DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 375 438 CS 508 709

AUTHOR	Yarbro, Susan
TITLE	Watching TV and Recognizing Stereotypes: Another Application of the "Drip, Drip" and "Drench" Hypotheses.
PUB DATE	Aug 94
NOTE	29p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication (77th, Atlanta, GA, August 10-13, 1994).
PUB TYPE	Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Cultural Images; Developing Nations; Higher Education; *Mass Media Effects; Mass Media Role; *Stereotypes; *Student Attitudes; Television Research; *Television Viewing; Undergraduate Students
IDENTIFIERS	Focus Groups Approach; Indiana University

ABSTRACT

A study examined the relationship between amount of television viewing and recognition of stereotypes. Subjects, 60 undergraduate students enrolled in mass media, advertising, and public relations classes at Indiana University, viewed movies produced by United States production companies but set in developing nations. After each movie, students completed questionnaires and participated in focus group discussions. Results indicated that: (1) subjects in general tended to rate "native" movie characters more negatively and white movie characters more positively; (2) the amount of television viewing alone did not correlate with subjects' recognizing more negative attributes than positive ones; and (3) the amount of television viewing did have a significant interaction effect when combined with the race or ethnic group of the character being viewed. Focus group responses indicated that subjects did not necessarily believe the stereotypes they saw in the media, but they did think that stereotypes were useful devices for understanding and interpreting the world, and subjects were at a loss when it came to going beyond the stereotypes. Findings support the "Drip, Drip" hypothesis (people who watch a lot of television form their ideas about the real world based on the world they see on TV) and extend the "Drench" hypothesis (viewers drenched by intense programs on cultures they know nothing about may be prone to accept the screen version) by suggesting that heavy television viewers may not only see stronger stereotypes in TV characters they watch often, but may also be more likely to recognize stereotypes in other characters. (Contains 38 references and 3 tables of data.) (RS)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 375 438

Watching TV and Recognizing Stereotypes: Another Application of the "Drip, Drip" and "Drench" Hypotheses

Susan Yarbro
Indiana University
200 Ernie Pyle Hall
Bloomington, IN 47405
812-855-1721
email: syarbro@ucs.indiana.edu

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
S. Yarbro
TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

Presented at the Mass Communication and Society Division
Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication Conference
August 10-13, 1994
Atlanta, Georgia

CS508709

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Mass communication researchers have generally agreed that television has tended to stereotype characters and that these stereotypes are particularly extreme for characters who are not white, Anglo-Saxon males. The stereotypes differ from decade to decade and among types of programming, but the consensus is that people of color, members of ethnic groups, and women are under represented and seldom presented as well-rounded, competent, important, and independent. The result, television critics say, is that viewers learn that white men are the only important people in the world and that they control it.

But a review of the literature and a study conducted with students at Indiana University suggests that the representation of stereotypes on television may have other effects-- that while people may learn stereotypes from television, they may also learn how to recognize stereotypes when they see them. This lesson could be important because the ability to recognize stereotypes may be the first step in overcoming them.

The Nature of Stereotypes

Walter Lippmann (1922) was the first to use the idea of stereotype as a social scientific construct. He suggested that people do not respond directly to external reality (the "world outside" ourselves) but to a "representation of the environment which is in lesser or greater degree made by man himself" (p. 10). Because reality is too complex to be fully represented in this "pseudo-environment," people use stereotypes to simplify it. Lippmann's use of stereotype was similar to modern social psychologists' concept of schema as a cognitive structure used to process information about the environment (Bartlett, 1932; Fiske & Taylor, 1984). Lippmann did not attach a negative evaluation to the idea of stereotype, but did maintain that stereotypes are the result of societal influences: "In the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world we

pick out what our culture has already defined for us, and we tend to perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture" (p. 55).

Stereotypes were first linked to attitudes and prejudice by Katz and Braly (1933), who conducted the classic empirical study of stereotypes by giving Princeton undergraduates a list of adjectives and asking them to indicate which items were typical of different ethnic groups. In their use of traits to define stereotypes of groups and in linking the concepts of stereotype and prejudice, Katz and Braly established the pattern for research on stereotypes. Media researchers adopted the descriptive method when they started to examine stereotypes on television.

Stereotypes and Television

Research completed in the 1960's and 70's has documented how television presents a distorted picture of some groups. White males have always been highly visible, but for years we simply didn't see many African-Americans, Native Americans, Hispanics, Jews, Middle Easterners, or other people of color or members of ethnic groups. A study of 63 hours of prime time programming in 1978, showed whites appeared 95.8 percent of the time and blacks 8.3 percent of the time (Weigel, Loomis and Soja, 1980). The U.S. Commission on Civil Rights (1977) found that the proportion of non-white characters on television nearly doubled between 1969 and 1974, increasing from 6.6% to 12.5%. But most of the gains were made by minority males, who constituted about half of all non-white characters in 1973 and 1974. Although non-white females made up 51.8% of minorities in the U.S. during the early 70's, only 21.4% of all non-white characters on television were females. The commission concluded that minority women were nearly invisible as major characters.

ERIC

Members of other racial or ethnic groups were also under represented on TV. Asian-Americans represented 18.4% of TV characters in 1973 and 19.1% in 1974 (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). Hispanics have been even less visible. In a content analysis of the three TV seasons between 1975 and 1978, Greenberg and Baptista-Fernandez (1980) recorded 53 Hispanics among 3549 characters. Hispanics represented 1.5% of the characters, although the 1978 census estimated Hispanics comprised 9% of the U.S. population.

