DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 093 009 CS 500 742

AUTHOR Civikly, Jean M.; Plax, Timothy G.
TITLE The Effects of Information Exposure Activities on Attitudinal Changes Among Co-Culturals: Some Preliminary Findings.
PUB DATE Apr 74
NOTE 26p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the International Communication Association (19th, New Orleans, April 17-20, 1974)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.75 HC-$1.85 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS Attitudes; Communication (Thought Transfer); Cultural Differences; *Cultural Factors; *Educational Research; *Ethnic Groups; *Social Attitudes

ABSTRACT

To examine the effect of various activities and interactions on the attitudes of members of co-cultures toward each other was the purpose of this study. The research was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, semantic differential scales were developed for the measurement of attitudes toward co-cultures. Each of five sets of scales was used to measure perceptions of a different cultural group: black, Chicano, native American, Anglo, and Filipino. The data were collected from 89 students enrolled in basic speech communication courses at the University of New Mexico. The students were randomly selected and instructed to indicate their feelings about each cultural group as accurately as they could for each scale. The findings indicated that similar factor structures were found when measuring the perceptions of co-cultures together or separately. In the second stage, attitudinal changes across activities and cultures were measured. A group of six Anglo and six Chicano subjects engaged in a series of four co-cultural activities, and subjects also responded individually to attitude scales. The findings indicated that there is no difference in the effects of certain co-cultural information activities on attitude changes toward other cultures. (WR)

The Effects of Information Exposure Activities on Attitudinal Changes Among Co-Culturals: Some Preliminary Findings

Jean M. Civikly

and

Timothy G. Plax

Department of Speech Communication
University of New Mexico
Albuquerque, New Mexico

Paper presented at the twenty-second annual conference at the International Communication Association, April 17-21, 1974, New Orleans, Louisianna.

That the United States is a country of many distinct cultures, and all too-often a setting for culture clashes, is obvious from racial situations which have developed over the years, and in particular the last fifteen years. While culture consciousness has been prominent in the Black, Chicano, and Native American movements, it is questionable if each culture is aware of the beliefs and life styles of cultures other than their own. Information about cultural characteristics can be provided in any number of ways, and can be the basis for attitudinal changes(Rich, 1974).

The purpose of the present research was to determine the effect of varying degrees of cultural information activities on attitudinal change among representatives of co-cultures. The term "co-culture" (Smith, 1973) refers to cultural groups in a country(the U.S.) other than the dominant culture(Anglo-Americans). "Co-culture" is preferred over the more frequent label of "sub-culture" since it indicates the existence of different cultural characteristics on an equal basis, rather than the comparison and evaluation (usually subordination) of cultures to the dominant white cultural standard. A similar distinction has been made by Williams(1970) in his discussion of the difference and deficit theses as they relate to language of the poor.

In this initial exploratory investigation, two general research questions were examined. First, what are the effects of four cultural information activities on attitudes toward other cultural groups? Second, do co-cultures differ in their amount of attitude change following engagement in co-cultural information activities? Published research on the impact of co-cultural experiences is considerable (Hisager, 1949; Kiell, 1951; Lambert, 1954; Loomis,

1948; Smith, 1955; Taba, 1952; Wallace, 1949; Goff, 1962; Gardner, 1962). Results, however, are inconsistent. In a review of over thirty studies, Cook and Selltiz(1955) describe the dilemma:

> ...at least three(studies) have reported no significant differences in attitude related to the contact experience. Of the remainder, approximately half reported generally favorable changes. The other half reported qualified results--findings, for example, that some types of contact led to favorable attitude changes, others to unfavorable changes; or that contact resulted in favorable changes on the part of some individuals, in no change on the part of others, and in unfavorable changes for still others; or that contact led to changes in some dimensions of attitude or behav ior but not in others. Less systematic observations of practical experience have led to the same range of conclusions, plus still another-- that contact may lead to generally unfavorable attitudes and even to actual violence.

