

Student Work

---

5-1999

## Communication stereotypes of Caucasian college students

Danna Voorhes Swartz

Follow this and additional works at: <https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork>

 Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Please take our feedback survey at: [https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV\\_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE](https://unomaha.az1.qualtrics.com/jfe/form/SV_8cchtFmpDyGfBLE)

---

### Recommended Citation

Swartz, Danna Voorhes, "Communication stereotypes of Caucasian college students" (1999). *Student Work*. 112.

<https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork/112>

This Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@UNO. It has been accepted for inclusion in Student Work by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@UNO. For more information, please contact [unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu](mailto:unodigitalcommons@unomaha.edu).

COMMUNICATION STEREOTYPES OF CAUCASIAN COLLEGE STUDENTS

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Communication

and the

Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

by

Danna Voorhes Swartz

May 1999

UMI Number: EP72751

All rights reserved

INFORMATION TO ALL USERS

The quality of this reproduction is dependent upon the quality of the copy submitted.

In the unlikely event that the author did not send a complete manuscript and there are missing pages, these will be noted. Also, if material had to be removed, a note will indicate the deletion.



UMI EP72751

Published by ProQuest LLC (2015). Copyright in the Dissertation held by the Author.

Microform Edition © ProQuest LLC.

All rights reserved. This work is protected against unauthorized copying under Title 17, United States Code



ProQuest LLC.  
789 East Eisenhower Parkway  
P.O. Box 1346  
Ann Arbor, MI 48106 - 1346

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Acceptance for the faculty of the Graduate College,  
University of Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the  
requirements for the degree Master of Arts, University of  
Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Marshall Pristell  
Owen G. Mordaunt  
Michael Hill

Chairperson Marshall Pristell

Date 4-16-99

## ABSTRACT

This thesis examined what communication stereotypes are held by Caucasian college students. The literature review focused on defining stereotypes, the function and roles of stereotypes, how stereotypes serve as communication barriers, and findings of previous studies of stereotypes. The research question asked what are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students? Participants in the study were 200 Caucasian, undergraduate students who were asked to complete a survey regarding typical communication characteristics of each group in question. The results indicated uniformity in response to Japanese- and African-Americans with less agreement on characteristics of Mexican-Americans. Discussion, interpretation of results, and future research are explored, especially in the context of the development of stereotypes and how they impact individual perceptions.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Many people deserve my gratitude for their support throughout the duration of my studies. First, I thank Dr. Michael Hilt and Dr. Owen Mordaunt for being a part of the thesis committee. Also, I am forever grateful to Dr. Marshall Prisbell for serving as my advisor and giving me the guidance I needed to complete this thesis. I appreciate you taking on the additional duty of overseeing my graduate work.

Secondly, I thank my parents for providing such a good example and for setting an education as a priority. I thank Patrick for going beyond the call of duty and for always being there when I needed him the most. Your love, patience, computer knowledge, parenting skills and support were invaluable.

And finally, I give a special "thank you" to the three people who truly made the completion of this thesis possible. Alice, thank you for being my special helper who showed me how to keep everything in perspective. Corinna and Bob, I am forever indebted to you. For without you and your unselfish giving of time and energy, I never could have finished.

I thank God for all of you!

## CONTENTS

I.	Title Page	i
	Approval Page	ii
	Abstract	iii
	Acknowledgements	iv
	Contents	v
II.	CHAPTER ONE	
	Statement of the Problem	1
	Review of Literature	5
	Stereotypes Defined	5
	Function and Role of Stereotypes	11
	Stereotypes as Communication Barriers	16
	Previous Studies of Stereotypes	29
	Purpose of Thesis	37
	Replication	37
	Research Question	39
III.	CHAPTER TWO	
	Methodology	40
	Participants	40
	Procedure	40
	Measurement	42
	Data Analysis	43
IV.	CHAPTER THREE	
	Results	46
	Participant Characteristics	46
	Research Question Results	46
	Participant Comments	49
V.	CHAPTER FOUR	
	Discussion	53
	Interpretation of Results	53
	Strengths of the Study	57
	Limitations of the Study	58
	Further Research	60
	Application	61
VI.	NOTES	64

VII. REFERENCES	65
VIII. APPENDICES	
Appendix A - Stereotype Checklist	70
Appendix B - Copy of Communication Behavior Descriptors and Participant Response Forms	71
Appendix C - IRB Proposal & Acceptance	76
IX. TABLES	
Table 1 - African-American Characteristics	82
Table 2 - Mexican-American Characteristics	84
Table 3 - Japanese-American Characteristics	86
Table 4 - Twelve Commonly Assigned African-American Characteristics	88
Table 5 - Twelve Commonly Assigned Mexican-American Characteristics	89
Table 6 - Twelve Commonly Assigned Japanese-American Characteristics	90
Table 7 - Uniformity in Assigned Characteristics	91



## Chapter 1

### Statement of the Problem

In this age of diversity and enlightenment, many would argue that negative stereotypes and their impact on interpersonal relations are decreasing as people become educated to be more sensitive to people of different ethnicity, backgrounds or orientations. If questioned, many would deny holding stereotypes against other races, sexes or groups. But research has shown (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Linville & Fischer, 1998; Leonard & Locke, 1993; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971; Rich, 1974; Weitz & Gordon, 1993) that college students report holding stereotypes towards various groups and those stereotypes have not had a significantly positive or negative change over time. Researchers have examined stereotypes (Allport, 1954; Brislin, 1986; Edwards, 1940; Jussim, Coleman & Lerch, 1987; Leyens, Yzerbyt & Schadron, 1994; Lippman, 1922; Samovar, Porter & Jain, 1981; Schoenfeld, 1942), cultural roles of stereotypes (Baldwin, 1998; Biernat, Vescion & Manis, 1997; Hecht, 1998; Hinton 1993; Maass & Arcuri, 1996; Schaller, Rosell & Asp, 1998; Smith, 1973; Wilder & Simon, 1998; Wittenbrink, Parker &

Judd, 1998) and how these stereotypes become communication barriers (Clyne, 1994; Devine, 1989; Dion, Berscheid & Walster, 1972; Gudykunst, 1991; Hoppner, 1986; Kurokawa, 1971; Lindsley, 1998; Porter & Samovar, 1976; Schenck-Hamlin, 1978; Snyder, Tanke & Berscheid, 1977). All of these factors lead to continued communication problems between ethnic, racial and social factions of American society.

The focus of this thesis is on stereotypes that undergraduate Caucasian college students hold. According to Smith (1973), stereotyping is dangerous for people communicating across racial lines because it prejudices communicators before interacting. He states that a person who believes that Mexican-Americans are lazy will communicate with Mexican-Americans on that stereotype and interact with them with that basis.<sup>1</sup> Similarly if a person believes that Anglo-Americans are not trustworthy, then the person is not likely to enter totally and honestly into communication with an Anglo-American. Smith argues that to be effective communicators, people must respond to each other as individuals first.

To better understand the origin and impact of stereotypes on cross-cultural communication, it is important to

understand how culture, race and ethnicity impact a person's pattern of thought. As stated by Ogawa (1971) stereotyping is a way of patterning that allows people to make shortcuts in their thinking. And because their actions are usually based upon their cognitions, stereotypes are influential in their communicative behavior. As they relate to persons of different ethnic or racial backgrounds from their own, stereotypes tend to provide people with images that they incorporate into their world, or community view. In his research, Ogawa (1971) found that college students considered African-Americans to be militant, Mexican-Americans to be showy, Japanese-Americans to be humble, and Anglo-Americans to be vicious and conniving.

Smith (1973) states that transracial difficulties have seldom been explored in terms of fundamental communication problems that might be avoided by effectively manipulating symbols and signs. He states that when persons of different ethnic backgrounds have problems relating to each other, they resort to "attack" words and name-calling which aims at the other person's character, intelligence or integrity. The disgruntled person blames the difficulty in communication on the other's dishonesty or stupidity.

Smith argues that although blacks and whites living in America have many common experiences, values, and aspirations, there are numerous instances where communication lags because of misunderstandings.

In his study, Smith (1973) lists three reasons why there is a need for positive, effective transracial communication. First he states effective transracial communication increases the possibility of shared meanings and experiences that make for a more orderly society. Secondly, shared meanings and experiences increase the effectiveness of relationships and the opportunity for meaning exchange and interchange of thoughts and ideas. Third, transracial communication tends to have more tension. Strange interactional situations and race differences, unfortunately, can increase individual tension in an already strange setting, and the ability to engage in meaningful communicative behavior with a person of another race is one way to decrease tensions.

The following review of literature looks at how stereotypes are influencing peoples' perceptions of others and how those stereotypes serve as barriers to communication.

## Review of Literature

### Stereotypes Defined

Since Katz and Braly's 1933 study of stereotypes, many scholars have studied stereotypes as a means to understand issues in the realms of sociology, psychology and communication (Allport, 1954; Baldwin, 1998; Brislin, 1986; Edwards, 1940; Hecht, 1998; Huber, 1989; Leyens, Yzerbyt & Schadron, 1994; Lippman, 1922; Samovar, Porter & Jain, 1981; Schaller, Rosell & Asp, 1998; Schoenfeld, 1942). Stereotypes are a key factor in cross-cultural communication and the following definitions can assist in understanding stereotypes.

Lippman (1922) first described stereotyping as a simplification process in which people can understand the environment in which they live that is too big, complex and fleeting for direct acquaintance. He said that stereotypes were pictures in people's heads and renditions of the social world compatible with their values and beliefs. He agreed that stereotypes might have negative consequences, but believed that they were an inevitable feature of normal cognitive processing.

In an effort to facilitate the classification of research in stereotypes, Edwards (1940) categorized the dimensions of stereotypes as:

1. Uniformity – The extent to which an individual's response is in accord with the responses of others.
2. Direction – Favorableness or unfavorableness of the response.
3. Intensity – The degree of favorableness or unfavorableness.
4. Quality – The content of the response.

Using the Edward's classification, Schoenfeld (1942) described the characteristics of stereotypes as:

1. Being held by a number of persons.
2. Referring to a class or type of person or thing.
3. Implying falsification, or at least lack of evidence to support the beliefs involved.
4. Not necessarily being pejorative, but may be flattering.

In another classification, Samovar, Porter and Jain (1981) argue that stereotypes are learned behaviors that tend to be self-perpetuating and impact aspects of intercultural communication. They define stereotypes as overgeneralized, oversimplified, or exaggerated beliefs

associated with a category or group of people. Similarly to Edwards (1940), they state that stereotypes vary in the following areas:

1. Direction – Favorable versus unfavorable.
2. Intensity – How strongly a person believes in a given stereotype.
3. Accuracy – Some stereotypes are false while others may develop from an overgeneralization of facts.
4. Content – All people do not hold the same set of stereotypes for a given group and content also changes over time.