Content analyses also show that the non-white characters who do appear onTV exhibit a limited number of traits and fulfill a limited type of role. In 1973, non-white males cast as major characters held jobs primarily as police officers, soldiers, and criminals (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). The most common occupation among the 53 Hispanic characters coded by Greenberg and Baptista-Fernandez (1980) was that of "crook," but nearly as many were law enforcement officers. No Hispanic was a doctor, lawyer, or banker. In 1973 and 1974, fewer than half the non-white females were employed. Of those who had jobs, most were nurses, secretaries, receptionists, maids or prostitutes (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977).

Life on children's television wasn't much different. Of 440 characters identified on one Saturday morning's programs in 1971, 13% were nonwhite (Mendelson and Young, 1972). The black characters were portrayed as almost universally good; there were no black villains. Mendelson and Young also analyzed white foreigners and found that good characters rarely spoke with an accent, but over half the villains had accents, usually German or Russian. Gypsies, Swiss, French, and Italian characters were portrayed as derogatory stereotypes. Barcus (1983) found that 184 of 1,145 characters on children's programs in January of 1981 could be classified as members of ethnic groups other than white American. The most common group was white European, accounting for 42% of all ethnic portrayals. That was followed by

ERIC

blacks (black Africans or African-Americans; 23%), Hispanics (19%), Arabs (7%), and Asians (5%). Only one Native American appeared: Tonto in The Lone Ranger.

Barcus noted that more than half of black characters held professional jobs, but most of those characters were restricted to informational programs designed to teach children about minority occupations. When he coded the jobs held by characters in cartoon shows, he found occupational stereotypes. Black-held positions included an African diplomat, an African village laborer, a police chief, a musician and a mechanic. Asians were cooks, a rickshaw driver, a busboy and a dragon lady. Hispanics worked as a bullfighter, a construction worker, a ship's cook, a kidnapper and a cafe owner. On the other hand, characters who appeared to be German were a surgeon, a doctor, a scientist, a music professor, a housekeeper, and a ship's captain.

Neither prime time entertainment nor children's programs purport to show the world as it is, but television news does. But throughout the 70's and 80's, researchers found minorities under represented both as conveyors of news and as news sources. In 1974 and 1975, 2.4% of network correspondents were non-white males; 3.5% were nonwhite females (U.S. Commission on Civil Rights, 1977). 11.3% of all news makers (either news sources or subjects of news stories) were nonwhite, and the greatest proportion of those were criminals (36.4% compared to 9.9% for whites). A constructed week of network newscasts randomly drawn during the spring of 1987 showed 5.5% of the correspondents were nonwhite males and .9% were nonwhite females (Ziegler & White, 1990). Another sample from 1989 showed 7.6% of the correspondents were nonwhite males and there were virtually no nonwhite females. The 1989 figures were not statistically significant; the researchers attributed the lack of significance to the dominance of white males in the sample.

ERIC

Learning Stereotypes from Television

Although most studies of stereotypes on television were done in the 70's and 80's and may not reflect current trends, they nevertheless provide information about what today's young adults watched on TV when they were children. It's clear that children in the 70's and 80's saw relatively few people of color or members of ethnic groups on television, and those they did see tended to exhibit a limited number of traits and fulfill a limited number of roles.

Mass communication researchers have tried to access whether children learn these stereotypes from TV and whether the stereotypes result in prejudicial attitudes. Although theory suggests children learn a great deal from television and research supports the belief that children are strongly influenced by televised violence (Gerbner et al., 1976, 1977, 1978, 1979, 1980, 1980b; Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior, 1971), it remains unclear whether children learn prejudicial or racist attitudes from TV. Bandura's social learning theory suggests that children can learn stereotypes, attitudes, values and expectations about people's roles and behaviors through observation (Bandura, 1977). Gerbner (Gerbner, Gross, Morgan, & Signorielli, 1980) suggests that the more people watch TV, the more likely they are to see reality as similar to the representations of life and society portrayed on TV. Other studies have shown television acts as a socializing agent and has an impact on children's attitudes and values (Liefer, Gordon & Graves, 1974; Liebert, Neale, & Davidson, 1973). But Zuckerman, Singer, and Singer (1980) assessed the racial and sex-role stereotypes of children and determined that children's IQ and mothers' levels of education were related to children's attitudes, but television viewing was not. Greenberg (1972) maintains that white children learn about black children from television more often than black children learn about white children, and that whites who did not socialize with black children were more likely to believe TV portrayals of blacks were realistic. In a later study, Atkin, Greenberg, and

McDermott (1977) interviewed nearly 1,000 white youngsters in California and Michigan. Two-fifths said TV was their main source of information about black people. Studies of adults performed by Tan and colleagues suggest learning of stereotypes is not limited to children. They found Chinese and American college students as well as adults in Taiwan and Mexico who watched more television listed more stereotypes for Americans than those who watched less television (Tan, 1982; Tan, Li, and Simpson, 1986).

Social Identity Theory and Mass Media Stereotypes

As some researchers have noted, thinking of people in terms of stereotypes does not necessarily result in prejudicial attitudes (Katz and Braly, 1933; Karlins, Coffman & Walters, 1969). But social identity theory (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986) suggests that once we characterize people as belonging to groups outside our own group, our tendency is to think about them in terms of stereotypes, and there's a short step between assigning someone to an outside group and feeling hostility toward him or her based on group membership.