The research area is indeed multi-faceted. Selltiz, Hopson, and Cook(1956) investigated the effects of situation factors on personal interaction between individuals from different cultures. The subjects used in the experiment were European and non-European students attending American universities. The researchers found that in certain universities the opportunities for European students to associate with Americans was greater. However, no differences in attitude change were found between European students having either a high or low degree of interaction with American students. In an early study, McCammon(1936) reported favorable reactions by Anglo children toward Mexican-Americans when the Anglo pupils attended schools in which Mexican-American enrollment was higher. Mc Cammon also found that knowing Mexican-Americans personally and reading about them in books were the best sources of favorable opinions, while movies and hearsay were the chief sources of unfavorable opinions.

Studies investigating co-cultural and intergroup relations(Triandis, Malpass, and Davidson, 1973) indicate that differences in attitude change are likely to be observed across both activities and co-cultures.

However, most research findings in this area stem from studies concentrating on general notions of intergroup relations and interaction, without consideration of the effects of either the type of contact between individuals or the amount and type of information about the different cultures which is revealed in the co-cultural activity. For example, Smith(1955) attempted to determine whether or not certain types of intercultural experiences have a significant impact on individual attitudes and behavior. The results of his study suggest that an unstructured heterogenous intercultural experience does not have a significant impact on general social attitudes, at least as measured over a relatively brief time span. However, specific attitudes have been observed to change.

Triandis(1964), in an extensive review of published research dealing with cultural influences upon cognitive processes, concluded that attitudes of persons of different cultures may be quite different, and that much of the variance in the culture-specific attitudes can be traced to the culture. Culture-specific factors may influence human experience and perception. It would seem reasonable then that by processing culture-bound information and observing different life styles, attitudes might be changed and/or new ones might be formed.

The present study extended the findings of previous research by examining the effect of four different types of activities and interactions on attitudes between co-cultures. Specific to the present research was an examination of a continuum of co-cultural activities, representing varying degrees of exposure to information about different cultural groups representative of the Southwest United States. Subjects were drawn from the Black, Chicano, Native American, and Anglo cultures.

The research was conducted in two stages. In the first stage, semantic differential scales were developed for the measurement of attitudes toward co-cultures. In the second stage, attitudinal changes across activities and cultures were measured.

Two specific hypotheses for Stage II were formulated:

1. There will be a greater amount of attitude change in a positive direction as activities increase in degree of involvment(i.e., there will be more attitude change after the interaction activity than after the reading, listening, or speaking activities);
2. Co-cultures will differ in the amount of attitude change following each cultural activity.

STAGE I

In the first stage, scales were developed for the measurement of attitudes toward co-cultures and of attitude changes in the second stage.

METHOD

The current investigation employed as its initial item pool five sets of 75 semantic differential-type scales representing the dimension of evaluation in studies reported by Osgood(1957),1965), Fulton(1970), Williams, (1971), and Civikly(1973). Scales with high loadings on given factors in these studies were included. The item pool was composed of 75 semantic differential-type scales for five concepts. Each of the five sets of scales was used to measure perceptions of a different cultural group. The specific cultural groups were: Black, Chicano, Native American, Anglo, and Filipino. These cultural groups were chosen since four would be used in the second

stage of the experiment. The Filipino group was used in the first stage [redacted] construction of the scales only. The data in this investigation were collected from 89 students enrolled in basic Speech Communication Courses at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque. The students were selected at random and instructed to indicate their feelings, about each particular cultural group, as accurately as they could for each scale.

Statistical Analysis

First, composite data from the 89 subjects for the five concepts were submitted to principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. Second, the data from each culture-concept were submitted to principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation. A total of six factor analyses were computed.

The criteria for interpretation of the results included the following: (a) an eigenvalue of 1.0 was set for termination of factor extraction; (b) for an item to be considered loaded on a factor, it was required to have a primary loading of at least .50 on that factor and no secondary loading above .40; (c) in order for a factor to be considered meaningful, it was required to have at least four items loaded on it. The primary reason for computing six separate analyses was to determine if the factors held across all cultures, and if they did not, to locate culture-specific factors and scales to be used in Stage II of the study.

