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ABSTRACT

The present study addresses the relationship between status characteristics and task cues. In addition, how cognitive information processing models apply to simultaneous effects of diffuse status and demonstrated confidence is explored. Through a 2x2 factorial design, simultaneous effects of demonstrated confidence (confident/unconfident) and race (black/white) upon influence and perceptions were tested. The experiment took place in a mock jury setting. Results indicated that confidence significantly affected both influence and perceptions. Race effects were significant on the perceptions. The implication of the results to an expanded model of cognitive information processing strategies are discussed. It is suggested that confidence buffers but does not eliminate status based inequalities in decision making groups.
SIMULTANEOUS EFFECTS OF STATUS AND TASK CUES: COMBINING, ELIMINATION OR BUFFERING?

Emergence of differential power and prestige among members of task groups has long been known (Bales 1953; Heinicke and Bales 1953; Slater 1955). However, there are different views about the source of power and prestige. For example, Expectation States Theory\(^2\) argues for the importance of status characteristics in the development of intra-group differentiations (Berger et al. 1966, 1977, 1980). Behavioral Styles Theory, on the other hand, argues for the impact of "demeanor". In this latter model, demeanor often connotes displays of dominance (Lee and Ofshe 1981; Mazur, 1973; 1985; Rosa and Mazur, 1979).

Recent research has shown a dichotomy between cues which portray dominance and those cues which show task competence. The distinction is that dominance involves threat and coercion (commanding, intrusive styles of interaction). Alternatively, task cues encompass factual, confident and relaxed interaction patterns which are not threatening. There is growing evidence that task cues are more effective predictors of interpersonal influence than dominance cues (Ridgeway, 1987; Ridgeway, Berger and Smith, 1985; Ridgeway and Diekema, 1989).

While the current studies have compared the efficacy of dominance with task cues, there has been little attempt to compare the relative strength of task cues with effects of diffuse status characteristics (Mohr, 1986). It is the purpose of the present study to explore the relative effectiveness of task cues against one diffuse status characteristic (race). An additional goal is to expand the existing models of cognitive information processing to the understanding of mutual effects of diffuse status and task cues.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Expectation States Theory argues that interactants develop performance expectations (generalized anticipation about future task performance) for one other. These expectations lead to subsequent power and prestige differences (Berger, Conner
and Fisek, 1974). The higher the expectation advantage for the self, the higher the probability that the self will receive opportunities to interact, will contribute more, will receive positive evaluations for his/her contribution and will exert influence. These four aspects form the highly correlated power and prestige order of the group (Berger et al. 1977).

It is also suggested that diffuse status characteristics (race, sex, etc.) have differentially evaluated states which carry general expectations for positive or negative overall ability. In groups where members differ in external status, the expectations derived from cultural beliefs are activated and determine influence even when the characteristics are not relevant in the situation (Berger et al. 1966; Moore, 1968). For example, if race is a diffuse status, a black person will be perceived as less capable and will be accorded less influence.

Task cues, like diffuse status, also seem to lead to differential expectations and differential influence (Berger, Wagner and Zelditch, 1983). In Berger et al. s (1986) definition, task cues make claims or allow inferences about how an actor will do in a given task. Moreover, it is suggested that task cues are indicative or expressive. The former involves explicit declarations about one's task capabilities. Expressive task cues, on the other hand, are implicit markers of one's task competence and revolve around a "sense of confidence". Expressive task cues subsume eye contact, fluency of speech, body posture etc. and are seen as more powerful than indicative task cues (Berger et al. 1986). As such, they have been often utilized as indices of task cues in general (Ridgeway, 1987; Ridgeway and Diekema, 1989).

Most studies compare the effects of task cues to the effects of dominance (Ridgeway, 1987; Ridgeway and Diekema, 1989). How task cues in general, and expressive task cues in particular fare in relation to diffuse status (which is also expressive, but categorical, see Berger et al. 1986) is rarely explored. It is often assumed that interactants' demonstrated task competence will coincide with their diffuse status. Task cues are even seen as a function of expectation advantages created
by external status (Berger et al. 1983:73). In this view, then, task cues are believed to be so highly correlated with diffuse status that any attempt to explore their independent or interactive effects is considered redundant. As a result, incongruencies between diffuse status and task cues have never been adequately addressed in current research.

