information in a form that is very close to the way in which it is presented to us, especially if those terms are cognitively efficient. This is not to say that humans have "photographic memory" for what they read or see. The findings could also be indicative of the participants in the present studies simply remembering the key element of an article they read less than ten minutes before being asked
to perform the relevant task. Testing to see if the same language recall pattern emerges when more time has elapsed between article presentation and the article reconstruction task would yield more support to the former explanation.

It is very likely that the results of Study 2 were affected by the recent negative publicity surrounding the Cuban government. Although differences in perceptions about Haitians and Cubans probably existed prior to the event, any negative views towards the Cuban government would have been exaggerated by this event. It is unclear what effects this might have on perceptions of refugees fleeing Cuba. If participants held very mixed views about Cuban refugees, the abstract-concrete manipulation could have mixed effects that canceled out the results.

Replicating the present studies with different groups, possibly non-existent ones, would lend more support to a general psycholinguistic principle related to nouns. This would rule out preexisting biases toward the target group. Then the desired valence toward the created groups could be directly manipulated, and the tests of the effects of interest could perhaps answer some of the questions that have been raised from the present studies. Conversely, another replication strategy would be to use other group selected because people have strong, preexisting views about them. Since there would be no ambiguity about whether the degree of positive and negative preexisting views was
canceling out any obtained results, the test of the effects of interest would be interpretable.

This area of research has many possibilities for explaining and understanding the influence of words we use on our descriptions and perceptions of others. More broadly, this line of research can investigate further the impact language has on our behavior as social perceivers. Although these studies have barely scratched the surface of this area of understanding, they have uncovered fertile ground for future study.
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Table 1

Loadings of Items in the Policy and Plight Factors for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1:</th>
<th>Factor 2:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policy</td>
<td>Plight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>3.905</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>39.1</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach's Alpha</td>
<td>.85</td>
<td>.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMPATHY (1)</td>
<td>-.144</td>
<td>.791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFCAMP (5)</td>
<td>.172</td>
<td>.717</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFECOND (6)</td>
<td>.196</td>
<td>.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFINANC (3)</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>.106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASYLUM (2)</td>
<td>.770</td>
<td>.226</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFINANC (12)</td>
<td>.673</td>
<td>.019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMMIGRAT (11)</td>
<td>.741</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAIN (9)</td>
<td>.686</td>
<td>.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAINED (10)</td>
<td>.813</td>
<td>-.218</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTGRD (14)</td>
<td>.394</td>
<td>.247</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses following items correspond to the questionnaire item number in the Appendix.
Table 2
Means and Standard Deviations for Target Group Description and Target Article Valence Responses on Factor Plight for Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group Description</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4.625 (0.486)</td>
<td>5.125 (0.641)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>4.083 (1.218)</td>
<td>5.042 (1.339)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores range from 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate more sympathy towards target group. Standard deviations are located inside the parentheses. N = 8 per cell.
Table 3

Factor Loadings of Items for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Factor 1: Policy</th>
<th>Factor 2: Plight</th>
<th>Factor 3: US Intervention</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eigenvalue</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>1.58</td>
<td>1.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% Variance</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cronbach’s Alpha</td>
<td>0.86</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASYLUM (2)</td>
<td>0.755</td>
<td>0.206</td>
<td>0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USFINANC (3)</td>
<td>0.630</td>
<td>0.270</td>
<td>0.225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMIGRATE (11)</td>
<td>0.736</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td>0.332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NOTPUSH (13)</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>-0.083</td>
<td>-0.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMAND (15)</td>
<td>0.829</td>
<td>0.128</td>
<td>0.006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REFCAMP (5)</td>
<td>0.599</td>
<td>0.186</td>
<td>0.240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANGER (8)</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.838</td>
<td>-0.111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYMPATHY (1)</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.554</td>
<td>0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DETAIN (10)</td>
<td>0.149</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>0.680</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COASTGRD (14)</td>
<td>0.079</td>
<td>-0.254</td>
<td>0.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESPECT (7)</td>
<td>0.491</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td>0.462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIFECOMP (6)</td>
<td>0.381</td>
<td>0.319</td>
<td>-0.341</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPLAIN (9)</td>
<td>0.112</td>
<td>0.577</td>
<td>0.534</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNFINANC (12)</td>
<td>0.433</td>
<td>0.476</td>
<td>0.029</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>USDISCRIM (4)</td>
<td>0.285</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>0.030</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Numbers in parentheses following items correspond to the questionnaire item number in the Appendix.
Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations for Target Group Description and Target Article Valence Responses on Factor Plight for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Haitians</th>
<th></th>
<th>Cuban</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Article Valence</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
<td>Concrete</td>
<td>Abstract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>5.353 (0.656)</td>
<td>4.853 (1.115)</td>
<td>4.706 (0.867)</td>
<td>4.647 (1.169)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>5.441 (0.846)</td>
<td>4.735 (1.147)</td>
<td>5.088 (0.734)</td>
<td>5.441 (0.982)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Scores range from 1 to 7. Higher scores indicate more sympathy towards target group. Standard deviations are located inside the parentheses. N = 17 per cell.
Table 5
Means and Standard Deviations for Article Reconstruction Frequencies for Target Group Description and Target Article Valence Responses of "Haitians/Cubans" for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Target Group Description</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Haitians</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Valence</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.353 (1.367)</td>
<td>1.294 (1.213)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0.588 (0.939)</td>
<td>1.529 (1.007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Article Valence</td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>0.647 (0.862)</td>
<td>2.000 (2.291)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>0.471 (0.624)</td>
<td>1.882 (1.764)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations are located inside the parentheses.
N = 17 per cell.
Table 6