Results

Factor analysis of the composite 375 scales revealed two factors composed of 28 scales(see Table 1). These factors were interpreted as follows: Factor I, corresponding to Character, accounted for 52.5% of the

total variance. Scales with the heaviest loadings on this factor were: kind-cruel, good-bad, courteous-discourteous. Factor II measured Sociability and overt behavior, and accounted for 16% of the variance. It was characterized by such scales as: extroverted-introverted, talkative-shy, and timid-bold.

Factor analysis of the Filipino scales revealed two factors composed of 13 scales(see Table 2). Factor I (Character) accounted for 36.1% of the variance with representative scales being pleasant-unpleasant, likeable-not likeable, and good-natured-irritable. Factor II (Sociability) accounted for 9.5% of the variance. Representative scales included: adventurous-cautious, talkative-shy, and extroverted-introverted.

Factor Analysis of the Anglo scales revealed two factors composed of 10 scales(see Table 3). Factor I was identified as Attractiveness and accounted for 33% of the variance. Scales included with the factor were: respectful-disrespectful, fair-unfair, attractive-repulsive. Factor II (Character) appeared to measure interpersonal traits, accounted for 10.1% of the variance, and included such scales as: concerned-indifferent, selfish-unselfish, honest-dishonest.

Factor analysis of the Black scales revealed two factors composed of 17 scales(see Table 4). The factors were interpreted as follows: Factor I (Value) appeared to measure significance and accounted for 38.7% of the variance. Scales included with this factor were: significant-insignificant, valuable-worthless, important-unimportant. Factor II (Sociability) was concerned with interpersonal behaviors and accounted for 8.1% of the variance. Representative scales were: agreeable-disagreeable, friendly-unfriendly, and sociable-unsociable.

Factor analysis of the Chicano scales revealed two factors composed of 19 scales(see Table 5). Factor I (Sociability) was concerned with interpersonal behaviors and accounted for 48.4% of the variance. Scales leading heavily on this factor were: safe-dangerous, good-bad, and sweet-sour. Factor II was interpreted to measure Competence and accounted for 9.0% of the variance. Scales characterizing this factor were: expert-inexpert, experienced-inexperienced, and educated-uneducated.

Factor analysis of the Native American scales revealed two factors composed of 28 scales(see Table66). Factor I measured Sociability and accounted for 37.9% of the variance, with such scales as secretive-candid, enthusiastic-hesitant, and intimate-remote. Factor II was identifiable as Character and accounted for 15.9% of the variance. Representative scales for this factor were: pleasant-unpleasant, sweet-sour, and peaceful-belligerent.

A summary chart of the six factor analyses and the variance accounted for by each factor follows:

Analysis	Factor I	Factor II
Composite	Character (52.5%)	Sociability (16.0%)
Filipino	Character (36.1%)	Sociability (9.5%)
Anglo	Attractiveness (33.0%)	Character (10.1%)
Black	Value (38.7%)	Sociability (8.1%)
Chicano	Sociability (48.4%)	Competence (9.0%)
Native American	Sociability (37.9%)	Character (15.9%)

Discussion

The findings of the first study indicate that similar factor structures were found when measuring the perceptions of co-cultures together or separately. However, although the factors were interpreted simi arly across cultures, the scales loading highest were culture-bound. In other words, it appears that the scales resulting from each culture would be more salient overall predictors of attitudes and attitude change for that culture than the scales resulting from the original 375 scales taken together.

STAGE II

The second stage of the research was planned to answer two research questions. First, is there a difference in the effects of certain co-cultural information activities on attitude changes toward other cultures? Second, are there differences between co-cultures in the amount of attitude change following engagement in specific co-cultural activiels.

