Journal of Communication Vol 24(1)
Winter 1974, 36-47

Archie Bunker's Bigotry:
A Study in Selective Perception and Exposure

by Neil Vidmar and Milton Rokeach

A U.S.-Canadian study finds that **All in the Family** *may reinforce rather than reduce racial and ethnic prejudice*

The enormously popular CBS television show *All in the Family* centers around Archie Bunker, a conservative, superpatriotic working-class American who browbeats his kind but "dingbat" wife Edith and who is especially adept in the employment of ethnic slurs. His main antagonists are his daughter Gloria and, especially, his son-in-law Mike. Mike and Gloria live with the Bunkers while Mike is finishing college, and the basic theme of the show is the conflict between "lovable bigot" Archie and liberal-minded Mike. Archie rails at Mike for his long hair, Polish ancestry, prolonged state of unemployment, and liberal (if not "Commie") position on sundry issues of the day.

All in the Family, first aired in January 1971, broke rather drastically with the U.S. television traditions of skirting racial and ethnic issues; it also broke all TV viewing records. Writing nine months later in the *New York Times*, novelist Laura Z. Hobson charged that portraying Archie as a lovable bigot actually condones and even encourages bigotry. (5) *All in the Family* producer Norman Lear countered by agreeing with the *New York Times* television critic John J. O'Connor, who had lauded the show on the ground that humor can be a remarkably effective weapon against prejudice. Moreover, Lear said, Mike provides an effective rebuttal to Archie because Mike is "always the one who is making sense" while Archie is always seen by the television audience as the one whose logic is at best a kind of "convoluted logic"; since the program brings bigotry "out in the open and has people talking about it," children "will ask questions about the bigotry . . . and parents will have to answer." (8)

Lear's line of argument thus appears to be twofold: (a) mixing humor with bigotry releases tension, and this catharsis reduces prejudice; (b) poking fun at bigotry and bringing it out in the open gives the viewer insight into his own prejudices, thus helping to reduce them even further. The former argument is, of course, similar to the contention that the portrayal of violence on TV is cathartic and thus reduces aggressive behavior. (6, 11).

Neil Vidmar, Associate Professor of Psychology at the University of Western Ontario, is on leave as a Russell Sage Resident in Law and Social Science at Yale University's School of Law. Milton Rokeach is Professor of Sociology and Psychology at Washington State University and author of *Open and Closed Mind* and *The Nature of Human Values*. An earlier version of this paper was presented at the meetings of the Eastern Psychological Association in Washington, D.C., May 1973.

Following the Hobson-Lear exchange, others have entered the fray with sharply contrasting opinions. (12, 17) Sanders, for example, charged that the show appeals to racism and may be teaching impressionable children racial slurs, as evidenced by the fact that fan mail applauds Archie for his prejudice. (14) In sharp contrast, critic Arnold Hano contended that "fifty million Americans are being told, week after week, that it does you no good to be a bigot" and that criticism of the program comes from the "ethnic professionals" and the "so-called intellectual leaders of the community." (3) Actor Carroll O'Connor, who portrays Archie, asserted in a *Playboy* interview that "a lot of people write that we're making them understand their own feelings and their own prejudices." (13) And the Los Angeles chapter of the NAACP, in apparent agreement with the views expressed by Lear, Hano, and O'Connor, presented its 1972 Image Award to *All in the Family* for its contribution to race relations.

For whatever reason, social scientists have thus far not brought their theories and methods to bear on the controversy about the beneficial or harmful effects of *All in the Family*. To date the arguments and counterarguments that have been made about the show have come from persons in the realms of literature and entertainment rather than in social science. The only exception is an opinion survey conceived and financed by the CBS organization itself, which was conducted during the early weeks following the program's debut. (7) In that study a sample of viewers were interviewed by telephone about their reactions to the program. The results showed that the majority of respondents, including minority group members, enjoyed the program and reported that they were not offended by it. Although CBS was careful to point out that conclusions about attitude change could not be drawn from a single or "one-shot" survey, the report nonetheless implied that most viewers perceived *All in the Family*'s satirical intent—and therefore that its impact would, if anything, be to reduce prejudice.