Social identity theory holds that it is psychologically advantageous for us to categorize people. We believe members of our own group are like us, and we see members of out-groups as being both different from us and more extreme. Since we derive our identities from our in-groups and since we seek to achieve high self-esteem, we are motivated to perceive in-group members positively. Because group evaluations are based on comparisons, we perceive our group as "better" than the other group. A classic study by Sherif and his colleagues (Sherif, Harvey, White, Hood & Sherif, 1961) shows that when two groups view one another as out-groups and have hostile feelings toward each other, even placing group members together in a social situation does not decrease their hostility. Conflict and stereotyping disappeared only

when members of both groups had to work together to reach specific goals important to both groups.

Because people tend to interact with members of their own group and avoid members of out-groups, we seldom have the opportunity to overcome stereotypes. When mass media define members of the out group stereotypically, we are subject to double jeopardy. Because we often have no other basis for judging members of an out-group (Tan & Suarchavarat, 1988; Hartmann & Husband, 1981) and because we tend to remember information consistent with already existing stereotypes rather than information that is inconsistent with stereotypes (Hamilton & Trolier, 1986), we may be particularly susceptible to television stereotypes of people belonging to other ethnic groups or minorities. Stereotypes, therefore, become "a convincing substitute for reality, and more important, an integral part of social reality as perceived by the majority of Americans" (Winston, 1982, p. 177). If our stereotype of members of an out-group is largely negative, our need for self-esteem and identification with our group leads us to see people in the other group as inferior to us. We develop a prejudicial attitude toward them.

Modern Racism, Cultural Racism and Ethnocentrism

Entman (1992) suggests that even when we attempt to consciously reject prejudicial attitudes, we may exhibit what he calls modern racism. Entman defines modern racism as "a compound of hostility, rejection and denial on the part of whites toward the activities and aspirations of black people" (p. 341). Modern racists accuse African Americans of "pushing too hard" or "moving too fast." Modern racists express fear or resentment of blacks, reject the political agenda endorsed by black leaders, and often deny that racism is still a problem. Entman suggests that the presence of black newscasters or reporters on television actually

encourages modern racism by allowing audiences to conclude that blacks no longer suffer from discrimination. Black anchors adopt the same style of presentation as their white counterparts, reporting news about blacks from a white perspective, rather than from a black one. The effect, according to Entman, is that white viewers see blacks are capable of adhering to white values and can succeed in the system. The "other" can become "one of us" if he or she really wants to.

Why should the "other" want to be like us? Because, as social identity theory tells us, we are the in-group and therefore the better group. Jones (1988) uses the concepts of power and ethnocentrism to recast this psychological phenomenon in social terms. He defines our assumption that the "other" should want to be like "us" as cultural racism, the overlaying of power on ethnocentrism. Under cultural racism, difference is defined as deficient and conformity to the appropriate standard ("our" standard) is consistently reinforced. The primary assumption of cultural racism is that "our way is the best way; the majority rules, and tradition prevails" (p. 132). Therefore the presence on television of blacks who adopt stereotypical white patterns of conversation and behavior is seen not as acknowledging diversity but as encouraging cultural racism.

Modern racism and cultural racism become especially important concepts if viewers not only see stereotypical representations on television but come to believe those stereotypes are accurate representations of members of racial or ethnic groups. As we have seen, research examining that issue has led to conflicting results. Adoni and Mane's theory of social reality (1984) suggests the concept of stereotype may have different dimensions.

Social Reality Theory

Adoni and Mane identify three types of social reality: First, objective social reality is experienced as the objective world existing outside the individual. Second, symbolic social reality is any form of symbolic expression of objective reality. This includes art, literature and the media. Third, subjective social reality is constructed by the individual using input from both objective and symbolic realities. Researchers have assumed that children who learn stereotypes from television (symbolic reality) necessarily apply them when creating their own attitudes (subjective reality) about people in the real world (objective reality). But work done by Zemach and Cohen (1986) suggest that people do not necessarily mistake television reality for objective reality when they construct versions of the world. A survey of 1,202 respondents in Israel led Zemach and Cohen to conclude that viewers saw more stereotypes of women on TV than they did in real life and that heavy viewers saw more stereotypes on television than light viewers saw. But heavy viewers also tended to extend stereotypes seen on television to the real world more than light viewers. In other words, heavy viewers not only recognized the television (symbolic) version of women more readily than did light viewers, they also "believed" it (made it part of their subjective reality) more readily than did light viewers.

Zemach and Cohen did not ask viewers about specific programs or characters, but in a study of the "Drench" hypothesis, Reep and Dambrot (1989) did. The "Drench" hypothesis suggests that some television characters may be so forceful that we use them to define a significant portion of the role images we hold. "Drench" contrasts with the more traditional "Drip, Drip" hypothesis which states that the continuous presentation of stereotyped television characters teaches us stereotypes against which we assess real life (Gerbner, Gross, Signorielli, & Morgan, 1980, 1980a).

Reep and Dambrot asked viewers about male and female characters in Hunter, Moonlighting, Remington Steele, and Scarecrow and Mrs. King. They found a linear relationship between frequency of viewing a particular program and assessment of stereotypes for specific characters. The more viewers watched a program, the more they recognized characters in those programs as being stereotypes. Two aspects of this study are important to note. First, Reep and Dambrot assessed viewers' recognition of stereotypes of television characters and did not ask viewers whether the stereotypes they recognized apply to people in the real world. Second, Reep and Dambrot make no statement about whether the characters they asked about were, in fact, stereotypes. Their interest was primarily in whether viewers would see stereotypical behavior in TV characters.

