

FAMILIARITY AS A VARIABLE
IN ANTICIPATED COMMUNICATION

by

Craig A. Dudczak
B.S./Ed., Eastern Illinois University, 1973
M.A., Eastern Illinois University, 1974

Submitted to the Department of Communication Studies
and the Faculty of the Graduate School of the
University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy.

FAMILIARITY AS A VARIABLE
IN ANTICIPATED COMMUNICATION

Craig A. Dudczak, Ph.D.
University of Kansas, 1984

Abstract

Persons anticipating interaction with another person respond differently as a function of their familiarity with the other person. It was predicted that a person anticipating interaction with another from a familiar ethnic background would engage a broader cognitive schema which would be reflected in the number of additional items of information, questions asked, and elements of a written impression generated by a subject. Conversely, it was expected that a person anticipating interaction with another whose was from an unfamiliar ethnic background would select fewer additional items of information, ask fewer questions, and write fewer elements of a written impression. This prediction was supported in the whole in two of the three dependent measures.

A second prediction was that persons anticipating interaction with a target from a familiar ethnic background would select personality-related items in the information selection, questions asked, and impressions generated. Conversely, persons expecting to interact with another from an unfamiliar background would represent the target in descriptive items of information, questions, and elements of their impression. This prediction was not supported in any of the three measures.

An unpredicted finding was that all subjects, regardless of their familiarity of the ethnic background of the target, represented the target in personality-related items. This result was obtained in all three measures including the additional items selected, questions asked, and impressions recorded.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

There are two sets of people who deserve recognition for their unfailing support. First, there are those who have assisted me in my formal education. I am especially grateful to Dr. Walter H. Crockett who directed this dissertation. He is a scholar, a teacher, a friend, and a model. I would hope that some day I could be more like him. Dr. Donn W. Parson who served as my adviser for my three years at K.U. and who also served on this dissertation committee provided counsel when I put barriers in my path. He also let me use my allotment of three marbles more than once. Dr. Kenneth Johnson helped me get through the statistical analysis of my data. His patience and long hours of help at odd hours got me through more than once.

Other faculty at K.U. and elsewhere have a part in this, even though they were not on the dissertation committee. Dr. Karlyn Campbell is the most formidable teacher and scholar I have ever had the privilege to know. Dr. Wil Linkugel more than once got me through the maze of the administrative requirements. He's also not a bad first baseman. Dr. Thomas Beisecker provided an open office more than once. Dr. Stephan Horak from Eastern Illinois helped me find my roots. Ms. Karen Pfelderer from Maine West H.S. helped me find the path I've chosen and allowed me to discover my soul.

There are too many friends in the Communication Studies Department to list them all by name. I am grateful to the colleagues I shared three years with in the graduate program. I learned much

from them all. Gregg Walker stands as the first among equals.

The other people in my life whose support I cherish are my family. I could not have done any of this without Cindy, my wife. She supported me through the highs and the lows. She deserves the recognition. I must also acknowledge my parents for their constant encouragement and support. My in-laws, Col. & Mrs. Morris H. Shedd, bolstered me.

Finally, it is to the memory of Joseph F. Krzyminski and Stanley Dudczak, my grandfathers, that I dedicate this work.

C.A.D.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iii
TABLE OF CONTENTS.	v
LIST OF TABLES	viii
CHAPTER I. INTRODUCTION	1
Basic Cognitive Processes	3
George A. Kelly.	4
Discussion of Kelly.	6
Extension of Impression Formation.	7
Familiarity as a Salient Stimulus.	10
Discussion of Familiarity and Social Stereotypes	13
Model of Familiarity in Impression Formation.	14
Statement of Research Hypotheses.	15
CHAPTER II: METHOD.	17
Pilot Studies	17
Pilot Study 1.	17
Pilot Study 2.	18
Subjects.	20
Independent Measures.	20
Dependent Measures.	23
Item Selection Task.	23
Question Task.	25
Personal Impression Task	26
Background Information.	27

	<u>Page</u>
Personal Perception Questionnaire.	27
Personal Background Inventory.	28
General Procedures.	29
CHAPTER III: RESULTS.	35
Item Selection Task	35
Question Task	37
Impression Task	41
Personal Perception Questionnaire	45
Summary	47
CHAPTER IV: DISCUSSION.	49
Ethnicity as a Construct.	51
Dependent Measures.	54
Familiarity as a Predictor of Construct Extensiveness	57
Suggestions for Further Research.	60
Conclusion.	61
REFERENCES	63
APPENDIX 1: ETHNIC FAMILIARITY QUESTIONNAIRE.	71
APPENDIX 2: IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE.	72
APPENDIX 3: INTERVIEW	74
APPENDIX 4: INDEX	76
APPENDIX 4-A: SELECTION TASK: ITEM DESCRIPTIONS.	77
APPENDIX 5: ITEM SELECTION SHEET.	79
APPENDIX 6: SUBJECT QUESTIONS	80
APPENDIX 7: RATER INSTRUCTIONS: QUESTION TASK.	81
APPENDIX 8: PERSONAL IMPRESSION FORM.	82
APPENDIX 9: RATER INSTRUCTIONS: IMPRESSION TASK.	83

	<u>Page</u>
APPENDIX 10: PERSONAL PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE	84
APPENDIX 11: PERSONAL BACKGROUND INVENTORY	86
APPENDIX 12: CONSENT STATEMENT	87
APPENDIX 13: TASK INSTRUCTIONS	88
APPENDIX 14: DEBRIEFING STATEMENT.	89
APPENDIX 15: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: SELECTION TASK	90
APPENDIX 16: PERSONAL PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS	91
APPENDIX 17: QUESTION TASK RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT	94
APPENDIX 18: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUESTION TASK.	95
APPENDIX 19: IMPRESSION TASK RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT	96
APPENDIX 20: ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: IMPRESSION TASK.	97

LIST OF TABLES

	<u>Page</u>
1. Total Items Selected with Proportions Selected by Type.	36
2. Questions Asked by Condition.	40
3. Impression Task: Elements Written by Condition	44

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Imagine that you are in the situation where you are about to meet a person for the first time. Prior to meeting the person you will probably anticipate what this person will be like. It is likely that you would begin your search for information about this person by attempting to find whether he/she possesses traits or characteristics with which you are already familiar. Your own familiarity with certain traits or characteristics used to label the person would create expectations about what the person would be like.

Assume for a moment that the person you are going to meet comes from a background with which you are unfamiliar. How does your unfamiliarity with the person's background affect the way in which you anticipate the interaction and the manner in which you will proceed to learn additional information?

Normally, we might initially attempt to anticipate what the person will be like from first-hand information which we have available. So in the case where we knew that the person was a Russian, our own first-hand experience with Russians might serve as a model against which our expectations are formed. But what if we have never previously met a Russian? It would seem likely that where we lack first-hand information we, nevertheless, have a repository of second-hand information--from what others have told us, from what we have read, or from associations which reside in

memory for which we have lost the original trace of its source--which we may use to construct an expectation of what the person will be like.

Occasionally, we may encounter situations where we have little or no previous experiences, whatever their source, to draw upon to create a set of expectations. In these instances does our anticipation and preliminary behavior vary from those instances in which we are better prepared? Further, does our unfamiliarity with the anticipated encounter alter the kinds of information we choose to elicit? Do our initial impressions about the person change?

The present study is directed toward answering these types of questions. In a sense, it focuses upon the nature of the intrapersonal processing which occurs before an anticipated encounter. It is the assumption of this study that most persons will act differently in the manner they process information and form impressions about another person when the target person is "familiar" to them than when the target person is "unfamiliar." A threefold process will be advocated later in this section to account for the differences underlying the way in which familiar and unfamiliar target persons are anticipated.

The outline of this introduction will follow the sequence whereby a consideration will first be given to the cognitive theories which have been advocated that account for how individuals process information. Second, a review of research pertinent to impression formation focussing upon initial impressions and discrimination among

types of stimulus conditions will be presented. Third, a review of research dealing with familiarity and unfamiliarity of target persons will be analyzed. Fourth, a general model explaining how familiarity and unfamiliarity operate as an organizing principle in the impression formation process will be offered. Finally, a formal statement of the research hypotheses for the present study will be made.

Basic Cognitive Processes

The fundamental assumption underlying this study is that persons attempt to make meaningful their perceptions of others. Perceptions are understood not as cognitive reproductions of the person or thing observed, but rather as an interpretation which the perceiver uses to anticipate actions by the other person or thing, and which also serve to guide the perceiver in his/her behaviors directed toward the person/thing. Attempts at communication is seen as a form of behavior which is a directed response, with cognitive processes serving as mediational role between the reception of stimuli from external sources and the enactment of intentional responses. The focus of this point of view is upon the creative/interpretive process through which information is made meaningful.

The foundations for this perspective are drawn initially from the work of the late George A. Kelly and developed by a number of his successors. The following section attempts to trace the development of this thought incorporating several divergent perspectives.

George A. Kelly

Kelly (1955) begins with the assumption that humans are similar to scientists in that each person seeks to predict and control the course of events in which he/she is involved. Rather than merely responding to events, humans are conceived to create anticipatory patterns with which to view the world and which are validated for the individual through the correspondence between the patterns and the realities which the person experiences. Kelly called these patterns "constructs," which represent the person's way of construing the world. The formal statement of Kelly's perspective is known as his "Fundamental Postulate" which states "a person's processes are psychologically channelized by the ways in which he anticipates events." (p. 46).

The several corollaries to the fundamental postulate provide an explanation of the processes involved in individual perception. The Construction Corollary implies that there are pre-existing structures which allow a person to notice certain elements of an event (Neisser, 1976) rather than others. Nystedt and Magnusson (1982) summarize that the construction corollary means that representations of reality occur through mental manipulation of internal models of events.

The Individuality Corollary implies that there are "different approaches to the anticipation of the same event" (Kelly, 1955, p. 55). Despite these differences Kelly holds that persons can hold common ground. The Organization Corollary suggests that constructs exist in an hierarchy of relationships. The hierarchy

is evolutionary and adapts to minimize incompatibilities and inconsistencies. The Dichotomy Corollary implies both that there are a finite number of constructs employed by a person as well as that these constructs are dichotomous. By dichotomous Kelly means that our understanding is both based on how a construct is similar to other objects in the category as well as how they are different from items which are excluded.

Kelly next stated a Choice Corollary which implies that the person is aware of his/her choices and can choose to alter the construal of reality. Experience tests those choices which are adequate with those found to be unsatisfactory likely to lead to alternative choices in future construals. The Range Corollary implies that each construct has a limited focus and range of convenience. The Experience Corollary explains that as persons experience new events, they create new constructs for the anticipation of other similar events. This allows an adaptation to the working hypotheses a person employs as a test of experience.

In the Modulation Corollary Kelly notes that superordinate constructs are free to exercise new relationships and add elements within their range of experience while subordinate levels of constructs are determined by their relation to higher elements within a person's construction system. Kelly follows this with a Fragmentation Corollary which implies that what may be inconsistent within one person's construction system may be compatible within another person's system. Inconsistencies at a subordinate level may be unimportant so long as the larger system provides the individual with adequate predictions.

In his last two corollaries, Kelly deals with the employment of construction systems within larger social groupings. The first of these, the Commonality Corollary, implies that understanding is not possible without commonality of experiential cycles. It becomes possible for persons to share experiences in common through similar construals of experiences. He then notes, through his Sociality Corollary, that to the extent one person construes the construction processes of another, he may play a role in the social processes involving the other person. This may be the closest Kelly comes to saying that in order to communicate with another we must be able to construct an appraisal of the other person's construction of reality.

Discussion of Kelly

Kelly provides a rich starting point for an understanding of individual attempts to construct an understanding of a social world. Beginning with the metaphor of "Man as Scientist," Personal Construct Theory both accounts for the unique differences which characterize individuals as well as the process by which shared construals create a social reality. Individuals employ construction systems which may approximate those used by others. Where a high level of agreement exists in the anticipatory (and interpretive) schemata employed by social actors, it may be taken as sign evidence of the similarity of their underlying construct systems.

The importance of Personal Construct Theory to the field of communication lies in the anticipatory replication of another's construal as a necessary precondition for interpersonal communication.

When anticipating communication with another, a person seeks to anticipate the other's constructs so that he/she might understand them and create conditions for incorporating them within his/her own construct system. Failure on the part of a person to successfully anticipate the other's construction of reality operates as does the failure to anticipate any event. When anticipatory schemata prove to be inadequate for the person, he/she ultimately abandons them in favor of others which may prove to be more satisfactory. As Kelly (1955, p. 136) concludes about the nature of communication, he notes:

The notion of communication is itself a construct and, just as we let a construct represent that of which it is a construction, we let a communicated construct represent the personal construct of which it is a construction. The communicated construct is the construing of the person who "receives" it; one of its elements is the construct of the person who had it beforehand. The construct of the person from whom the communication takes place is real; so is the communicated construct, but the communicated construct is a construction of the original construct and hence not identical with it.

Communication becomes only a special sense in which a person employs constructs. When a person successfully anticipates the constructs employed by another, the Commonality and Sociality Corollaries are discharged and "communication" becomes possible.