For the first question, four co-cultural activities were investigated; (1) a reading activity in which subjects were exposed to information describing three cultures in addition to their own;[1] (2) a listening activity in which subjects listened to audio tapes approximately thirty minutes in length, describing three cultures in addition to their own;[2] (3) a speaking activity in which subjects gave speeches in support of three cultures other than their own; and (4) an interacting activity in which subjects interacted personally with a specific culture other than their own.[3]

Based upon the results of Stage I, the attitude measures used were specific to each co-culture, and were measured across the two seaparate factors for each culture. Four scales were used for the measurement of each factor.

A total of eight scales for each culture were used in the pretest-posttest measurements. For each activity, the scales were randomly reflected and scrambled. All subjects read the same material, heard the same tapes and received identical instruction forms and observation forms for the speaking and interacting activities respectively.

Subjects

To answer the first question (i.e., whether a difference existed in the effects of certain co-cultural activities on attitude changes toward other cultures), six Anglo and six Chicano students[4] enrolled in basic Speech Communication classes at the University of New Mexico, Albuquerque were used. Difference scores for both Anglos and Chicanos were computed from pretest-posttest measurements of the three cultures other than their own for each activity, excepting the interacting activity.[5] No comparisons could be made between co-cultures because of a possible order effect resulting from having the same subjects participate in all of the activities and all of the testing sessions. However, differences across activities acould be observed.

To answer the second question (i.e., whether a difference existed between certain co-cultures in the amount of attitude change following engagement in four co-cultural activities), twelve Anglo and twelve Chicano students enrolled at the same university were used. In order to determine whether co-cultures differed in attitude changes toward cultures other than their own, separate samples were used in each activity. However, because of the limited number of subjects available, it was necessary at the present time to randomly select two activities as a sample of the original four. Twelve Anglo and Twelve Chicano subjects participated in the reading activity; twelve Anglo and twelve Chicano subjects participated in the listening activity.

Dependent Measures

Semantic differential-type scales developed in Stage I of the study were used to measure attitude changes. For Anglos, Factor I, the scales used were; respectful-disrespectful(.55); fair-unfair(.56); happy-sad(.75), and attractive-repulsive(.71). For factor II, the scales used were; unselfish-selfish(.69),; concerned-indifferent(.64); honest-dishonest(.53); and kind-cruel(.52).

The scales used to measure Factor I for Native Americans were; candid-secretive(.82); timid-bold(.75); talkative-shy(.74); and open-closed(.67). For Factor II, the scales used were; agreeable-disagreeable(.76); beautiful-ugly(.71); pleasant-unpleasant(.69); and sweet-sour(.66).

The scales used to measure Factor I for Blacks were; important-unimportant (.76); significant-insignificant(.71); valuable-worthless(.69); and attractive-repulsive(.67). For Factor II, the scales used were; good-natured--irritable (.73); sweet-sour(.69); sociable-unsociable(.69); and agreeable-disagreeable(.64).

The scales used to measure Factor I for Chicanos were; sweet-sour(.76); safe-dangerous(.76); good-bad(.75); and courteous-discourteous(.69). For Factor II, the scales used were; educated-uneducated(.74); expert--in-expert(.66), successful-unsuccessful(.64), and advantaged-disadvantaged(.59).

Scale scores were summed only across their representative factor. Difference scores were computed from pretest-posttest measurements on the two separate factors for each of the four cultures. Differences scores were used to in analyses computed to test the two hypotheses.

Procedure

To answer the first question, a group of six anglo and six Chicano subjects engaged in a series of four co-cultural activities over a four-month period.[6] Prior to and following each activity, subjects responded to attitude scales noted previously. Subjects were participating in activities naturally

occurring in their Speech Communication course in Intercultural Communication. Testing and activity times were held constant for all subjects.

Answering the second question involved having individual co-cultural subjects come to an assigned room and engage in a single activity. Prior to and following the activity, each subject responded to attitude scales described earlier. The completion of the total number of individual activities took four months. Testing and activity times were held constant for all subjects.