While television critics have worried for decades that TV teaches viewers to see others in terms of stereotypes, Reep and Dambrot's study suggests TV may be teaching us something else--- not necessarily to see others as stereotypes but to recognize stereotypes when we see them. In other words, we learn to differentiate between the symbolic reality seen on television and the objective reality seen in the "real world." We have the option of using representations from symbolic reality in forming our opinions of the "real world," but the connection is not inevitable.

Both the "Drench" and "Drip, Drip" hypotheses offer support for this view. If heavy viewers of particular TV programs recognize characters in those shows to be more stereotyped than light viewers of those programs, then it may follow that heavy TV viewers in general are more adept at recognizing stereotyped characters than light viewers.

Hypotheses

A study involving undergraduate students at Indiana University looked at the relationship between amount of television viewing and recognition of stereotypes. Students viewed movies produced by U.S. production companies but set in developing nations. Because these movies were produced by U.S. production houses and designed primarily for U.S. audiences, it was assumed they would present views of natives from the developing nations from the point of view of U.S. citizens. Because our subjects were mostly white students from the midwest United States, we expected the subjects would tend to view natives in the films as members of an out-group and would tend to view white or western Europeans in the films as members of their in-group. The first hypothesis tested whether subjects would recognize native characters as negatively portrayed members of an out-group compared with white or western European characters as more positively portrayed members of an in-group.

The next hypothesis investigated whether people who watch more television would be influenced by TV's negative portrayals of ethnic or racial groups and whether they would be more likely to see negative traits. The hypothesis tested whether high TV viewers would see more negative than positive attributes for all characters, regardless of race or ethnic group. Two assumptions were made in connection with subjects' amount of TV viewing: 1) Subjects, who were mostly in their late teens or early 20's, grew up seeing television stereotypes of the 70's and 80's; and 2) Subjects who were high TV viewers as adults were also high TV viewers as children.

Two hypotheses tested the relationship between the amount of television viewing and the race or ethnic group of the character being rated. Following both the "Drench" and "Drip, Drip" analyses, which suggest that people who watch a lot of television may be better at recognizing stereotypes of television characters, it was hypothesized that high TV viewers

would recognize greater differences in stereotypes between native and white characters in films, and that low TV viewers would not see such extreme differences. The assumptions listed in the previous paragraph were also made for hypotheses three and four.

Here are the hypotheses:

1. Stereotypes of native characters will beviewed by subjects as more negative than stereotypes of white/west European characters.
2. High TV watchers will recognize more negative stereotypesfor all characters than low TV watchers.
3. High TV watchers will recognize more negative stereotypes for native characters and more positive stereotypes for white/west European characters.
4. Low TV watchers will see less difference in stereotypes between native characters and white/western European characters.

Method

Sixty undergraduate students enrolled in introduction to mass media, advertising, and public relations classes at Indiana University watched U.S. produced movies set in developing nations. Students were randomly assigned to five groups; each group watched four movies.[1] After each movie, students rated selected characters on 7-point semantic differential scales consisting of 37 bi-polar attributes. The lower end of the scale represented "positive" attributes

---

[1]Movies about Indo-China: Good Morning Vietnam, The Killing Fields, The Green Berets, and Red Dust.

Movies about Latin America: The Torrid Zone, Flying Down to Rio, The Emerald Forest, and Medicine Man.

Movies about Africa: Mister Johnson, Mountains of the Moon, King Solomon's Mines, and Stanley and Living.

Movies about the Middle East, North Africa, and Turkey: Khartoum, Midnight Express, Harem, and Not Without my Daughter.

Movies about China: The Good Earth, Enter the Dragon, The Last Emperor, and China Cry.

or those stereotypical of citizens of developed nations. These attributes were labeled "positive" because they were assumed to be stereotypical of the students' in-group, citizens of developed nations. The upper end of the scale represented "negative" attributes or those stereotypical of citizens of developing nations. These attributes were labeled "negative" because they were assumed to be stereotypical of the students' out-group, citizens of developing nations. Subjects were instructed to rate the attributes of both native and white characters as represented in the films. Only in focus groups carried out after subjects had completed the questionnaires did we discuss the students' personal views of the characters.

Students also provided some demographic data, including the number of hours a day they watched TV. TV viewing was divided into low viewers (less than 1 hour a day), medium viewers (1 to 2 hours a day), and high viewers (3 to 5 hours a day). Because of the complexity of the data set and the interest in comparing recognition of stereotypes of white characters with recognition of stereotypes of native characters, the unit of analysis used in this study was a particular subject's rating of a particular attribute for a particular character. Attributes for all white characters were compared with attributes for all native characters. The data yielded a total of 320 cases for each attribute.

Results

The strongest support was found for hypothesis 1, that subjects would recognize more negative stereotypes for characters native to developing countries than for characters from developed countries. Significant differences between whites and natives were found for 19

ERIC

attributes. Most were significant at the .000 level. Results are shown in Table 1. Only attributes which proved significant for at least one of the four hypotheses are shown.[2]

No support was found for the second hypothesis, that high TV watchers will recognize more negative stereotypes than low TV watchers. In fact, the data clearly indicated that both high and low TV watchers were as likely to see positive stereotypes as negative ones. T-tests comparing recognition of stereotypes between high and low TV viewers yielded a value significant at $p < .05$ for only one attribute, active-passive. The t-value for was .016. This may have been a type I error.