Extension of Impression Formation

While Kelly lays the groundwork for a position which says that cognitive structures mediate the interpretation of external events, others have contributed to the development of this theory. Perhaps most important within the field of communication has been the work of Delia. In outlining what has been labeled the "constructivist"

perspective, Delia (1976) has argued that we never directly experience another person, but rather we construct an impression. He notes (p. 367):

The constructivist perspective implies directly that our understanding of other people is always in terms of images or impressions. The other is never a reflected reality. We can never apprehend another's intentions, inner qualities, or attitudes. Rather, in interpersonal perception the individual constructs an impression of the actions, qualities, or attitudes of the other through interpreting aspects of the other's appearance and behavior within particular cognitive dimensions.

The essential features of Delia's perspective rest with the assumption that perception of another consists both of representations of the other's behaviors and actions and the inferred dispositional qualities attributed to the other. The source of information about another may consist either of observed instances of behavior or inferred attributes from reports about the person (Delia, 1976; 1977). Additionally, the impression may rely upon dimensions which are individually idiosyncratic or socially shared (Delia, 1976). Sharing in Kelly's metaphor of "man as scientist," Delia (1976) concludes that perception is "an attempt after meaning," interposing an interpretive cognitive structure between physical sensation and conceptual understanding.

Associated concepts developed by others also address the cognitive mediation identified in Personal Construct Theory and Constructivism. Perhaps the most familiar concepts surround contemporary explanations of stereotyping. Stewart et al. (1979), for example, explain stereotyping as a strategy to formulate a

plan of expectations for dealing with information which is uncertain. Hamilton (1979) further notes the necessity of reducing the complexities of the stimuli to which a person is subjected. The individual copes with these stimuli through a process of categorization (Stewart et al., 1979; Snyder, 1981; Hamilton, 1979; 1981) which allows the person to anticipate the nature of the other person to be encountered. Further, the anticipation of the other directs the behavior of the perceiver in the ensuing interaction. Snyder (1981) outlines this procedure as a four-step process (p. 200):

- (1) perceivers anticipate their forthcoming interaction with targets in the light of available stereotypes; (2) these stereotypes guide the formation of scenario-like anticipations of what events are to appear as the interaction unfolds; (3) in these scenarios targets are imagined to behave in accord with stereotyped-based inferences and predictions about their attributes and behaviors; (4) these scenarios actively guide the perceiver's interactional strategy.

The importance of the process Snyder outlines for stereotyping is in its accounting for the relationship between (a) the cognitive process of association and anticipation and (b) the behavioral strategy the perceiver employs. Stereotypes are not simply cognitive structures. Rather, they create the conditions for the course of subsequent behaviors. To the extent that one employs stereotypes as a normal process of categorizing events in anticipation of encounters with persons or objects, stereotypes actively contribute to the forms of behavior associated with human communication.

Several biasing or predispositional tendencies have been observed in the employment of stereotypes. The concern here is not primarily with the content of the stereotype; theoretically a

stereotype should produce distortions which result in positive consequences. Rather, the interest with stereotyping is with the process by which it skews perceptions in the anticipation of interaction.

Snyder, Tanke, and Berscheid (1977) note that one effect of stereotypes is that they lead to the overestimation of the occurrence of instances which confirm the stereotype. They trace this tendency to over-represent confirming instances to what Tversky and Kahneman (1973) had labeled the "availability heuristic." In short this availability heuristic states that there is a greater tendency to rely on elements which are cognitively more available. To the extent that a stereotype categorizes information into patterns of familiarity, those categories, once engaged, become more available to the individual perceiver.

Hamilton (1979, 1981) expands upon the influence of stereotypes in noting that the cognitive availability of certain preconceived categories of objects may create a perceptual bias to discount other pertinent associations which could be made; the other associations are discounted because of the reliance upon the stereotypes' available categorization scheme. In some ways one may read stereotypes as possessing the elements which Burke (1945) described as terministic screens, except that in the discussion of stereotypes, little emphasis is placed on the symbolic importance of the language user, as compared to dealing with the precepts of the perceiver.

Familiarity as a Salient Stimulus

Up to this point the discussion has largely focused on the process by which perceivers utilize stereotypes to anticipate salient

items from among those available. One factor which appears to have a high degree of salience across individuals is their familiarity with the person with whom they anticipate interaction. Support for this contention is provided through a number of studies which have demonstrated that subject familiarity with a target results in a greater number of descriptions about the target person. Beach and Wertheimer (1961), for instance, found that subjects provided the greatest amount of information about targets with whom they had the greatest acquaintance. Not surprisingly, the subjects had the greatest number of descriptions about themselves, followed by well-known targets (known to self) with the least number of descriptions provided for not well-known targets.

Fiske and Cox (1979) reported that subjects wrote more elaborate descriptions of persons well-known to them than of less well-known acquaintances. Additionally, Fiske and Cox reported that the descriptions for the well-known targets were more likely to be represented by more abstract personality elements while the less well-known descriptions were relatively concrete in accounting for background types of information. Supnick, cited in Crockett (1965) similarly found that children tended to represent friends through the description of traits while more concrete behaviors were used in accounting for strangers. Supnick also reported that children would report more information about a friend than about a stranger (Scarlett, Press, and Crockett; 1971).

Hamilton, Katz, and Leirer (1980) account for the obvious ease of retrievability of self-descriptive items in terms of the familiarity

we have for ourselves. It is only a slight extension to expand this rationale to the likelihood that others with whom we are familiar should similarly allow us more knowledge of what they are like and hence, reflect in a greater extensiveness of item recall. Bass (1981) reflecting on his previous analysis (1966) advanced two reasons for interaction and recall to increase as a function of the familiarity and intimacy of group members; (1) members feel more secure in interacting with each other than with strangers, and (2) they can predict each other's actions.

In addition to personal familiarity which may exist for a person in regards to an acquaintance who is well-known, other, socially-shared, types of familiarity may exist. Hamilton (1979) notes that differential response to ethnic groups is not possible without a prior categorization process. Of course, Hamilton notes that stereotypes about ethnic groups tend to be a socially-shared categorization rather than an idiosyncratic expression. Similarly, Snyder (1981) proposes that among well-known social stereotypes are sex, age, religion, race, ethnicity, national origin, bodily appearance, sexual orientation, occupation, political affiliation, and social class. So while it may be necessary on occasion to distinguish between personal stereotypes and social stereotypes (Stewart et al., 1979), there is some basis for accepting that there are some stereotypes which are commonly shared within categories of a population. Where these social stereotypes exist, generalizations may be drawn about their collective familiarity and, presumably, about the likelihood that they would engender a broader engagement of descriptions than would a less

familiar target.

Discussion of Familiarity and Social Stereotypes

Given that distinctive items create a heightened level of salience for the perceiver, the question is whether familiarity generates distinctiveness for subjects. Much of the previous research (Beach and Wertheimer, 1961; Fiske and Cox, 1979) have used subject-generated operationalizations of familiar and unfamiliar conditions. There is a fair amount of evidence that familiar targets do engage a broader description of the target than to unfamiliar targets. Additionally, there seems to be some indication that the type of information a familiar target is likely to elicit is more abstract and personality oriented than the relatively behavioral descriptions elicited by an unfamiliar target.

Given that stereotyping appears to be a normal process by which persons categorize information allowing them to anticipate events, and that certain patterns within stereotyping appear to be socially shared in dealing with the categorization of types of information, it would be expected that people from a familiar background would generate a more extensive description and a more abstract personality-oriented description from a perceiver than would people from an unfamiliar background.

What happens when there is no readily available stereotype in which to categorize the anticipated target? Previous research does not provide much guidance as most studies have used alternative familiar categories which subjects could utilize in their construction

(or reconstruction) of a stereotype.

Except for those studies previously noted which asked subjects to think of someone who was not well-known to them, most research in impression formation has relied upon the operationalization of two available constructs within the repertoire of the subjects. Given that the direction of research findings has supported the relationship between familiarity and the extensiveness of descriptions of target persons, it would seem necessary to test whether the unfamiliarity of a target would actually result in a reduced construction of descriptions provided by subjects.

Model of Familiarity in Impression Formation

The proposed model of familiarity in impression formation endeavors to operationalize an unfamiliar treatment which both maintains ecological validity as well as restricts the employment of pre-existing stereotyped constructs for the unfamiliar condition. The formal model may be stated in a set of propositions which are presented in the following:

1. Persons anticipate interactions with others.
 - A. Anticipation of events results in a theory of the sequence of events.
 - B. Stereotypes operate to provide an anticipatory schema.
 1. The anticipatory schema manifests itself in behaviors which attempt to enact the anticipated sequences.
 2. Social stereotypes provide for shared anticipatory schema.
 3. Social stereotypes about a person provide a set of descriptive elements that will be expected of that person.

4. Conversely, the absence of social stereotypes about a person from an unknown background yields relatively few descriptive elements.
5. A large number of socially shared stereotypes should lead to the influence of a relatively large proportion of abstract, personality items.
6. By comparison, the absence of stereotypes about a person from an unfamiliar background should leave the description of that person with a greater proportion of concrete, behavioral elements.

Statement of Research Hypotheses

The research question for the present study is divided into two main hypotheses, each of which has imbedded three sub-hypotheses.

Hypothesis₁: People from familiar backgrounds will result in subjects generating a greater number of total elements than will subjects exposed to people from an unfamiliar background.

Sub-hypothesis₁₁: In order to generate such descriptions, subjects will select a greater number of additional items of information about people from a familiar background than about people who are exposed to an unfamiliar target.

Sub-hypothesis₁₂: Similarly, subjects will ask a greater number of questions about a person from a familiar background than about someone from an unfamiliar background.

Sub-hypothesis₁₃: Subjects will write a greater number of elements in their impressions of someone from a familiar background than of someone from an unfamiliar background.

Hypothesis₂: Subjects who anticipate interaction with someone from a familiar background will include proportionally more personality-related items than will subjects who anticipate interaction with someone from an unfamiliar background. Conversely, subjects anticipating interaction with an unfamiliar person will reflect proportionally more behavior-related items.

- Sub-hypothesis₂₁: These differences will be reflected in the kinds of additional items of information subjects select about a person.
- Sub-hypothesis₂₂: These differences will be reflected in the kinds of questions subjects ask of a person.
- Sub-hypothesis₂₃: These differences will be reflected in the kinds of items subjects will write in their descriptions of a person.

CHAPTER TWO

METHOD

Prior to conducting the study it was necessary to select a method to represent the familiar and unfamiliar target groups to subjects. It was decided that since this country is an amalgamation of various ethnic groups, such groups would include some that would be perceived as well-known to most people and others would be more obscure. Two pilot tests were conducted to determine if "familiar" and "unfamiliar" groups do, in fact, exist for the typical subject.

Pilot Studies

Since many ethnic groups can be identified, it was decided that the initial list should be limited to ethnic groups which conformed to the racial composition of the subjects. Given that the "typical" undergraduate at the University of Kansas is caucasian and of European extraction, it was decided that the potential ethnic targets should also be European.

Pilot Study 1

In the first pilot study a list of forty-five European ethnic groups was assessed by an independent group of undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Kansas during the 1982 Spring semester. All of the groups on the list were "real" except for three bogus listings. Some of the groups represented national identities (e.g., French, Italian, Spanish, etc.) while others were culturally distinctive subgroups within a larger national identity (e.g., Ukrainian,

Alsatian, etc.). Other ethnic groups had regional identification but are not exclusively identified within a single larger national identity (e.g. Basque, Tyrolian, etc.). Seventeen subjects completed the pilot test. They were told to "check the groups on the list with which you are familiar." To be considered it was only necessary that you know something about the group. Your knowledge may be based upon first-hand experience, information you have read, or information provided to you from another person. "It is not important that you know a great deal about the group." Subjects were told they should check all of the groups with which they were familiar. No time limit was imposed, although all of the subjects completed this task within five minutes. Only one subject selected a bogus group; his survey was disregarded. The complete list of ethnic groups surveyed in Pilot Study 1 may be found in Appendix 1.

Pilot Study 2

Based on the results of the first pilot study, the four ethnic groups which were most frequently selected as familiar and the four which were least often selected were identified. The four "familiar" and four "unfamiliar" groups were rated by a second, independent group of undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Kansas during the 1982 Spring semester. The subjects were given a form listing the name of the ethnic group and then a series of questions pertaining to the group (See Appendix 2). The purpose of the second pilot was to determine whether the familiar targets were associated with valid characteristics of the group (e.g., country of origin),

while the unfamiliar targets were not. Each subject was asked to rate all eight targets (four familiar and four unfamiliar) for each category of questions. To familiarize the subjects with this task, a sample (Mexican) target was used. Each subject received the eight rating sheets with the order randomized to control for ordering effects in the responses.

The second pilot test validated the results of the first pilot. Subjects were able to select country of origin and otherwise confirm familiarity with the four groups previously identified as "familiar." Similarly, ethnic targets which were unfamiliar to the first target group could not be identified by country of origin in the second pilot test.

Based upon the results of the two pilot tests it was decided that "ethnicity" constituted a valid construct for the operationalization of familiarity/unfamiliarity. The two ethnic groups which were most frequently identified by the pilot subjects were selected for the main experiment as familiar targets. The two familiar targets, English and German, were identified by 29 of 31 subjects from the combined pilot groups (93.6%). Likewise, the two ethnic groups least frequently identified, Kashubs and Walloons, were chosen for use in the main experiment as unfamiliar targets. Kashubs were not identified by any subjects while Walloons were identified (incorrectly) by 2 of 31 subjects (6.7%).