In his 1954 study of the nature of prejudice Allport (1954) describes stereotyping as a person's oversimplification of an experience by attending to certain features of the information only. Based on this selected information, categories and generalizations are formed which help to cope with vast quantities of available data. Similarly, Brislin (1986) defines stereotypes as convenient summarizing statements people employ in organizing their knowledge, or presumed knowledge about others. Brislin states:

The use of stereotypes reflects normal processes of thinking and behaving which are common to all human

beings. Stereotypes are an example of a very useful and important aspect of intelligent and efficient thinking: the formation of categories. People cannot respond to the thousands of individual pieces of information which impinge on their sense each day. Rather, people must gather the individual pieces of information into categories and then respond to the categories. The normal need to categorize also extends to the people with whom an individual interacts. The individual cannot respond to the unique characteristics of all people. Rather, categories must be formed, and these become the focus of the individual's response. (p. 78)

In her study of how stereotypes impact the way a person judges others, Huber (1989) describes stereotyping as the categorization process which simplifies the receiving, storing and retrieving of information about people. It is also a process for simplifying the ordering of conflicting, incomplete, inconsistent or ambiguous information. She defines stereotyping as a phenomenon where a single characteristic can trigger an entire set of other, loosely-defined associations or expectations. Huber (1989) suggests that many stereotypes begin as personal stereotypes, but



through time the stereotypes are manipulated. This manipulation is sometimes in an active form by conscious manipulation, on an individual or mass media level, but mainly done at a non-conscious level which leads to social stereotypes. She argues that social stereotypes are enduring because they are self-enforcing, self-perpetuating and are reinforced by the population within a defined cultural group or area.

In agreement with Huber (1989), Samovar, Porter and Jain (1981) earlier argued that stereotypes are learned from three sources:

1. Stereotypes are learned from parents, relatives, friends and others with whom people interact frequently. The tendency to learn stereotypes is particularly strong when a person has not had sufficient personal experience with the members of the group being stereotyped.

2. Stereotypes are developed through personal experiences. After interacting with one or two members of a group, traits are generalized and people condition themselves to then see those traits in future meetings with members of that group. By selective perception, those traits are reinforced to strengthen stereotypes.

3. Stereotypes are learned through mass media which presents oversimplified generalizations and stereotypes about societal groups.

Leyens, Yzerbyt and Schadron (1994) differentiate between stereotypes and stereotyping. They define stereotypes as shared beliefs about person attributes, usually personality traits, but often also behaviors of a group of people. They argue that this definition is only a small part of the stereotyping process and that stereotypes are the end-product of the process. They define stereotyping as the actual process of applying a stereotypical judgement and determining that an individual is interchangeable with other members in the same category.

In Hecht's (1998) review of how prejudice is communicated, he defines stereotypes as well-learned, widely shared, socially validated general beliefs or cognitions about disempowered groups that reinforce or justify prejudice and reduce ambiguity. He states that stereotypes are consensual beliefs about a group with behavioral implications and are often seen as facts by those who hold them and receive much social support. Hecht (1998) states that most White people are aware of

stereotypes of ethnic minorities, and these stereotypes are activated automatically in the presence of their targets.

When looking at the tolerance levels of groups, Baldwin (1998) defines stereotypes as generalized attitudes, usually seen as negative, associated with mental categories or organizing principles. He states that these attitudes are supported by factors in an individual's environment including family, personal contact and media. In a similar study of intergroup behavior, Schaller, Rosell and Asp (1998) defined stereotypes as "both cognitive structures that are stored in individual minds, as well as consensual beliefs that are shared between individuals and stored in contextual structures" (p. 11).

The next section reviews how these previous definitions assist in understanding the role and function of stereotypes in the formation of impressions and the effectiveness of interpersonal interactions.

### Function and Role of Stereotypes

The function and role of stereotypes also has been the focus of scholars (Biernat, Vescio & Manis, 1997; Hamilton, 1979; Jussim, Coleman & Lerch, 1987; Wilder & Simon, 1998; Wittenbrink, Park & Judd, 1998). Hamilton (1979) says that

through stereotyping, a perceiver makes inferences about a person because of that person's membership in some group. Thus a person's ethnicity serves as a cue which increases the likelihood of the perceivers making certain internal attributions about the person. He states that stereotyping is a process that allows implications about people beyond the information received.

Agreeing that people use stereotypes as part of their interpersonal response mechanism, Jussim, Coleman and Lerch (1987) describe three theories on stereotypes to explain how stereotypes function:

1. Complexity-extremity – People have more categories for people of their own groups and see other groups as less complex.
2. Assumed-characteristics – Stereotypes inform people of important background characteristics of group members.
3. Expectancy violation – When expectations are violated by an out-group member, positive violations are seen more positively than those for in-group members and are seen more negatively than those for in-group members.

Biernat, Vescio and Manis (1997) show that stereotypes function to provide useful information regarding category-specific standards regarding attributes or behavior from

members of a category or group. They argue that in a judgement situation, stereotype activation triggers the evaluation of members in different groups.

Wittenbrink, Park and Judd (1998) illustrate this in an experiment in which eight pieces of information about a subject resulted in different stereotypes if the information was processed configurally, rather than piece-by-piece. They describe how perceivers who believe that African Americans' attributes reflect victim status have quite different evaluative and behavioral reactions to that group than do perceivers who see the same characteristics as indicating African Americans as instigators of aggression. Wittenbrink, Park and Judd (1998) argue that stereotypes are complex, cognitive structures. They suggest that stereotypes include group attributes as well as beliefs about structural relations linking those attributes together and theories about the world that provide causal explanations about stereotype content. They state that pieces of information processed in different combinations can produce impressions that could not be predicted from mere aggregation of information. Samovar, Porter and Jain (1981) describe the rare-zero differential of stereotyping in which a rare trait is identified as the

dominant trait of a group because it is not found in other cultures. They state that when this type of trait is observed, there is a tendency to assume it is wide-spread and typical rather than rare and atypical.

In a study of social perception and behavior, Wilder and Simon (1998) state that:

Stereotypes reflect categorical thinking, and are most likely to affect social perception and behavior when we are engaged in categorical thought. When we contemplate and interaction with someone, particularly someone about whom we know little other than surface information (e.g., gender, occupation), our initial response to that person will be in terms of the social categories to which the individual belongs. The initial response can certainly influence the course of subsequent interaction. But once interaction had begun and we are actively involved in a dynamic relationship, the relationship is the structure that guides our cognitions and subsequent actions. General stereotypes of the social category become relatively unimportant compared with the live interaction. In our view, stereotypes (categorical judgments) have greater impact on expectations of future behavior and

recall of past behavior than on the present, dynamic interaction that engulfs the individual. (p. 38)

After studying stereotypes and racial images, Kurokawa (1972) states:

A social role is a set of prescriptive rules, or guides to behavior, for persons of a given category. What is prescribed for a category is ordinarily performed by its members and expected for them. Prescription, expectancy, and performance all converge in the social role, but in the social stereotype there are categorical expectancies without prescriptions and it is a matter of controversy as to whether or not those of a category perform in such a way as to confirm the expectancy. Stereotypes are not objectionable merely because they are generalizations about categories since they are valuable when true. What is objectionable about them is their ethnocentrism and prejudice involving a negative attitude, a prejudgment, regarding other individuals in terms of their perceived group affiliation. (p. 101)

In an examination of breakdowns in oral discourse, Clyne (1994) argues that miscommunication is a serious issue in communication between cultures because it can go unnoticed

by either party which can increase ethnic and racial stereotypes and cause communication conflict in which dignity and/or trust are threatened. Clyne also argues that different expectations in communication may lead to inter-cultural communication breakdown, but also to inter-cultural communication conflict, stereotypes and prejudice.

Following Kurokawa's (1972) argument that stereotypes can be objectionable and Clyne's (1994) argument that miscommunication causes stereotypes, how stereotypes and communication styles play a key role in developing barriers among groups are reviewed.

#### Stereotypes as Communication Barriers

Samovar, Porter and Jain (1981) state that when communicating with an unfamiliar group, relying on stereotypes is a defense mechanism and device for reducing anxiety. They argue that stereotypes provide a way to overcome frustrations when not knowing how to respond in an environment without familiar symbols or behaviors. They state that rather than expending the energy needed to becoming familiar with other groups, people become willing to reduce confusion by accepting misleading or incorrect information in the form of stereotypes. Within this type



of stereotyping, communication is hindered. They follow with the argument that stereotypes affect perceptions and other cognitive processes during interactions with other groups. Samovar, Porter and Jain (1981) state that stereotypes affect personal encounters in many ways including minimizing the contact with other groups, seriously affecting the quality of interaction to induce distortion and defensive behaviors. They note that defensive and superficial communication reduces the chances of future meaningful interaction which leads to the reinforcement of stereotyping leading to the vicious circle of negative communication. They also note that intense, negative stereotypes can lead to confrontation and open conflicts which often have lasting effects for future communication between the members of the groups involved.

A simple way to understand communication barriers between groups is to use Tafoya's (1983) definition that a barrier to interpersonal communication is anything that prevents, restricts or impedes the convergence of meaning by words or gestures, between two or more persons in a social setting. For the purpose of this thesis, that definition is used to further look at communication barriers as they relate to stereotypes stemming from ideas about different races,

ethnic or cultural groups.

Tafoya (1983) begins the list of communication barriers with deception, defensive behavior, proxemics, physical attractiveness or physical stigmas as potential barriers. He continues the list communication barriers as stemming from:

1. Limitations of a receiver's capacity.
2. Distraction.
3. The unstated assumption.
4. Incompatibility of schemes.
5. Intrusion of unconscious or partly conscious

mechanisms.

6. Confused presentation.
7. The absence of communication facilities.

Tafoya's (1983) list of communication barriers is similar to characteristics listed in previous definitions of stereotypes. Gudykunst (1991) lists stereotypes as a form of communication barrier. He states that stereotypes in and of themselves do not lead to communication breakdowns, but if inaccurate stereotypes are held rigidly, they lead to inaccurate predictors of behavior and misunderstandings. He continues that the cultural and ethnic norms and rules for communication learned as children often contribute to

misunderstandings when communicating with people who are different.

Kurokawa (1971) describes stereotypes as one of the most subtle yet powerful means of maintaining existing prejudices. Hinton (1993) agrees with Kurokawa's description and states that stereotyping is an extreme form of typing where a whole group of people is seen as homogeneous with the same characteristics and are an important factor in prejudice and discrimination. Hinton argues that people consider it "useful" to perceive people in terms of types rather than viewing them in terms of individuality and a descriptive label serves to evoke a range of expectations about the person labeled. When these expectations are fulfilled, the interaction is deemed mutually satisfactory, but if the expectations are not fulfilled, there is a breakdown in interaction. He continues that by seeing a group of people as all having the same characteristics leads to misperceptions, prejudice and causes the person labeled to be offended during the interaction.

