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American students, as well as people of other nations, form perceptions of others who differ from their own cultural, racial, and social groups. These mental pictures are "stereotypes."

The purpose of this study was to identify stereotypes that American students enrolled at Western Michigan University (WMU) had about Arabs and to determine if there were differences in these stereotypes when students were classified by race, sex, level of education, age, and sources of stereotypes. Twenty-five bipolar adjectives were organized as semantic differential scales to assess students' perceptions. The instrument was either mailed or hand delivered to a sample of 400 students; 296 (74%) responded. The t-test and one-way analysis of variance were used for each of the 25 scales. Major findings of the analyses of data were:

1. Arabs were stereotyped by WMU American students as quite rich and anti-American. They also described Arabs as slightly autocratic, radical, terrorist, knowledgeable, brave, and intelligent.

2. Differences were found between black and white American students in the way Arabs were stereotyped on 7 of the 25 adjective scales.
3. Differences were found between male and female students on only 2 adjective scales.

4. Differences were found between graduate and undergraduate students in their stereotypes of Arabs on 6 of the 25 polar pairs.

5. It was found that the age of the students had a significant effect on their stereotypes of Arabs. Differences in the mean test scores between age groups showed that the youngest group of students held the most unfavorable stereotypes toward Arabs over the other groups of students.

6. The primary source on which American students based their information had a significant effect on their stereotypes. Students who based their information on television were more likely to hold unfavorable stereotypes toward Arabs. However, the more favorable stereotypes were found among students who had personal contact with Arabs.
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CHAPTER I

INTRODUCTION

The notion of ethnic stereotypes has received tremendous attention over the past 60 years. The term ethnic stereotype was created by Lippmann in 1922, and the first empirical study of stereotypes was conducted by Katz and Braly (1933). A stereotype, as defined by Lippmann, is "a picture in our heads." Within this picture, an individual tends to characterize another person and places him or her favorably or unfavorably within a larger structure that disregards his or her individuality.

Americans, along with people of other nations, hold these mental images of people, races, and ethnic groups. Based on these mental pictures, people see themselves and their own group as the standard. Stereotypical attitudes, as Porter (1982) pointed out:

not only influence our overt behaviors, they also cause us to distort our perception. ... The major source of cultural variance in attitudes is ethnocentrism, which is a tendency to view people unconsciously by using our own group, our own customs as the standard for all judgments. We place ourselves, our racial, ethnic or social group, at the center of the universe and rate all others accordingly. The greater their similarity to us, the nearer to us we place them. The greater the dissimilarity, the farther away they are. We place one group above another... one nation-state above another. We tend to see our own group, our own country, our own culture as the best, as the most moral. (p. 273)

This study attempted to explore and identify the "picture" of Arabs in Americans' "heads."
A central question in the matter of national attitude and belief is the way the members of any given nation perceive the members of another. Generally, the people of one nation—and the United States is no exception—harbor stereotyped images of other nations, starkly simple and exceedingly inaccurate. . . . The nature of the various types of images . . . their comparison with reality and the identification of causal factors are attackable problems. Until some headway is made, international relations must always be in danger of decisions based on fantasy. (Buchanan, 1953, p. 45)

Investigation into the area of stereotypes, especially between two nations, is essential in promoting understanding on complete, reliable, and accurate information.

Statement of the Problem

Past investigations into stereotypes have been conducted in the United States. The early studies of stereotypical attitudes in the U.S. concentrated on America's major ethnic groups; namely, blacks, whites, orientals, and Hispanics. These studies dealt with how members in each ethnic group stereotyped the members in other ethnic groups. Also, the investigation of stereotypes has been undertaken on an international basis and has been considered by UNESCO as one of the most important "tensions" affecting international understanding.

According to Gilbert (1951):

Increased attention is being given to the role of ethnic stereotypes in international relations. It is already fairly well recognized that the stereotype . . . that national groups maintain with respect to each other often stand in the way of international understanding and may even contribute to international hostilities. (p. 245)

Furthermore, it was suggested that unfavorable stereotypes are harmful in regard to international relations and that perhaps two
nations will collide with each other in war because they are following different pictures. According to Klineberg (1951):

It is not only possible, but even highly probable, that unfavourable stereotypes concerning a particular nation constitute a fertile soil in which hostility may be more easily developed. . . . Hostility can obviously be generated more easily between two nations which hold unfavourable stereotypes regarding each other. (p. 505)

Newsom (1982) suggested that Americans' perception of the Arabs is affected by stereotyped labels such as "terrorists," "oil-rich," "greedy," "radical," "leftists," and "anti-American" (p. 61).

Also, Terry (1982) indicated that the images of Arabs in popular American literature are remarkably similar whether they are described as killers in espionage stories or as greedy, lustful oil merchants in novels of economic calamities. "Moreover, racial, religious and ethnic stereotypes that are no longer acceptable when applied to Italians, Poles, Jews, or Blacks are unhesitatingly applied to Arabs" (p. 104).

The stereotypes of Arabs are evident everywhere in American media, magazines, television shows, films, newspapers, and so forth. In general, these stereotypes are oversimplified, insulting, and rude to Arabs.