Some viewers applaud Archie for his racist viewpoint, while others applaud the show for making fun of bigotry

There is, however, an alternative hypothesis which might explain why the program was enjoyed by the great majority of viewers. Perhaps prejudiced and unprejudiced persons ascribe different meanings to the intent and outcomes of *All in the Family* episodes: nonprejudiced viewers and minority group viewers may perceive and enjoy the show as satire, whereas prejudiced viewers may perceive and enjoy the show as episodes "telling it like it is." Such an hypothesis seems to be supported by the fact that some viewers write letters (to newspaper editors, to CBS officials, and to people associated with the program) which applaud Archie for his racist viewpoint, while others applaud the show for effectively making fun of bigotry. (12)

Our purpose was to provide an empirical basis for determining the relative merits of the opposing contentions about the positive or negative effects

of *All in the Family*. The study addressed itself to two hypotheses, which can be identified as the selective perception hypothesis and the selective exposure hypothesis.

The selective perception hypothesis would suggest that viewers differing in degree of prejudice or racism would have different reasons for finding *All in the Family* entertaining, would identify with different characters, and would interpret the outcomes of the weekly episodes differently. A number of studies (1, 4, 9) have shown that a person's attitudes and values will affect that person's perception or interpretation of social stimuli. Cooper and Jahoda, for example, presented subjects with cartoons that made fun of a prejudiced character named Mr. Biggott. They found that whereas non-prejudiced persons perceived and appreciated the humor in the cartoons, prejudiced subjects distorted their meaning to avoid ridiculing or deprecating Mr. Biggott. (1) Selective perception can similarly come into play with *All in the Family*. To the unprejudiced viewer Archie may be seen as a dumb, bigoted "hard-hat," while to a prejudiced person Archie's chief ideological adversary, son-in-law Mike, may be seen as a long-haired, lazy "meathead Polack" who spouts liberal slogans. More succinctly, the selective perception hypothesis would lead us to expect that low prejudiced viewers would be more likely to perceive and enjoy *All in the Family* as a satire on bigotry, while high prejudiced viewers would be more likely to perceive and enjoy *All in the Family* for "telling it like it is." Thus, it can be predicted that high and low prejudiced viewers would enjoy the program to an approximately equal extent but for different reasons: high prejudiced persons would be more likely to enjoy it because they admire Archie, because they see Archie as making better sense than Mike, and because they see Archie as winning in the end. In addition, high prejudiced persons should be less offended by Archie's ethnic slurs and be less likely to see Archie as the person who is being ridiculed.

The selective exposure hypothesis leads us to yet another prediction: low prejudiced and high prejudiced persons will not necessarily watch *All in the Family* to the same extent. A substantial body of literature has indicated that, at least in natural field settings, there is a tendency for persons to expose themselves to social stimuli and situations which are congruent with their prior attitudinal dispositions. (2, 10) The CBS survey report, working on the assumption that *All in the Family* is widely viewed as satire, has speculated that it would be low prejudiced persons who would expose themselves to the program more frequently than high prejudiced persons. (7) Thus, Klapper stated that

> *people who view this program presumably feel differently about the topics involved than those who do not. . . . I would venture to guess, for example, that voluntary viewers would be likely to be somewhat more involved in other anti-prejudice activities, even if only in their other media choices.* (7, p. 19)

But what if most *All in the Family* viewers do not see it as satire and in fact identify with Archie? In such an event the selective exposure hypothesis would predict that high prejudiced rather than low prejudiced persons would be the more likely to watch the program, because the main character has personal qualities and attitudes which appeal to their own self-image and world outlook.

It is not possible to say in advance which of these competing selective exposure hypotheses is the more tenable, because we cannot say in advance how many viewers will and will not perceive *All in the Family* as satire. But they can be put to an empirical test. Working on the assumption that most viewers will indeed perceive the program as satire, we could predict that *All in the Family* viewers will more likely be persons low in prejudice, identify with Mike over Archie, and disapprove of Archie's use of ethnic and racial slurs. Conversely, working on the assumption that the selective perception hypothesis is correct and therefore that many viewers see Archie as "telling it like it is," we could predict that frequent viewers will more likely be persons high in prejudice, identify with Archie over Mike, and approve (or at least condone) Archie's use of ethnic and racial slurs.