Statistical Analyses

Twelve one-way analyses of variance were computed to answer the first research question. Six were computed on each of the two factors examined. The analyses were computed as follows:

1. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Chicanos across all four activities(Factors I and II);
2. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Blacks across the reading, listening and speaking activities(Factors I and II);
3. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Native Americans across the reading, listening, and speaking activities(Factors I and II);
4. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Anglos across all four activities(Factors I and II);
5. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Blacks across the reading, listening, and speaking activities(Factors I and II);
6. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Native Americans across the reading, listening, and speaking activities(Factors I and II).

To answer the second research question, twelve independent t-tests were computed. The computation of these tests was justified since all comparisons were orthogonal. Six were computed on each of the two factors examined. The analyses were computed as follows:

1. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Chicanos between reading and listening activities(Factors I and II);
2. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Blacks between reading and listening activities (Factors I and II);
3. The attitude changes of Anglos toward Native Americans between reading and listening activities(Factors I and II);
4. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Anglos bewteen reading and listening activities(Factors I and II);
5. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Blacks between reading and listening activities(Factors I and II);
6. The attitude changes of Chicanos toward Native Americans between reading and listening activities(Factors I and II).

Comparisons (t-tests for related measures) were made between pretests and posttests for each cultural group, for each activity, and for each of the two factors. The .05 level of confidence was set for all analyses.

Results

Before computing any of the primary analyses, it was necessary to ensure that the pretest means for all conditions did not differ. Simple analyses of variance indicated that no significant differences existed on any group of pretest scores.

On each of the three types of analyses computed, no significant differences were found. All one-way analyses of variance resulted in $F < 1$. All independent t-tests resulted in $t < 1$. All correlated t-tests resulted in $t < 1$.[7]

Discussion

Hypotheses 1 and 2 were not supported for the study. First, findings indicate that thre is no difference in the effects of certain co-cultural information activities on attitude changes toward other cultures. It is important to note that not only were no differences observed across any group of activities for any of the cultures observed, but also that no significant changes in pretest-posttest attitudes resulted for any culture on any activity. Second, findings indicate that there is no difference between certain co-cultures(i.e., Anglos and Chicanos) in the amount of attitude change following engagement in specific co-cultural activities. Also, both of the co-cultures used to answer the second research question indicated no pretest-posttest attitude changes or difference score changes between any pair of co-cultures or any pair of co-cultural activities.

The lack of confirmation of the two hypotheses does agree in part with past research that also reports no differences in cultural activities and no observable attitude changes except on very specific attitudes and for long-term personal interactions(MC Cammon, 1936; Cook and Selltiz, 1955).

However, the results of the present study may be the consequence of several factors. First, the fact that such small n's were used in the computation of all statistical analyses made it a much more rigorous test. More data is in the process of being collected and all analyses will be recomputed with the larger N's.[8] Second, it may very well be that the activities investigated in this study were not sufficiently realistic or representative of each culture. However, judges did agree that the material for the reading and listening activities discussed similar tpics for each culture. Although the activities were chosen to represent the cognitive,

affective, and psychomotor dimensions of the learning experience, post interviews with with subjects in the interacting activity (subjects interacted in the home environment of a member of a culture other than their own), indicated that several home situations were no different from the participant-observer's, and to expect change in such cases would be misleading.

Third, the procedure used may have been ineffective, countering any effect on attitude change. However, the attitude scales used were scrambled and reflected for each testing, and time was held constant for subjects and activities. Finally, issues regarding the sample and population should be reviewed. In retrospect, the use of college students is most probably a biased sample, one which tends to have more liberal attitudes to begin with, particularly on social issues, such as that considered in this study. There is also the possibility that college students are quite sensitive to measures of attitudes to a culture in general, (rather than a particular indivudal who happens to be a member of a specific culture), resulting in a reluctance to make a more definite response for each scale. It is also suggested that factors other than culture may be operating, notably educational attainment and socio-economic status(Rich, 1974). A regression analysis of on incoming data will determine if this is so. Another matter relating to population is that the New Mexico area offers a unique place for cross-cultural relationships. The co-existence of different cultures appears to be widely accepted and more supported than in many areas of the country. Pretest means (generally 5 or 6 on a 7 point scale) indicate that co-cultures were initially favorable toward cultures other than their own, making it harder to achieve any noticeable attitude change. It should be noted that the results also indicate that there was no significant decrease in attitude.