In order to test hypotheses three and four, a two-way ANOVA was conducted to check for an interaction between amount of TV viewing and the ethnic group being rated. Eleven variables yielded F-values significant at $p < .05$ for the interaction. A post-hoc multiple comparison test was used to determine more specifically where the interaction lay. The analysis provided support for hypothesis three, that high TV viewers would recognize more negative attributes for natives and more positive attributes for whites in the movies they viewed. With this test, 17 attributes proved to be significant at $p < .05$. Results are listed in Table 2.

Results provided more modest support for the fourth hypothesis, that low TV viewers would see less difference in stereotypes between native and white characters in the movies. In this case, the test hypothesis was the null hypothesis and nonsignificant differences between native and white viewers were those that supported the hypothesis. Twelve the of 39 original attributes were nonsignificant, $p > .05$. Results are in Table 3.

---

[2]Attributes which did not show significant differences were industrious-lazy, energetic-lethargic, important-unimportant, sterile-prolific, calm-excitable, candid-deceitful, unemotional-emotional, frigid-lustful, non-violent-violent, grateful-ungrateful, moral-immoral, conforming-deviant, kind-cruel, and selfless-greedy.

Discussion

Study results lead to two conclusions: First, subjects in general tended to rate native movie characters more negatively and white movie characters more positively. Although subjects were instructed to rate the characters based on their representations in the films rather than on the subjects' personal assessment of the characters, it's impossible to say with complete certainty whether students are simply recognizing stereotypes present in the movie or reporting their own stereotypes. But it seems logical that we would find more variance and therefore smaller F-ratios if students were indeed reporting their own stereotypes. The high F-ratios, usually significant at $p < .000$, seem to indicate high agreement among the subjects concerning their perceptions of the stimulus materials. In other words, the characters in the movies were stereotyped and subjects generally had no trouble recognizing those stereotypes.

The most interesting result of this study may be the relationship between amount of TV viewing and the recognition of stereotypes. The lack of support for hypothesis 2 indicates that the amount of TV viewing alone does not correlate with subjects' recognizing more negative attributes than positive ones. It was the race or ethnic group of the character being assessed that affe ed subjects' ratings rather than the main effect of TV viewing patterns.

Amount of TV viewing did have a significant interaction effect when combined with the race or ethnic group of the character being viewed. One possible explanation for this interaction suggests another phenomenon at work: Subjects who watched more TV may have been "experts" on symbolic reality. Our subjects who watched more television were apparently better able to recognize more negative stereotypes for native characters than for white characters, while subjects who watched less television recognized fewer negative stereotypes for native characters than for white characters. The high TV watchers coded 17 attributes they considered more negative for native characters; the low TV watchers coded 11. In addition,

ERIC

high TV watchers saw greater differences between native and white characters. The mean difference between ratings of native and white characters for high viewers was 2.065. The mean difference for low viewers was 1.308. The mean difference for high viewers becomes even more interesting when compared to the mean difference for native and white characters judged by all subjects, which was 1.266.[3] This suggests that subjects who watched more TV may have learned to recognize stereotypes of particular groups, especially out groups. In this case, they were more likely to recognize negative stereotypes exhibited by members of ethnic groups as portrayed in selected films. This finding extends the "Drench" hypothesis by suggesting that heavy viewers may not only see stronger stereotypes in TV characters they watch often, but may also be more likely to recognize stereotypes in other characters.

Focus Group Responses

Comments made by members of our focus groups tend to support this suggestion. The students talked confidently about the stereotypes they saw in the films. Some noted that, although representations of "the other" had changed over the years and now tend to be more positive, modern characterizations are often still stereotypes:

> It's like before we had these old-fashioned stereotypes of them being goofy and Latin lovers and now we have the kind of stereotype, especially with the movies with the Native Americans, it's like, oh, they're so perfect and pure and beautiful and strong and those are the same types of stereotypes used for native Americans in this country. In some ways the stereotypes are better, but they're just stereotypes.

Students often recognized that stereotypes were used as a dramatic technique to further the plot:

---

[3]Mean differences were calculated only for attributes showing significant variation between white and native characters.

> It's kind of hard to avoid stereotypes when you're given a time frame and you're thinking about economics, and people don't want to sit through a 10-hour movie while you develop a plot, so it's a quick way to develop a plot.

One student said that, while stereotyping people may not be an ethical thing to do, "It's a Hollywood thing to do." Another suggested that stereotypes may once have been used out of ignorance in films but today are used more consciously, in order to show a particular point of view.

While subjects indicated they did not necessarily believe the stereotypes they saw in the media, they did think stereotypes were useful devices for understanding and interpreting the world, a way of controlling what Lippmann (1922) called "the great blooming, buzzing confusion of the outer world" (p. 55):

> I think it makes it easier... I mean, we live in a world that's getting smaller and we're hearing about all these different countries. Putting people into stereotypes makes it a lot easier to think about it, because you can't think about every single person, five billion people, as being a three-dimensional person. I mean, you've got to be able to group people some way, and to be able to say, well, all South Americans are hot-headed. Well, that's a really simplistic one, but it makes it a lot easier to think about all those groups of people.

Most students agreed that stereotyping people is not a good thing. And although they believed the stereotypes they saw in entertainment programming, including movies and television, did not accurately represent real people, students were generally at a loss when it came to going beyond the stereotypes. Several subjects blamed the educational system for presenting "others" in stereotypical terms. The students who watched films about Vietnam complained that their history courses stopped after War World II and they had no way of knowing "the facts" about the Vietnam War. Students who saw movies about communism in China said they had no courses dealing with communism or Asian history and so had no way to judge the accuracy

of those movies. Several students blamed the media for perpetuating stereotypes instead of presenting "real" people:

> And I think, I do, that TV has a lot to do with how they portray things. Whether they portray us, the United States, as being superior and dominant. And everybody else as being the other person, more or less. They don't portray everybody else as people too. And that has a lot to do with how we see things. Because that's what we've got. We feel like "that's our real news" and we believe it. Too often, journalism people have their own bias, so that's what we have to go on.