Two groups of respondents were employed—American adolescents and Canadian adults from an area where the program is seen weekly. Both groups were asked about their reactions to *All in the Family* and were, in addition, presented with attitude questions designed to measure their ethnocentrism or prejudice.[1]

The U.S. adolescent sample consisted of 237 students, ranging in age from 14 to 18 years. They attended a senior community high school in a small town in the midwestern United States. Volunteers were solicited during study hours, and virtually all of those solicited agreed to participate. Two-thirds of this group were male, and all were white. The survey was administered as an anonymous written questionnaire.

The initial Canadian sample consisted of 168 adults who were randomly selected from voting lists in London, Ontario. Seventy-seven percent of this sample, 130, agreed to be interviewed; 65 percent were female and 35 percent were male. Half of these respondents were contacted through face-to-face interviews and the other half by telephone. Statistical analyses of differences between the telephone and face-to-face groups showed no differences regarding refusal rate, basic attitudes toward *All in the Family*, or amount of prejudice. Accordingly, we ignored this variable in all further analyses of the Canadian sample.

The survey was basically the same for both the U.S. and Canadian samples, although the ethnocentrism questions were tailored for each culture. Eleven items designed to elicit reactions to *All in the Family* are

[1] This research was supported, in part, by a Faculty of Social Science Grant, University of Western Ontario, and a Canada Council Grant to the first author and by a National Science Foundation Grant to the second author. We are indebted to students in the first author's Current Social Problems course (Summer, 1972) for helping to collect the Canadian data and to Mr. Emil Borgini, Principal of Gillespie Community Unit High School, Gillespie, Illinois, for generously allowing us access to the U.S. adolescents.

Table 1: Percent responses to All in the Family item alternatives

	U.S. adolescents (N = 237)	Canadian adults (N = 133)
1. How often do you watch "All in the Family"?		
every week	13%	24%
almost every week	35	29
only occasionally	32	36
almost never	14	10
never	6	1
2. Is there any reason you don't watch it more often?		
It is offensive	13%	10%
3. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about the program?		
very enyoyable	53%	38%
enjoyable	34	55
not enjoyable	8	5
very unenjoyable	5	2
4. How funny is the show?		
extremely funny	24%	15%
very funny	39	44
somewhat funny	24	28
only mildly funny	7	9
not funny	6	4
5. Which of the two main characters (Archie or Mike) do you like or admire more?		
admire Archie	62%	66%
6. Archie and Mike often disagree with one another about various issues. In your opinion which of these two men usually makes better sense?		
Archie makes better sense	13%	11%
7. Generally speaking, at the end of program does Archie win or lose?		
Archie wins	42%	40%
8. Which of the main characters in the show is most often made fun of?		
Archie	10%	32%
Mike	46	10
Edith	36	58
Gloria	2	0
Lionel	6	—
9. Archie often refers to members of various minority groups as "coloreds, coons, Chinks," etc. Do you see anything wrong in using these names for minority groups?		
nothing wrong	35%	43%
wrong	33	33
very wrong	32	24
10. In 20 years will your attitudes and values be most similar to Archie (or to one of the other main characters)?		
similar to Archie	23%	—
11. Has watching the show made you aware that you had prejudices you didn't know about?		
Yes	—	20%

shown in Table 1. A few additional questions, including a question about frequency of television viewing in general, were also asked.

The measure of ethnocentrism or prejudice for the U.S. adolescents consisted of six questions, each of which had two alternative responses: (1) Do you think white students and Negro students should go to the same schools or to separate schools? (2) In your opinion, which is more to blame if a person is poor: lack of effort on his own part, or circumstances beyond his control? (3) Do you think Negroes are as intelligent as white people—that is, can they learn things as well if they are given the same education and training? (4) Do you feel there should be strong laws against homosexuals, or do you feel that if two adults want to be homosexuals that is their own business? (5) Which factor do you believe most accounts for the failure of minority groups like Negroes, Indians, and Spanish Americans to achieve equality with white people, restrictions imposed by white society, or lack of initiative and hard work? (6) Which of the following statements best describes your feeling toward hippies: they should be forced to get a bath, a haircut, and a job; or they should be allowed to live their lives as they choose? For the Canadian group questions 1 and 5 were replaced with more culturally relevant items, as follows: (1) In your opinion do you think Canadian Indians are so unreliable that they can never be trusted to take care of themselves, or that they are perfectly capable of managing their own affairs? (5) In your opinion, do you think the French Candians in Quebec should forget about their French culture and learn English, or that they have a right to a French culture, including speaking the French language? The responses to the six items in each sample were summed to form a single index, and a median split was used to categorize respondents as high or low in prejudice or ethnocentrism.