The present study is an attempt to explore more fully the relationship between two qualitatively different variables (expressive task cues and diffuse status) attempting to explain the same phenomena (influence and perceptions). In the proposed model, incongruence is not only considered a possibility, but of vital importance in the cognitive information processing strategies. In order to fully comprehend the relative evaluation of one variable against the other, the concept of "buffering" is central to the proposed model. Before an in-depth articulation of buffering, a brief review of the existing strategies is in order.

Cognitive strategies. In multiple status situations, there exist two cognitive models to explain the emergence of expectations: "elimination" and "combining". In elimination, self-other expectations are assumed to emerge on the basis of a characteristic. Let us denote the positive and negative states with (+) and (-). According to Hughes (1945), a black physician (- +) is likely to be perceived as "black" and will be excluded from social encounters. What is eliminated is the positive state of occupation. Although Hughes (1945) advocates its potency, elimination is rare in multiple status situations (Webster and Driskell 1978; Webster, Roberts and Sobieszek 1972. For an exception, see Hembroff, Martin and Sell 1981). Of course, elimination is possible where one of the variables is task cues. Expanding the argument, a white (R+ denoting the positive state of race) person can be perceived as "better" and accorded more influence regardless of his/her level of confidence (C+ or C-). It is also possible that confidence (C+) will transcend the effects of race (R+ or R-). Respectively, the two elimination hypotheses can be expressed as:

\[
[(R+C+) = (R+C-)] > [(R-C+) = (R-C-)]
\]

\[
[(R+C+) = (R-C+)] > [(R+C-) = (R-C-)]
\]
The combining strategy, on the other hand, suggests that individuals form expectations by aggregating all available information from diffuse status characteristics (Berger and Fisek, 1970; Webster, Roberts and Sobieszek, 1972; Zelditch, Lauderdale and Stublarec, 1980). Combining assumes equal weighting of information from different statuses if their strength of relevance to the task is equal. For example, if the task is patient care, a black physician (- +) will not be perceived as good as a white physician (+ +), but better than a black nurse (- -). Under equal weighting assumption, a black physician (- +) is equal to a white nurse (+ -). If occupation is more relevant to patient care, however, the incongruent categories will be subordinated (black physician (- +) > white nurse (+ -)). The applications of the combining model to race and demonstrated confidence effects are:

\[
[(R+C+) > [(R+C-) = (R-C+)] > (R-C-)] **(Equally weighted)
\]

\[
[(R+C+) > (R-C+) > (R+C-) > (R-C-)] **(C + more relevant)
\]

Although combining has received substantial support, there are ambiguities inherent in its multiple status assumptions and predictions. First, the relevance argument has little predictive utility since the strength of relevance of diffuse status characteristics has never been clearly ranked in the literature (Webster and Driskell, 1978). In the preceding patient care example, common sense allows us to predict that occupation will be more relevant than race. Can one as easily predict the relative weighting of occupation against gender or age or education? Is occupation more relevant than race or sex in jury deliberations or political party leadership?

A more serious problem is the explicit assumption that combining is additive. Additivity may apply to multiple status settings, but can hardly be assumed when simultaneous effects of external status and task cues are in question. As a matter of fact, some evidence exists about the interactive effects of the two variables on influence and perceptions (Tuzlak, 1988). Berger et al. also cite findings where status and non-status characteristics (personal attributes in that case) interact in complex
ways (1983:62). The combining model is inadequate to deal with such complex effects.

In explorations of indicators of power and prestige in small groups, there is no empirical justification for expecting differential strengths in the ability of task cues to determine behavior over a diffuse status characteristic such as race. On the contrary, Berger et al. (1986) claim that status characteristics form the basis of differentiation in expectation states, which in turn determine congruent variations in task cues. In their conceptualization, status characteristics governs task cues. Many other possibilities abound, however. It is common sensical to assume that task cues may be more directly relevant in those situations where goal attainment is deemed valuable. It is similarly reasonable to expect that two variables will have an interactive effect (Tuzlak, 1988). The complex nature of such effects, however, cannot be fully explored within the existing additive models. Therefore, I propose the buffering model which places an explicit emphasis on the evaluative strength assigned to behavioral demonstrations of task confidence. Buffering provides a more refined conceptual tool for the examination of complex cognitive processes precisely because it suggests a deflection of the otherwise powerful negative effects of diffuse status. Buffering suggests that demonstrated confidence will absorb some degree, but not the sum total of negative status generalizations. In short, the buffering model predicts the following ordering along with interactions:

\[(R+C+) > (R-C+) > (R+C-) > (R-C-)\] **(plus interaction effects)