Subjects

Subjects for the main experiment were undergraduate students enrolled in one of three Basic Communication courses, an Interview course, and an Intercultural Communication course at the University of Kansas during the 1982 Summer semester. All students received class credit for participation. Subjects signed up for participation at a central location and reported to the Communication Research Complex in groups ranging from one to five in number.

Seventy-nine student volunteers actually participated in the study. The results from all subjects were not included in the analysis. Sixteen subjects who listed a foreign country as their place of birth (See Question #5 on the Personal Background Inventory, Appendix 11) were excluded. Three additional subjects were randomly excluded to equalize cell size (two subjects from the Familiar treatment and one from the Control treatment) leaving sixty subjects. These sixty subjects were distributed with twenty each in the Familiar (German and English), Unfamiliar (Kashub and Walloon), and Control (Kansas City area) conditions.

Independent Measures

Based on the results of the pilot studies it had been determined that certain ethnic designations were generally familiar (German and English) while other ethnic designations (Kashub and Walloon) were unfamiliar to the typical undergraduate student. The task of constructing independent treatments was to focus subject's attention upon the variable of ethnic familiarity. Previous research (Snyder

and Uranowitz, 1978; Juhnke, 1980) had found that the alteration of a single or limited number of trait items in a stimulus description could yield substantial differences in subsequent impression formation. Based upon those findings it was decided that a case study approach which varied the ethnic reference would be an appropriate instrument to present the familiarity/unfamiliarity construct.

Rather than use a descriptive paragraph to present the stimulus information, it was decided that an interview format would be used (See Appendix 3). The choice of an interview format was made in the belief that it would be more involving to subjects and would be perceived as describing a real person. The interview format allowed the hypothetical interviewer to elicit information from the interviewee.

The interview was written in such a way that the information elicited could be described as typical of anyone. If familiarity with the ethnic target affects the nature of one's impressions, varying the ethnic identification of the interviewee across subjects should produce consistent differences in impressions.

Identical interviews were associated with each of the familiar and unfamiliar targets and the control target. The only difference among the stimulus sets was the ethnic identification attributed to the interviewee. In all cases the interviewee was given the name "Stan." In addition to an initial ethnic identification in the preface to the interview, "Stan" made three references to his ethnic background in the course of the interview in the familiar and unfamiliar treatments. No ethnic reference was made in the control condition.

The choice to include two ethnic targets respectively within the familiar and unfamiliar treatments was made to avoid what Cook and Campbell (1979) label as the "mono-operation bias." A single treatment of a familiar ethnic target, for instance, might mask some peculiarity that a number of subjects may have held about the ethnic group. The use of two treatments of the familiar and the unfamiliar target groups allowed at least some control of confounding by unknown effects unique to a particular ethnic label.

The control target was defined only as a person living in the Kansas City area, with no reference made to ethnic background. It was reasoned that any deviation from the control group by either the familiar or the unfamiliar targets would be attributable to the subjects' familiarity with the ethnic background of the targets. Kansas City was chosen because of its proximity to the university as a large and diverse metropolitan area. Many undergraduates attending the University of Kansas come from the Kansas City area and presumably would have some impression of what a Kansas Citian is like. As a regional center, Kansas City would presumably also be familiar to undergraduates who did not live in the Kansas City metropolitan area.

In summary, the independent measure consisted of three categories of familiarity: two familiar ethnic targets (English and German), two unfamiliar ethnic targets (Kashub and Walloon), and a control target (Kansas City area). By varying the ethnic identification of the target reference, the independent measure sought to determine whether such a manipulation would induce differential responses in impression formation among subjects.

Dependent Measures

The thesis of the present study is that subjects would make a differential response in their impressions of a targeted person based upon their familiarity with the target person. It was necessary, therefore, to design measurements which allowed both the quantity and quality of responses to be measured. Three separate dependent measures were developed.

Item Selection Task

This measurement allowed subjects to select additional items of information about the target beyond that which was presented in the interview. Assuming that a familiar target allows the subject to engage a wider array of his/her cognitive schemata, it would be expected that subjects who received one of the familiar social backgrounds would select a larger number of additional items describing the target person, while the unfamiliar social background would cause the subject to focus on relatively few traits in an attempt to develop a core impression of the other targets.

The Item Selection Task consisted of forty-eight items of additional information which the subject could select. One measure of information search was the total number of additional items each subject selected. The forty-eight items were divided into two groups of twenty-four items each: a set of personality traits and a set of self-reported background items. The first group of items was derived from the personality trait items generated by Passini and Norman (Passini and Norman, 1966; Norman, 1963). These items were

selected because they have been found to have a stable reference for subjects in previous studies. They were randomized in order and intermixed with background information items on a master "index" (See Appendix 4). Each personality trait item was said to have been provided by a group rating of the target by persons who knew him. It was assumed that more such personality trait items would be sought for a familiar target as subjects would believe that they already had a rough knowledge of the target's "objective" behavioral traits.

The other twenty-four items in the "Item Selection Task" consisted of ostensibly self-reported information provided by the target. They represented demographic information about the target. Items such as "religion," "income," etc. were constructed as relatively "objective" items of information which the target provided about himself (See Appendix 4).

After reading the interview subjects were told they would be permitted to learn additional information about the interviewee. They were asked to scan the "Index" of additional items and then select as many items as they felt were necessary to form an "accurate" impression of the target person. When they found an item to select, subjects were told to turn to the appropriately numbered index card available in their booklet, select and read the card, and then return the card to its pocket in the test booklet. After reading the information contained on a card, subjects were asked to record the number of the item they had selected on the "Item Selection Sheet." (See Appendix 5).

Subjects were instructed that they could select as many additional items of information as they wished, remembering to record each item after they had selected it. However, they were told they should only select those items which they felt would help them form a "more accurate impression." When they finished this task they were asked to inform the experimenter who then provided them with additional instructions.

In all target treatments the nature of the "Index," item descriptions (on the index cards) and Item Selection Sheet were identical. Differences in the number and type of information selected would be inferred to have been caused by the independent operation of the target's ethnic familiarity.

Question Task

As a second dependent measure subjects were asked whether there was any additional information about the target they would like to know in order to form a more accurate impression of the person. This was structured as an open-ended task. Subjects could write as many (or as few) additional questions as they wished. These questions would ostensibly be used to find additional information about the target.

The "Subject Questions" (See Appendix 6) were first counted to generate a score of total questions with the expectation that subjects who read about unfamiliar targets would ask fewer questions. Second, independent raters carried out a qualitative discrimination between the types of questions subjects asked. They coded questions as containing a request for background information, for personality

information, for both, or for neither. It was expected that the unfamiliar target subjects would induce more requests for background information than would the familiar target subjects.

Personal Impression Task

When subjects had completed the "Question Task," they were given a "Personal Impression Form" (See Appendix 8) on which they were asked to write a "brief description of the person's personality." Subjects were asked to write their impressions as though they were describing "Stan" to a friend.

The open-ended impressions were later rated by an independent group of coders. The coders were undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Kansas who were trained by the experimenter to code the impressions. Each coder was paid for his/her service and was not otherwise involved in the experiment. Ratings consisted of two parts. First, raters counted the total number of sentences written by each subject on the "Impression Formation Form." The sentence was selected as the unit of analysis because it represented a complete thought on the part of the subject. It was expected that the familiar target would cause the subject to generate more extensive impressions (sentences) because the familiarity with the target should have engaged more preconceptions by the subject.

Second, raters categorized the sentences into four categories. Sentences which represented an objective/demographic account of the target by the subject were coded as "Objective/Descriptive" information; those which represented an opinion or an evaluation of the target were

coded as "Subjective/Evaluative" information; those which contained elements of both "Objective/Descriptive?" and "Subjective/Evaluative" were coded as "Both"; and those which fit neither category were coded as "Neither" (See Appendix 9). Corresponding to the qualitative distinction expected in the "Item Selection Task," it was expected that the unfamiliar targets would generate more "Objective/Descriptive" responses by subjects.

Background Information.

At the conclusion of the administration of the third dependent measure subjects were asked to complete two additional scales. The first of these instruments, the "Personal Perception Questionnaire" (See Appendix 10), was designed to obtain validity checks on certain of the procedures and the subjects' background knowledge of target ethnicity. The second instrument, the "Personal Background Inventory" (See Appendix 11), was designed to obtain demographic information about the subjects.

Personal Perception Questionnaire

The first question asked whether subjects experienced difficulty in forming an impression. The second question asked subjects their confidence of the accuracy in the impression they formed. The third question asked whether subjects thought information about the target's personality was more important than information about his activities and background. This question represented a general validity check on the proportion of items selected in the two test conditions. The fourth question sought to determine the

subject's familiarity with the target's ethnic background. This question operated as a validity check for the independent measure. The fifth question was a further check on the familiarity of ethnic targets. It asked subjects to identify the country from which the ethnic target would have come. The sixth question asked subjects whether they needed additional information to form an accurate impression of the target person. Question seven asked subjects to express their interest to meet a person from the targeted ethnic background. This measure was seen as a check on the subject's involvement in the task.

All of the questions on the "Personal Perception Questionnaire" were constructed on a bi-polar interval scale allowing equal intervals between extremes and the mid-point (neutral) rating. Question number five, which asked subjects to identify the country of the target's origin, was coded as either correct or incorrect. The complete form of the questionnaire is reproduced in Appendix 10.

Personal Background Inventory

The last instrument completed by all subjects was the "Personal Background Inventory" which sought to obtain demographic information about the subject pool. It was not used in any of the analysis of the data, per se, but rather represented an attempt to determine, post facto, whether the characteristics of the subject pool were similar in the familiar and the unfamiliar target treatments. The complete form of the inventory is reproduced in Appendix 11.

General Procedures

Subjects signed up for sessions at a common posting area. They were tested in groups of one to five members. Each subject was randomly assigned to one of three conditions: Familiar target, Unfamiliar target, or Control target. They were given the following instructions:

"Sometimes we know in advance of meeting a person that we are going to meet him or her. In this study you are going to have the opportunity to meet a person, but first you will get to know a little something about the person through an interview which was conducted with either him or her. You will have an opportunity to find out some additional information about this person."

At this time each subject received a binder which contained information about the target. Subjects were instructed to open their binders to the first page which contained a "Consent Statement" (See Appendix 12). In addition to the written consent statement, subjects were verbally told that they could withdraw from participation in the study at any time they choose. After all subjects had completed reading and signing the "Consent Statement," they were asked to turn to the "Task Instructions" (See Appendix 13). In addition to the written instructions, the subjects were given a verbal explanation of the task as well as a demonstration of the "Item Selection Task." The oral instructions were presented as follows:

"When I ask you to begin you should read the enclosed interview to your satisfaction. By this I mean that you may reread the interview or selected parts as often as you like. When you have completed reading the interview you will then have an opportunity to learn additional items of information about the person in the interview. You can do this by first scanning the index sheet, making note of those additional items which you feel would help you form a more accurate impression of this person. The index consists of forty-eight items. Each is followed by either an "S" or a "G." An "S" indicates that the information provided about the item was self-reported. So consider an "S" as a self-report. A "G" indicates that the information was provided by individuals who know the person in the interview. Consider a "G" as a group-report. Each of the items is numbered from "1" through "48." These numbers are not arranged sequentially on the index. To find the information identified by the number in the index, turn to the plastic sheets which appear in the back of your binder. Find the number which corresponds to the item you have selected. There are forty-eight sequentially numbered cards in the plastic sheets--one for each item in the index. Simply remove the card from its plastic holder, turn it over, read

the information contained on the back of the card, and then return the card to the plastic sheet. When you have returned the card to its place in the binder, record your selection of the item number on the "Item Selection Sheet." Use the first slot to record the number of the first item you selected. Let's say that item "49" was the first you selected. Record the number "49" in the first slot on the Item Selection Sheet. If the next item you selected was "56," record that number in the second blank slot. Continue selecting items as long as you feel they will help you form a more accurate impression of what the person in the interview is really like. Does everyone understand?"

At this point subjects were told that they would work in separate rooms so that they would work at their own pace. When they completed the "Item Selection Task" they were told that they would receive additional instructions. They were also told that if they needed to check on procedures, they could refer to the pink sheet labeled "Task Instructions" (See Appendix 13). Subjects were again asked if they had any questions, and following these, were asked to move into one of the satellite rooms in the Communication Research Complex. When subjects had completed the Item Selection Task they were given the following instructions:

"I've asked you to form an impression based upon the information in the interview and the information I provided you. It may be that there were additional

things you would have liked to know about this person which would have helped you form a more accurate impression. What questions, if any, would you like to ask this person or ask someone who knew this person fairly well? Would you please write those questions on this form?"

Each subject was given the "Subject Question Form" (See Appendix 6). When each subject has completed writing his/her questions, the Subject Question Form was collected and the following instructions were given:

"I've asked you to form an impression of the person in the interview. Now I would like you to share your impression with me. I would like you to think about how you would describe this person to a friend. You may include information that was included in the interview or the additional items you selected, but I am not asking you simply to recall as many items as you can. Rather, I am interested in your impression of the person. How would you describe this person to a friend? Do you have any questions?"