In describing the process of communicating between cultures and how to improve communication effectiveness, Gudykunst (1991) explains that:

To illustrate, our stereotypes always affect our communication. Stereotypes, however, lead to ineffective communication more frequently when the person with whom we are communicating comes from another culture than when the person comes from our own culture. One reason for this is that our stereotypes of our culture tend to be more "accurate" and favorable" than our stereotypes of other cultures. "Inaccurate" and "unfavorable" stereotypes of other cultures and ethnic groups cause us to misinterpret messages we receive from members of those cultures and ethnic groups. (p. x)

Gudykunst (1991) argues that in addition to differences in language and culture, stereotypes contributes to misunderstandings in intercultural and interethnic encounters. He states that stereotypes create expectations that often cause messages received from people who are different to be misinterpreted and lead people who are different to misinterpret messages they receive as well. Gudykunst says that the behavior expectations of people from other cultures and/or ethnic groups are based on how they are categorized such as "Mexican-American." He continues by saying that until someone is familiar with the

person to whom they are communicating, interactions with them will be based on the category in which they were placed. Gudykunst (1991) concludes by stating that "stereotypes create self-fulfilling prophecies. We tend to see behavior that confirms our expectations, even when it is absent. We ignore disconfirming evidence when communicating on automatic pilot. If we assume someone else is not competent and communicate with them based on this assumption, they will appear incompetent (even if they are actually competent)" (p.74).

Stereotyping is particularly dangerous for transracial communicators because it prejudices the communicators before they interact (Smith 1973). Smith states that the principle menace of stereotyping is that it does not allow the communicator to see the other as a unique individual. Following this premise, Smith argues that when two people interact, one or the other perceives himself as superior to, or more powerful than, the other person. People often assume a high- or low-status position in relation to the other and this self-conception is determined by immediate and distant influential factors. Smith argues that impressions can often change dramatically during communication when one communicator learns that the other

person is of a low-status ethnic group, even though the initial meeting may have been pleasant. The communicator with preconceived notions about other ethnic groups may adjust his communicative approach to the other person.

In a proposal that racial stereotypes are activated automatically upon detection of membership in a racial group, Devine (1989) argues that because people are exposed to pervasive cultural representations, stereotypes become unintentionally part of a person's perceptions. She also argues that the automatic activation of stereotypes remains in place even among individuals who do not endorse the stereotypic beliefs. Bargh (1992) agrees and states that group stereotypes may be easily activated by the presence of such identifying features as skin color or gender characteristics. And once activated, the stereotype both shapes the interpretation of the target's behaviors and fills in stereotype-consistent features in the perceiver's impression of that target that were not present in the stimulus information.

An important part of communication and barriers to communication is the verbal language that is used. Hinton (1993) reports that a person's voice can be used to characterize him with the regional stereotype associated

with their accent and that voices elicit stereotyped personality judgements. Maass and Arcuri (1996) argue that language is the dominant means by which stereotypes are defined, communicated and assessed. They state that embedded in the lexicon of any language at any given moment in history are social beliefs about groups that are automatically "absorbed" during language acquisition.

Porter and Samovar (1976) further describe the impact of stereotypes on communication. They state that stereotypes interfere with communicative experiences and limit their effectiveness by predisposing people to behave in specific ways when confronted by a particular stimulus and by causing people to attach generalized attributes to others who are encountered. Porter and Samovar (1976) describe an example when stereotypes effected perceptual judgements. In two similar tests of judgements made by English-Canadians toward French-Canadians, it was found that on the basis of speech patterns, language, and dialect, English-Canadians rated French-Canadians unfavorably in areas such as ambition, self-confidence, religiousness, intelligence, dependability, likeability and character. The researchers argue that the stereotypes held by the English-Canadians of the French-Canadians led them to behave negatively toward

stimuli identified as being French-Canadian. They stated that this shows that people make social judgements about others based on stereotype attributes assigned on the basis of insufficient evidence such as the sound of their voice and not on true personal character attributes.

Hoppner (1986) agrees and argues that many problems in intergroup communication that can be attributed to dialect differences are better attributed to the interpretation of these dialects. He argues that members of groups interpretively create dialects related to their social stereotypes of groups. The use of these schemas is not only influenced by the presence of intergroup conflict, but also increases conflict and leads to a focus on intergroup differences. In a study conducted by Biernat, Vescio and Manis (1997) which focused on the stereotypes that Whites are more verbally skilled than African-Americans, participants judged the verbal ability of individuals from each group. Half of the individuals being judged had high ability and the other half had low ability. What the research showed was that when using an objective scale to judge verbal ability, the African-American individuals were always judged to be less verbally able than the White individuals at each level of ability/stereotype.



On an interpersonal level, Maass and Arcuri (1996) state that interpersonal communication uses both linguistic and nonverbal devices to transmit stereotypes just as the mass media. They say that children may develop a negative attitude toward Blacks either by observing their parents avoid contact with Black people or by listening to conversations in which their parents label Blacks as lazy or aggressive. Maass and Acuri suggest that derogatory ethnic labels may have a strong and largely automatic effect on the perception of minority members. Smith (1973) argues that tension and anxieties often result in transracial communication because people operate on heresay, customs and fears which can lead to irrational behavior.

In part with irrational behavior, stereotypes lead to preconceptions about a person or group. Hinton (1993) agrees and states that the consequence of holding stereotyped view is that they can lead to expectations of the behavior of those stereotyped. He gives the example of a teacher holding a stereotype about a racial group that includes low intelligence. The teacher's communication with students of that racial group will reflect that view and generally the students of that racial group will not

perform to their abilities. In another study, Snyder, Tanke and Berscheid (1977) found that male students expected female students to be more sociable, posed, humorous and socially adept when they believed her to be physically attractive rather than unattractive. In a similar study, Dion, Berscheid and Walster (1972) found that female students, assumed to be attractive by male students, behaved in communication in accordance with the stereotype projected for attractive female students. Similarly, male students communicated in different styles and patterns when they assumed the female students to be unattractive. Maass and Acuri (1996) note that people make changes in their communication style to match the stereotypic characteristics of a person's perceived communicational efficiency such as high-class to low-class or health-care professionals to patients.

Similiarily, Schenck-Hamlin (1978) found that "When a listener perceived a speaker to be affiliated with a class of people, a stereotype toward the user of that speech was called up and the listener reacted to the speaker in accordance with the framework of the stereotype" (p. 276). Schenck-Hamlin argues that this happens because stereotyping is a conceptual process that involves

inferring a general set of traits about a group to an individual in that group.

Leonard and Locke (1993) also found that stereotypes had a significant impact on communication between groups. They state that:

Whites are unlikely to approach Blacks if they perceive their behavior as threatening and defensive, as the results of this research indicate. Conversely, Blacks, perceiving or anticipating a threat in interactions with Whites, will probably not approach Whites. With little immediacy or approach in their mutual behaviors, it is certain that Blacks and Whites will not perceive or experience liking of the other. The resultant communication, if indeed there is any, will probably be hostile or, at best, neutral. Few close and trusting relationships can result. (p. 341)

Lindsley (1998) studied the impact of stereotypes on professional growth within organizations. She found that stereotypes increase perceived differences in communicative behavior between ethnic groups. She states that:

Thus, ethnic differences in African American and European American styles of communicating can result in outcomes in which members of each group

misunderstand the other. African Americans may perceive European Americans' relatively indirect forms of assertiveness and less emotionally expressive styles as meaning that Whites are not very open to debate and do not care very much about issues. By contrast, European Americans may misinterpret African American styles as being too aggressive and emotional.

(p. 202)

Lindsley (1998) continues by stating that stereotypes serve as filters for interpreting communicative behaviors. For example, an African American male who likes to debate can be seen as dangerous because of stereotypes related to violence. Lindsley argues that stereotypes negate individual identity and cause characteristics to be imposed on someone solely based on group membership.

Studies of communication and stereotypes have found that stereotypes impede communication among groups and often cause existing stereotypes to be compounded. The following section reviews studies which document stereotypes held by various groups throughout this century.

### Previous Studies of Stereotypes

The research conducted in this thesis will follow that of Ogawa (1971) which studied communication stereotypes. This section reviews studies which led to Ogawa's focus.

In 1933, Katz and Braly published what would become a much replicated study (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Linville & Fischer, 1998; Leonard & Locke, 1993; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971; Rich, 1974; Weitz & Gordon, 1993) on the racial stereotypes of college students. For their study, they worked from the premise in Katz's previous research that "Attitudes toward racial and national groups are in good part attitudes toward race names. Attitudes are stereotypes of our cultural pattern and are not based upon animosity toward a member of a proscribed group because of any genuine qualities that inhere in him" (p. 280).

In their study of racial stereotypes of college students, Katz and Braly (1933) asked 100 Princeton students to choose, from 84 adjectives, the traits which they considered to be the most characteristic of each of the following 10 groups which were significant ethnic groups during that time: Germans, Italians, Negroes, Irish, English, Jews, Americans, Chinese, Japanese and Turks.

Katz and Braly concluded that the degree of agreement among student responses in assigning characteristics seemed too great to be the result of direct contact with members of the group. They found that the traits assigned to each group were those consistent with common characterizations and popular stereotypes found in the media.

Following Katz and Braly, Meenes (1943) conducted a follow-up study to compare the racial stereotypes of students in 1935 and 1942 at Howard University. He followed the same procedure as Katz and Braly in an effort to determine if the propaganda and news surrounding the events of 1942 impacted racial stereotypes. He found that the stereotypes obtained in 1942 agreed in large measure with those of the 1935 study at Howard University except for the Chinese, Japanese, Germans, Turks and Italians. The stereotypes for those groups changed positively or negatively depending on their role in World War II.

Again at Princeton University, Gilbert (1951) conducted a follow-up study to Katz and Braly on the stereotype persistence and change among college students. His goal was to give attention to "the extent to which stereotypes persist or fade in the course of time, or undergo radical changes as an accompaniment of shifting international

relations, socioeconomic conditions and propaganda"(p. 245). Gilbert cited Meenes (1943) as giving a useful indication of changing conceptions, but argued that the study did not cover a long enough span to indicate broad psychocultural trends in stereotype persistence and change. In his study, Gilbert found evidence of persistence of stereotypes with characteristics being the most common in 1932 also being the most frequent in 1950.

Following Gilbert's study, researchers who have replicated Katz and Braly's study have done so with fewer racial groups that are more applicable to the current racial climate. Kurokawa (1971) studied the mutual perceptions of racial images between White, Black and Japanese Americans. Using Katz and Braly's adjective list, adults, college students and school children in California were surveyed. She states that because the time, location and composition of the samples is so different from Katz and Braly's study, she is concerned with how the self versus other perceptions differ and not how the stereotypes listed directly compare with the Katz and Braly study. She found that "minority acceptance of the negative image ascribed by the dominant group, which was generally true in

the Katz and Braly study, did not hold true in this study" (p. 213).