THE PRESENT STUDY

In a mock-jury setting, the joint effects of confidence as an index of expressive task cues, and race on influence and perceptions were investigated. A 2x2 factorial design was used. Factor levels were black/white for race and confident/unconfident for confidence. Influence was the dependent variable and was measured as changes in award judgments of subjects after exposure to a target. Targets argued for $2,000 compensation and their race and confidence formed the four conditions. Since the
initial awards were $8,000 or higher, a reduction in judgments signifies the influence of the target.

In light of the accumulated evidence gathered within the tradition of Expectation States Theory, those who possess the advantageous states of status characteristics are accorded more power and prestige, and thus more influence in task groups. Recent findings show that task cues also affect interpersonal influence. Therefore, the first hypothesis states that:

1. Both race and confidence will have main effects on influence. White or confident targets will exert more influence than black or unconfident targets.

In the present study, perceptions of the target were also of interest. Perceptions were measured through 24-item, seven point semantic differential scales, similar to the ones used in earlier studies (Ridgeway, 1987). Of the 24, six items related to perceptions of task competency. These were confident/unconfident; sure of self/unsure of self; convincing/unconvincing; consistent/inconsistent; competent/incompetent and intelligent/unintelligent. Three items related to the likeability of the target (pleasant/unpleasant; likeable/unlikeable; positive/negative). Status attributions to the target were measured by high status/low status; leader/follower and influential/not influential items.

In the Expectation States literature, there is evidence that more highly valued states of status characteristics are associated with positive perceptions of the possessors of those characteristics (Webster and Driskell, 1978). It has been observed that task related cues also lead to differential perceptions and evaluations. The advantageous levels of such cues (such as sustaining eye contact rather than looking down, speaking fluently versus speaking with pauses and fillers) have been linked to higher evaluations for one's task related competence, and higher attributions to the demonstrators as influential (Berger et al. 1986; Ridgeway, 1987). Moreover, interactants who demonstrate advantageous levels of task cues are found to be better liked (Ridgeway, 1987). In light of these, the second hypothesis was:
2. Both race and confidence will lead to differential perception and evaluation of the targets. White or confident targets will be seen as more competent, will be better liked and will receive higher status attributions than black or unconfident targets.

The third hypothesis is drawn from the proposed buffering model which predicts that confidence of the black target will buffer, but not eliminate his status disadvantage. The last hypothesis will be tested through the presence of interactions as well as the ordering of conditions in the buffering model.

3. Confidence and race will have interactive effects on targets' influence as well as perceptions of their task competence, likeability and status.

METHOD

Setting. In the experimental room, there were two 20-inch, black and white television monitors. The monitors were suspended from the ceiling (about 5-6 feet and at a 40° angle).

Subjects. Subjects were 97 female students who were taking introductory sociology courses. They were randomly assigned to experimental sessions in groups of two to 10. Of the 97, five were "black". Since race is a crucial variable, responses from black students are excluded from the analysis. None of the subjects expressed clear suspicion about the procedures.

Phases of the study. The experiment consisted of six phases.

1. Subjects read a civil injury case which was adopted (with modifications) from Nemeth and Wachtler (1974).

2. First compensation: Subjects made an award judgment for the plaintiff by checking one of the categories (ranging from $1,000 to $26,000) on a response sheet.

3. Manipulation of variables: Subjects saw one of the four stimulus tapes in which two male "jurors" were discussing the case they previously read. The tape took approximately 10 minutes. The jurors were identified as "John" and "Bill". John was the same student (white) throughout all conditions. Bill was the target. At the bottom of the T.V. monitors, 3x5 inch cards identified John and Bill according to their seats.
4. Second compensation: Subjects were asked to indicate a compensation they now saw fit, regardless of the amount they awarded before. They were reminded about the importance of serving on juries and urged to take other jurors' arguments into account. Responses were recorded on a sheet similar to the first.

5. Semantic differential scales: Subjects expressed their "impressions" of their "fellow" jurors on 24-item, seven point semantic differential scales. Half of the randomly selected items were arranged from positive to negative, and the other half, from negative to positive in order to control for response bias.