Subjects were then given the "Personal Impression Form" (See Appendix 8). When the subjects had completed the Personal Impression Form, they were given the following instructions:

"This next instrument is a rating scale. Consider the ends of the scale to be opposite and extreme positions to the question. For instance, if on the

first question you found it difficult to form an impression of the person described in the interview, then you would mark the scale towards the left side. The more difficult you found the task of forming an impression to be, the closer to the left side of the scale you would mark. On the other hand, the easier you found the task of forming an impression to be, the closer to the right-hand side of the scale you would mark. Do you have any questions?"

When subjects had completed the "Personal Impression Form" it was collected and they were then given the "Personal Perception Questionnaire" (See Appendix 10). When each subject had completed the questionnaire, it was collected and he/she was given the form labeled "Background Information" (See Appendix 11). The following instructions were then presented:

"This last task just asks you for a little bit of background information about yourself. When you complete this task you may come back into the main room and I will give you some background information as to what this is all about."

When each subject had completed the "Background Information" task and was reassembled in 4017 Wescoe, he/she was given the "Debriefing Statement" (See Appendix 14). After all subjects had read the debriefing statement, additional information about the experiment was provided in response to subjects' questions.

After all questions and discussion was completed, the subjects were thanked and dismissed. Subjects were asked not to discuss the research hypotheses with their classmates who might yet participate in the study. The typical session took about forty-five minutes to complete.

CHAPTER THREE

RESULTS

Two main hypotheses were tested. Limited support was obtained for each. Primary analysis of the mixed design used a repeated measures analysis of variance with supplementary omega-squared analysis to account for the proportion of variance.

Item Selection Task

It was predicted that subjects receiving the familiar target treatment would select a greater number of additional items of information about the target than would unfamiliar and control target treatments. It was further predicted that familiar target subjects would select more personality (group-reported) items than would unfamiliar target subjects. Conversely, subjects in the unfamiliar treatment were predicted to select more demographic (self-reported) items than would subjects receiving the familiar treatment.

While the number of additional items selected was greater for the familiar target treatment, the repeated measures ANOVA indicates that the difference between the familiar and the unfamiliar treatments was not significant, $F(2, 57) = 0.65, p > .25$. The mean scores for the additional items selected is reported in Table 1.

Similarly, while familiar condition subjects did select more personality items ($M = 9.35$) compared with their unfamiliar ($M = 8.40$) or control condition ($M = 8.50$) counterparts, the ANOVA results indicate this failed to obtain statistical significance,

$F(2,57) = 1.24, p > .25$. The converse was also unsupported as unfamiliar target subjects choose fewer ($M = 7.10$) demographic items than did familiar target subjects ($M = 9.15$).

While not predicted, a main effect was obtained in which more personality items were selected than demographic items. Repeated measures ANOVA indicated that a significant difference exists for the selection of items types, $F(1,57) = 7.51, p < .01$. An omega-square statistic indicates that this difference accounted for 2.42 percent of the total variance. Analysis for ANOVA is in Appendix 15.

Table 1
TOTAL ITEMS SELECTED WITH PROPORTIONS
SELECTED BY TYPE

Variable	<u>Treatment Condition</u>			Mean
	Unfamiliar Target	Familiar Target	Control Target	
Total Items	15.50	18.50	14.65	16.22
Demographic Items	7.10	9.15	6.15	7.47
Personality Items	8.40	9.35	8.50	8.75

Two items from the "Personal Perception Questionnaire" lend indirect support to the absence of an interaction effect of the item type preference by subject condition. Question #3 asked subjects to respond to the statement "Information about this person's personality traits was more helpful than information about this

person's activities and preferences" (1 = Agree Totally; 7 = Disagree Totally). Differences in response by treatment condition would be expected here. The unfamiliar target treatment would be expected to result more disagreement relative to the familiar target subjects. A one-way ANOVA indicates no significant differences among treatment groups, $F(2,57) = 0.75, p > .40$. Group means are reported in Appendix 16.

Item #6 on the Personal Perception Questionnaire also reflects on these results. The item asked, "Do you think that you would need additional information to form a satisfactory impression of this person?" (1 = Much Additional Information Needed; 7 = No Additional Information Needed). A desire for more additional information would tend to support the main effect that familiar target subjects needed additional information to satisfy their presumed engagement of a broader schemata about the target. However, a one-way ANOVA indicated that there was no significant difference among subjects by condition, $F(2,57) = 0.74, p > .40$.

Question Task

Each subject completed the "Subject Questions" form (See Appendix 6). It was predicted that familiar target subjects would ask more questions than the unfamiliar target counterparts. Further, it was predicted that familiar target subjects would ask more personality questions than unfamiliar target subjects, and conversely, that unfamiliar target subjects would ask more background information questions.

It was decided that the unit of analysis of what constituted a question would be a complete sentence or an independent clause imbedded within a series of questions. Four coders were recruited and trained to code questions (See Appendix 7).

The coders' ratings of the types of questions asked by subjects were combined into a single rating for each question unit. The coders were blind to the condition of the subject they were evaluating. Four hundred and thirty-eight question units were generated by the sixty subjects. In 321 cases (73.6%) the coders were unanimous in their category choice. In eighty-two judgments (18.7%), three of the four coders were in agreement with the fourth coder choosing another category. In twenty-three cases (5.3%), coders were split with two each favoring the selection of separate categories. (In this case the composite rating was obtained by a fifth coder who served as a tie-breaker in a binary choice.) In twelve cases (2.4%), two coders were in agreement on the selection of a single category with the other two coders choosing alternate, but not similar, categories. In these instances the composite coding used the category selected by the two coders who were in agreement. Using Scott's pi as a coefficient of reliability, an acceptable level of intercoder reliability was obtained ($\pi = .71$). Computation of the Scott's pi for intercoder reliability is reported in Appendix 17. Scott's pi (Scott, 1955; Holsti, 1968, 1969) provides a conservative estimate of the intercoder reliability.

For the purposes of the analysis of the Question Task, it was decided that only those questions which were coded to be asking

for personality information or for background information would be used. Hence, only four hundred and thirteen (413) of the four hundred and thirty-eight (438) questions asked were used for the following analysis.

The first prediction, that familiar target subjects would ask more total questions than would unfamiliar target subjects, was supported by the data. Subjects who received the familiar treatment asked more questions ($\underline{M} = 9.50$) than did either the subjects who received the unfamiliar treatment ($\underline{M} = 6.80$) or control treatment subjects ($\underline{M} = 6.50$). Means for the total questions and questions by type is reported in Table 2. Repeated measures ANOVA indicates that this difference is significant, $\underline{F} (2,57) = 4.99, p \underline{.01}$. Omega-square analysis indicates that this difference accounts for 4.26% of variance.

The second prediction, that familiar target subjects would ask proportionally more personality questions than would unfamiliar target subjects and its converse were not supported. ANOVA results indicate that the interaction of type of question by condition was not significant, $\underline{F} (2,57) = .69, p \underline{.25}$.

As with the Selection task, however, a main effect was discovered for the question type. It appears that across all three conditions there was a significant difference in the representation of personality questions, $\underline{F} (1,57) = 15.23, p \underline{.001}$. Omega-square analysis indicates that this difference accounted for 10.94% of variance. The computation for the repeated measures ANOVA is reported

in Appendix 18.

Table 2
QUESTIONS ASKED BY CONDITION

Type of Question	<u>Treatment Condition</u>			Mean
	Unfamiliar Target	Familiar Target	Control Target	
Total Questions	6.80	9.50	6.50	7.60
Background	2.00	4.15	2.45	2.90
Personality	4.80	5.35	3.95	4.70

In summary, the analysis of the data for the Question Task revealed support for the prediction that familiar target subjects would ask more total questions than would unfamiliar target subjects. The analysis failed to support the second prediction that familiar target conditions would produce a greater selection of personality questions than unfamiliar target conditions. Similarly, it was not supported that unfamiliar target treatment would result in the selection of more background questions than subjects in the familiar condition. If anything, the means for the unfamiliar background question ($\underline{M} = 2.00$) is less than that obtained for the familiar treatment ($\underline{M} = 4.15$). Finally, the unpredicted main effect was observed that personality questions were asked more frequently regardless of subject condition.

Impression Task

The final dependent measure asked subjects to write a brief impression of the target's personality. It was predicted that the familiar target subjects would write more extensive impressions than would their unfamiliar target counterparts. It was also predicted that familiar target subjects would represent more personality traits in their open-ended descriptions than would unfamiliar target subjects who in turn were expected to reflect a greater proportion of background items in their impressions.

As with the Question Task, the basic unit of analysis was the sentence. Four coders rated each sentence as one of four categories (1 = Objective/Descriptive; 2 = Subjective/Evaluative; 3 = Both; 4 = Does not fall into the categories above). The types of elements in impressions coded by the raters was reduced to composite score for each element. Coders were again blind to the conditions they were coding. Four hundred and twenty-five sentences were generated by the sixty subjects. Coders were unanimous in two hundred and fifty-six (60.2%) cases; in one hundred and sixteen ratings (27.3%), three of four coders were in agreement with the fourth coder choosing another category; in forty-three judgments (10.1%), coders were split between two categories (again the composite was obtained by a fifth coder executing a binary choice). Finally, in ten cases (2.4%), two coders agreed in the selection of a single category with each of the other two raters selecting an alternate and separate category. Scott's pi for the intercoder reliability of these ratings was .59 which falls somewhat below the range Krippendorff

(1980) sets for tentative acceptability. See Appendix 19 for computation and raw agreement data.

As with the Question Task, further analysis was conducted on only those composite ratings which fell either into the "Objective/Descriptive" or "Subjective/Evaluative" categories. This resulted in three hundred and thirty-eight (338) of the original four hundred and twenty-five (425) coded elements being used for the following analysis.

The first predicted result was that familiar target subjects would write more extensive impressions than would their unfamiliar target counterparts. When the analysis of data is based only on the elements which were coded as "Descriptive/Objective" and "Subjective/Evaluative," the difference among treatment conditions does not attain significance, $F(2,57) = 2.00, p > .10$. A reanalysis of the data was conducted including the total number of sentences written. When the analysis included all elements written, a significant difference among treatment conditions is obtained, $F(2,57) = 3.15, p < .05$. It should be noted that the maximum difference among cells occurs between the familiar and the control conditions, and not between the familiar and unfamiliar treatments which was expected. A supplementary analysis performed using the Student-Newman-Juels procedure establishes a range of 1.52 at the .05 level for grouping means; this indicated that the mean of the unfamiliar group did not differ significantly from either the familiar or control targets. The means for the Impression Task are presented in Table 3.

The second prediction measured by the Impression Task was whether familiar target subjects would produce more "Subjective/Evaluative" sentences than unfamiliar target subjects who were expected to write a higher proportion of "Objective/Descriptive" elements. While familiar target subjects did write more Subjective/Evaluative elements than did unfamiliar target subjects, the interaction expected between type of element written and treatment condition was not significant, $F(2,57) = .69, p > .25$.

As with the Selection Task and the Question Task, an unpredicted main effect was observed for the type of impression written. Regardless of treatment condition, subjects were very inclined to write personality-related "Subjective/Evaluative" appraisals of targets, $F(1,57) = 156.26, p < .001$. A supplementary analysis using the omega-square statistic indicated that this accounted for 57.06% of the variance. Analysis of Variance tables and computations may be found in Appendix 20.

Table 3

IMPRESSION TASK: ELEMENTS WRITTEN BY CONDITION

Variable	<u>Treatment Condition</u>			Mean
	Unfamiliar Target	Familiar Target	Control Target	
Total Elements	7.05	7.95	6.30	7.10
Both & Neither	1.50	1.55	1.35	1.47

Adjusted Total	5.55	6.40	4.95	5.63
Objective/ Descriptive	.70	.90	.65	.75
Subjective/ Evaluative	4.85	5.50	4.30	4.88

Notes on Table 3.

1. Both and Neither are the combined codings used to categorize elements which are neither "Objective/Descriptive" or "Subjective/Evaluative."
2. Adjusted Total reflects only those elements which are categorized as "Objective/Descriptive" plus "Subjective/Evaluative."

In summary, the results from the Impression Task indicate that familiar targets do result in subjects generating more written elements in their descriptions. The expected interaction between type of written element and treatment condition was not supported. However, there is strong support for the unpredicted result that subjects tend to represent their written impressions along the dimension of

"Subjective/Evaluative" elements rather than as "Objective/Descriptive" elements regardless of treatment condition.

Personal Perception Questionnaire

After subjects had completed the Selection Task, Question Task, and Impression Task, they completed the Personal Perception Questionnaire which operated as a series of validity checks. Items #3 and #6 have already been discussed as measurements of main effects with the results reported under the Question Task. They are excluded from further discussion of results here.

The first item asked subjects, "As you searched through the information in the booklet, did you find it difficult to form an impression of the person described there?" (1 = Extremely Difficult; 7 = Not at all Difficult). A finding of difference among the three treatment conditions would not be expected as the interview format and information available through the Selection Task were identical. ANOVA indicated no significant difference in difficulty of forming impressions occurred among treatment groups, $F(2,57) = 0.75, p > .40$. Mean scores for the treatment groups are reported in Appendix 16.

A second check of subjects involved a comparison of their relative confidence of their impressions. Question #2 asked, "How confident are you that your impression of this person is an accurate impression?" (1 = Extremely Confident; 7 = Not at all Confident). No difference in confidence level was expected. ANOVA indicates that treatment groups displayed no significant difference in their confidence of impressions, $F(2,57) = 0.68, p > .50$. Group means are reported in

Appendix 16.