In 1971, Ogawa argued that previous studies such as Katz and Braly (1933) and Gilbert (1951) were too concerned with stereotypes in a broad sense and he wanted to look at specific behavior in a specific situation. His research focused on Black communication in a small discussion group situation and how students stereotypically expected Black Americans to behave in a discussion situation. Ogawa defines stereotypes as "relatively simple, generally rigid cognitions of social groups which blind the individual to the manifold differences among the members of any group-- racial, ethnic, age, sex, social class" (p. 274). He used Katz and Braly's checklist methodology for determining stereotypes and developed a stereotype checklist of ethnic communication characteristics. This checklist was developed by asking 35 Caucasian undergraduates at the University of California at Los Angeles what they considered the communication characteristics of Black-, Mexican- and Japanese-Americans in a discussion situation. The students' list was supplemented with terms from Katz and Braly's original list and from research of contemporary stereotypes of the three groups. The final checklist



included 57 traits (see Appendix A) and was given to 100 Caucasian undergraduate students in basic speech classes at the University of California at Los Angeles. Although Ogawa's study centered on Black-Americans, he stated that he added the Mexican and Japanese groups to have a comparative base and provide subjects with a chance to contrast groups.

Ogawa found that traits listed for Black- and Mexican-Americans had a remarkably close resemblance to each other. The top four traits for Black-Americans were argumentative, emotional, aggressive and straightforward. The top four traits for Mexican-Americans were emotional, argumentative, sensitive and straightforward. Japanese-Americans were found to be intelligent, courteous, industrious and quiet. Ogawa concluded that:

Finally, stereotypes can elicit a selective perception process, thereby blocking open-minded consideration of what blacks say. Rather than being viewed at the moment of utterance, for its own worth and in the specific discussion situation, black communication would be preconceived and unequally evaluated through the referent of stereotypes. Response to black communication would not be geared to what is, but to

what is predisposed to be. In short, black participation in the mainstream of contemporary social dialogue can be hindered by communication stereotypes. (p. 280)

Rich (1974) used Ogawa's (1971) methodology to learn what communication stereotypes Black ghetto residents assign to Anglo-, Japanese- and Mexican-Americans. She found that Anglo-Americans are seen as evasive, critical, conservative, ignorant and boastful. Japanese-Americans are seen as intelligent, industrious, soft-spoken, reserved and nonmilitant. Finally, Mexican-Americans were described as emotional, radical, talkative, argumentative and loud.

Leonard and Locke (1993) followed the studies of Ogawa (1971) and Rich (1974) to determine if perception of communication stereotypes had changed. Using a modified version of Ogawa's checklist, Leonard and Locke questioned Black and White undergraduate students about communication stereotypes. The researchers found that Blacks perceived Whites as demanding, manipulative, organized, rude and critical. Whites perceived Blacks as loud, ostentatious, aggressive, active and boastful.

Weitz and Gordon (1993) used Katz and Braly's method to study the stereotypes of black women by white, female

college undergraduates. Using a modified Katz and Braly scale, they found that the images of black women differed substantially from those of American women in general. They found that black women were characterized as loud, talkative, aggressive, intelligent, straightforward and argumentative while American women in general were found to be intelligent, materialistic, sensitive, attractive and sophisticated. The researchers argued that through this study, black women are found to be threatening even by those who otherwise appeared to be nonracist and nonsexist.

Linville and Fischer (1998) argue that it is difficult to change stereotypes. They show that when a group is homogeneous, people are more likely to generalize stereotype-consistent information about an individual to the group as a whole, but less likely to generalize counter-stereotypic information about an individual to the group. They argue that seeing groups as homogeneous facilitates stereotype formation, resilience, application and overall the evaluations of group members are more extreme. They note that people most often view their outgroups as being more stereotypic than their ingroups. They state that African-American college students viewed White students as more stereotypic than themselves. But

interestingly they found that White students reported themselves as more stereotypic. They suggest that White students are learning to de-emphasize ethnic differences, whereas African-American students have an increasing value for ethnic pride and differences.

As found in the previous studies noted in the literature review, stereotypes have been a part of American culture and play a role in the way society functions. The next section reviews what stereotypes are held by college students today.

### Purpose of Thesis

Understanding the impact of stereotypes is a difficult task and many scholars have followed Katz and Braly's (1933) original study in order to determine the stereotypes of various groups in society. The purpose of this thesis will be a replication of a previous study so definitions of replication will be reviewed in relation to the research question.

### Replication

The value of replication has been noted by many scholars including Fisher (1942), Tukey (1969), Cohen (1965), Gulliksen (1968), Barker and Gurman (1972), and Kelly, Chase and Tucker (1979).

Barker and Gurman (1972) noted that a replication experiment is a "time-honored scientific report" designed to repeat an experiment to better examine the conclusions of a colleague's experiment. But Barker and Gurman also argue that true replication is an unattainable ideal in behavioral science research because of changes in subjects and other variables. They argue that an experimenter

should choose to replicate an experiment according to one of the following and that the success is measured in terms of equivalence of results:

1. Both the procedural and dependent variables.
2. Only the dependent variables.
3. Only the procedural variables.
4. Neither the procedural nor dependent variables.

In an argument for replication, Lykken (1968) states that "most theories should be tested by multiple corroboration and most empirical generalizations by constructive replication" (p. 151). He goes onto define the three types of replication as:

1. Literal - Attempting to duplicate the experimenters exact sampling procedure, experimental treatments, measuring techniques and methods of analysis.
2. Operational - Duplicating the sampling and experimental procedures used by the experimenter to determine if the same results can be produced.
3. Constructive - Attempting to obtain the same results through whatever means possible.

Kelly, Chase and Tucker (1979) define a replication experience as a study which copies or reproduces an experiments methods, procedures and outcomes. They list

four categories of replications that reflect increasing levels of both departure from the original study and generalizability of research:

1. Literal – Earlier findings are reexamined using the same manipulations and measures.

2. Operational – The essential conceptual meaning remains unchanged, but criterion measures are varied and the dependent variable would represent a different operationalization of the construct.

3. Instrumental – Dependent measures are replicated and experimental manipulations are varied.

4. Constructive – Both manipulations and measures are varied while attempting to achieve equivalent results to the original.

#### Research Question

The purpose of this thesis is to conduct a literal replication of Ogawa's (1971) study and investigate the following research question:

RQ1: What are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students?

## Chapter 2

### Methodology

The methodology for this thesis followed Ogawa's (1971) study of communication stereotypes in which he used Katz and Braly's (1933) checklist methodology to question 100 undergraduate students about stereotypes of African-, Mexican- and Japanese-Americans.

### Participants

Participants were 200 Caucasian undergraduate University of Nebraska at Omaha students. Participants were selected from basic communication courses. The participants' responses will remain anonymous and confidential. After completing the questionnaire, the participants were informed of the purpose of the study.

### Procedure

Participants were administered a checklist form (Ogawa, 1971) which included words from Katz and Braly's (1933) original stereotype checklist and stereotypes Ogawa found to represent communication stereotypes of African-, Mexican- and Japanese-Americans. Traits were randomly



ordered to form a 57-trait checklist (see Appendix A for the checklist).

The stereotype checklist and response forms were distributed by the researcher during communication classes to the undergraduate students (see Appendix B for a copy of the questionnaire given to the participants).

Only forms from 200 Caucasian students were used. Forms from non-Caucasian students and graduate students were discarded. The written instructions supplied to the students were:

Read through the following list of words and circle those which seem to you typical of the communicative behavior of African-Americans. Circle as many of the words in the following list as you think are necessary to characterize the communication of these people adequately. If you do not find appropriate words on this page for all the typical African-American characteristics, you may add those which you think necessary for an adequate description.

When finished, participants were asked to place the response sheet face down and to not make any changes or refer to that page again. They were also instructed not to write their names on the form. Participants were then asked to repeat the process with the checklist for Mexican-Americans and Japanese-Americans. Finally, participants were given the following verbal instructions:

Now go back over the three lists of words which you have chosen and mark with an X the five words in each list which seem to you the most typical of the communicative action of the ethnic group in question.

The design of this study, which replicated Ogawa's (1971) study, is similar to that used in other previous studies (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Linville & Fischer, 1998; Leonard & Locke, 1993; Meenes, 1943; Rich, 1974; Weitz & Gordon, 1993). The primary difference between this thesis and previous studies is the ethnic groups used. Ethnic groups targeted in earlier studies represent the immigrant and minority groups relevant at the time of the studies.

### Measurement

Participants were asked to choose among 57 different communication stereotypes as related to African-, Mexican- and Japanese-Americans. The stereotypes were listed in a random order as done in Ogawa's (1971) study. Ogawa developed the list by asking Caucasian undergraduates what they considered the communication characteristics of these groups. The five characteristics of each group, determined to be the most typical, were noted by the participants on a response form.

The response form also contained questions regarding the participant's gender, age, ethnic background and year in school. Response forms from non-Caucasian participants were not used.

The content or face validity of the measurement is shown through the degree to which the stereotype checklist form includes positive, negative and neutral communication stereotype options from which participants can choose. The stereotype checklist form has been shown to be a reliable measurement tool through the consistency of responses in previous similar studies of stereotypes and those which conducted a comparative analysis to previous studies of stereotypes (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Linville & Fischer, 1998; Leonard & Locke, 1993; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971; Rich, 1974; Weitz & Gordon, 1993).

### Data Analysis

The research question explored is "what are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students?" To answer this question, the findings were reviewed in two ways as was done in

previous studies (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971).

First, the total chosen characteristics and percentage of the chosen characteristics for the communication characteristics participants checked as the five most typical characteristics of each group were calculated. From those totals, the 12 most frequently assigned communication characteristics were listed to give a summarization of the characteristics that students checked as the five most typical characteristics of each group.

Secondly, the degree of uniformity of participants' communication characteristic selection was determined. In order to determine the degree of uniformity of the maintained stereotypes, Katz and Braly's (1933) probability model for degree of agreement was used. Katz and Braly's (1933) method for determining degree of agreement is to calculate the least number of characteristics which have to be included to find 50 percent of the total possible votes cast by the participants for each racial/cultural group. In this thesis, if there was no patterning of chosen characteristics, half of the characteristics (28.5) would receive 50 percent of the votes. If the participants agree

on the five most common characteristics, 2.5 characteristics would receive 50 percent of the votes.

Demographic data of participants is reported in this thesis. The racial information given by participants was used to eliminate the responses of those participants who did not label themselves as Caucasian/White on the Communication Behavior Descriptors and Participant Response Form.

## Chapter 3

### Results

The purpose of this thesis was to investigate the research question of what communication stereotypes do Caucasian undergraduate college students hold towards African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans. To investigate this question, 200 participants were administered a questionnaire asking them to select typical communication characteristics of African-, Japanese- and Mexican-Americans based on Ogawa's (1971) study. Other demographic questions were also asked.

#### Participant Characteristics

Of the 200 Caucasian undergraduate students sampled, 106 (53%) were male and 94 (47%) were female. The mean age of the subjects was 21.6 years old. Participants year in school was reported as 81 (40.5%) freshman, 41 (20.5%) sophomores, 33 (16.5%) juniors and 45 (22.5%) seniors.