Whatever the reason, whether any or a combination of the above, the present study suggests further research investigating different samples, activities, and co-cultures in different areas of the country. Undoubtedly, the nature of this initial research has been exploratory. The findings of the first stage of the study(scale construction) should offer assistance to future investigators. The cultural factors identified and the scales developed can be used to retest the same questions posed in this study. It would also be interesting to determine whether the same culture-specific scales and factors emerge in other populations in the U.S.--a task similar to Osgood's(1971) research on the international level, and one which could make similar analogies within the U.S.

FOOTNOTES

1. The reading selection was entitled "Communication in Transracial Situations," by Arte Johnson. The article discusses positive and negative stereotypes for Anglos, Blacks, Chicanos, and Native Americans, and differences in life orientations (time, relational aspects, man-nature perceptions, and activity) for each culture.

2. The audio tapes were recorded by known individuals in the University of New Mexico community. Each individual was introduced as a representative from a specific co-culture.

3. Each of the activities was chosen to represent one of Popham's(1965) dimensions of learning; cognitive, affective, psychomotor, or a combination of any two or all three.

4. Data were collected for additional subjects, but these subjects cited were the pairs that had similar interactions and therefore could be analyzed for all four activities.

5. For the interacting activity, each subject interacted with only one other culture, i.e., Anglos with Chicanos and vice versa.

6. Black and Native American subjects were also used but due to the extremely low numbers, they were not included in this part of the analysis. Efforts are being made to procure more responses from representatives of these two cultures.

7. The Critical "F" value needed was 3.10, df = 3/20; the critical "t" value for independent measures was 2.23, df = 10; the critical "t" value for correlated means was 2.20, df = 11.

8. Because all of the statistical analyses proved to be non-significant, and because the researchers are still collecting data to re-analyze the research questions, no tables were included in this convention report. Resulting means, t's, and F's, can be obtained by contacting either of the authors at the University of New Mexico.

REFERENCES

Civikly, J.M. A descriptive and experimental analysis of teacher nonverbal communication in the college classroom. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, 1973.

Cook, S.W., and Selltiz, C. Some factors which influence the attitudinal outcomes of personal contact. International Social Science Bulletin, 1955, 7, 51-58.

Fulton, R.B. The measurement of speaker credibility. Journal of Communication, 1970, 20, 270-279.

Gardner, G.H. Cross cultural communication. Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 58, 241-256.

Goff, R.M. Psychology and intercultural interaction. Journal of Social Psychology, 1962, 58, 235-240.

Hisager, H. An evaluation of an attempt to form international attitudes. Journal of Social Psychology, 1949, 30, 207-216.

Kiell, N. Attitudes of foreign students. Journal of Higher Education, 1951, 22, 188-194; 225.

Lambert, R.D.(Ed.) American through foreign eyes. Annual of American Political and Social Science, 1954, 295, September.

Loomis, C.P., and Schuler, E.A. Acculturation of foreign students in the United States. Applied Anthropology, 1948, 7, 17-24.

Mc Cammon, E.L. Study of children's attitudes toward Mexicans. California Journal of Elementary Education, 1936, 5, 119-128.

Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: University of Illinois, 1957.

Osgood, C.E. Cross cultural comparability in atttiude measurement via multilingual semantic differentials. In Steiner, I.D., and Fishbein, M.(Eds.) Current studies in social psychology. Chciago: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1965, 95-107.

Osgood, C.E. Exploration in semantic space. Journal of Social Issues, 1971, 27, 5-64.

Popham, W.J. The teacher-empirist: A curriculum and instruction supplement. Los Angeles: Tinnon-Brown, Inc., 1965.

Rich, AL. Interracial Communication. New York: Harper and Row, 1974.