Items #4 asked subjects to answer "How familiar are you with persons of this ethnic background?" (1 = Extremely Familiar; 7 = Extremely Unfamiliar). This question served as a validation check on the independent measure. It was expected that familiar and unfamiliar targets should cause subjects to respond differently to this question. ANOVA indicates a significant difference among treatment groups, $F(2,57) = 40.02, p < .001$. This check indicates that the familiar target was, in fact, familiar to the subjects in the treatment condition ($M = 2.65$) while the unfamiliar treatment was not ($M = 6.45$). The control group (Kansas City area gravitated toward the mid-point value ($M = 3.70$) which was expected.

Item #5 asked subjects to list the country of origin from which the ethnic target would have come. Unfamiliar targets generated incorrect responses (0.0% correct responses recorded); familiar target subjects generated correct responses (85% correct responses with the remainder identifying the target as coming from the United States). Control (Kansas City area) subjects were also expected to generate correct responses (90% correct responses recorded; responses were coded to be correct if subject indicated United States, Kansas City, Kansas or Missouri. Two subjects responded "I don't know.") This item corroborates the results from Item #4.

Item #7 asked subjects "How interested are you to meet a person of this background?" (1 = Extremely Interested; 7 = Not at all Interested). This question was intended as a measure of subject involvement in the task. The ANOVA indicates that there were no

significant differences among groups, which was expected,

$F(2,57) = 0.75, p > .40.$

Summary

The general results from the analysis of these data suggests limited support for the hypothesis that familiarity will result in the utilization of a broader range of constructs which translates into differential behaviors when compared to subjects preparing to engage unfamiliar targets. Subjects with a familiar target directed a greater number of questions toward the anticipated target and included a greater number of total written sentences in their impressions of the target.

The results do not support the second hypothesis that subjects preparing to engage a familiar target will be more inclined to forego background information, ask questions which elicit personality trait information, or form impressions which are more heavily dependent upon "Subjective/Evaluative" information than would their counterparts who anticipate interaction with an unfamiliar target. Instead, the analysis would indicate that target familiarity, per se, does not change the selection or processing of the types of impressions a subject forms about a target person.

An unexpected finding which occurred through all three dependent measures was a main effect for the type of item. Regardless of treatment condition, subjects were more inclined to select more personality items when they could select additional items of information. They were also inclined to ask more personality eliciting questions.

Finally, all subjects represented elements of the impressions as "subjective" and "evaluative." The occurrence of these main effects across all three dependent measures suggests that personality elements are more important in the formation of an impression than are demographic, objective, or background types of elements.

CHAPTER FOUR

DISCUSSION

The present investigation sought to assess quantitative and qualitative differences in the information-gathering and information-seeking behavior of subjects who anticipate meeting an unknown person who comes from either a familiar or an unfamiliar ethnic background. Contrary to expectations, the subjects did not seek additional items of information available to them to a significantly greater degree when the target person was from a familiar ethnic background. Subjects also did not differentiate between familiar and unfamiliar targets in the types of additional information they selected. This finding was also unexpected; familiar targets were expected to evoke a greater preference for personality items than unfamiliar targets. Similarly, the unfamiliar subjects did not select a greater number of demographic items about the target than did the familiar subjects. If anything, the reverse was true, though the differences were not statistically significant. The only main effect which was supported was that all subjects tended to select personality items in preference to demographic items.

A second task involved the generation of questions to be asked of the target. It was expected that subjects would generate more questions for familiar targets than for unfamiliar targets. This result was confirmed. It appears that familiarity with the targets allowed subjects to employ a broader set of schemata in asking questions, resulting in a greater number of questions being asked. The type of question asked, however, did not differ as expected. Familiar subjects

were not more likely than unfamiliar subjects to ask personality-related questions. In fact, subjects who asked questions of a familiar target asked proportionally fewer personality-related questions than did their unfamiliar counterparts. Again, a main effect was found such that all subjects had a preference to ask personality-related questions, regardless of their treatment condition.

A final task completed by subjects was to write their open-ended impressions of the target as they might describe this person to a friend. It was expected that subjects with a familiar target would display more extensive impressions than would those with unfamiliar targets. While significance for the total number of elements written was obtained, the source of the significance was in the comparison between the familiar and the control subjects. Subjects with familiar targets did not write significantly longer impressions than subjects with unfamiliar targets. It was also expected that qualitatively a difference would be found in the types of impressions written. Subjects with a familiar target were expected to rely more heavily on subjective/evaluative elements while subjects with an unfamiliar target would display a greater proportion of objective/descriptive elements in their impressions. While not statistically significant, the direction of the results points to the reverse being true. There was also a very significant tendency for all subjects to represent the target in personality-related elements.

In general, these results point toward a limited support of only one of the two main hypotheses. The first hypothesis predicted that familiar target subjects would utilize more elaborate schemata which would manifest itself in the selection of more additional items of

information, more questions, and a greater number of elements in their impressions. Support for this hypothesis was obtained in the total number of questions generated and in the number of written elements of an impression a subject had.

The second hypothesis, which predicted that familiar subjects would be more inclined toward focusing on personality trait-related schemata, was not supported by any of the three dependent measures. Rather, a main effect for all subjects was obtained in preferring personality-related items. The possible reasons for these results which were obtained and the implications these hold for future research are the subject of the balance of this discussion.

Ethnicity as a Construct

While it is difficult to account for the significance of "ethnicity" as a meaningful construct to most subjects, there is some indirect evidence to suggest that "ethnicity" was not a particularly potent construct for at least some of the subjects. During the operation of the study, several of the subjects asked for clarification of the question "How familiar are you with persons of this ethnic background?" in the Personal Perception Questionnaire. At least two subjects asked whether "ethnic background" referred to the person's religion. It could not be determined how many other subjects who did not ask similar qualifying questions had confounded ethnicity with religion or some other construct.

The various ethnic categories which had been selected for the study were "real" ethnic groups. However, despite the fact of their

existence in this country, Kashubs (Perkowski, 1966, 1969; Wasilewski, 1934; Crozier, 1981) and Walloons (Griffis, 1923; Turney-High, 1953; Irving, 1980) have never been prominent outside of very regionalized locations in the United States. Perkowski (1969) estimated that there were only about 250,000 in the United States concentrated around Winona, Minnesota, Stevens Point, Wisconsin, and Detroit, Michigan (Crozier, 1981). Walloon settlements are even less prominent. They are to be found primarily in upstate New York, around Albany, and in parts of New Jersey and Pennsylvania (Griffis, 1923). Given that Kashubs speak a dialect of Polish (Horak, 1961) and Walloons a French dialect (Turney-High, 1953), they would not be especially distinctive to most Americans who would tend to group them with their respective language groups. What this suggests is that a Kashub would not be especially distinguishable from someone who is Polish. Similarly, a Walloon might be easily mistaken for a Frenchman.

The problem of using these groups with the ambiguity which apparently existed for some subjects is that their very unfamiliarity may have made them non-credible. In the debriefing sessions, when pressed to try to guess the country of origin of the respective groups, several subjects volunteered "Arabia" as the homeland for Kashubs and "Wales" for Walloons. At least a few subjects did ask whether they really existed.

The issue with the question of ethnicity has to do with the non-equivalence created by the familiar/unfamiliar treatment. A non-familiar ethnic group may simply allow subjects to invoke the most accessible category in which to place them and then build a

prototype based upon the categorization (Higgins, Rholes, and Jones, 1977). While people of familiar ethnic background may be targeted with a known stereotype, those from an unfamiliar background may simply be stereotyped by the most available set of terms. In this case, the unknown foreign origin of the unfamiliar ethnic might simply have led subjects to categorize them under the broad category of "foreigner."

What is unknown in the present study is how subjects determine the salient focal features of the unfamiliar target. While the results indicate a difference in the total number of questions asked and elements of impressions formed as being greater for the familiar target than for the unfamiliar target, it is unknown to what features of the unfamiliar target a subject directs his/her attention. Distinct from the possibility that subjects abstracted the ethnic target labels of "Kashub" and "Walloon" into a general category of "foreigner" is the alternate possibility that they ignored the ethnic reference altogether in preference to some other salient features. An availability heuristic might suggest that convenience would direct attention to some other feature (Tversky and Kahneman, 1973).

So while the present study provides support that there is a difference in the amount of information (questions and impressions) generated from the ethnic target, it is uncertain how the subjects in the unfamiliar treatment condition actually regarded the unfamiliar target. The operationalization of the independent variable as a dimension of ethnic familiarity better explains why a familiar target might be salient; it is less adequate in explaining what happens with the processing of a subject who is confronted with the

unfamiliar target reference. The validity check provided by Item #4 of the Personal Perception Questionnaire only indicates that subjects acknowledged that they were not familiar with the unfamiliar target. It does not (and cannot) indicate whether the construct employed to represent the unfamiliar target is any less complete than the one employed for the familiar target.

Dependent Measures

One unexpected result was the consistent preference for personality items in all three dependent measures regardless of treatment condition. Subjects tended to select personality items in the Selection Task, ask personality-related questions in the Question Task, and include more subjective/evaluative elements in their written impressions in the Impression Task.

One possible reason for this result may have been an artifact of the construction of the instructions. In two instances the instructions asked subjects to form an impression of the target person's "personality." The written instructions for the Selection Task (See Appendix 13) include the phrase "repeat the search process until you feel you have formed an accurate impression of this person's personality." Similarly, in the written instructions to the Impression Task, subjects were asked to "write a brief impression of the person's personality."

These instructions may have led to an over-representation of personality items in the Selection Task and the Impression Task. While no similar mis-instructions were present in the Question Task,

the cumulative weight of the reference to personality items may have led to a greater representation of these types of items in the dependent measures than would have occurred otherwise.

Were such an effect to occur, it would tend to wash out the expected interaction between treatment condition and type of item selected. Personality items would tend to be over-represented relative to any interaction effect which may have occurred. This is indirectly suggested by the high proportion of personality items selected, personality-related questions asked, and the number of subjective/evaluative elements represented in impressions across the three treatment groups.

A somewhat related problem is suggested by the intercoder reliability coefficients provided within the Question Task and the Impression Task. The coefficient of .71 for the Question Task only falls within the range Krippendorff (1980) labels as being "highly tentative." The coefficient for the Impression Task, .59, falls below this range. While admittedly the conventions for what constitutes an acceptable level for intercoder reliability is open to argument (Holsti, 1969; Krippendorff, 1980), the strongest support for accepting the findings of a main effect operating for type of item (personality) is to be found in the consistency of this main effect across the three dependent measures. That is to say, that even if the intercoder reliability ratings are accepted as only tentative for interpretation, the fact that all three measures, including the Selection Task which does not depend upon coders' ratings, are consistent should suggest that there is a reliable tendency for personality-related items to

dominate the impressions subjects generate.

A third concern relating to the operation of the dependent measures deals with the categories employed for the rating tasks. In previous research conducted by Fiske and Cox (1979), coders were asked to discriminate between "concrete behaviors" and "personality traits." It would appear from their results that such a distinction may be more reliable across coders. In the present study the category terms for the Question Task were "background information" and "personality information." In retrospect it may be questioned whether these two categories are exclusive and unambiguous. In the codings for the Question Task, unanimity among coders was achieved in 73.6% of all codings. An example of an ambiguous question which resulted in an evenly-split coding between the personality and background information categories was the question "Is Stan patriotic?" Questions such as this may be as easily coded as seeking background information as asking about Stan's personality.

The Impression Task coding categories appear to have provided even greater ambiguity. Unanimity among coders was achieved in only 60.2% of ratings. The use of "objective/descriptive" and "subjective/evaluative" categories was not precise enough to obtain substantial intercoder reliability. The low proportion of the use of the "objective/descriptive" category for ratings ($\bar{M} = .75$) per subject out of a total of 5.83 elements per subject tend to indicate that it was possible for most statements to be interpreted by coders as containing subjective/evaluative elements. Coupled with the low intercoder reliability (.59), there is a strong possibility that the

categories did not sufficiently distinguish among statement.

These three features of the dependent measures--the wording of the instructions, the marginal intercoder reliability, and the ambiguity of the coding categories--may be taken together as an explanation for the unexpected presence of the preference subjects displayed for the selection of personality items across conditions. At least some refinement of the procedures for the dependent measures would seem to be appropriate.

Familiarity as a Predictor of Construct Extensiveness

The hypotheses of the present study were not concerned with the content of subject's constructs, per se. Rather, the initial concern was with the process by which persons form constructs in anticipation of interaction with another person. While the differentiation expected between familiar and unfamiliar subjects in their preference for type of information was not obtained, there is evidence from this research to indicate that subjects do differentiate between familiar and unfamiliar targets.

The prediction that familiar targets would generate more extensive constructs has some support. Familiar targets apparently caused subjects to generate more questions than did unfamiliar targets. While an alternate hypothesis might imply that familiar targets would have need of fewer questions, presumably because subjects already had sufficient information about them, the finding that subjects did ask more questions would tend to support the assumption that familiarity engages a broader schema than does the unfamiliar target.

Unlike these previous studies, however, two new elements may be added to the interpretation of the effects of familiarity on the extensiveness of an impression. First, the previous studies do not deal with the behavioroid measurement of anticipated interaction. Both Beach and Wertheimer (1961) and Fiske and Cox (1979) had subjects represent familiar and unfamiliar cases without the expressed intention of expecting to meet the target. From a communication perspective, the present study moves the application of the extensiveness of a cognitive schema to the realm of the general behaviors a person actually utilizes when anticipating interaction. The extensiveness of cognitive categories becomes translated into behaviors preliminary to the interaction.