#### Research Question Results

The research question asked, "what are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and

Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students?" Following Ogawa's (1971) study, the totals for each communication characteristic participants checked as the five most common were calculated (see Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 for totals and percentages for each group). From those totals, the 12 most frequently assigned communication characteristics were listed (see Table 4, Table 5 and Table 6).

African-Americans were reported to be loud (F = 80, 40%), straightforward (F = 61, 30.5%), ostentatious (F = 53, 26.5%), talkative (F = 52, 26%), emotional (F = 50, 25%), boastful (F = 47, 23.5%), aggressive (F = 46, 23%), intelligent (F = 43, 21%), individualistic (F = 42, 21%), argumentative (F = 38, 19%), open (F = 32, 16%), and noisy (F = 29, 14.5%). Mexican-Americans were characterized as soft-spoken (F = 32, 16%), emotional (F = 32, 16%), courteous (F = 32, 16%), ignorant (F = 32, 16%), quiet (F = 31, 15.5%), hesitant (F = 30, 15%), talkative (F = 29, 14.5%), reserved (F = 28, 14%), straightforward (F = 26, 13%), uninvolved (F = 26, 13%), quarrelsome (F = 24, 12%), humble (F = 23, 11.5%), inarticulate (F = 23, 11.5%), and loud (F = 23, 11.5%). Japanese-Americans were stereotyped as intelligent

(F = 125, 62.5%), courteous (F = 77, 38.5%), soft-spoken (F = 66, 33%), quiet (F = 49, 24.5%), efficient (F = 44, 22%), humble (F = 38, 19%), industrious (F = 36, 18%), conservative (F = 33, 16.5%), reserved (F = 32, 16%), practical (F = 26, 13%), passive (F = 25, 12.5%), imaginative (F = 24, 12%), and meditative (F = 24, 12%).

Secondly, the degree of uniformity of participants' communication characteristic selection was determined by using Katz and Braly's (1933) probability model for degree of agreement. The Katz and Braly (1933) method for determining degree of agreement is to calculate the least number of characteristics which have to be included to find 50 percent of the total possible votes cast by the participants for each group. In this thesis, if there was no patterning of chosen characteristics, half of the characteristics (28.5) would receive 50 percent of the votes. If the participants agree perfectly on the five most common characteristics, 2.5 characteristics would receive 50 percent of the votes. In this study, the number of communicative characteristics per group which must be included to find 50 percent of the votes are 9.6 for African-Americans, 19.44 for Mexican-Americans and 9.0 for Japanese-Americans (see Table 7).



The low number of characteristics needed to reach 50 percent suggests that a degree of uniformity exists for all three sets of responses. Japanese-Americans appear to be seen the most stereotypically.

### Participant Comments

Although not analyzed statistically, participants provided written, verbal and non-verbal feedback in addition to what was provided through the survey.

Additional characteristics were listed by participants. Characteristics added for African-Americans were defensive and group-oriented. Characteristics added for Mexican-Americans were dirty, poetic, egocentric, humorous and hard-working. One participant divided Mexican-American characteristics by gender and listed males as argumentative, critical quarrelsome, arrogant and rude. Females were characterized as sensitive, courteous and reserved. One participant responded with, "Don't know much about Mexican-Americans." Japanese-Americans were characterized as nice and helpful. One participant used fictional film personalities to characterize Mexican-Americans as "Cheech and Chong" while characterizing Japanese-Americans as "Jackie Chan."

Participants also wrote comments on their surveys. One participant noted that characteristics "varies with the person." A participant posed the question, "I don't understand why we are stereotyping. Are we not supposed to be getting away from the racial views?!" One participant who completed the survey wrote, "I don't feel comfortable simply providing stereotypes for your study. This is not a good representation of actual attitudes and beliefs - what about the reasons behind these words?" A participant stated, "Each person is different ... I'm sure someone has one of each of these qualities. People are all different. I don't know how to pick a category based on skin color." Another participant noted that, "It depends on the person. Not all talk the same. All of these can define different people at different times."

Some students chose not to participate in the survey and did not accept a copy, put the survey in the trash or handed it back after looking at the first page. There were 20 students who chose to participate, but after completing the first page with demographic information left the rest of the survey blank. Their comments included:

1. You know what I decided, is that every human being no matter what gender they are is all of these things, and that is why I am not filling out the rest of this survey.

2. No typical communicative behavior

3. I don't think that you can characterize any group of people (grouped by race, gender, age, whatever). These characteristics depend on the individual, not the group they're in.

4. (page 1) I don't think I can pick out certain words to describe an entire race when all people are different.

(page 2) I don't know every Mexican-American that lives, so I'm not going to stereotype the entire race. (page 3) Every person is different! He or she may possess some or none of these words.

5. (page 1) I think all of these are true. Different people have different characteristics so I guess all of them. I agree with all of them. (page 2) For me these once again are stereotypes. None of these together denote an entire race. Many Mexican-Americans are a mixture of all. (page 3) Each is unique. All cultures have a combination of all those characteristics. They can't define one group of people. These are characteristics of all humans not just a certain race.

6. I feel that all of these apply to each race. It depends on the purpose or person, not race. Everyone of these can be found in every race.

There were 45 surveys which were not included as part of the research question results because participants were not Caucasian or were graduate students. Of those participants, only one chose not to complete the survey after receiving it. Two students made comments which included:

1. I have chosen all of the characteristics in each category 12-68 for all three pages. It is unconvincing to categorize the actions of an entire group because everyone is different. Thanks.

2. (page 1) I have met people like all of these. Can't do it with African-Americans. (page 2) Everyone is different. Can't do it with Mexican-Americans. All of them were especially ostentatious (number 29) though. (page 3) Again, I've met different Japanese with all of these qualities. However, Japanese do seem to have these characteristics in common. (Note: Participant listed courteous, reserved, soft-spoken, and quiet as typical communication characteristics.)

## Chapter 4

### Discussion

In the preceding chapter, the results of investigating the research question of what communication stereotypes do Caucasian undergraduate college students hold towards African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans were reported. In this chapter, the research question is examined in regard to the results. Strengths and limitations of the research, as well as suggestions for further research are discussed.

### Interpretation of Results

The research question examined in this thesis was:

RQ1: What are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students?

Caucasian undergraduate college students saw African-Americans as loud, straightforward, ostentatious, talkative and emotional. Mexican-Americans were seen as soft-spoken, emotional, courteous, ignorant and quiet. Japanese-Americans were seen as intelligent, courteous, soft-spoken, quiet and efficient (see Table 1, Table 2 and Table 3 for

complete lists). From the calculation of the degree of uniformity it is found that Japanese-Americans are viewed in a more stereotypical fashion than African- or Mexican-Americans. Comments made by participants and non-participants regarding the survey administered generally showed a negative perception of stereotypes and the process of stereotyping.

In following conclusions by previous researchers, a few points should be made regarding this thesis. First, overall characteristics listed by participants in this study towards African-Americans show similar patterns in aggressive characteristics, but an increase in reported intelligence than previous studies (Gilbert, 1951; Katz & Braly, 1933; Kurokawa, 1971; Leonard & Locke, 1993; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971; Weitz & Gordon, 1993). Similarly, Mexican-Americans are seen as less aggressive than previous studies (Kurokawa, 1971; Ogawa, 1971). Characteristics listed for Japanese-Americans appear to be similar in intelligence level, but less threatening than previous studies (Gilbert, 1951; Kurokawa, 1971; Meenes, 1943; Ogawa, 1971). Although this has not been calculated statistically, an overview of the research appears to show

a change in reported stereotypes which encompasses more positive attributes in this thesis than previous studies.

Second, uniformity in responses leads to questions regarding the reasons for the low and high uniformity in responses. What is the reason for the high uniformity in response for Japanese-Americans, which is a non-prevalent group in the Omaha metropolitan area where the survey was administered? What is the reason for the low uniformity in response to African-Americans which is the predominant minority group in the area? And finally, is there a reason for the contrasting low uniformity and lack of any predominant characteristics selected in regard to Mexican-Americans? In his study of changes in stereotypes, Gilbert (1951) showed similar degrees of uniformity to responses in Katz and Braly's (1933) study which showed a higher degree of uniformity in responses to groups that were more familiar to survey participants. Schoenfeld (1942) argues that previous researchers have been in error when stating there should be greater uniformity in response to groups with which participants have recently been in conflict, least definite for distant and unfamiliar people, and intermediate for their own or related groups. Schoenfeld's findings showed the greatest uniformity in responses to

groups that participants were not in conflict with and to which they were familiar. Kurokawa (1971) argues that whether or not familiarity impacts stereotyping depends on the nature of personal contact. She states that "While casual, superficial contact may reinforce prejudice, contact that bring knowledge and acquaintance are likely to engender sounder beliefs concerning racial groups" (p. 233).

Finally, participants and non-participants had diverse reactions towards taking survey. Some participants seemed to find value in discovering communication barriers while other were offended by the idea of stereotyping. In his study which reviewed changes in reported stereotypes by college students, Gilbert (1951) states that:

The present generation of college students is more reluctant than the previous generation to make stereotyped generalizations about the character of ethnic groups, especially those with whom they have had little contact. Some students regard it as almost an insult to their intelligence to be required to make such generalizations, while others do so with considerable reservations. This is clear in spite of the fact that some of the stereotypes (like Negro and



Jew) persist to a fair degree while others (like German and Japanese) have changed in a negative direction as a result of recent hostilities. With these exceptions, there is less ethnocentric bias and uncritical generalization in group characterization by the educated American 'majority group.' (p. 252)

### Strengths of the Study

The first strength pertains to the purpose of this thesis which was to conduct a literal replication of Ogawa's (1971) study of communication stereotypes. According to Lykken's (1968) and Kelly, Chase and Tucker's (1979) definitions of literal replications, this thesis met the criteria of duplicating Ogawa's methodology by using a similar sample, procedure, measurement and analysis.

Another strength of this study was the size of the participant population. Of the 200 Caucasian undergraduate students sampled, 106 (53%) were male and 94 (47%) were female. The students sampled ranged in age from 17 to 48.

### Limitations of the Study

The first limitation of the thesis is the simplicity of the survey instrument. Rich (1974) argues that the methodology employed by Ogawa (1971) is flawed by a lack of sophistication, but that its simplicity makes it an excellent tool for an initial investigation into communication stereotypes. Schoenfeld (1942) states that studies following the Katz and Braly methodology do not take into account participants familiarity with groups they are characterizing. Huber (1989) reports that two main criticisms of stereotype research are the unnatural method of investigation because it involves the description of a person without actually referring to a person. And secondly, the subject's impressions revolve around an invented person and relation to a stereotype. Huber (1989) also criticizes the testing procedure of stereotyping stating that the three main methods of adjective checklists, evaluation of photographs and rating of statements limit the raters to a list of preselected items which may not be relevant to the rater or group being rated. Weitz and Gordon (1993) argue that the most common technique for investigating minority stereotyping is the Katz and Braly scale which they argue contains too many

male characteristics and encourages participants to only envision men when completing the survey. Weitz and Gordon (1993) also argue that using terms such as African-American implies a "politically correct" view and could decrease participants willingness to give non-politically correct answers.