Selltiz, C., Hopson, A.L., and Williams, R.M. The effects of situational factors on personal interaction between foreign students and Americans. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 33-44.

Smith, A.L. Transracial communication. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall, Inc., 1973.

Smaith, H.P. Do intercultural experiences affect attitudes? Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1955, 51, 469-477.

Smith, M.B. Cross cultural education as a research area. Journal of Social Issues, 1956, 12, 3-8.

Taba, H. A study of an exchange group or an evaluation of the International Relations Clubs Tour. New York: Carnegie Endowment for International Peace, 1952.

Triandis, H.C. Cultural influences upon cognitive processes. In Berkowitz, L.(Ed.) Advances in experimental social psychology. Volume I, New York: Academic Press, 1964, 1-48.

Triandis, H.S., Malpass, R.S., and Davidson, A.R. Psychology and culture. In Mussen, P.H., and Rosenzweig, M.R.(Eds.) Annual review of Psychology, 24, Palo Alto: Annual Reviews, Inc., 1973, 355-378.

Wallace, J.A. The organization, operation, and evaluation of a European field trip in international economics for twenty-three women college students. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, University of Pennsylvania, 1949.

Williams, F. Language and poverty. Chicago: Markham Publishing, 1970.

Williams, F., Whitehead, J.L., and Miller, L.M. Attitudinal correlates of children's speech characteristics. Center for Communication Research, University of Texas-Austin. 1971.

TABLE 1

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perceptions of all Cultures

	Variables	Factors I	Factors II
1.	Respectful - Disrespectful	.58*	-.05
2.	Kind - Cruel	.70*	-.01
3.	Honest - Dishonest	.60*	-.10
4.	Fair - Unfair	.59*	.00
5.	Extroverted - Introverted	-.03	.55*
6.	Peaceful - Belligerant	.65*	-.23
7.	Agreeable - Disagreeable	.61*	-.00
8.	Adventurous - Cautious	-.01	.56*
9.	Sweet - Sour	.71*	.15
10.	Good-natured - Irritable	.59*	.01
11.	Friendly - Unfriendly	.64*	.23
12.	Beautiful - Ugly	.50*	.09
13.	Talkative - Shy	-.12	.74*
14.	Courteous - Discourteous	.64*	-.06
15.	Responsible - Irresponsible	.56*	.02
16.	Candid - Secretive	-.10	.54*
17.	Safe - Dangerous	.60*	-.00
18.	Smooth - Rough	.57*	-.00
19.	Good - Bad	.66*	.05
20.	Open - Closed	.22	.52*
21.	Sincere - Insincere	.62*	.01
22.	Likeable - Not Likeable	.62*	.13
23.	Enthusiastic - Hesitant	.05	.53*
24.	Active - Passive	.03	.53*
25.	Virtuous - Sinful	.55*	-.14
26.	Nice - Awful	.66*	.07
27.	Timid - Bold	-.22	.63*
28.	Pleasant - Unpleasant	.68*	-.00
	% Total Variance	52.5	16

* Items Loading Highest On Factor Indicated

TABLE 2

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perception of Filipinos

Variables	Factors I	II
1. Attractive - Repulsive	.61*	.06
2. Extroverted - Introverted	.07	.67*
3. Peaceful - Belligerent	.54*	-.13
4. Adventurous - Cautious	.06	.77*
5. Good natured - Irritable	.53*	.15
6. Beautiful - Ugly	.66*	.23
7. Shy - Talkative	.12	.66*
8. Responsible - Irresponsible	.55*	.01
9. Secretive - Candid	.00	.53*
10. Likeable - Not likeable	.70*	.05
11. Comfortable - uncomfortable	.50*	.06
12. Nice - Awful	.68*	.07
13. Pleasant - Unpleasant	.75*	.02
% Total Variance	36.1	9.5

*Items Loading Highest on Factor Indicated.