The less subjects knew about a culture and the more intense the depiction of that culture in a film, the more subjects seemed willing to accept the film's version of the culture. Subjects who saw Midnight Express, a powerful film about an American caught smuggling drugs out of Turkey and confined to a prison there, seemed to have no way to judge the prison society represented in the film:

> Actually, it was living at the bottom of a dirt pile. It was absolutely nasty. People were vile. Everything was raunchy. Can't adjust to that. It looked like a garbage dump.

The students who saw films about Turkey or the Middle East also adopted an ethnocentric response that appeared more extreme than any expressed by those who watched other movies. One subject who watched Midnight Express extended the description of the prison as a "garbage dump" to the rest of the society. Another suggested that the Turkish system of justice was inferior to the American one:

> I think in America it's good that... at least, we who aren't in prison are given the feeling there's justice, even inside prison walls. That it's rather human, there's still a standard of living that's established and kept. And we see none of that in the Turkish prison. People are stabbed, "always below the waist," and there was no law. There was nothing to prevent you from being killed. It would have been very frightening. And the food seemed uneatable. But conditions over all were not what Americans would probably expect.

Subjects who viewed Not Without My Daughter and Harem could not imagine the Middle East women depicted in the movies could be truly happy. Students insisted that, had the women

been exposed to western culture, they would have found their own lives intolerable. Subjects repeatedly said women in Iran or Saudi Arabia were happy only because they don't know any better:

> They don't know that they can speak out. They just automatically think that they have to follow the itinerary of the husband. And when they go to the market they think it would really throw a kink in things if someone did speak up over there. I don't think she'd last long because the men would suppress her, but I think they're just not aware that there is a difference. I don't think they're aware they do have rights, or in an American society they would have rights.

When considering both quantitative and qualitative analyses, it appears as if students who viewed these films experienced the "Drench" effect and the result was symptomatic of cultural racism. The forceful, negative presentation of life in the Middle East or Turkey had a powerful effect on subjects' perceptions not only of the situations presented in the movies but also on their perceptions of what life in those countries is "really like." Since subjects had no independent information, they accepted the symbolic representations presented on the screen and used them to construct subjective representations about Turkey and Saudi Arabia. The extremely negative portrayals combined with subjects' lack of knowledge about life in Turkey or Saudi Arabia and their belief that life in the United States is superior. The result was cultural racism: Our justice system is better. Middle Eastern women would prefer the life style of American women if only they knew more about it.

The students in our study seemed to recognize the importance of looking beyond movies and the mass media to learn about people from other cultures. Students agreed that the most effective way to overcome stereotypes is by getting to know people from other cultures or ethnic or racial groups. One student who worked in a Chinese restaurant discussed a fellow worker from China:

> There's this one woman I work with, you know. She told me that during the Cultural Revolution and everything that she had to go through, she went from

> being a professor to working in an electric factory. And she, you know, comes over here, and now she's working in a Chinese restaurant! Just the whole gambit of the things that they've done. You know, it's like hearing stories from the grandparents-- it's a whole other culture, entirely different. You know, they try to understand us and we try to understand them, and maybe we're just a lot more open-minded than some people. But it is, it's neat, it's neat to know about other cultures. And they are very individual. The owner is Chinese, and it doesn't seem like he ever stops working. And that may be just typical of owners. He's a perfectionist. But it may be personal. You know, I can't say that it's because he's Chinese. It may just be that he's the owner. I couldn't say that they're different than us, other than their culture.

It appears from this study that both the "Drip, Drip" and "Drench" hypotheses may have roles in the recognition and formation of stereotypes. Although "Drip, Drip" has been interpreted primarily in terms of Gerbner's cultivation analysis, that people who watch a lot of television form their ideas about the real world based on the world they see on TV, this study suggests that heavy viewership may be correlated with the recognition of stereotypes as well as with viewers' willingness to apply them to the real world. This idea does not contradict the "Drench" hypothesis but works in conjunction with it. As our focus group discussion suggested, when viewers are "drenched" by intense programs or films offering representations of a culture or ethnic group about which the viewers have no other information, they may be more prone to accept the screen version. Viewers who have independent information gained through education or personal experience about a group of people or culture may be less likely to accept the screen representation, but, especially if they're heavy TV watchers, they may be more likely to recognize the stereotype.

This study only suggests how these differing levels of involvement with television and film may have different effects for viewers with varying levels of knowledge. Other studies are needed to investigate the extent to which viewers differentiate between recognizing stereotypes and applying them to the real world, the extent to which viewers "drenched" by particular

ERIC

representations see those representations as either stereotypes or accurate accounts, and the extent to which personal knowledge of a group is used to override screen representations.

Bibliography

Adoni, H., & Mane, S. (1984). Media and the social construction of reality: Toward an integration of theory and research. Communication Research, 11, 323-340.

Atkin, C., Greenberg, B., & McDermott, S. (1977). Race and social role learning from television. Paper presented at ACT research workshop, Televised Role Models and Young Adolescents. Harvard Graduate School of Education. Cited in Barcus, F. E. (1983). Images of life on children's television: Sex roles, minorities, and families. New York: Praeger.