6. Subjects were debriefed and paid $5.00.

**Video-tapes.** A white male played the role of John across all four conditions and argued for a $14,000 compensation. The target (Bill) was either black or white, acted either in a confident or an unconfident style and argued for $2,000. The two students who acted as Bill were comparable in height, weight and age. They wore dress shirts.

At first, one of the two cameras used showed John and Bill sitting at the same side of a rectangular table since the head seat has independent implications for influence (Nemeth and Wachtler, 1974). From then on, cameras focused on the juror who was speaking. Each juror presented three blocks of arguments. Final tapes were pre-tested on 39 first-year students who rated the target on the six task competence related items of the semantic differential scales (confident, sure of self, convincing, consistent, competent and intelligent). A one-way ANOVA indicated that confidence manipulation strongly affected the perceptions of the target ($F_{(1,37)}=9.18, p=.004$). In addition, the perception of the target's dominance as measured by three semantic differential items (dominant, aggressive, assertive) showed no significant differences ($p>.2$). Race of the target was visually unmistakable and thus did not require a manipulation check.

**Manipulation of confidence.** In the present study, portrayed confidence of the target was used as an index of task cues. It was varied through body posture (relaxed and open versus slumped and closed), eye-contact (looking at the camera versus
mostly looking down), absence or presence of nervous gestures (playing with a pen, scratching the head) and slight differentiations in speech (fluent versus hesitant). The black target had a slight West Indian accent which was part of his diffuse status.

RESULTS

Analysis of Change in Compensations.

A two-factor analysis of variance (2x2) revealed that confidence had a significant effect on influence ($F_{(1,88)}=13.84, p<.001$). Confident targets were more influential. Race effects were in the predicted direction, but not significant ($F_{(1,88)}=1.73, p=.19$). The race and confidence interaction was also not significant ($p>.1$). Table 1 shows the means and standard deviations of the awards and the amount of change by conditions.

Table 1 about here

Analysis of semantic differential ratings.

Table 2 provides the mean ratings of the target on each of the task capacity, status attributions and likeability dimensions as well as the univariate (ANOVA) and multivariate (MANOVA) probabilities for the main effects and interactions.

Table 2 about here

Task capacity ratings. As Table 2 indicates, the MANOVA results show highly significant main effects for race ($p<.001$), confidence ($p<.001$) and their interaction ($p<.001$) on the target's task competence. White or confident targets received more positive ratings (main effects). The unconfident black target received the lowest ratings (interaction effect).

In order to interpret the MANOVA results, it is necessary to consult the univariate (ANOVA) findings on each of the six items. As clearly shown in Table 2, the main effects of race ($p<.01$), confidence ($p<.001$) and their interaction ($p<.001$) are strongly present on the "confident" and "sure of self" items. "Convincing" ($p<.001$) and "competent" ($p<.05$) items show additional effects for target's demonstrated confidence. For "consistent" and "intelligent" items, neither race nor confidence made a difference. Subjects might have rated the content of the target's speeches as
"consistent" rather than the style in which they were delivered. The content was constant across all conditions. Moreover, subjects might have been reluctant to rate any one of the targets as unintelligent since they knew that the jurors were also university students like themselves.

Overall then, the perception of target's task capacity was a function of both his race and his demonstrated confidence and their interaction.

**Status Attribution.** MANOVA results also show significant main effects for race (p<.01), confidence (p<.001) and their interaction (p<.01) on the status attributed to the target (Table 2). While white or confident targets received the highest ratings, the unconfident black target received the lowest ratings. These multivariate effects can be traced to confidence effects (p<.001) on "high status", "leader" and "influential", race effects (p<.01) on "high status" and "leader" and a strong interaction effect (p<.001) on "leader" ratings.

**Likeability.** The socioemotional ratings of the target were strongly determined by the multivariate and univariate effects of race, portrayal of confidence and their interaction (p<.001). The unconfident black target received severely negative ratings on all three items (Table 2).

**Ordering of conditions.** From Tables 1 and 2, the ordering of the conditions can be seen. Changes in compensation, are ordered as: white/confident ($5,913) > black/confident ($4,000) > white/unconfident ($2,131) > black/unconfident ($2,000). Differences between the first two (p=.1) or the last two conditions are not significant. However, the incongruent conditions (black/confident and white/unconfident) are significantly different (one-tail t(44)= 1.81, p<.05).