Table 1 shows the percentage of persons in each sample who responded to the various item alternatives designed to elicit reactions to *All in the Family*. The two samples were on the whole quite similar in their responses. Almost everyone had seen the program; most of them enjoyed it (Item 3) and found it funny (Item 4), and only a small percentage found it offensive (Item 2). Table 1 also shows that over 60 percent of the television viewers in both samples liked or admired Archie more than Mike (Item 5) and that 40 percent or more thought it was Archie who usually won at the end of the program (Item 7). A rather small percentage, between 11 and 13 percent, thought Archie made better sense than Mike (Item 6).

Which one of the main characters in the show was most often made fun of (Item 8)? If the show is generally viewed as a satire on bigotry, then Archie should be the person seen most often as the butt of the show's humor. Table 1 indicates, however, that only 10 percent of the U.S. adolescents named Archie as the person most often made fun of; 46 percent of the Americans named Mike and 36 percent named Edith.[2] Similarly,

[2] It is worth noting that post-survey remarks by respondents indicated they did not remember who Lionel was or did not consider him to be a main character in the program.

only 32 percent of the Canadian viewers named Archie as the character most often made fun of, while a majority (58 percent) thought Edith was the most ridiculed. Finally, 35 percent of the American sample and 45 percent of the Canadian sample saw nothing wrong in Archie's use of ethnic and racial slurs (Item 9).

All too many viewers saw nothing wrong with Archie's use of racial and ethnic slurs

Some of these findings are, of course, quite consistent with the findings obtained by the CBS survey: most viewers enjoyed the program and found it funny, and only a small percentage found it offensive. Other findings, however, indicate a wide range of affective reactions to the show's characters, their behavior, and the outcomes. Considered all together, they suggest, contrary to the CBS report, that all too many viewers did not see the program as a satire on bigotry, had identified with Archie rather than Mike, saw Archie as winning, did not perceive Archie as the character who was the most ridiculed, and, perhaps most disturbing, saw nothing wrong with Archie's use of racial and ethnic slurs.

The *selective perception* hypothesis proposes that the prior attitudes of the viewers would be related to or would predict reactions to the characters and outcomes of *All in the Family* episodes. To test this hypothesis, we split the distribution of attitudinal scores at the median so viewers could be categorized as high or low in prejudice. Then, we compared differences in the reactions of the high and low prejudiced viewers to *All in the Family* by means of the chi-square statistic. Table 2 shows that the high and low prejudiced viewers did not differ in the extent to which they regarded *All in the Family* as enjoyable or funny (Items 3 and 4). They did, however, differ in their other reactions to the program. High prejudiced persons in both the U.S. and Canadian samples were significantly more likely than low prejudiced persons to admire Archie over Mike (Item 5) and to perceive Archie as winning in the end (Item 7). While most respondents did indicate that they saw Mike as making better sense than Archie, we must also note that the high prejudiced American adolescents were significantly more likely than low prejudiced adolescents to perceive Archie as making better sense (Item 6). Findings were in the same direction for the Canadian adult sample, although these fall short of the usually accepted level of statistical significance. Moreover, high prejudiced U.S. adolescents indicated significantly more often than low prejudiced adolescents that their values would be similar to Archie Bunker's 20 years hence (Item 10).[3] Table 2 also indicates that high prejudiced Canadian adults condoned Archie's slurs significantly more often (Item 9), and the U.S. data showed a trend in the same direction. Finally, high prejudiced Canadian viewers saw the show as poking fun at Archie significantly less often than did low prejudiced viewers (Item 8).

[3] This question was not asked in the Canadian sample.