Means and Standard Deviations for Article Reconstruction

Frequencies for Target Group Description and Target Article

Valence Responses of "Refugees" for Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Target Group</th>
<th>Target Group Description</th>
<th>Article Valence</th>
<th>Concrete</th>
<th>Abstract</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Haitians</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.412 (1.228)</td>
<td>1.118 (1.364)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>1.059 (0.966)</td>
<td>1.000 (1.061)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cubans</td>
<td></td>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>1.765 (1.147)</td>
<td>1.118 (1.317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Negative</td>
<td>2.118 (1.495)</td>
<td>1.000 (1.369)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Standard deviations are located inside the parentheses.

N = 17 per cell.
Appendix A

Cover Sheet and Target Articles
The purpose of this study is to examine psycholinguistic effects on attitudes and memory. You will first be presented with the text of a newspaper article; read it with the level of attention you normally would when reading a newspaper. Once you have completed reading the article, your task will be to answer questions related to the content of that article.

Please work through the experiment carefully yet efficiently, and do not skip any of the questions. Stop when you have completed questions 1-15, and wait for further instructions.
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many Haitians were having second thoughts. Only moments before, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that there was trouble again in Haiti, that pro-army gunmen had fired on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of Haitians who fled Haiti and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Many Haitians at Guantanamo Bay now refuse to return to their country even though the United States military is occupying it. Haitians are being encouraged to return home in response to their dissatisfaction with conditions provided for their subsistence by the United States at Guantanamo Bay.

For the nearly 15,000 Haitians at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Haiti’s military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for the return of the ousted president Jean-Bertrand Aristide, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is no contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. A group of 222 Haitians were returned to Haiti on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of Haitians do not want to go back," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the Haitian refugees living here. "For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those Haitians have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The Haitians are a much more volatile group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred Haitian refugees chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They complained about a lack of freedom, about not being allowed to go to the US, about being held in "prison" when they had escaped the "prison of Haiti."

Haitians complained about the food and the water and they thrust notes for relatives that had made it to the US into the hands of anyone willing to take them.

One Haitian said, "We are so desperate here. This is no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'Why did we come here?'"

A group of Haitians lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and wanted political asylum. "We deserve freedom," said a Haitian signholder.

Haitians who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Haiti, even if ousted President Aristide is returned to power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of the opposition to Aristide," said one Haitian.

That Haitian, however, said he felt he had no other option than to return home. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to return to Haiti, and they were expected to leave for Port-au-Prince on a Coast Guard cutter on Sunday.
Refugees from Haiti Doubt Decision to Go Home

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many immigrants from Haiti were having second thoughts. Only moments before, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that there was trouble again in Haiti, that pro-army gunmen had fired on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of people who fled Haiti and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Many refugees from Haiti at Guantanamo Bay now refuse to return to their country even though the United States military is occupying it. Refugees from Haiti are being encouraged to return home in response to their dissatisfaction with conditions provided for their subsistence by the United States at Guantanamo Bay.