Table 2 also shows an identical ordering of the conditions in target's perceived confidence, status attributions and likeability (in respective order: white/confident= 5.26/4.64/5.06 > black/confident= 5.17/4.55/5.04 >> white/unconfident= 4.56/3.86/ 3.70 > black/unconfident= 3.57/2.70/1.81). None of the white/confident ratings are significantly different from black/confident ratings. The
incongruent conditions (black/confident and white/unconfident), however, are all significantly different (one-tail \( t_{(44)} = 1.99, p < .05 \) for task capacity; \( t_{(44)} = 2.30, p < .05 \) for status attribution and \( t_{(44)} = 3.57, p < .001 \) for likeability). The last two conditions in all three dimensions are also significantly different (one-tail \( t_{(44)} = 3.40, p < .001 \) for task competence; one-tail \( t_{(44)} = 4.23, p < .001 \) for status perception and one-tail \( t_{(44)} = 5.79, p < .001 \) for likeability). Thus, the ordering of conditions support either unequally weighted combining or the buffering models which predict \((R + C^+) > (R - C^+) > (R + C^-) > (R - C^-)\).

**DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS**

In the present study, confidence had significant effects on influence. The race effects were in the predicted direction but not significant. Thus the first hypothesis was partially supported. In the multivariate analyses of the semantic differential ratings, race and confidence effects and their interaction were highly significant. White or confident targets received the highest ratings. The black target who appeared unconfident received the least favourable ratings. He was also disliked the most. These findings fully support the second hypothesis.

The third inquiry was whether race and confidence effects will support the proposed buffering model. The present findings of both objective and subjective measures produced an ordering which parallels both the combining strategy where strength of relevance of confidence is higher than race and the proposed buffering models. However, the strong interaction effects on all three subjective measures are more supportive of the buffering model. Moreover, the observed ordering points to a more sensitive conceptualization of buffering as:

\[ (R + C^+) \sim (R - C^+) > (R - C^+) > (R - C^-) \]

Not only increased similarity (not equivalence) between the first two conditions, but also the dramatic difference of the last condition from the others are in line with the claims based on the buffering model.
Before the implications of these results can be discussed, three issues need clarification. First, participants were females, while the jurors were males. Although this does not explain the between condition differences, it is possible that gender might have attenuated race effects on influence. In other words, whether white or black, the juror could have been influential simply because "males are supposed to be better" on juries (Nemeth, Endicott and Wachtler, 1976; Strodtbeck and Mann, 1956). Future studies can avoid the possibility of this type of attenuation by integrating both the subjects' and the jurors' sex into the design, or by keeping sex constant.

A second issue which cannot be ruled out is the probable differences in the behavior of the two targets. In spite of the practice sessions and numerous tapings, the fact remains that the white and black targets were different people. Perhaps, future research can utilize multiple targets.

A third issue relates to the fact that only one type of task cues (expressive) were employed in this study. Whether the effects of indicative task cues are similar to those that were observed remains to be seen. However, there is reason to believe that indicative cues might not be as strong as the expressive cues about one's task competence (Berger et al. 1986).

Within the above qualifications, the present study shows task cues to have a powerful effect on influence. Yet, as seen in the ordering of conditions, race also had effects. Although the latter did not reach significance, the confident black target was not quite as influential as his white counterpart, while the unconfident black target exerted the least amount of influence. The latter also received the most negative ratings on task capacity, status attributions and was the most disliked.

At this point, the strong discrepancy between the objective measure of influence and the semantic differential ratings needs to be noted, although a robust explanation for the discrepancy is not available. Perhaps, university students have learned the social unacceptability of showing overt forms of rejection while still being less careful about monitoring their negative subjective judgments toward their black peers.
Perhaps, demonstrated confidence remedies only influenceability of the target, without changing the way he (she) is perceived or evaluated.

In the present study, the simultaneous effects of one type of task cues and race were analyzed according to a modified model of the information processing strategies that are used in multiple status situations. The analyses of the incongruent states showed that subjects took both confidence and race of the target into account. Moreover, there is reason to believe that information is processed in more complex ways than the additive aggregation assumption of the combining model. The present findings show a need for an elaboration of the existing cognitive strategies in order to expand their applicability to situations involving diffuse status and non-status characteristics situations such as indicative or expressive task cues.