Generally, then, the quantitative data shown in Table 2 tend to support the selective perception hypothesis—namely, that prejudiced persons identify more with Archie, perceive Archie as making better sense than Mike, perceive Archie as winning. We also asked the respondents what they particularly liked or disliked about Archie or Mike. High prejudiced persons spontaneously indicated that they disliked things about Mike significantly more often than about Archie; low prejudiced persons spontaneously indicated that they disliked things about Archie significantly more often than about Mike. But even more interesting are their explanations of why they liked or disliked these characters. People who disliked Archie indicated that he is a bigot, domineering, rigid, loud, and that he mistreats his wife. Persons who liked Archie reported he is down-to-

Table 2: Differences between high and low prejudice viewers in their reactions to *All in the Family*

	U.S. adolescents			Canadian adults		
Variable	High prej.	Low prej.	p	High prej.	Low prej.	p
3. How enjoyable is it?						
very enjoyable	27%	26%		18%	20%	
enjoyable	19	15	n.s.	29	26	n.s.
not enjoyable	5	3		1	4	
very unenjoyable	4	1		2	0	
4. How funny is it?						
extremely funny	12%	12%		8%	7%	
very funny	17	22		22	22	
somewhat funny	12	12	n.s.	14	14	n.s.
mildly funny	2	5		4	5	
not funny	2	4		2	2	
5. Who do you like or admire?						
Archie	38%	24%		40%	26%	
Mike	18	20	.05	13	21	.05
6. Who makes better sense?						
Archie	10%	3%		8%	3%	
Mike	44	43	.01	43	46	.10
7. Does Archie win?						
Wins	29%	13%		26%	14%	
Loses	25	33	.01	26	34	.05
8. Who is made fun of?						
Archie	4%	6%		11%	21%	
Others	50	40	n.s.	40	28	.05
9. Ethnic slurs?						
not wrong	22%	13%		29%	14%	
wrong	18	15	.10	14	19	.01
very wrong	15	17		7	17	
10. Whose values will be similar?						
Archie	16%	7%		—	—	
Others	39%	38	.05	—	—	—

earth, honest, hard-working, predictable, and kind enough to allow his son-in-law and daughter to live with him. Persons who liked Mike reported he is tolerant and stands up for his beliefs; those who disliked him reported he is stupid, narrow-minded, prejudiced against the older generation, rebellious, lazy, and a "banner waver."

Both the quantitative and qualitative analyses supported the selective perception hypothesis. Reactions to the program were varied, and these reactions were related to or a function of prior attitudes. This conclusion is clearly at variance with those who have assumed and have argued that television viewers of *All in the Family* uniformly perceive the program's satirical intent.

The second hypothesis, the *selective exposure* hypothesis, goes further to propose that underlying attitudinal predispositions will cause viewers to watch *All in the Family* to different extents. The CBS report, assuming as it did that the program was more or less uniformly perceived as a satire on bigotry, proceeded to speculate that the more frequent viewers would be low prejudiced persons. However, if we assume that many viewers do not see it as a 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, and (c) condone Archie's use of ethnic and racial slurs. To test these hypotheses, we categorized those viewers who indicated they watched the program every week or almost every week as "frequent viewers" and those who watched it only occasionally, almost never, or never as "infrequent viewers" (see Table 1, item 1 for item alternatives). We then compared these two groups of viewers for ethnocentrism or prejudice, identification with Archie or Mike, and condonement of ethnic and racial slurs.

Although the predicted relationship concerning prejudice was not found for Canadian adults, it was found for the American adolescents: frequent adolescent viewers of *All in the Family* were significantly more likely to be high prejudiced rather than low prejudiced (Table 3). Skeptics

Table 3: Frequency of viewing **All in the Family** and differences in prejudice, and program reactions

Variable	U.S. adolescents Freq. view	Infreq. view	p	Canadian adults Freq. view	Infreq. view	p
A. Prejudice						
High	26%	19%		26%	25%	
Low	24	31	.05	25	24	n.s.
5. Who do you like or admire?						
Archie	39%	23%		36%	30%	
Mike	11	27	.01	14	20	n.s.
9. Ethnic slurs?						
not wrong	21%	14%		29%	14%	
wrong	17	16	.05	17	16	.01
very wrong	11	21		6	18	

might argue that high prejudiced persons watch television generally more often than low prejudiced persons, and are therefore more likely than low prejudiced persons to watch *All in the Family* also. In such an event the significant relationship between prejudice and frequency of watching *All in the Family* would be spurious. To find out, we asked subjects to estimate how many hours of television they watched each day and on the basis of these responses classified them as "frequent" or "infrequent" viewers of television in general. We found no significant relationship between frequency of watching television in general and prejudice ($x^2 = 0.89$, df = 1). We thus seem justified in concluding that high prejudiced adolescents are more prone than less prejudiced adolescents to watch *All in the Family* in particular.