For the nearly 15,000 refugees from Haiti at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Haiti’s military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for the return of the ousted president Jean-Bertrand Aristide, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is no contingency plan for the refugees if they do not, said a military spokesman here. A group of 222 refugees from Haiti were returned to Haiti on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of refugees from Haiti do not want to go back," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the refugees living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those refugees from Haiti have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The refugees from Haiti are a much more volatile group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred refugees from Haiti chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They complained about a lack of freedom, about not being allowed to go to the US, about being held in "prison" when they had escaped the "prison of Haiti."

Refugees from Haiti complained about the food and the water and they thrust notes for relatives that had made it to the US into the hands of anyone willing to take them.

One person from Haiti said, "We are so desperate here. This is no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'Why did we come here?'

A group of refugees from Haiti lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and wanted political asylum. "We deserve freedom," said one person holding a sign.

People from Haiti who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Haiti, even if ousted President Aristide is returned to power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of the opposition to Aristide," said one man.

That man, however, said he felt he had no other option than to return home. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to return to Haiti, and they were expected to leave for Port-au-Prince on a Coast Guard cutter on Sunday.
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many Haitians were not having second thoughts. Moments later, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that pro-army gunmen were no longer firing on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of Haitians who fled Haiti and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here. Some Haitians at Guantanamo Bay now wish to return to their country now that the United States military is occupying it. Haitians are being encouraged to return home from the subsistence camps at Guantanamo Bay funded entirely by the United States government.

For the nearly 15,000 Haitians at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Haiti’s military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for the return of the ousted president Jean-Bertrand Aristide, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is a contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. Already, a group of 222 Haitians were returned to Haiti on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of Haitians want to go to the United States," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the Haitian refugees living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those Haitians have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The Haitians are a much more hopeful group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred Haitian refugees chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They wanted to share their stories about the violence that has been occurring in their homeland and about the opportunities Haitians may find in the US.

Haitians acknowledged that the food and living conditions were challenging at best to deal with, but that they are thankful to have left the dangerous conditions in Haiti behind. Letters to Haitian relatives living in the US announcing the Haitians pending immigration are sent from Camp Six daily.

One Haitian said, "We were so desperate in Haiti. That was no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'When will we get to America?'"

A group of Haitians lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and needed political asylum. "Let us experience political freedom in the United States," read one Haitian’s sign.

Haitians who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Haiti, even if ousted President Aristide is returned to power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of the opposition to Aristide," said one Haitian.

However, that Haitian said he felt his family would be allowed to immigrate to the United States, where his brother is living in Florida. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to be sponsored by his brother. Haitians at Camp Six still feel thankful that they were not returned to dangerous conditions in Port-Au-Prince by the Coast Guard.
Many Refugees From Haiti Wish to Move On to United States

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION — Many people from Haiti were not having second thoughts. But moments later, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that pro-army gunmen were no longer firing on demonstrators in Haiti.

In Camp Six are hundreds of people who fled Haiti and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Some refugees from Haiti at Guantanamo Bay now wish to return to their country now that the United States military is occupying it. Those refugees from Haiti are being encouraged to return home after being informed of the situation there.

For the nearly 15,000 refugees from Haiti at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Haiti’s military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for the return of the ousted president Jean-Bertrand Aristide, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is a contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. Already, a group of 222 refugees from Haiti were returned to Haiti on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of people from Haiti want to go to the United States," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the refugees from Haiti living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those people have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The refugees from Haiti are a hopeful group because they feel they are part of a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred refugees from Haiti chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They wanted to share their stories about the violence that has been occurring in their homeland and about the opportunities people from Haiti may find in the US.

Refugees from Haiti acknowledged that the food and living conditions were challenging at best to deal with, but that they are thankful to have left dangerous conditions in Haiti behind. Letters to relatives living in the US announcing the refugees from Haiti’s pending immigration are sent from Camp Six daily.

One person said, "We were so desperate in Haiti. That was no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, ‘When will we get to America?’"

A group of refugees from Haiti lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and needed political asylum. "Let us experience political freedom in the United States," read one person from Haiti’s sign.

People from Haiti who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Haiti, even if ousted President Aristide is returned to power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of the opposition to Aristide," said one man from Haiti.

However, that man said he felt his family would be allowed to immigrate to the United States, where his brother is living in Florida. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to be sponsored by his brother. Refugees from Haiti at Camp Six still feel thankful that they were not returned to dangerous conditions in Port-Au-Prince by the Coast Guard.
Some Cubans Doubt Decision to Go Home

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many Cubans were having second thoughts. Only moments before, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that there was trouble again in Cuba, that pro-army gunmen had fired on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of Cubans who fled Cuba and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Many Cubans at Guantanamo Bay now refuse to return to their country even though the United States military is occupying it. Cubans are being encouraged to return home in response to their dissatisfaction with conditions provided for their subsistence by the United States at Guantanamo Bay.