The current findings suggest that task cues work in ways similar to diffuse status characteristics. With some caution, it may also be added that task cues can buffer the negative generalization of external status. This is an optimistic finding indeed since those who possess the lower states of diffuse status characteristics (blacks, women, etc.,) may be able to increase their influence by modifying the task confidence they demonstrate. Earlier efforts already point to the efficacy of performance characteristics (Cohen and Roper, 1972; Freese, 1974; 1976; Freese and Cohen, 1973; Pugh and Wahrman, 1983) in creating interaction equality among status unequals. To this battery of efforts, we can tentatively include the buffering effects of portrayed confidence.

The claims made in the foregoing study are small indeed. The distinction between the proposed buffering model and existing variations of the combining model may also be small. However, in decision-making situations where status based inequalities abound, we have much to gain from incremental insights into the cognitive information processing strategies that people use. The present study is an attempt to translate one such effort into
Table 1. Means and Standard Deviations\(^a\) of First and Second Compensations and Amount of Change by Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>DEMEANOR</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>MEAN COMPENSATION IN DOLLARS</th>
<th></th>
<th>(\text{MEAN COMPENSATION IN DOLLARS})</th>
<th>(\text{CHANGE})</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>FIRST</td>
<td>SECOND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>15,913</td>
<td>11,913</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>(6.47)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLACK</td>
<td>UNCONFIDENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>12,174</td>
<td>10,174</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>(6.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>CONFIDENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13,826</td>
<td>7,913</td>
<td>5,913</td>
<td>(6.39)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WHITE</td>
<td>UNCONFIDENT</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16,696</td>
<td>14,565</td>
<td>2,131</td>
<td>(6.07)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)Standard deviations are presented in parenthesis.
Table 2. Means and levels of significance on the selected items

differential items by conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ITEMS</th>
<th>CONDITION MEANS</th>
<th>EFFECTS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B/C</td>
<td>B/U</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TASK CAPACITY</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>3.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.02)</td>
<td>(0.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confident</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>1.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.41)</td>
<td>(0.76)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sure of self</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.47)</td>
<td>(1.55)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convincing</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>3.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.71)</td>
<td>(1.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consistent</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>4.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.68)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Competent</td>
<td>4.78</td>
<td>3.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.51)</td>
<td>(1.38)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>5.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
<td>(1.14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STATUS</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATTRIBUTION</td>
<td>(1.05)</td>
<td>(0.86)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Status</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>3.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.09)</td>
<td>(1.17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>2.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.18)</td>
<td>(1.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Influential</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.93)</td>
<td>(1.69)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIKEABILITY</td>
<td>5.04</td>
<td>1.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.21)</td>
<td>(0.78)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pleasant</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.56)</td>
<td>(1.96)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.28)</td>
<td>(1.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>1.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(1.46)</td>
<td>(0.52)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a B=Black W=White C=Confident U=Unconfident
Standard deviations appear in parenthesis
b R=Race T=Task Conf. R*T=Race and Task Conf. Interaction
(*)= p<.05; (**)= p<.01; (***)= p<.001
c Only the positive side of the scales are reported.
Higher numbers indicate a more positive perception.
d Reported MANOVA results are based on Wilks's criteria.
FOOTNOTES

2. Expectation States Theory is a complex theoretical constellation. In the present work, Expectation States Theory is utilized to refer to Status Characteristics and Expectation States formulations.

3. It should be noted that the above example is not a pure form of the "elimination process" as conceptualized by the Expectation States theorists. Hughes's (1945) example is a multiple status characteristics situation in which a single characteristic (race) is activated. Since all colleagues are assumed to be physicians, occupation is not a differentiating characteristic in the group. What is more representative of an elimination process is the tendency of white patients to avoid black doctors which Hughes (1945) briefly mentions.

4. This study was carried out as a four-factor (2x2x2x3) factorial design. Only the (2x2) factorial portion of the results from the first 97 subjects (the lowest common denominator of 23 per condition) are presented here.

5. Each subject was urged to consider herself as serving on the same jury with the "fellow jury members" she saw on the tape. The varying size of experimental groups due to the availability of subjects is unfortunate, but not likely to be a crucial factor in the study.

6. I thank the anonymous reviewer who made this suggestion.
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