Second, the procedures of the present study differ from the previous research in at least one important way. While the previous studies (Beach and Wertheimer, 1961; Fiske and Cox, 1979) simply utilized referents provided by the subjects within their own experience, the present study used referent targets outside of the subjects' own choice. Fiske and Cox (1979) asked subjects to think of a friend or stranger. Beach and Wertheimer (1961) asked subjects to provide descriptions about themselves, a well-known other, and a less well-known other. These operationalizations of familiarity which are subject-provided don't address the ecological validity of unanticipated interactions which are commonplace.

In real life we are often in the position where we are told that we will be meeting someone before the initial encounter. As soon as we learn of the imminence of the upcoming encounter, we are likely to begin an anticipatory scan in preparation for the meeting. When

the anticipated encounter involves someone whose characteristics can be categorized into pre-existing categories, it appears that it leads to greater inquiries and broader impressions of the target. If the person is unknown to us and the limited information we have available does not easily fit within pre-existing categories already available to us, it appears that we limit our inquiries and restrict our impressions about that person.

It may be that people pay more attention to a person from a familiar background and have more extensive categories to apply to that person. Consequently, they seek more information. The extensiveness of impression appears to reflect that the familiar target has engaged more extensive cognitive categories. Presumably, subjects in the familiar condition had more information. That is why they wrote more extensive impressions. Similarly, the results indicating that subjects asked more questions of the familiar targets may be taken to indicate greater attention is directed to familiar persons than to unfamiliar persons.

While the results do not support the expectation that the type of information with which subjects are concerned differs as a function of their familiarity, it, nevertheless, does tend to indicate a differential attention to the target person. At least one dimension of target salience may be taken to be the familiarity with which another person approaches him/her.

Suggestions for Further Research

The limitations discussed concerning the dependent measures suggest several alterations in the design and operation of the study would be appropriate:

1. Instructions--It would be appropriate to remove from the instructions any requests that subjects seek information, ask questions, or write impressions about the target's "personality." The inclusion of a request for "personality" descriptions may alter subjects' descriptions to over-represent personality items relative to other types of information they would include in their descriptions.

2. Coding categories--The non-exclusive and potentially ambiguous categories used for coding the subjects' questions and impressions lends itself to two alterations in this part of the procedure. First, the unit of analysis may benefit units smaller than a complete question. Questions or elements which were coded as containing both objective/descriptive and subjective/evaluative elements may require that each part (personality element and background information element) be coded as separate units. This would be especially important in the Impression Task where three hundred and thirty-eight units of the four hundred and twenty-five recorded elements were used for the analysis of the interaction between condition and type of information selected. The 87 elements which were excluded do not necessarily reflect the same proportion of personality and background elements as were reflected in those included in the analysis.

Second, the category description provided the coders should be changed to parallel those used by Fiske and Cox (1979) which

distinguished between concrete behaviors and personality traits. These categories would be appropriate to both the Question Task and the Impression Task.

3. Other Variables--The possibility of other variables which may interact with familiarity are considerable. Two are considered here. First, it would seem appropriate to investigate the function of age (development) with the preference subjects have for differential items. The research conducted by Supnick used children. When children select information on a dimension of familiarity, it appears that there is a differentiation made of familiarity in their representation of personality versus background/behavior items.

Second, there may be a difference in preference for personality versus behavior items created by the context of the interaction. It would be expected that the purpose for which one anticipated meeting another person would create differences in the relative importance of seeking personality over behavioral types of information.

Conclusion

The data provided support for one of two research hypotheses. There is some support which suggests that when subjects are familiar with the target they tend to ask more questions and form more extensive impressions. In terms of the quantity of additional items selected, numbers of questions asked, and total impressions formed, there was a clear indication of more complex schema being applied when the target was familiar.

The data completely failed to support the second hypothesis; that familiar targets would evoke a greater reliance on personality-

related information. Some evidence, although not statistically significant, indicates that unfamiliar targets generated a greater preference for personality items among subjects.

An unexpected main effect was found indicating that all subjects had a preference for personality items. Several limitations in design and execution of the study are possible contributing factors which may both explain why the second hypothesis was not confirmed as well as why the unexpected main effect was obtained. It would seem that further study in the area of impression formation measuring the initial impressions and subject-directed behaviors toward the target may refine these results.

REFERENCES

- Adams-Webber, J.R. Assimilation and Contrast in Personality Judgment: The Dichotomy Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Bass, B.M. Stogdill's Handbook of Leadership, Revised and Expanded Edition. New York: Free Press, 1981.
- Beach, L., & Wertheimer, M. A Free Response Approach to the Study of Person Cognition. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1961, 62, 367-374.
- Boxer, P.J. The Flow of Choice: The Choice Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Burke, K. A Grammar of Motives. New York: Prentice-Hall, 1945.
- Byrne, D. Interpersonal Attraction and Attitude Similarity. In C.D. Mortensen & K.K. Sereno (Eds.) Advances in Communication Research. New York: Harper & Row, 1973.
- Cantor, N., & Mischel, W. Prototypes in Person Perception. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology Vol. 12. New York: Academic Press, 1980.
- Carlston, D.E. Events, Inferences, and Impression Formation. In R. Hastie, T.M. Ostrom, E.B. Ebbeson, R.S. Wyer, D.L. Hamilton, & D.E. Carlston (Eds.) Person Memory: The Cognitive Basis of Social Perception. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.

- Cook, T.D., & Campbell, D.T. *Quasi-Experimentation*. Chicago: Rand McNally, 1979.
- Crockett, W.H. *The Organization of Construct Systems: The Organization Corollary*. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Crockett, W.H. *Cognitive Complexity and Impression Formation*. In B. A. Maher (Ed.) Progress in Experimental Personality Research, Vol. 2. New York: Academic Press, 1965.
- Crozier, W.L. *A People Apart: A Census Analysis of the Polish Community of Winona, Minnesota, 1880-1906*. Polish American Studies, 1981, 38, 1-12.
- Delia, J.G. *Constructivism and the Study of Human Communication*. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1977, 63, 66-83.
- Delia, J.G. *A Constructivist Analysis of the Concept of Credibility*. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 1976, 62, 361-375.
- Duck, S. *Two Individuals in Search of Agreement: The Commonality Corollary*. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Fiske, S.T., & Cox, M.G. *Person Concepts: The Effect of Target Familiarity and Descriptive Purpose on the Process of Describing Others*. Journal of Personality, 1979, 47, 136-161.
- Gara, M.A. *Back to Basics in Personality Study--The Individual Person's Own Organization of Experience: The Individuality Corollary*. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.

- Griffis, W.E. The Story of the Walloons. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin, 1923.
- Hamilton, D.L. A Cognitive-Attributional Analysis of Stereotyping. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 12. New York: Academic Press, 1979.
- Hamilton, D.L. Illusory Correlation as a Basis for Stereotyping. In D.L. Hamilton (Ed.) Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Interpersonal Behavior. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1981.
- Hamilton, D.L., Katz, L.B., & Leirer, V.O. Organizational Processes in Impression Formation. In R. Hastie, T.M. Ostrom, E.B. Ebbeson, R.S. Wyer, D.L. Hamilton, & D.E. Carlston (Eds.) Person Memory: The Cognitive Basis of Social Perception. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.
- Hastie, R., & Carlston, D.E. Theoretical Issues in Person Memory. In R. Hastie, T.M. Ostrom, E.B. Ebbeson, R.S. Wyer, D.L. Hamilton, & D.E. Carlston (Eds.) Person Memory: The Cognitive Basis of Social Perception. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1980.
- Hayden, B.C. Experience--A Case for Possible Change: The Modulation Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Higgins, E.T., Rholes, W.S., & Jones, C.S. Category Accessibility and Impression Formation. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1977, 13, 141-154.
- Holsti, O.R. Content Analysis. In G. Lindzey & E. Aronson (Eds.) The Handbook of Social Psychology, Vol. 2.

- Holsti, O.R. Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities. Reading, Massachusetts: Addison Wesley, 1969.
- Horak, S.M. Poland and Her National Minorities 1919-1939. New York: Vantage Press, 1961.
- Irving, R.E.M. The Flemings and Walloons of Belgium. London: Minority Rights Group Report No. 46, 1980.
- Juhnke, R.G. Information-Acquisition Strategies and Impressions of Typical and Atypical Target Persons. Lawrence, Kansas: Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, 1980.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. On the Psychology of Prediction. Psychological Review, 1973, 80, 237-251.
- Kelly, G.A. The Psychology of Personal Constructs. New York: Norton, 1955.
- Krippendorff, K. Content Analysis. Beverly Hills, California: Sage, 1980.
- Mancuso, J.C., & Eimer, B.N. Fitting Things into Sorts: The Range Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Neisser, U. Cognition and Reality. San Francisco: Freeman, 1976.
- Norman, W.T. Toward an Adequate Taxonomy of Personality Attributes: Replicated Factor Structure in Peer Nomination Personality Ratings. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 1963, 66, 574-583.

- Nystedt, L., & Magnusson, D. Construction of Experience: The Construction Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Passini, F.T., & Nornam, W.T. A Universal Conception of Personality Structure? Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1966, 4, 44-49.
- Pavitt, C. Preliminaries to a Theory of Communication: A System for the Cognitive Representation of Person and Object-Based Information. In M. Burgoon (Ed.) Communication Yearbook 5. New Brunswick, New Jersey: Transaction Books, 1982.
- Perkowski, J.L. A Kashubian Idiolect in the United States. Bloomington, Indiana: Indiana University Press, 1969.
- Perkowski, J.L. The Kashubs--Origins and Emigration to the United States. Polish American Studies, 1966, 23, 1-7.
- Rips, L.J. Quantification and Semantic Memory. Cognitive Psychology, 1975, 7, 307-340.
- Rosch, E. Principles of Categorization. In E. Rosch & B.B. Lloyd (Eds.) Cognition and Categorization. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1978.
- Scarlett, H., Press, A., & Crockett, W. Children's Description of Peers: A Wernerian Analysis. Child Development, 1971, 42, 439-453.
- Scott, W.A. Reliability of Content Analysis: The Case of Nominal Scale Coding. Public Opinion Quarterly, 1955, 19, 321-325.

- Smith, E.E., Shoben, E.J., & Rips, L.J. Structure and Process in Semantic Memory: A Featural Model for Semantic Decisions. Psychological Review, 1974, 81, 214-241.
- Snyder, M. On the Self-Perpetuating Nature of Social Stereotypes. In D. Hamilton (Ed.) Cognitive Processes in Stereotyping and Interpersonal Behavior. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, 1981.
- Snyder, M., & Swann, W.B. Behavioral Confirmation in Social Interaction: From Social Perception to Social Reality. Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 1978, 14, 148-162.
- Snyder, M., Tanke, E.D., & Berscheid, E. Social Perception and Interpersonal Behavior: On the Self-Fulfilling Nature of Social Stereotypes. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1977, 35, 656-666.
- Snyder, M., & Uranowitz, S.W. Reconstructing the Past: Some Cognitive Consequences of Person Perception. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 941-950.
- Stewart, R.A., Powell, G.E., & Chetwynd, S.J. Person Perception and Stereotyping. Westmead, England: Saxon House, 1979.
- Taylor, S.E., & Fiske, S.T. Salience, Attention, and Attribution: The Top of the Head Phenomena. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.) Advances in Experimental Social Psychology, Vol. 11. New York: Academic Press, 1978.
- Taylor, S.E., Fiske, S.T., Etcoff, N.L., & Ruderman, A.J. Categorical and Contextual bases of Person Memory and Stereotyping. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 1978, 36, 778-793.

- Tschudi, F., & Rommetveit, R. Sociality, Intersubjectivity, and Social Processes: The Sociality Corollary. In J.C. Mancuso & J.R. Adams-Webber (Eds.) The Construing Person. New York: Praeger Special Studies, 1982.
- Turney-High, H.H. Chateau Gerard: The Life and Times of a Walloon Village. Columbia, South Carolina: University of South Carolina Press, 1953.
- Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. Availability: A Heuristic for Judging Frequency and Probability. Cognitive Psychology, 1973, 5, 207-232.
- Wasilewski, L. Nationalities in Pomerania. London: The Baltic Institute, 1934.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX 1

ETHNIC FAMILIARITY QUESTIONNAIRE

Listed below are a number of ethnic groups. If you know of a person who is a member of any of the groups listed in the following or know some of the characteristics (traits) of these groups, make a mark by the name of the group. It is not important that you have very great knowledge of the group as long as you have heard or know of them or you know persons who belong to the group. This is not a test. Do not ask others for information about any group with which you are unfamiliar.

_____ Alsatian	_____ Flem	_____ Mexican
_____ Basque	_____ French	_____ Norwegian
_____ Bavarian	_____ Gaucho	_____ Pole
_____ Belgian	_____ German	_____ Prussian
_____ Bohemian	_____ Hispanic	_____ Rumanian
_____ Burgundian	_____ Hungarian	_____ Saxon
_____ Corsican	_____ Irish	_____ Scot
_____ Croatian	_____ Italian	_____ Serbian
_____ Crynician	_____ Kashub	_____ Sicilian
_____ Czechoslovakian	_____ Lapplander	_____ Spaniard
_____ Dane	_____ Lasatian	_____ Swiss
_____ Dutch	_____ Latvian	_____ Thurugian
_____ English	_____ Lithuanian	_____ Walloon
_____ Estonian	_____ Magyar	_____ Welsh
_____ Finn	_____ Maltese	_____ Yorkshireman

APPENDIX 2

IDENTIFICATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Answer the following questions to the best of your ability. If you cannot answer an item or are unfamiliar with the reference group to which it refers, please indicate so. We are interested in knowing how familiar most Americans are with various ethnic groups living in the United States. Do not try to guess unless you really know the answer.