Bandura, A. (1977). Social learning theory. Englewood Cliffs, N.J.: Prentice-Hall.

Barcus, F. E. (1983). Images of life on children's television: Sex roles, minorities, and families. New York: Praeger.

Bartlett, F. C. (1932). Remembering: A study in experimental and social psychology. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Entman, R. M. (1992) Blacks in the news: Television, modern racism and cultural change. Journalism Quarterly, 69, 341-361.

Fiske, S. T., & Taylor, S. E. (1984). Social cognition. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Eleey, M. F., Fox, S., Jackson-Beeck, M., & Signorielli, N. (1976). Violence Profile No. 7: Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967-1975. Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Eleey, M. F., Jackson-Beeck, M., Jeffries-Fox, S., & Signorielli, N. (1977). Violence Profile No. 8: Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967-1975. Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Jackson-Beeck, M., Jeffries-Fox, S., & Signorielli, N. (1978). Violence Profile No. 9: Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967-1975. Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Signorielli, N., Morgan, M., & Jackson-Beeck, M. (1979). Violence Profile No. 10: Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967-1975. Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1980). The "mainstreaming" of America: Violence profile no. 11. Journal of Communication. 30, 11-29.

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1980a). Aging with television: Images on television drama and conceptions of social reality. Journal of Communication, 30, 37-47.

ERIC

Gerbner, G., Gross, L., Morgan, M., & Signorielli, N. (1980b). Violence Profile No. 11: Trends in network television drama and viewer conceptions of social reality, 1967-1975. Philadelphia: Annenberg School of Communications, University of Pennsylvania.

Greenberg, B. S. (1972). Children's reactions to tv blacks. Journalism Quarterly, 49, 5-14.

Greenberg, B.S. (1988). Some uncommon television images and the drench hypothesis. In Oskamp, S. (Ed.). Television as a social issue: Applied social psychology annual 8. Newbury Park: Sage.

Greenberg, B. S. & Baptista-Fernandez, P. (1980) Hispanic-Americans: The new minority on television. In Greenberg, B. S. Life on television: Content analyses of U.S. TV drama. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Hamilton, D. L., & Trolier, T. K. (1986) Stereotypes and stereotyping: An overview of the cognitive approach. In Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. Prejudice, discrimination, and racism.. Orlando: Academic Press.

Hartmann, P., & Husband, C. (1981). The mass media and racial conflict. In Cohen, S., & Young, J. (Eds.). The manufacture of news: Social problems, deviance and the mass media. (pp. 288-303). Beverly Hills, Sage.

Jones, J. J. (1988) Racism in black and white. In Katz, P. A., & Taylor, D. A. (Eds.) Eliminating racism: Profiles in controversy. New York: Plenum Press.

Karlins, M., Cofman, T. L., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 13, 1-16.

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

Leifer, A. D., Gordon, N. J., & Graves, S. R. (1974). Children's television: More than mere entertainment. Harvard Educational Review, 44, 213-245.

Liebert, R. M., Neale, J. M., & Davidson, E. S. (1973). The early window: Effects of television on children and youth. New York: Pergamon.

Lippmann, W. (1922). Public opinion. New York: Harcourt, Brace, Javanovitch.

Mendelson, G., & Young, M. (1972). Network children's programming: A content analysis of black and minority treatment of children's television. Newtonville, MA: Action for Children's Television. Cited in Comstock, G., Chaffee, S., Katzman, N., McCombs, M., & Roberts, D. (1978). Television and human behavior. New York: Columbia University Press, 38.

Reep, D.C., & Dambrot, F. H. (1989). Effects of frequent television viewing on stereotypes: 'Drip, drip' or 'drench'? Journalism Quarterly. 66, 542-550, 556.

Sherif, J., Harvey, O.J., White, F.J., Hood, W.R., & Sherif, C.W. (1961). Intergroup conflict and cooperation: The Robber's Cave experiment. Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press.

Surgeon General's Scientific Advisory Committee on Television and Social Behavior. (1971). Television and growing up: The impact of televised violence. Rockville, MD: National Institute of Mental Health.

Tan, A. S. (1982). Television use and social stereotypes. Journalism Quarterly, 59, 119-122.

Tan, A. S., Li, S., and Simpson, C. (1986). American TV and social stereotypes of Americans in Taiwan and Mexico. Journalism Quarterly, 63, 809-814.

Tan, A.S., & Suarchavarat, K. (1988). American TV and social stereotypes of Americans in Thailand. Journalism Quarterly, 65, 648-654.

United States Commission on Civil Rights. (1977). Window dressing on the set: Women and minorities in television. Washington, D.C: U. S. Commission on Civil Rights.

Weigel, R. H., Loomis, J. W., & Soja, M. J. (1980). Race relations on prime time television. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 39, 884-893.

Winston, M.R. (1982) Racial consciousness and mass communications. Daedalus, 111, 171-182.

Zemach, T., & Cohen, A.A. (1986). Perception of gender equality on television and in social reality. Journal of Broadcasting & Electronic Media, 30, 427-444.

Ziegler, D., & White, A. (1990). Women and minorities on network television news: An examination of corespondents and newsmakers. Journalism Quarterly. 34, 215-223.

Zuckerman, D.M., Singer D.G., & Singer, J.L. (1980). Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 10, 281-294.