TABLE 3

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perceptions of Anglos

Variables	Factors	
	I	II
1. Respectful - Disrespectful	.55*	.28
2. Kind - Cruel	.38	.52*
3. Honest - Dishonest	.35	.52*
4. Fair - Unfair	.56*	.38
5. Happy - Sad	.75*	.02
6. Attractive - Repulsive	.71*	.05
7. Artistic - Unartistic	.05	.50*
8. Courteous - Discourteous	.02	.51*
9. Concerned - Indifferent	.07	.64*
10. Unselfish - Selfish	.10	.69*
% Total Variance	33	10.1

*Items Loading Highest on Factor Indicated.

TABLE 4

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perceptions of Blacks

Variables	Factors I	Factors II
1. Attractive - Repulsive	.69*	.15
2. Significant - Insignificant	.71*	.16
3. Artistic - Unartistic	.64*	.07
4. Valuable - Worthless	.69*	.33
5. Peaceful - Belligerant	.11	.50*
6. Sharp - Dull	.51*	.02
7. Important - Unimportant	.76*	.25
8. Agreeable - Disagreeable	.13	.64*
9. Sweet - Sour	.20	.69*
10. Good-Natured - Irritable	.16	.53*
11. Friendly - Unfriendly	.19	.73*
12. Beautiful - Ugly	.61*	.17
13. Admirable - Contemptible	.51*	.23
14. Concerned - Indifferent	.20	.53*
15. Smooth - Rough	.25	.54*
16. Sociable - Unsociable	.21	.69*
17. Strong - Weak	.51*	.22
% Total Variance	38.7	8.1

*Items Loading Highest on Factor Indicated

Table 5

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perceptions of Chicanos

Variables	Factors	
	I	II
1. significant-insignificant	.50*	.05
2. peaceful-belligerent	.55*	.13
3. agreeable-disagreeable	.51*	.07
4. experienced-inexperienced	.22	.54*
5. sweet-sour	.76*	.17
6. friendly-unfriendly	.60*	.15
7. courteous-discourteous	.69*	.26
8. advantaged-disadvantaged	.07	.59*
9. safe-dangerous	.76*	.07
10. smooth-rough	.65*	.16
11. good-bad	.75*	.16
12. sincere-insincere	.53*	.28
13. comfortable-uncomfortable	.57*	.12
14. nice-awful	.60*	.11
15. competent-incompetent	.28	.54*
16. expert-inexpert	.07	.66*
17. pleasant-unpleasant	.53*	.10
18. educated-uneducated	.11	.74*
19. successful-unsuccessful	.14	.64*
% Total Variance	48.4	9.0

*Items loading highest on factor indicated

Table 6

Rotated Factor Matrix of Perceptions of Native Americans

Variables	Factors I	Factors II
1. Fair-unfair	.03	.56*
2. attractive-repulsive	.31	.61*
3. intimate-remote	.53*	.16
4. peaceful-belligerent	.23	.59*
5. agreeable-disagreeable	.10	.76*
6. sweet-sour	.20	.66*
7. good-natured--irritable	.05	.64*
8. friendly-unfriendly	.19	.63*
9. beautiful-ugly	.19	.71*
10. shy-talkative	.74*	.07
11. secretive-candid	.82*	.02
12. advantaged-disadvantaged	.62*	.11
13. smooth-rough	.20	.51*
14. good-bad	.26	.51*
15. open-closed	.68*	.25
16. likeable-not likeable	.11	.53*
17. enthusiastic-hesitant	.56*	.06
18. comfortable-uncomfortable	.34	.51*
19. passive-active	.65*	.04
20. energetic-tired	.51*	.13
21. nice-awful	.04	.65*
22. timid-bold	.75*	.01
23. pleasant-unpleasant	.05	.69*
24. positivistic-negativistic	.60*	.28
25. sociable-unsociable	.61*	.29
26. responsive-unresponsive	.59*	.25
27. confident-undonfident	.65*	.16
28. weak-strong	.53*	.09
% Total Variance	37.9	15.9

*Items loading highest on factor indicated