Further research should encompass an updated list of characteristics. For example, in the initial stage of their research Katz and Braly (1933) asked students to give traits they considered most characteristic of the groups in question. Ogawa (1971) developed his list by asking undergraduate students for communication characteristics and these were combined with the original Katz and Braly (1933) list. Leonard and Locke (1993) redefined the list used by Ogawa (1971) by replacing terms that did not clearly describe communication.

An additional limitation to this type of stereotype research is reluctance by participants to classify groups of people. Despite being assured anonymity, some survey participants for this thesis verbally questioned the appropriateness or repercussions of responding with non-flattering responses. Other participants voluntarily provided written comments regarding their resistance to

group classification. Additionally, researchers have noted that there are differences in public and private attitudes people display towards various groups (Katz & Braly, 1933).

### Further Research

This thesis has raised additional issues and concerns regarding stereotypes and how they relate to communication barriers between ethnic and racial groups. Future research could review the origin of stereotypes. Research questions could focus on the origin of stereotypes by determining the role media messages play in stereotype development.

Stereotype development could be studied in the context of a person's background and how the amount of personal contact with various groups impacts stereotype development. Leonard and Locke (1993) argue that factors such as socioeconomic class, age and geographical location impact held stereotypes.

Further research could also explore how gender impacts reported stereotypes. Studies could review differences in stereotypes as reported by each gender towards similar groups. Additionally, studies could review differences in stereotypes as reported for each gender in similar groups.

Age could also play a part in stereotypes held. Research could review variances in stereotypes held by different age groups or study at what age stereotypes are acquired. Ross (1992) argues that the psychocultural dispositions, rooted in early learning experiences, are crucial in creating commonly held images of the self and others and determine a society's overall level of conflict. Additional research could also review how communication stereotypes are translated into perceptions by those holding the stereotypes.

### Application

The information learned about stereotypes can be applied in many disciplines to assist people in enhancing communicating. Students in all fields could benefit from developing an understanding of what stereotypes they hold and how those stereotypes impact their communication. Additionally, students can gain an understanding of how they propagate stereotypes and what measures can be taken to decrease societal levels of conflict. This information could be used within academic and organizational settings.

Examples of how this can be used include training managers and others in organizational authority to

understand how stereotypes influence their perception of co-workers and may negatively impact competency levels (Gudykunst, 1991; Porter & Samovar, 1976). Co-workers also should have an understanding of how stereotypes they hold can cause communication to break down between groups and impact a person's professional growth within an organization (Lindsley, 1998). Those working in academic fields at all levels should be aware of how their communication reflects stereotypes and in turn effects student performance (Hinton, 1993). Similarly, people in fields such as healthcare should be aware of how they change their communication style when working with patients with various perceived stereotypic characteristics (Maass & Acuri, 1996). An equally important area which impacts the origins of stereotypes is the mass media (Huber, 1989; Samovar, Porter & Jain, 1981). People in the media should become skilled in understanding how the words and images projected to society at large can develop, reinforce or perpetuate negative stereotypes.

In summary, this thesis reflects past research findings of group stereotypes held by college students. The views reported in this thesis illustrates the need for additional research regarding stereotypes and how to effectively

counteract the communication barriers brought by stereotypes.

**NOTES**

1. Terms for groups have changed over the course of time. References in this thesis to groups reflect the terms, punctuation, capitalization and spelling used by each researcher in the individual studies.



## REFERENCES

- Allport, G.W. (1954). The nature of prejudice. Reading, MA; Addison Wesley.
- Baldwin, J.R. (1998). Tolerance/Intolerance. In Hecht, M.L. (Ed.) Communication Prejudice. (pp. 24-56) London: Sage.
- Bargh, J.A. (1992). Does subliminality matter to social psychology? In R.F. Bornstein & T.S. Pittman (Eds.), Perception without awareness: Cognitive, clinical and social perspectives (pp.236-255). New York: Guilford.
- Barker, H.R., & Gurman, E.B. (1972). Replication versus tests of equivalence. Perceptual and Motor Skills, 35, 807-815.
- Biernat, M., Vescio, T.K. & Manis, M. (1998). Judging and behaving toward members of stereotyped groups: A shifting standards perspective. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler & C.A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior (pp. 151-175). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Brislin, R. W. (1986). Prejudice and intergroup communication. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intergroup Communication (pp.74-85). London: Edward Arnold Limited.
- Cohen, J. (1965). Some statistical issues in psychological research. In B.B. Wolman (Ed.), Handbook of Clinical Psychology (pp. 95-121). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Clyne, M. (1994). Inter-cultural Communication at Work. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Devine, P.G. (1989). Stereotypes and prejudice: Their automatic and controlled components. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 56, 5-18.
- Dion, K., Berscheid, E. & Walster, E. (1972). What is beautiful is good. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 24, 285-290.

Edwards, A.L. (1940). Studies of stereotypes. Journal of Social Psychology, 12, 357-366.

Fisher, R.A. (1942). The design of experiments. Edinburgh, England: Oliver and Boyd.

Gilbert, G.M. (1951). Stereotype persistence and change among college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 46, 245-254.

Gudykunst, W.B. (1991). Bridging differences-- effective intergroup communication. Newbury Park, CT: Sage.

Gulliksen, H. (1968). Methods for determining equivalence of measures. Psychological Bulletin, 70, 534-544.

Hamilton, D.L. (1979). A cognitive attribution analysis of stereotyping. Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, 12, 53-84.

Hecht, M.L. (Ed.). (1998). Communication Prejudice. London: Sage.

Hinton, P.R. (1993). The psychology of interpersonal perceptions. London: Routledge.

Hopper, R. (1986). Speech evaluation of intergroup dialect differences: The shibboleth schema. In W.B. Gudykunst (Ed.), Intergroup Communication (pp.127-136). London: Edward Arnold Limited.

Huber, S. (1989). The impact of stereotypes on person judgement. Frankfurt on the Main, Germany: Peter Lang.

Jussim, L., Coleman, L.M. & Lerch, L. (1987). The nature of stereotypes: A comparison and integration of three theories. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 52, 536-546.

Katz, B. & Braly, K. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 28, 280-290.

Kelly, C.W., Chase, L.J., & Tucker, R.K. (1979). Replication in experimental communication research: An analysis. Human Communication Research, 5, 338-342.

Kurokawa, M. (1971). Mutual perceptions of racial images: White, black, and Japanese Americans. Journal of Social Issues, 27, 213-235.

Kurokawa, M. (1972). Stereotypes and racial images--white, black and yellow. Human Relations, 25, 101-120.

Lindsley, S.L. (1998). Communicating prejudice in organizations. In Hecht, M.L. (Ed.) Communication Prejudice. (pp. 187-205) London: Sage.

Lippmann, W. (1957). Public Opinion. London: Collier-Macmillan Limited.

Leonard, R., & Locke, D.C. (1993). Communication stereotypes - Is interracial communication possible?, Journal of Black Studies, 23, 332-343.

Leyens, J., Yzerbyt, V. & Schadron, G. (1994). Stereotypes and Social Cognition. London: Sage.

Linville, P.W. & Fischer, G.W. (1998). Group variability and covariation: Effects on intergroup judgment and behavior. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler & C.A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior (pp. 123-150). London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lykken, D.T. (1968). Statistical significance in psychological research, Psychological Bulletin, 70, 151-159.

Maass, A., & Arcuri, L. (1996). Language and stereotyping. In C.N. Macrae, C. Stangor, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), Stereotypes and Stereotyping (pp. 193-226). New York: Guilford.

Mackie, D.M. & Smith E.R. (1998). Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior: Crossing the boundaries. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler & C.A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior (pp. 423-450). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Meenes, M. (1943). A comparison of racial stereotypes of 1935 and 1942. Journal of Social Psychology, 17, 327-336.

Ogawa, D.M. (1971). Small group communication stereotypes of black Americans. Journal of Black Studies, 1, 273-281.

Rich, A.L. (1974) Interracial Communication. New York: Harper and Row.

Samovar, L.A., Porter, R.E., & Jain, N.C. (1981). Understanding Intercultural Communication. Belmont, California: Wadsworth.

Schaller, M., Rosell, M.C., & Asp, C.H. (1998). Parsimony and pluralism in the psychological study of intergroup processes. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler & C.A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior (pp. 3-25). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Schenck-Hamlin, W.J. (1978). The effects of dialectical similarity, stereotyping, and message agreement on interpersonal perception. Human Communication Research, 5, 15-26.

Snyder, M., Tanke, E.D. & Berscheid, E. (1977). Social perceptions and interpersonal behavior: On the self-fulfilling nature of social stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 55, 656-666.

Smith, A.L. (1973). Transracial Communication. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Tafoya, D.W. (1983) The roots of conflict, a theory and typology. In W. B. Gudykunst (ed.). Intercultural and intercultural communication annual, (pp. 205-238). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Tukey, J.W. (1969). Analyzing data: Sanctification or detective work? American Psychologist, 24, 83-91.

Weitz, R., & Gordon, L. (1993). Images of black women among anglo college students, Sex Roles, 28, 19-34.

Wilder, D. & Simon, A.F. (1998). Categorical and dynamic groups: Implications for social perception and intergroup behavior. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler & C.A. Insko (Eds.), Intergroup Cognition and Intergroup Behavior (pp. 27-44). London: Lawrence Erlbaum.

APPENDIX A**Stereotype Checklist**

Hesitant	Argumentative
Intelligent	Critical
Nonmilitant	Methodical
Practical	Alert
Submissive	Straightforward
Meditative	Soft-Spoken
Boastful	Quarrelsome
Ignorant	Conservative
Witty	Arrogant
Industrious	Concealing
Emotional	Aggressive
Efficient	Uninvolved
Suave	Imaginative
Passive	Noisy
Evasive	Directive
Conventional	Quiet
Persistent	Humble
Ostentatious (showy)	Conformable
Obliging	Open
Radical	Individualistic
Loud	Fluent
Sensitive	Silent
Courteous	Responsive
Hostile	Incomprehensible
Reserved	Talkative
Nondirective	Rude
Jovial	Defiant
Inarticulate	Imitative
Resistant	

**APPENDIX B**

**Copy of Communication Behavior Descriptors and Participant  
Response Forms**

(1-3) \_\_\_\_\_ Code

(4) \_\_\_\_\_ Line Number

(5-8) Age: \_\_\_\_\_ years \_\_\_\_\_ months

(9) Gender: \_\_\_\_\_ male \_\_\_\_\_ female

(10) Race: \_\_\_\_\_ Caucasian/White  
\_\_\_\_\_ African-American/Black  
\_\_\_\_\_ Hispanic – Mexican, Cuban, Puerto Rican  
\_\_\_\_\_ Asian-American/Pacific Islander  
\_\_\_\_\_ American Indian/Alaskan Native  
\_\_\_\_\_ Other \_\_\_\_\_ (write in)

(11) Year in School:

\_\_\_\_\_ Freshman  
\_\_\_\_\_ Sophomore  
\_\_\_\_\_ Junior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Senior  
\_\_\_\_\_ Graduate School



**Page 1**

Read through the following list of words and circle those which seem to you typical of the communicative behavior of African-Americans. Circle as many of the words in the following list as you think are necessary to characterize the communication of these people adequately. If you do not find appropriate words on this page for all the typical African-American characteristics, you may add those which you think necessary for an adequate description.