Table 3 also shows that frequent *All in the Family* viewers admired Archie more often than Mike (Item 5)—significantly more often in the U.S. sample and more often, but not significantly so, in the Canadian sample. It further shows that frequent watchers in both samples condoned Archie's ethnic slurs significantly more often than infrequent viewers (Item 9). Thus, the data support the selective exposure hypothesis in a direction that seems opposite to that suggested by the CBS report: *All in the Family* seems to be appealing more to the racially and ethnically prejudiced members of society than to the less prejudiced members.

We have attempted to bring social psychological theory and empirical methods to bear on the *All in the Family* controversy. In general, the data seem to support those who have argued that the program is not uniformly seen as satire and those who have argued that it exploits or appeals to bigotry. There are, however, some methodological aspects of the data that need to be discussed.

First, what about the generalizability of the results? The two studies included 370 respondents in the U.S. and Canada; is it valid to generalize from findings thus obtained to over 50 million *All in the Family* viewers? Ideally, of course, more extensive and representative samples would have been desirable. But the basic findings reported here have been replicated with two very different samples, differing in age (adolescents versus adults), nationality (Americans versus Canadians), and method of interviewing (anonymous written questionnaire versus face-to-face and telephone interviews). The fact that the findings were on the whole similar despite such differences increases confidence in our findings.

Second, it should be noted that our study, like the earlier CBS survey, is also a single survey and thus not designed to draw conclusions about the effects of *All in the Family* on attitude change. As Klapper (7) has pointed out, the only true test for attitude change would be an experimental design which has (a) a matched control sample of nonviewers who can be compared to the "experimental" or viewing group and (b) attitude measurements before and after viewing a series of the programs. Despite the fact that the present study is not an experimental study, the findings

surely argue against the contention that *All in the Family* has positive effects, as has been claimed by its supporters and admirers. We found that many persons did not see the program as a satire on bigotry and that these persons were more likely to be viewers who scored high on measures of prejudice. Even more important is the finding that high prejudiced persons were likely to watch *All in the Family* more often than low prejudiced persons, to identify more often with Archie Bunker, and to see him winning in the end.[4] All such findings seem to suggest that the program is more likely reinforcing prejudice and racism than combating it.[5]

The present findings also seem to cast doubt on Norman Lear's and John O'Connor's contention that by mixing humor with bigotry the show leads to a cathartic reduction of bigotry. If high prejudiced persons do not perceive the program as a satire on bigotry, they will not experience a cathartic reduction in prejudice.

On balance the study seems to support more the critics who have argued that *All in the Family* has harmful effects. Some serious questions have been raised by those critics. Both Hobson (5) and Slawson (16) have asserted that by making Archie a "lovable bigot" the program encourages bigots to excuse and rationalize their own prejudices. Sanders (14) has charged that "already there is evidence that impressionable white children have picked up, and are using, many of the old racial slurs which Archie has resurrected, popularized and made 'acceptable' all over again." Our empirical research suggests that at the very least those charges have a valid psychological base.

[4] There is tentative evidence that similar psychological dynamics may come into play regarding other television programs as well. *Sanford and Son*, a situation comedy modeled after *All in the Family*, is about a black junk dealer who is prejudiced against whites. On the basis of findings from the present research we speculated that while Sanford is a likable character in many ways, he also exhibits behavior consistent with the common stereotype of Negroes: he is lazy, lives in a junkyard, and throws his beer cans out the front door. On the other hand, his son Lamont is ambitious and hard working. In an exploratory study 97 Canadian adults were asked the following question: Sanford and his son Lamont have different attitudes and life styles; in your opinion which one of these two men is more typical, that is, similar to Negroes in general? Fifty-six percent of the respondents named Sanford, 26 percent named Lamont, and the remaining 18 percent refused to answer on the grounds that it was unfair to stereotype or that they didn't know enough about Negroes. As expected, high prejudiced persons were significantly more likely ($p < .01$) than low prejudiced persons to name Sanford than to name Lamont or refuse to answer. More detailed research is obviously needed, but the finding is intriguing.