For the nearly 15,000 Cubans at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Cuba's military rulers are to yield power to President Fidel Castro, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is no contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. A group of 222 Cubans were returned to Cuba on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of Cubans do not want to go back," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the Cuban refugees living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those Cubans have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The Cubans are a much more volatile group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred Cuban refugees chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They complained about a lack of freedom, about not being allowed to go to the US, about being held in "prison" when they had escaped the "prison of Cuba."

Cubans complained about the food and the water and they thrust notes for relatives that had made it to the US into the hands of anyone willing to take them.

One Cuban said, "We are so desperate here. This is no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'Why did we come here?'"

A group of Cubans lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and wanted political asylum. "We deserve freedom," said a Cuban signholder.

Cubans who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Cuba under President Castro's power. "We don't think it will be safe to go back until they have gotten rid of Castro," said one Cuban.

That Cuban, however, said he felt he had no other option than to return home. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to return to Cuba, and they were expected to leave for Havana on a Coast Guard cutter on Sunday.
Refugees from Cuba Doubt Decision to Go Home

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many immigrants from Cuba were having second thoughts. Only moments before, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that there was trouble again in Cuba, that pro-army gunmen had fired on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of people who fled Cuba and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Many refugees from Cuba at Guantanamo Bay now refuse to return to their country even though the United States military is occupying it. Refugees from Cuba are being encouraged to return home in response to their dissatisfaction with conditions provided for their subsistence by the United States at Guantanamo Bay.

For the nearly 15,000 refugees from Cuba at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Cuba’s military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for president Fidel Castro, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is no contingency plan for the refugees if they do not, said a military spokesman here. A group of 222 refugees from Cuba were returned to Cuba on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of refugees from Cuba do not want to go back," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the refugees living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those refugees from Cuba have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The refugees from Cuba are a much more volatile group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred

Refugees from Cuba complained about the food and the water and they thrust notes for relatives that had made it to the US into the hands of anyone willing to take them.

One person from Cuba said, "We are so desperate here. This is no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'Why did we come here?'"

A group of refugees from Cuba lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and wanted political asylum. "We deserve freedom," said one person holding a sign.

People from Cuba who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Cuba under President Castro’s power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of Castro," said one man.

That man, however, said he felt he had no other option than to return home. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to return to Cuba, and they were expected to leave for Havana on a Coast Guard cutter on Sunday.
GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many Cubans were not having second thoughts. Moments later, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that pro-army gunmen were no longer firing on demonstrators.

In Camp Six are hundreds of Cubans who fled Cuba and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Some Cubans at Guantanamo Bay now wish to return to their country now that the United States military is occupying it. Cubans are being encouraged to return home from the subsistence camps at Guantanamo Bay funded entirely by the United States government.

For the nearly 15,000 Cubans at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Cuba's military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for president Fidel Castro, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is a contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. Already, a group of 222 Cubans were returned to Cuba on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of Cubans want to go to the United States," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the Cuban refugees living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those Cubans have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The Cubans are a much more hopeful group because they feel they got caught in a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred Cuban refugees chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They wanted to share their stories about the violence that has been occurring in their homeland and about the opportunities Cubans may find in the US.

Cubans acknowledged that the food and living conditions were challenging at best to deal with, but that they are thankful to have left the dangerous conditions in Cuba behind. Letters to Cuban relatives living in the US announcing the Cubans pending immigration are sent from Camp Six daily.

One Cuban said, "We were so desperate in Cuba. That was no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'When will we get to America?'"

A group of Cubans lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and needed political asylum. "Let us experience political freedom in the United States," read one Cuban's sign.

Cubans who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Cuba under President Castro's power. "We don't think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of Castro," said one Cuban.

However, that Cuban said he felt his family would be allowed to immigrate to the United States, where his brother is living in Florida. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to be sponsored by his brother. Cubans at Camp Six still feel thankful that they were not returned to dangerous conditions in Havana by the Coast Guard.
Many Refugees From Cuba Wish to Move On to United States

GUANTANAMO BAY NAVAL STATION - Many people from Cuba were not having second thoughts. But moments later, word had come from a nearby hangar, where a big television is permanently tuned to CNN, that pro-army gunmen were no longer firing on demonstrators in Cuba.