Table 1: Recognized Stereotypes of Natives and Whites

Stereotype	Natives*	Whites*	Dif.*	F-Ratio	Sig.
Colorless-colorful	4.54	4.54	0.00	.052	ns
High class-low class	4.90	2.91	1.99	168.424	.000
Educated-illiterate	4.57	2.27	2.30	235.155	.000
Rational-intuitive	4.34	3.18	1.16	40.736	.000
Intelligent-unintelligent	3.86	2.63	1.23	7.340	.001
Beautiful-ugly	4.08	3.02	1.06	50.171	.000
Healthy-sick	3.58	2.50	1.08	49.774	.000
Advanced-primitive	5.29	2.49	2.80	322.394	.000
Superior-interior	4.45	2.92	1.53	99.552	.000
Honest-dishonest	3.75	3.58	0.17	0.301	ns
Brave-cowardly	3.26	2.86	0.40	6.682	.010
Clean-dirty	4.42	2.55	1.87	124.429	.000
Active-passive	3.34	2.73	0.61	36.752	.002
Sophisticated-naive	7.40	2.77	1.93	122.146	.000
Smart-stupid	3.58	2.59	0.99	42.006	.000
Successful-unsuccessful	3.91	2.78	1.13	53.132	.000
Skeptical-believing	4.70	3.94	0.76	14.231	.000
Strong-weak	3.34	2.91	0.43	6.801	.009
Serious-humorous	3.10	3.56	-0.46	0.013	ns
Dominant-submissive	4.28	2.76	1.52	81.307	.000
Wise-foolish	4.01	3.31	0.70	18.836	.000
Good-bad	3.77	3.21	0.56	10.958	.001
Stable-changeable	4.07	3.89	0.33	2.918	ns

Attributes for developed nations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Attributes for undeveloped nations

*Natives: Mean of attribute for natives
*Whites: Mean of attribute for whites
*Dif: Difference between means for natives and whites

Table 2: Recognition of Stereotypes in Native and White Characters by High TV Viewers

Stereotype	Natives*	Whites*	Dif.*	t*
Colorless-colorful	5.40	1.00	4.40	5.886
High class-low class	5.13	2.74	2.39	22.379
Educated-illiterate	5.10	2.122	2.98	9.247
Rationa-intuitive	4.84	2.95	1.89	4.9986
Intelligent-unintelligent	4.44	2.17	2.27	6.593
Beautiful-ugly	4.14	2.93	1.21	3.892
Healthy-sick	3.59	2.21	1.38	4.266
Advanced-primitive	5.61	2.19	3.42	10.313
Superior-inferior	4.60	2.38	2.22	5.636
Honest-dishonest	3.71	3.98	-0.27	ns
Brave-cowardly	2.91	3.14	-0.23	ns
Clean-dirty	4.74	2.26	2.48	7.132
Active-passive	2.86	2.58	0.28	ns
Sophisticated-naive	4.64	2.37	2.27	6.133
Smart-stupid	3.60	2.56	1.04	3.178
Successful-unsuccessful	3.98	2.60	1.38	4.151
Skeptical-believing	4.74	3.58	1.26	3.091
Strong-weak	3.44	2.95	0.49	ns
Serious-humorous	3.20	3.37	-0.17	ns
Dominant-submissive	4.43	2.60	1.83	5.090
Wise-foolish	4.23	2.86	1.37	4.004
Good-bad	3.74	3.36	0.38	ns
Stable-changeable	4.36	3.05	1.31	3.176

Attributes for developed nations 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Attributes for undeveloped nations

*Natives: Mean of attribute for natives. *Whites: Mean of attribute for whites.
*Diff: Difference between native and white mean. *t: Dunn-Bonferroni Multiple-Comparison test. Critical value = 2.378. t <.05 unless otherwise noted.

Table 3: Recognition of Stereotypes in Native and White Characters by Low TV Viewers

Stereotype	Natives*	Whites*	Dif.*	t*	Hypothesis Supported
Colorless-colorful	4.58	4.51	0.07	0.224	yes
High class-low class	4.70	3.24	1.46	5.689	no
Educated-illiterate	4.56	2.36	2.20	8.754	no
Rational-intuitive	4.19	3.18	1.01	3.284	no
Intelligent-unintelligent	3.68	3.07	0.61	2.378	yes
Beautiful-ugly	3.86	3.41	0.45	1.774	yes
Healthy-sick	3.51	2.93	0.58	2.275	yes
Advanced-primitive	5.08	2.94	2.14	8.289	no
Superior-interior	4.34	3.27	1.07	3.502	no
Honest-dishonest	3.51	3.67	-0.16	0.542	yes
Brave-cowardly	3.47	3.23	0.24	0.873	yes
Clean-dirty	4.04	3.02	1.02	4.512	no
Active-passive	3.61	3.08	0.58	1.658	yes
Sophisticated-naive	4.62	3.00	1.62	5.676	no
Smart-stupid	3.62	2.85	0.77	3.021	no
Successful-unsuccessful	3.92	3.25	0.67	2.532	no
Skeptical-believing	4.75	3.67	1.08	3.251	no
Strong-weak	3.31	3.13	0.18	0.654	yes
Serious-humorous	3.39	3.65	-0.26	0.884	yes
Dominant-submissive	4.37	3.02	1.35	14.139	no
Wise-foolish	3.99	3.67	0.32	1.170	yes
Good-bad	3.72	3.42	0.30	1.064	yes
Stable-changeable	4.11	4.03	0.08	0.245	yes

Attributes for developed nations	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Attributes for undeveloped nations

*Natives: Mean of attribute for natives. *Whites: Mean of attribute for whites.
*Dif: Difference between means for natives and whites. *t: Dunn-Bonferroni Multiple-Comparison test. Critical value =2.378. Non-significant values support the hypothesis.

ERIC