1. Indicate whether you know or have ever heard someone referred to as a _____ .
 - A. _____ Yes
 - B. _____ No

2. If you answered "Yes" to question #1, continue with the following questions.
If you answered "No" to question #1, go to question #3.
 - A. In what country would you expect this person/group to originate? (Where is the native land of this group?)

 - B. Where would you expect a person of this ethnic origin to live in the United States?

 - C. How did you come to know a person of this group or learn of this group's existence?

 - D. Where would you expect persons of this group to live?

_____ Large City	_____ Small Town
_____ Small City	_____ Rural Area
_____ Suburb	_____ Other (List _____)

E. What occupation would you normally expect such a person to have?

- White collar job Agricultural job
 Blue collar job Other (List)
 Service job

F. List any sports or activities you would normally expect a person of this group to participate in:

G. What religious affiliation would you normally expect a person from this group to have?

- Catholic Protestant (List)
 Jewish Moslem
 Hindu Buddhist
 Other (List)

H. What characteristics (traits) do you identify with persons of this ethnic group now living in the United States? (Use additional space on the back if necessary.)

3. Would you be interested in meeting an American of _____ descent?

A. Yes

B. No

4. If you answered "Yes" to question #3, answer the following; if you answered "No" to question #3, go to question #5.

Why would you be interested in meeting an American of _____ descent?

5. Would you ever be interested in visiting the native land of an ethnic American of _____ descent?

A. Yes

B. No

APPENDIX 3

INTERVIEW

Read the following interview. We are trying to determine what impressions people have of various groups. The person in the following interview is a representative of one such group. When you have completed reading the interview, you will be given additional instructions.

BACKGROUND: Stan is middle-aged and of _____ descent living in the Kansas City area.

QUES: Tell us a little bit about yourself.

STAN: Well, I like to think of myself as fairly typical of the people who live in this area. I spend a lot of time with my family. I think my family is very important to me. In fact, I reserve some time each week so that we can do things together. Oh, by the way, I'm married and have three children. Helen, my wife, and I have been married a little over fifteen years. I have a son, John, who is twelve, Anna, who just turned ten, and my youngest boy, Mike, is seven.

QUES: What kinds of things do you do with your family?

STAN: We like to spend time outdoors; camping, picnicing, hiking, and that sort of thing. Sometimes we just go driving around in the country.

QUES: Are there any sports or activities that you like?

STAN: Well, I like to swim, always have. And I like to play soccer, which finally seems to be getting popular around here. I learned to play it at home as a boy and I have a group of friends at church who like to play.

QUES: How do you view your church and neighborhood?

STAN: Well, I think its important that a person should be active in the community. We do a lot of things through our church which sponsors many events. I think that Christmas and Easter are the most important for us. It gives us some time to share with family and friends. Its kind of nice with the _____ customs and food and songs and things like that. You know what I mean? Its just kind of special.

QUES: Are you happy with your life?

STAN: Generally, yes. There are problems sometimes, like in most families, I guess. But usually things are ok.

QUES: Are you healthy?

STAN: Oh yes. I don't get sick very often. In fact, I can't remember the last time I missed work because I was sick. Even when I was in school I didn't miss very many days.

QUES: What are your plans for the future?

STAN: Oh, I guess I don't plan very much ahead. I like to take things as they come.

QUES: Do you have any plans or hopes for your family?

STAN: Well, I hope I've been a good father. I think that I've done a good job in raising my family. I guess I hope that my children will grow up to be responsible people. I think its important that they should have a good sense of their responsibilities. I don't mean that they should grow up to be exactly like me, but I hope that maybe they will have some of my values. I guess I think its important that they keep a sense of their heritage.

QUES: Thank you for talking with us today.

STAN: Oh sure, it was nice talking with you.

APPENDIX 4

INDEX

This index is a listing of the information which is contained in the numbered packets. You should scan this index as a guide to selecting additional information about the person in the interview you have read. You may select as many items as you feel you need to form an accurate impression of this person's personality.

A (G) indicates that the item was provided through a group rating

An (S) indicates the item was provided by the person himself.

REFLECTIVENESS (G)	#3	GOODNATURED (G)	#45
SOPHISTICATION (G)	#36	TIDINESS (G)	#29
NERVOUSNESS (G)	#27	MUSIC PREFERENCE (S)	#17
FAVORITE SEASON (S)	#25	SOCIABILITY (G)	#15
EXCITABILITY (G)	#11	FLEXIBILITY (G)	#5
PERSEVERENCE (G)	#34	CAUTION (G)	#1
PETS (S)	#10	BOATING (S)	#22
CHRISTMAS CUSTOMS (S)	#20	SOCIAL ADEPTNESS (G)	#48
BIRTHPLACE (S)	#31	FAVORITE TV PROGRAM (S)	#30
SECRETIVENESS (G)	#44	POLITICAL PARTY (S)	#9
IMAGINATION (G)	#7	INCOME (S)	#23
AUTOMOBILE (S)	#43	ART SENSITIVITY (G)	#13
CHOIR (S)	#33	HOME (S)	#19
FAVORITE FOOD (S)	#41	COOPERATION (G)	#37
FAVORITE BEVERAGE (S)	#42	VEROSITY (G)	#8
EDUCATION (S)	#14	FRANKNESS (G)	#35
DEPENDABILITY (G)	#38	GENTLENESS (G)	#40
AGE (S)	#4	SCRUPLES (G)	#12
RELIGION (S)	#6	DANCING PREFERENCE (S)	#18
JEALOUSY (G)	#21	OPENNESS (G)	#39
ORGANIZATION (S)	#2	ANXIETY (G)	#16
READING HABITS (S)	#32	CAMPING (S)	#26
FAMILY (S)	#47	PESSIMISM (G)	#28
OCCUPATION (S)	#46	FAVORITE COLOR (S)	#24

APPENDIX 4-A

SELECTION TASK: ITEM DESCRIPTIONS

The following are the descriptions on the cards for each item appearing on the "Index" used in the Item Selection Task. Their number corresponds with the designation on the index and their location in the plastic card holders in the booklet.

1. The group rated Stan as very cautious.
2. Stan is a member of the VFW (Veterans of Foreign Wars).
3. The group rated Stan as somewhat unreflective.
4. Stan is forty-five (45) years old.
5. The group rated Stan as somewhat headstrong.
6. Stan is a Roman Catholic.
7. The group rated Stan as somewhat Imaginative.
8. The group rated Stan as somewhat talkative.
9. Stan usually votes Democratic.
10. Stan's family owns two dogs.
11. The group rated Stan as very excitable.
12. The group rated Stan as somewhat unscrupulous.
13. The group rated Stan as artistically sensitive.
14. Stan has a high school diploma.
15. The group rated Stan as very sociable.
16. The group rated Stan as somewhat anxious.
17. Stan usually listens to country and western music.
18. Stan and his wife enjoy ballroom dancing.
19. Stan lives in a three bedroom house.
20. Stan's family exchanges gifts on St. Nicholas Day (Dec. 6).
21. The group rated Stan as somewhat jealous.

22. Stan owns a motor boat.
23. Stan earned \$23,000 last year.
24. Stan's favorite color is blue.
25. Stan's favorite season is autumn.
26. Stan goes on a camping trip each summer.
27. The group rated Stan as somewhat tense.
28. The group rated Stan as not pessimistic.
29. The group rated Stan as very tidy.
30. Stan's favorite TV program is "MASH."
31. Stan was not born in the U.S.
32. Stan reads Newsweek regularly.
33. Stan is a member of his church choir.
34. The group rated Stan as very persevering.
35. The group found Stan as somewhat frank.
36. The group rated Stan as rather crude.
37. The group rated Stan as somewhat cooperative.
38. The group rated Stan as somewhat undependable.
39. The group rated Stan as somewhat narrow.
40. The group rated Stan as gentle.
41. Stan's favorite food is sausage.
42. Stan's favorite beverage is beer.
43. Stan owns a 1975 Chevrolet.
44. The group rated Stan as somewhat secretive.
45. The group rated Stan as fairly goodnatured.
46. Stan works as a repairman.
47. Stan is the youngest of three children.
48. The group rated Stan as poised.

APPENDIX 5

ITEM SELECTION SHEET

As you select items from the index, record the number of that item in the appropriate space below. Use the spaces in order with your first selection recorded in space #1, your second selection in space #2, your third selection in space #3, and so on.

- | | | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| 1. _____ | 17. _____ | 33. _____ |
| 2. _____ | 18. _____ | 34. _____ |
| 3. _____ | 19. _____ | 35. _____ |
| 4. _____ | 20. _____ | 36. _____ |
| 5. _____ | 21. _____ | 37. _____ |
| 6. _____ | 22. _____ | 38. _____ |
| 7. _____ | 23. _____ | 39. _____ |
| 8. _____ | 24. _____ | 40. _____ |
| 9. _____ | 25. _____ | 41. _____ |
| 10. _____ | 26. _____ | 42. _____ |
| 11. _____ | 27. _____ | 43. _____ |
| 12. _____ | 28. _____ | 44. _____ |
| 13. _____ | 29. _____ | 45. _____ |
| 14. _____ | 30. _____ | 46. _____ |
| 15. _____ | 31. _____ | 47. _____ |
| 16. _____ | 32. _____ | 48. _____ |

APPENDIX 6

SUBJECT QUESTIONS

Based upon the information you have received and the impression you have formed, write any questions you would like to ask the person in the interview. Confine your questions to the space provided on this side of the page.

* * * * *

APPENDIX 7

RATER INSTRUCTIONS: QUESTION TASK

RATER ID # _____

SUBJECT ID # _____

Read the questions which this subject has written. When you have completed reading all of the questions once, go back through the questions and rate each. Use the following coding format to rate each question:

- If the question asks for BACKGROUND information, code the question "1"
- If the question asks for PERSONALITY information, code the question "2"
- If the question asks for information about BOTH, code the question "3"
- If the question does not fall in the above categories, code the question "4"

If you have any questions ask the facilitator before proceeding. Work at your own pace, and if you feel you are becoming tired or distracted, inform the facilitator.

QUESTION #1 _____	QUESTION #11 _____	QUESTION #21 _____
QUESTION #2 _____	QUESTION #12 _____	QUESTION #22 _____
QUESTION #3 _____	QUESTION #13 _____	QUESTION #23 _____
QUESTION #4 _____	QUESTION #14 _____	QUESTION #24 _____
QUESTION #5 _____	QUESTION #15 _____	QUESTION #25 _____
QUESTION #6 _____	QUESTION #16 _____	QUESTION #26 _____
QUESTION #7 _____	QUESTION #17 _____	QUESTION #27 _____
QUESTION #8 _____	QUESTION #18 _____	QUESTION #28 _____
QUESTION #9 _____	QUESTION #19 _____	QUESTION #29 _____
QUESTION 10 _____	QUESTION #20 _____	QUESTION #30 _____

When you have completed each question, count the total number of ratings in each category. Enter the totals in the space below.

NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CODED AS "1" _____
 NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CODED AS "2" _____
 NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CODED AS "3" _____
 NUMBER OF QUESTIONS CODED AS "4" _____

TOTAL FROM ABOVE (1-4) _____

APPENDIX 8

PERSONAL IMPRESSION FORM

Based upon the information you have received, write a brief impression of the person's personality. Confine your written impression to the space provided on this side of the paper.

* * * * *

APPENDIX 9

RATER INSTRUCTIONS: IMPRESSION TASK

RATER ID # _____

SUBJECT ID # _____

Read the impression which this subject has written. When you have completed reading the impression once, go back through the impression and rate each sentence. Use the following coding format to rate each sentence.

- If the sentence is OBJECTIVE/DESCRIPTIVE, code the sentence "1"
- If the sentence is SUBJECTIVE/EVALUATIVE, code the sentence "2"
- If the sentence is BOTH, code the sentence "3"
- If the sentence does not fit in the above, code the sentence "4"

If you have any questions, ask the facilitator before proceeding. Work at your own pace, and if you feel you are becoming tired or distracted, inform the facilitator.

SENTENCE #1 _____	SENTENCE #11 _____	SENTENCE #21 _____
SENTENCE #2 _____	SENTENCE #12 _____	SENTENCE #22 _____
SENTENCE #3 _____	SENTENCE #13 _____	SENTENCE #23 _____
SENTENCE #4 _____	SENTENCE #14 _____	SENTENCE #24 _____
SENTENCE #5 _____	SENTENCE #15 _____	SENTENCE #25 _____
SENTENCE #6 _____	SENTENCE #16 _____	SENTENCE #26 _____
SENTENCE #7 _____	SENTENCE #17 _____	SENTENCE #27 _____
SENTENCE #8 _____	SENTENCE #18 _____	SENTENCE #28 _____
SENTENCE #9 _____	SENTENCE #19 _____	SENTENCE #29 _____
SENTENCE 10 _____	SENTENCE #20 _____	SENTENCE #30 _____

When you have completed coding each sentence, count the total number of ratings in each category. Enter the totals in the space below.