[5] Given these findings, a question arises about O'Connor's observation that "a lot of people" have written that the show gives them insight into their own prejudices. Who are these persons and how many are they? The Canadian survey asked a question which hints at a possible answer. Note from Table 1 that in response to a direct probe (Item 1), 20 percent of the interviewees indicated that the show had made them aware of some of their own prejudices. Such a response of course does not mean that they really gained insight or that they all wrote letters communicating that insight, but for the sake of speculation treat the answer at face value. The next question that can be asked is whether these persons were high or low in prejudice and whether they were frequent or infrequent viewers of the program. Of those 27 viewers (20 percent of the sample) reporting insight, 55 percent were low prejudiced viewers and 80 percent were infrequent watchers of the program. The relationship between prejudice and insight was not significant ($x^2 = 0.64$, $df = 1$), but the data between frequency of viewing and insight were ($x^2 = 8.4$, $df = 1$, $p < .01$); that is, the less frequent the viewing the more the reported insight. Thus, in both samples the data are in a direction opposite to that suggested by O'Connor: the majority of persons reporting insight were low in prejudice and were infrequent watchers of the program. There are three possible interpretations of the finding: (a) the more frequently persons watch the program, the less insightful they become about prejudice, (b) the infrequent, low prejudiced viewers were formerly high prejudiced persons who became less prejudiced as a result of watching *All in the Family*, or (c) infrequent and low prejudiced viewers are more likely to be persons who look for and/or report self-insights into prejudice. The last interpretation seems the most plausible. Because of the very small number of respondents involved in this analysis, one must, however, be cautious in drawing conclusions. Nonetheless, it can be suggested that persons who have written that *All in the Family* gave them insight into their own prejudices were on the whole low in racism or prejudice at the outset.

REFERENCES

1. Cooper, E., and M. Jahoda. "The Evasion of Propaganda." *Journal of Psychology*, 1947, *23*, 15–25.
2. Freedman, J. L., and D. O. Sears. "Selective Exposure." In Berkowitz, L. (Ed.). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
3. Hano, A. "Why We Laugh at That Bigot Archie." *Detroit Free Press*, March 19, 1972.
4. Hastorf, A. H., and H. Cantril. "They Saw a Game: A Case Study." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1954, *49*, 129–134.
5. Hobson, L. Z. "As I Listened to Archie Say 'Hebe' . . ." *New York Times*, September 12, 1971.
6. Johnson, R. N. *Aggression in Man and Animals*. Philadelphia: W. B. Saunders, Co., 1972, pp. 152–62.
7. Klapper, J. T. Untitled paper delivered at meeting of The Society for the Study of Social Problems, Denver, Colorado, August 29, 1971.
8. Lear, N. "As I Read How Laura Saw Archie . . ." *New York Times*, October 10, 1971.
9. Manis, M. "Interpretation of Opinion Statements as a Function of Recipient Attitudes and Source Prestige." *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 1961, *63*, 82–86.
10. McGuire, W. J. "The Nature of Attitudes and Attitude Change." In G. Lindzey and E. Aronson. *The Handbook of Social Psychology*, 2nd ed., Vol. 3. Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley, 1969.
11. Murray, J. P. "Television and Violence: Implications of the Surgeon General's Research Program." *American Psychologist*, 1973, *28*, 472–478.
12. *Newsweek*. "TV: Speaking About the Unspeakable." November 29, 1971, 52–60.
13. *Playboy*. "Carroll O'Connor: A Candid Conversation with Archbigot Archie Bunker's Better Half." January 1973.
14. Sanders, C. L. "Is Archie Bunker the Real White America?" *Ebony*, June 1972, 186–192.
15. Skornia, H. J. *Television and Society*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965.
16. Slawson, J. "How Funny Can Bigotry Be?" *Educational Broadcasting Review*, April 1972.
17. *Time*. "The Team Behind Archie Bunker & Co." September 25, 1972, 48–58.