- |                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 12. Hesitant             | 41. Argumentative    |
| 13. Intelligent          | 42. Critical         |
| 14. Nonmilitant          | 43. Methodical       |
| 15. Practical            | 44. Alert            |
| 16. Submissive           | 45. Straightforward  |
| 17. Meditative           | 46. Soft-Spoken      |
| 18. Boastful             | 47. Quarrelsome      |
| 19. Ignorant             | 48. Conservative     |
| 20. Witty                | 49. Arrogant         |
| 21. Industrious          | 50. Concealing       |
| 22. Emotional            | 51. Aggressive       |
| 23. Efficient            | 52. Uninvolved       |
| 24. Suave                | 53. Imaginative      |
| 25. Passive              | 54. Noisy            |
| 26. Evasive              | 55. Directive        |
| 27. Conventional         | 56. Quiet            |
| 28. Persistent           | 57. Humble           |
| 29. Ostentatious (showy) | 58. Conformable      |
| 30. Obliging             | 59. Open             |
| 31. Radical              | 60. Individualistic  |
| 32. Loud                 | 61. Fluent           |
| 33. Sensitive            | 62. Silent           |
| 34. Courteous            | 63. Responsive       |
| 35. Hostile              | 64. Incomprehensible |
| 36. Reserved             | 65. Talkative        |
| 37. Nondirective         | 66. Rude             |
| 38. Jovial               | 67. Defiant          |
| 39. Inarticulate         | 68. Imitative        |
| 40. Resistant            |                      |

**Page 2**

Read through the following list of words and circle those which seem to you typical of the communicative behavior of Mexican-Americans. Circle as many of the words in the following list as you think are necessary to characterize the communication of these people adequately. If you do not find appropriate words on this page for all the typical Mexican-American characteristics, you may add those which you think necessary for an adequate description.

- |                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 12. Hesitant             | 41. Argumentative    |
| 13. Intelligent          | 42. Critical         |
| 14. Nonmilitant          | 43. Methodical       |
| 15. Practical            | 44. Alert            |
| 16. Submissive           | 45. Straightforward  |
| 17. Meditative           | 46. Soft-Spoken      |
| 18. Boastful             | 47. Quarrelsome      |
| 19. Ignorant             | 48. Conservative     |
| 20. Witty                | 49. Arrogant         |
| 21. Industrious          | 50. Concealing       |
| 22. Emotional            | 51. Aggressive       |
| 23. Efficient            | 52. Uninvolved       |
| 24. Suave                | 53. Imaginative      |
| 25. Passive              | 54. Noisy            |
| 26. Evasive              | 55. Directive        |
| 27. Conventional         | 56. Quiet            |
| 28. Persistent           | 57. Humble           |
| 29. Ostentatious (showy) | 58. Conformable      |
| 30. Obliging             | 59. Open             |
| 31. Radical              | 60. Individualistic  |
| 32. Loud                 | 61. Fluent           |
| 33. Sensitive            | 62. Silent           |
| 34. Courteous            | 63. Responsive       |
| 35. Hostile              | 64. Incomprehensible |
| 36. Reserved             | 65. Talkative        |
| 37. Nondirective         | 66. Rude             |
| 38. Jovial               | 67. Defiant          |
| 39. Inarticulate         | 68. Imitative        |
| 40. Resistant            |                      |

**Page 3**

Read through the following list of words and circle those which seem to you typical of the communicative behavior of Japanese-Americans. Circle as many of the words in the following list as you think are necessary to characterize the communication of these people adequately. If you do not find appropriate words on this page for all the typical Japanese-American characteristics, you may add those which you think necessary for an adequate description.

- |                          |                      |
|--------------------------|----------------------|
| 12. Hesitant             | 41. Argumentative    |
| 13. Intelligent          | 42. Critical         |
| 14. Nonmilitant          | 43. Methodical       |
| 15. Practical            | 44. Alert            |
| 16. Submissive           | 45. Straightforward  |
| 17. Meditative           | 46. Soft-Spoken      |
| 18. Boastful             | 47. Quarrelsome      |
| 19. Ignorant             | 48. Conservative     |
| 20. Witty                | 49. Arrogant         |
| 21. Industrious          | 50. Concealing       |
| 22. Emotional            | 51. Aggressive       |
| 23. Efficient            | 52. Uninvolved       |
| 24. Suave                | 53. Imaginative      |
| 25. Passive              | 54. Noisy            |
| 26. Evasive              | 55. Directive        |
| 27. Conventional         | 56. Quiet            |
| 28. Persistent           | 57. Humble           |
| 29. Ostentatious (showy) | 58. Conformable      |
| 30. Obliging             | 59. Open             |
| 31. Radical              | 60. Individualistic  |
| 32. Loud                 | 61. Fluent           |
| 33. Sensitive            | 62. Silent           |
| 34. Courteous            | 63. Responsive       |
| 35. Hostile              | 64. Incomprehensible |
| 36. Reserved             | 65. Talkative        |
| 37. Nondirective         | 66. Rude             |
| 38. Jovial               | 67. Defiant          |
| 39. Inarticulate         | 68. Imitative        |
| 40. Resistant            |                      |

**APPENDIX C**

**Copy of IRB Proposal and Acceptance**

January 15, 1999

Institutional Review Board  
University of Nebraska Medical Center  
Eppley Science Hall 3018  
600 South 42<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Omaha, NE 68198-6810

To Whom It May Concern:

Please accept this material as my application to conduct research for the completion of the Master of Arts Degree in the Communication Department at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

I would like to apply for exempt status on the research for my thesis. Survey procedures will be used involving voluntary participation from subjects (see attached.)

Please let me know if you need further information.

Sincerely,

Danna A. Swartz  
909 Hopkins Drive  
Bellevue, NE 68005  
(402) 293-9476

**EXEMPTION FORM**

**SECTION 1: APPLICATION DATA**

TITLE OF RESEARCH PROPOSAL: Communication Stereotypes of Caucasian College Students

STARTING DATE: January 1999

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Danna Voorhes Swartz

SECONDARY INVESTIGATOR(S): none

DEPARTMENT/COLLEGE: Communication

ADDRESS: 909 Hopkins Drive, Bellevue, NE ZIP CODE: 68005

TELEPHONE: (402) 293-9476

**SECTION 2: CERTIFICATION**

**CERTIFICATION OF PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR:** Signature certifies that the research project as described will be conducted in full compliance with University of Nebraska Regulations governing human subject research as stated in the IRB Guidelines for the Protection of Human Subjects. It is understood that the IRB will be notified of any proposed changes which may affect the exempt status of the research.

Danna Swartz  
Signature of Principal Investigator  
1-15-99  
Date  
Graduate Student  
Position

**ADVISOR APPROVAL:** Student investigators are required to obtain approval from their advisor. Signature of approval certifies the research proposal has been approved and recommended for submission to the IRB.

Marshall Pribell  
Signature of Advisor  
1-15-99  
Date  
MARSHALL PRIBELL  
Printed Name of Advisor

The IRB requires submission of an original and one (1) copy of the Exemption Form.

**Institutional Review Board**  
**Section 3: Review of Information**  
**Page 2 of 3**

**I: Purpose of the Study**

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate the following research question: What are the communication stereotypes of African-Americans, Japanese-Americans and Mexican-Americans as maintained by Caucasian undergraduate college students?

**II: Characteristics of the Subject Population**

- a. Age Range - anticipated age range is 18 to 27
- b. Sex - Male and Female
- c. Number - 200
- d. Selection Criteria - Participants will be undergraduate University of Nebraska at Omaha students in basic speech communication courses.

**III: Method of Subject Selection** - Participants will be asked to participate in the study on a voluntary basis.

**IV: Study Site** - University of Nebraska at Omaha classrooms

**V: Description of Procedures** - Participants will be provided copies of the questionnaire (see attached) during class and will be asked to complete and return the questionnaire in class.

**VI: Confidentiality** - Subjects will be asked to provide their age, gender and race. No other identifying information will be gathered. This will ensure the anonymity of the participants during data analysis. The findings of this study will be published for purposes of completion of the Masters of Arts Degree in the Communication Department at the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

**VII: Informed Consent** - Due to the voluntary participation of participants, this study does not require informed consent. Any participant may elect not to participate. A brief explanation of the thesis topic will be given prior to distribution of the questionnaire and participants will

**Institutional Review Board****Section 3: Review of Information (cont'd)****Page 3 of 3**

be debriefed after completion of the questionnaire and participants may choose not to take part. Also, the anonymity factor of participants participation eliminates the possibility of disclosing participant's responses in a manner that will place them at any type of risk.

**VIII: Justification of Exemption** – This research study qualifies for exemption under Category 2. The method of research involves survey procedures and participation is voluntary. Participant responses will be recorded in such a manner that they can not be identified. Disclosure of the participants responses outside of the research could not reasonably place them at risk of criminal or civil liability or cause damage to their financial standing, employability or reputation.





Institutional Review Board (IRB)  
 Office of Regulatory Affairs (ORA)  
 University of Nebraska Medical Center  
 Eppley Science Hall 3018  
 986810 Nebraska Medical Center  
 Omaha, NE 68198-6810  
 (402) 559-6463  
 Fax (402) 559-7845  
 E- mail: [irbora@unmc.edu](mailto:irbora@unmc.edu)  
<http://info.unmc.edu/irb/irbhome.htm>

January 27, 1999

Danna Voorhes Swartz  
 909 Hopkins Drive  
 Bellevue, NE 68005

IRB#: 014-99-EX

TITLE OF APPLICATION/PROTOCOL: Communication Stereotypes of Caucasian College Students

Dear Ms. Swartz:

The IRB has reviewed your Exemption Form for the above-titled research project. According to the information provided, this project is exempt under 45 CFR 46:101b, category 2. You are therefore authorized to begin the research.

It is understood this project will be conducted in full accordance with all applicable sections of the IRB Guidelines. It is also understood that the IRB will be immediately notified of any proposed changes that may affect the exempt status of your research project.

Please be advised that the IRB has a maximum protocol approval period of five years from the original date of approval and release. If this study continues beyond the five year approval period, the project must be resubmitted in order to maintain an active approval status.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in black ink that reads 'E. Prentice/jlg'.