In Camp Six are hundreds of people who fled Cuba and tried to reach the US, only to be picked up by the Coast Guard and brought here.

Some refugees from Cuba at Guantanamo Bay now wish to return to their country now that the United States military is occupying it. Those refugees from Cuba are being encouraged to return home after being informed of the situation there.

For the nearly 15,000 refugees from Cuba at Guantanamo Bay, the agreement under which Cuba's military rulers are to yield power, paving the way for president Fidel Castro, means that they too are officially expected to return home.

There is a contingency plan for them if they do not, said a military spokesman here. Already, a group of 222 refugees from Cuba were returned to Cuba on Tuesday.

"The vast majority of people from Cuba want to go to the United States," said Marine Brig. General Michael J. Williams, who leads the force that oversees the refugees from Cuba living here.

"For them the end is in sight," he said. "And those people have a strong hope that political pressure will eventually change the policy towards them. The refugees from Cuba are a hopeful group because they feel they are part of a policy change."

At Camp Six, several hundred refugees from Cuba chanted "Liberated" when a group of journalists arrived Friday morning. They wanted to share their stories about the violence that has been occurring in their homeland and about the opportunities people from Cuba may find in the US.

Refugees from Cuba acknowledged that the food and living conditions were challenging at best to deal with, but that they are thankful to have left dangerous conditions in Haiti behind. Letters to relatives living in the US announcing the refugees from Cubas' pending immigration are sent from Camp Six daily.

One person said, "We were so desperate in Cuba. That was no way to live. My daughter asks me every day, 'When will we get to America?'"

A group of refugees from Cuba lined the barbed wire fence and held up signs saying they were political refugees and needed political asylum. "Let us experience political freedom in the United States," read one person from Cuba's sign.

People from Cuba who wish to immigrate to the United States do not feel that it is safe to return to Cuba under President Castro's power. "We don’t think it will be safe to go back for several years, until they have gotten rid of Castro," said one man from Cuba.

However, that man said he felt his family would be allowed to immigrate to the United States, where his brother is living in Florida. He signed the papers saying that he and his family wished to be sponsored by his brother. Refugees from Cuba at Camp Six still feel thankful that they were not returned to dangerous conditions in Havana by the Coast Guard.
Appendix B

Questionnaire
Please circle the number that corresponds with the amount of agreement you have with the following statements based on the article you just read.

1. I feel sympathetic towards the plight of the refugees.
   do not agree agree strongly
   1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7

2. I feel these refugees are justified for seeking political asylum in the United States.
   do not agree agree strongly
   1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7

3. I feel the United States is financially responsible for supporting these refugees.
   do not agree agree strongly
   1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7

4. I feel that discrimination against the people would be a problem in the United States.
   do not agree agree strongly
   1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7

5. I feel that conditions in US sponsored Guantanamo Bay refugee camps should not be improved.
   do not agree agree strongly
   1.........2.........3.........4.........5.........6.........7
6. I believe that the conditions in country from which these refugees came were life-threatening.

do not agree agree strongly

1........2........3........4........5........6........7

7. I feel that the US government has not shown enough respect to these people.

do not agree agree strongly

1........2........3........4........5........6........7

8. I feel that it is easy to understand the anger of the people in the article.

do not agree agree strongly

1........2........3........4........5........6........7

9. I feel that the refugees should have complained about conditions at Guantanamo Bay.

do not agree agree strongly

1........2........3........4........5........6........7

10. I do not feel that people should be detained by the US government at refugee camps.

do not agree agree strongly

1........2........3........4........5........6........7
11. I feel that the refugees deserve to immigrate to the United States.

do not agree  agree strongly

1........2........3.......4........5........6........7

12. I feel the United Nations is financially responsible for supporting these refugees.

do not agree  agree strongly

1........2........3.......4........5........6........7

13. I feel that these people should not push themselves where they are not wanted.

do not agree  agree strongly

1........2........3.......4........5........6........7

14. I feel that the US Coast Guard should not have picked up the refugees.

do not agree  agree strongly

1........2........3.......4........5........6........7

15. I feel that the people are being too demanding in seeking asylum.

do not agree  agree strongly

1........2........3.......4........5........6........7

PLEASE STOP. DO NOT TURN THE PAGE UNTIL YOU ARE INSTRUCTED TO!!!