NUMBER OF SENTENCES CODED AS "1" _____

NUMBER OF SENTENCES CODED AS "2" _____

NUMBER OF SENTENCES CODED AS "3" _____

NUMBER OF SENTENCES CODED AS "4" _____

TOTAL FROM ABOVE (1-4) _____

APPENDIX 10

PERSONAL PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE

Directions: Answer each of the following questions by either circling the one appropriate response on the seven-point scale or by writing a short answer. Only circle one response for each question.

1. As you searched through the information in the booklet, did you find it difficult to form an impression of the person described there?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Difficult						Not at all Difficult

2. How confident are you that your impression of this person is an accurate impression?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Confident						Not at all Confident

3. Information about this person's personality traits was more helpful than information about this person's activities and preferences.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Agree Totally						Disagree Totally

4. How familiar are you with persons of this ethnic background?

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Extremely Familiar						Extremely Unfamiliar

5. I would expect a person of this ethnic group to have come from the following country: (List the country in which you think this person was born.)

6. Do you think that you would need additional information to form a satisfactory impression of this person?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Much Additional
Information Needed

No Additional
Information Needed

7. How interested are you to meet a person of this background?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Extremely
Interested

Not at all
Interested

APPENDIX 11

PERSONAL BACKGROUND INVENTORY

1. Name _____
2. Sex M F
3. Age _____
4. Major area of Study (circle)
 - A. Architecture
 - B. Business
 - C. Arts and Science
 - D. Engineering
 - E. Fine Arts
 - F. Education
 - G. Journalism
 - H. Social Welfare
 - I. Health Science
 - J. Graduate School
 - K. Undecided
 - L. Other (List) _____
5. List the place (city, state, country) you were born _____
6. Where have you lived the longest (city, state, etc.) _____
7. Size of hometown (circle)
 - A. Rural
 - B. Small Town
 - C. Small City
 - D. Suburb
 - E. Large City
 - F. Other (List) _____
8. To the best of your ability, describe your ethnic background. (What nationality or ethnic groups can you trace in your ancestry?)
9. What year are you in school? (circle)
 - A. Freshman
 - B. Sophomore
 - C. Junior
 - D. Senior
 - E. Graduate
 - F. Other (List) _____
10. Family Size (Your immediate Family) _____
Number of Brothers _____ Number of Sisters _____

APPENDIX 12

CONSENT STATEMENT

The Department of Communication Studies supports the practice of protecting human subjects participating in research. The following information is provided so that you can decide whether you wish to participate in this present study. You should be aware that even if you agree to participate, you are free to withdraw at any time.

We are studying the manner in which people form impressions of others and then communicate with members of various groups. You will be asked to read an interview which was conducted with a member of one such group. You will be asked some questions about the interview, and you will have an opportunity to obtain additional information about the person in the interview. Later, you will be asked to prepare your own questions to ask this person. Any information which you provide will be coded, but you will not be identified by name or in any other way. We will analyze your information along with other individuals to find out what people wish to know about meeting a person from another ethnic group.

Your participation is solicited, but is strictly voluntary. Do not hesitate to ask any questions about the study. Be assured that your name will not be associated in any way with the research findings. We appreciate your cooperation very much.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Dudczak
Communication Studies
864-3368

Signature of Student Participant

Date

APPENDIX 13

TASK INSTRUCTIONS

You are being asked to form a personal impression of another person. Specifically, you are to build an impression by selecting items of information about that person. Based upon the impression you form, you will construct a set of questions to ask that person.

Source of Information. Each person who was interviewed had volunteered for this project. The interview you will receive is an edited version of one such interview. Additionally, each person was evaluated on a personality rating scale. The raters, in each instance, had known the person for at least six months. Finally, each person who was interviewed also completed an inventory of personal preferences, activities, and interests.

The information we have collected about one of the persons who was interviewed is contained in this booklet. In addition to the information contained in the interview, it is available to aid you in the formation of your impression about this person.

Procedure. When you are told to do so, you should proceed as follows:

1. Read the interview conducted with the person.
2. After you complete the interview, when instructed by the experimenter, you may select additional information from items listed on the index. Select an item of information from the Index and record the location number of that item in the first space on the Item Selection Sheet.
3. Find the corresponding Information Card on the final pages, read the information contained on the card, and then return the card to the slot from which it came.
4. Return to the Index and select another item of information.

Following these steps (2-4), repeat the search process until you feel you have formed an accurate impression of this person's personality. You may select items in any order, and you may select as many items as you wish. However, you should concentrate upon items you feel would be most helpful to you in forming an accurate impression of the person's personality.

When you have selected the items you feel you need to have formed an accurate impression, return the booklet and the Item Selection Sheet to the experimenter. He will give you further instructions and forms to complete.

APPENDIX 14

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

Thank you for your participation in this study. Now that it is over, let me tell you what the research is all about.

We are interested in knowing how a person's familiarity with another person's ethnic background affects the kinds of impressions s/he forms. We want to see if the impressions make a difference in the kinds of questions people ask when expecting to communicate with a person who comes from either a familiar or an unfamiliar background. To study this we have asked each of you to read an interview conducted with one of three target groups.

One third of you have read an interview with a person from a familiar target group. This interview would have involved a person of either German or English background. Another third of you will have read an interview conducted with a person from an unfamiliar target group. This interview would have involved a person from either a Kashub or Walloon background. The remaining third of you will have read a control interview conducted with a person from the Kansas City area.

In fact, all of you actually read the same interview. The only difference among the familiar, unfamiliar, and control target groups was that the familiar and the unfamiliar target interviews made specific reference to an ethnic background. By using the identical content of the interview, we can see if there are differences when the ethnic identity is altered.

We are not concerned with the particulars of your impressions as much as we are concerned with the extensiveness of your impressions. We have hypothesized that when a person expects to meet a person with whom s/he is unfamiliar, there should be a tendency to select relatively few features to form an impression. On the other hand, the person who expects to meet a person with whom s/he is familiar will select a larger number of features from which to form an impression. We have also hypothesized that when presented with a familiar target, a person should form a more elaborate impression using personality traits for references while the unfamiliar target should generate its impression based upon more of the descriptive information.

We won't know for awhile how this experiment will turn out. I can tell you about another set of studies which have made similar hypotheses in related areas. (Give the gist of Snyder and Uranowitz--altering the target on a single characteristic changes the interpretation of other information resulting in an altered impression. Give the Juhnke results--altering characteristics of the target age group does not result in discounting certain stereotypes.)

Again, thank you for your cooperation in participating in this study. Do you have any questions?

APPENDIX 15

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: SELECTION TASK

<u>Source</u>	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Subjects	2196.62	59			
Condition	49.4	2	24.7	0.65	n.s.
error between	2147.22	57	37.67		
Within Subjects	752.5	60			
Type of Item	84.35	1	84.35	7.51	.01
Type x Condition	27.82	2	13.91	1.24	n.s.
Error Within	640.33	57	11.23		
TOTAL	2949.12	119			

APPENDIX 16

PERSONAL PERCEPTION QUESTIONNAIRE RESULTS

1. Question 1: "As you searched did you find it difficult to form an impression .?"

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	4.85	1.53	.34
Familiar	5.35	1.23	.27
Control	5.20	1.19	.27

ANOVA: Impression Difficulty By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	2.63	1.32	0.79	.4778
Within Groups	57	100.30	1.76		
Total	59	102.93			

2. Question 2: "How confident are you that your impression is an accurate impression?"

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	3.45	1.57	.35
Familiar	3.30	1.56	.35
Control	3.85	1.50	.33

ANOVA: Impression Confidence By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	3.23	1.62	0.68	.5111
Within Groups	57	135.70	2.38		
Total	59	138.93			

3. Question 3: "Information about . . . personality traits was more helpful than information about . . . activities and preferences."

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	4.05	1.64	.37
Familiar	3.95	1.43	.32
Control	3.50	1.47	.33

ANOVA: Trait Reliance By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	3.43	1.72	0.75	.4781
Within Groups	57	130.90	2.30		
Total	59	134.33			

4. Question 4: "How familiar are you . . . with this ethnic background?"

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	6.45	1.15	.26
Familiar	2.65	1.53	.34
Control	3.70	1.45	.33

ANOVA: Familiarity By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	154.03	77.02	40.02	.001
Within Groups	57	109.70	1.92		
Total	59	263.73			

5. Question 5: "I would expect a person of this ethnic group to have come from the following country."

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Correct Responses</u>	<u>Incorrect Responses</u>
Unfamiliar	0 (1.00)	20 (0.00)
Familiar	17 (0.85)	3 (0.15)
Control	18 (9.90)	2 (0.10)

6. Question 6: "Do you think that you would need additional information to form . . . an impression of this person?"

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	4.00	1.86	.42
Familiar	3.80	1.96	.44
Control	3.35	1.31	.29

ANOVA: Need of Information By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	4.43	2.22	.74	.48
Within Groups	57	171.75	3.01		
Total	59	176.18			

7. Question 7: "How interested are you to meet a person of this background?"

<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Mean</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>SE</u>
Unfamiliar	3.40	1.56	.34
Familiar	3.85	1.52	.33
Control	3.35	1.57	.35

ANOVA: Interest By Treatment

<u>Source</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>SS</u>	<u>MS</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>F Prob.</u>
Between Groups	2	3.32	1.63	0.69	.5123
Within Groups	57	134.60	2.41		
Total	59	137.92			

APPENDIX 17

QUESTION TASK RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT

$$\text{Scott's pi} = \frac{\% \text{ of observed matches} - \% \text{ of expected matches}}{100\% - \% \text{ of expected matches}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ of expected matches} &= \frac{\sum(\text{selections/coder/category})^2}{N \text{ of selections/coder}} = \\ &= \frac{(\frac{565}{1,752} + \frac{1073}{1,752} + \frac{83}{1,752} + \frac{27}{1,752})^2}{=} \\ &= (.325)^2 + (.610)^2 + (.050)^2 + (.015)^2 = \\ &= (.105) + (.372) + (.003) + (.000) = .48 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ of observed matches} &= (\text{unanimous agreements}) \times 1.00 \\ &+ (3 \text{ agreements, 1 disagreements}) \times .50 \\ &+ (2 \text{ agreements, 2 alt. agreements}) \times .33 \\ &+ (2 \text{ agreements, 1 disagreement,} \\ &\quad 1 \text{ disagreement}) \times .17 \\ &+ (\text{No agreements}) \times .00 \end{aligned}$$

Total

$$\begin{array}{r} 321 \times 1.00 = 321.00 \\ 82 \times .50 = 41.00 \\ 23 \times .33 = 7.67 \\ 12 \times .17 = 2.00 \\ \hline 371.67 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pi} &= \frac{372}{438} - .48 \\ &= \frac{1.00 - .48}{1.00 - .48} = \frac{.37}{.52} \\ &= .71 \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX 18

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: QUESTION TASK

<u>Source</u>	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Subjects	398.09	59			
Conditions	59.27	2	28.64	4.99	.01
error between	338.82	57	5.94		
Within Subjects	551.50	60			
Type of Item	114.07	1	114.07	15.23	.001
Type x Condition	10.40	2	5.20	0.69	n.s.
error within	427.03	57	7.49		
TOTAL	949.59	119			

APPENDIX 19

IMPRESSION TASK RELIABILITY COEFFICIENT

$$\text{Scott's pi} = \frac{\% \text{ of observed matches} - \% \text{ of expected matches}}{100\% - \% \text{ of expected matches}}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ of expected matches} &= \frac{\sum (\text{selections/coder/category})^2}{N \text{ of selections/coder}} = \\ &= \frac{\frac{183}{1700} + \frac{1106}{1700} + \frac{325}{1700} + \frac{81}{1700}}{2} = \\ &= (.108)^2 + (.651)^2 + (.191)^2 + (.048)^2 = \\ &= (.012) + (.423) + (.037) + (.002) = .47 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \% \text{ of observed matches} &= (\text{unanimous agreements}) \times 1.00 \\ &+ (3 \text{ agreements, 1 disagreement}) \times .50 \\ &+ (2 \text{ agreements, 2 alt. agreements}) \times .33 \\ &+ (2 \text{ agreements, 1 disagreement,} \\ &\quad \quad \quad 1 \text{ disagreement}) \times .17 \\ &+ (\text{No agreements}) \times 0.00 \end{aligned}$$

Total

$$\begin{array}{r} 256 \times 1.00 = 256 \\ 116 \times .50 = 58 \\ 43 \times .33 = 14.33 \\ 10 \times .17 = 1.67 \\ \hline 330 \end{array}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{pi} &= \frac{330}{425} - .47 \\ &= \frac{1.00 - .47}{1.00 - .47} = \frac{.53}{.53} \\ &= .59 \end{aligned}$$

APPENDIX 20

ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE: IMPRESSION TASK

<u>Source</u>	<u>ss</u>	<u>df</u>	<u>ms</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Between Subjects	161.97	59			
Conditions	10.62	2	5.31	2.00	n.s.
error between	151.35	57	2.65		
Within Subjects	704.00	60			
Type of Item	512.54	1	512.54	156.26	.001
Type x Condition	4.51	2	2.26	0.69	n.s.
error within	186.95	57	3.28		
TOTAL	865.97	119			