Ernest D. Prentice, PhD  
 Vice Chair, IRB

EDP:jlg

TABLE 1

Communicative Characteristics Assigned to  
African-Americans by Caucasian College Students

	Not a Characteristic		Typical Characteristic		Most Typical Characteristic	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Hesitant	182	91	16	8	2	1
Intelligent	114	57	43	21.5	43	21.5
Nonmilitant	194	97	5	2.5	1	0.5
Practical	129	64.5	55	27.5	16	8
Submissive	188	94	12	6	0	0
Meditative	191	95.5	9	4.5	0	0
Boastful	110	55	43	21.5	47	23.5
Ignorant	157	78.5	22	11	21	10.5
Witty	126	63	46	23	28	14
Industrious	176	88	22	11	2	1
Emotional	84	42	66	33	50	25
Efficient	171	85.5	22	11	7	3.5
Suave	151	75.5	36	18	13	6.5
Passive	182	91	16	8	2	1
Evasive	168	84	31	15.5	1	0.5
Conventional	176	88	18	9	6	3
Persistent	124	62	47	23.5	29	14.5
Ostentatious	87	43.5	60	30	53	26.5
Obliging	192	96	6	3	2	1
Radical	161	80.5	33	16.5	6	3
Loud	65	32.5	55	27.5	80	40
Sensitive	169	84.5	25	12.5	6	3
Courteous	151	75.5	31	15.5	18	9
Hostile	149	74.5	41	20.5	10	5
Reserved	184	92	10	5	6	3
Nondirective	188	94	10	5	2	1
Jovial	158	79	32	16	10	5
Inarticulate	170	85	14	7	16	8
Resistant	165	82.5	30	15	5	2.5

**TABLE 1**  
**(Continued)**

	<u>Not a</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Most Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Argumentative	105	52.5	57	28.5	38	19
Critical	146	73	45	22.5	9	4.5
Methodical	189	94.5	11	5.5	0	0
Alert	165	82.5	26	13	9	4.5
Straightforward	75	37.5	64	32	61	30.5
Soft-Spoken	188	94	9	4.5	3	1.5
Quarrelsome	143	71.5	39	19.5	18	9
Conservative	176	88	21	10.5	3	1.5
Arrogant	140	70	48	24	12	6
Concealing	180	90	19	9.5	1	0.5
Aggressive	98	49	56	28	46	23
Uninvolved	189	94.5	8	4	3	1.5
Imaginative	140	70	48	24	12	6
Noisy	119	59.5	52	26	29	14.5
Directive	169	84.5	23	11.5	8	4
Quiet	194	97	4	2	2	1
Humble	182	91	14	7	4	2
Conformable	179	89.5	18	9	3	1.5
Open	105	52.5	63	31.5	32	16
Individualistic	101	50.5	57	28.5	42	21
Fluent	171	85.5	25	12.5	4	2
Silent	196	98	4	2	0	0
Responsive	143	71.5	41	20.5	16	8
Incomprehensible	180	90	11	5.5	9	4.5
Talkative	80	40	68	34	52	26
Rude	153	76.5	28	14	19	9.5
Defiant	152	76	35	17.5	13	6.5
Imitative	182	91	16	8	2	1

TABLE 2

Communicative Characteristics Assigned to  
Mexican-Americans by Caucasian College Students

	<u>Not a</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Most Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Hesitant	139	69.5	31	15.5	30	15
Intelligent	169	84.5	16	8	15	7.5
Nonmilitant	187	93.5	9	4.5	4	2
Practical	160	80	26	13	14	7
Submissive	161	80.5	25	12.5	14	7
Meditative	187	93.5	9	4.5	4	2
Boastful	166	83	20	10	14	7
Ignorant	148	74	20	10	32	16
Witty	174	87	16	8	10	5
Industrious	160	80	20	10	20	10
Emotional	137	68.5	31	15.5	32	16
Efficient	167	83.5	23	11.5	10	5
Suave	161	80.5	24	12	15	7.5
Passive	145	72.5	34	17	21	10.5
Evasive	161	80.5	30	15	9	4.5
Conventional	163	81.5	27	13.5	10	5
Persistent	155	77.5	28	14	17	8.5
Ostentatious	159	79.5	21	10.5	20	10
Obliging	178	89	15	7.5	7	3.5
Radical	182	91	13	6.5	5	2.5
Loud	150	75	27	13.5	23	11.5
Sensitive	164	82	22	11	14	7
Courteous	140	70	28	14	32	16
Hostile	158	79	26	13	16	8
Reserved	128	64	44	22	28	14
Nondirective	170	85	17	8.5	13	6.5
Jovial	176	88	13	6.5	11	5.5
Inarticulate	158	79	19	9.5	23	11.5

**TABLE 2**  
**(Continued)**

	<u>Not a</u>		<u>Typical</u>		<u>Most Typical</u>	
	<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Characteristic</u>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Resistant	162	81	21	10.5	17	8.5
Argumentative	150	75	36	18	14	7
Critical	177	88.5	18	9	5	2.5
Methodical	185	92.5	13	6.5	2	1
Alert	170	85	23	11.5	7	3.5
Straightforward	146	73	28	14	26	13
Soft-Spoken	134	67	34	17	32	16
Quarrelsome	151	75.5	25	12.5	24	12
Conservative	172	86	19	9.5	9	4.5
Arrogant	156	78	23	11.5	21	10.5
Concealing	165	82.5	20	10	15	7.5
Aggressive	160	80	28	14	12	6
Uninvolved	146	73	28	14	26	13
Imaginative	170	85	23	11.5	7	3.5
Noisy	156	78	28	14	16	8
Directive	171	85.5	20	10	9	4.5
Quiet	134	67	35	17.5	31	15.5
Humble	156	78	21	10.5	23	11.5
Conformable	169	84.5	23	11.5	8	4
Open	153	76.5	28	14	19	9.5
Individualistic	143	71.5	41	20.5	16	8
Fluent	166	83	27	13.5	7	3.5
Silent	162	81	30	15	8	4
Responsive	159	79.5	32	16	9	4.5
Incomprehensible	164	82	18	9	18	9
Talkative	136	68	35	17.5	29	14.5
Rude	166	83	19	9.5	15	7.5
Defiant	177	88.5	16	8	7	3.5
Imitative	168	84	25	12.5	7	3.5

TABLE 3

Communicative Characteristics Assigned to  
Japanese-Americans by Caucasian College Students

	<u>Not a</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Most Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Hesitant	149	74.5	32	16	19	9.5
Intelligent	48	24	27	13.5	125	62.5
Nonmilitant	171	85.5	25	12.5	4	2
Practical	121	60.5	53	26.5	26	13
Submissive	153	76.5	29	14.5	18	9
Meditative	134	67	42	21	24	12
Boastful	188	94	10	5	2	1
Ignorant	187	93.5	2	1	3	1.5
Witty	144	72	39	19.5	17	8.5
Industrious	114	57	50	25	36	18
Emotional	157	78.5	36	18	7	3.5
Efficient	115	57.5	41	20.5	44	22
Suave	185	92.5	13	6.5	2	1
Passive	125	62.5	50	25	25	12.5
Evasive	188	94	11	5.5	1	0.5
Conventional	128	64	57	28.5	15	7.5
Persistent	152	76	32	16	16	8
Ostentatious	191	95.5	6	3	3	1.5
Obliging	164	82	27	13.5	9	4.5
Radical	196	98	3	1.5	1	0.5
Loud	187	93.5	7	3.5	6	3
Sensitive	128	64	52	26	20	10
Courteous	72	36	51	25.5	77	38.5
Hostile	191	95.5	6	3	3	1.5
Reserved	91	45.5	77	38.5	32	16
Nondirective	163	81.5	27	13.5	10	5
Jovial	188	94	12	6	0	0
Inarticulate	190	95	6	3	4	2
Resistant	187	93.5	12	6	1	0.5

**TABLE 3**  
**(Continued)**

	<u>Not a</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>		<u>Most Typical</u> <u>Characteristic</u>	
	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Argumentative	188	94	6	3	6	3
Critical	166	83	27	13.5	7	3.5
Methodical	157	78.5	29	14.5	14	7
Alert	134	67	54	27	12	6
Straightforward	143	71.5	42	21	15	7.5
Soft-Spoken	68	34	66	33	66	33
Quarrelsome	193	96.5	5	2.5	2	1
Conservative	112	56	55	27.5	33	16.5
Arrogant	192	96	7	3.5	1	0.5
Concealing	156	78	40	20	4	2
Aggressive	191	95.5	4	2	5	2.5
Uninvolved	173	86.5	23	11.5	4	2
Imaginative	130	65	46	23	24	12
Noisy	189	94.5	7	3.5	4	2
Directive	164	82	32	16	4	2
Quiet	77	38.5	74	37	49	24.5
Humble	102	51	60	30	38	19
Conformable	162	81	31	15.5	7	3.5
Open	167	83.5	27	13.5	6	3
Individualistic	148	74	39	19.5	13	6.5
Fluent	163	81.5	26	13	11	5.5
Silent	118	59	66	33	16	8
Responsive	153	76.5	38	19	9	4.5
Incomprehensible	179	89.5	13	6.5	8	4
Talkative	173	86.5	14	7	13	6.5
Rude	191	95.5	5	2.5	4	2
Defiant	191	95.5	7	3.5	2	1
Imitative	180	90	19	9.5	1	0.5

TABLE 4

The Twelve Communicative Characteristics Most Frequently Assigned to African-Americans by Caucasian College Students

Characteristic	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Loud	80	40
Straightforward	61	30.5
Ostentatious	53	26.5
Talkative	52	26
Emotional	50	25
Boastful	47	23.5
Aggressive	46	23
Intelligent	43	21
Individualistic	42	21
Argumentative	38	19
Open	32	16
Noisy	29	14.5



TABLE 5

The Twelve Communicative Characteristics Most Frequently Assigned to Mexican-Americans by Caucasian College Students

Characteristic	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Soft-Spoken	32	16
Emotional	32	16
Courteous	32	16
Ignorant	32	16
Quiet	31	15.5
Hesitant	30	15
Talkative	29	14.5
Reserved	28	14
Straightforward	26	13
Uninvolved	26	13
Quarrelsome	24	12
Humble	23	11.5
Inarticulate	23	11.5
Loud	23	11.5

TABLE 6

The Twelve Communicative Characteristics Most Frequently  
Assigned to Japanese-Americans by Caucasian College  
Students

Characteristic	<i>f</i>	<i>P</i>
Intelligent	125	62.5
Courteous	77	38.5
Soft-Spoken	66	33
Quiet	49	24.5
Efficient	44	22
Humble	38	19
Industrious	36	18
Conservative	33	16.5
Reserved	32	16
Practical	26	13
Passive	25	12.5
Imaginative	24	12
Meditative	24	12

**TABLE 7**

The Least Number of Communicative Characteristics Which  
Must be Taken to Include Fifty Percent of the Possible  
Assignments for Each Group

---

Group (rank order)	Number of Traits Required
Japanese-Americans	9.0
African-Americans	9.6
Mexican-Americans	19.44

---