To many Americans the Arabs are machine-gun wielding terrorists striking from ambush, despotic rulers shouting hatred for Israel, cruel fanatics chopping off the hands of criminals, or shy women in shapeless black robes. . . . No picture of Arab world is as pervasive as the one of great oil wealth pouring into Cadillac agencies and gambling casinos and eventually buying up America. (Watson, 1984, pp. 26-27)

Ghareeb (1983) pointed out that the negative images of the Arab people have affected American public opinion, which may affect
governmental leaders as well. He believed that these negative images are not only harmful to their self-esteem, but also possibly dangerous in that these stereotypes could contribute to the creation of an atmosphere which may allow for the use of force against Arab nations.

This study was undertaken (a) to explore and identify the stereotypes held by Western Michigan University (WMU) American students toward Arabs; (b) to see the differences—if any—between the age, sex, race, and level of education of the WMU American student and his or her stereotypical attitude toward Arabs; (c) to find out and explore how WMU American students learn about Arabs; and (d) to make recommendations and provide the governmental Arabian officials with specific knowledge of their "picture" in American students' "heads."

Significance of the Study

Stereotypes have affected the American public's opinion either negatively or positively; and as a consequence, this may affect U.S. governmental leaders as well as U.S. foreign policy makers' perceptions toward Arab countries.

The Americans' negative stereotypes toward Arabs, as Terry (1982) suggested, wrench the political, social, and economic realities of Arab nations and help to produce a contrary climate of opinion between the Western World, especially the United States, and Arab countries.

Because the U.S. is one of the most powerful countries and has the highest percentage of educated people in the world, it is essential for Arabs to discover and understand the images and
stereotypical attitudes of American people toward them. This is important not only to establish and enhance the intimacy and the friendship between the U.S. and Arab countries, but also to create the human cohesion and the mutual understanding between both. Moreover, it is worthwhile for the more than 3 million individuals with Arab-American ethnic origin, living in the U.S., to examine and understand how they are stereotyped, and how they want to be stereotyped by other American ethnic groups, in order to exist in favor, friendliness, and kindness with those groups.

It was hoped that the findings of this study would be significant in determining and identifying what types of images and stereotypical attitudes Americans hold toward Arabs. Based on these findings, Arab officials may determine the range and intensity of American attitudes—specifically students'—toward them and attempt to change them by using the same sources on which American students have based their information of Arabs; such as, television, newspapers, magazines, radio, and so forth to reduce and eliminate the negative stereotypes—if there are any—and maintain positive attitudes. This could be done by airing paid programs and advertisements about Arabs in American media effectively.

Cantril (1953) has aptly stated:

People do not like to see themselves as others see them, but obviously the finding of the research must be made available to all who can utilize them to increase our understanding of each other, even at the risk that some might misuse them and try to exacerbate existing prejudices. (p. 1)
Research Questions

This study was conducted to provide answers for the following questions:

1. How do Western Michigan University black and white American students stereotype Arabs?
2. Is there a significant difference between black and white American students in their stereotypes of Arabs?
3. Is there a significant difference between male and female American students in their stereotypes of Arabs?
4. Is there a significant difference between graduate and undergraduate American students in their stereotypes of Arabs?
5. Is there a significant difference between the age of the student and his or her stereotype of Arabs?

Research Hypotheses

The hypotheses tested in this study which were drawn after a review of the related relevant literature are as follows:

1. There will be a difference between black and white American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.
2. There will be a difference between male and female American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.
3. There will be a difference between graduate and undergraduate American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.
4. The mean group scores on the SD used in this study will differ among students who are under 20 years, 20-30 years, 31-40
years, 41-50 years, and over 50 years.

5. The mean group scores on the SD used in this study will differ among students who based their information about Arabs on television, newspapers, magazines, and other.

Definition of Terms

The concepts and terms used in this study are described as follows:

Arabs: persons who consider themselves and consequently feel as members of Arabic nations and whose native language is Arabic (see Appendix A).

Age refers to the respondents' ages, grouped as follows: under 20 years, 20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years, 51 years and over.

Level of education refers to whether the respondent is a graduate or undergraduate student.

Origins of the stereotypes refer to the formation of stereotypes and the source from which they were established, such as television, magazines, newspapers, personal contact, and other.

Race refers to the ethnic origin of the respondent, whether he or she is a white or black American.

Stereotype is a generalization concerning trait, or statement of attributions made about the member of a particular ethnic or national group.
Overview of the Dissertation

In this chapter an introduction to the study, statement of the problem, significance of the study, research questions, research hypotheses, and definition of terms are provided. Chapter II presents the review of related literature to the research problem which consists of four sections: (a) definition of stereotypes, (b) the origin of stereotypes, (c) stereotypes of ethnic and national groups within and outside the U.S.A., and (d) the stereotypes of Arabs in American mass media. The research design and methodology are found in Chapter III. The chapter provides a description of instrumentation, population and sample, data collection, and data analysis used in the study. Chapter IV presents the findings of the study. The summary and conclusions as well as the recommendations of the study are found in Chapter V.
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

The purpose of Chapter II is to review the related literature which is relevant to the research problem. The review of the literature for this study consists of the following four sections: (a) definitions of stereotypes; (b) the origins of stereotypes; (c) how America's ethnic groups stereotype each other in the U.S., as well as how members of one nation stereotype members of other nations; and (d) the stereotypes of Arabs in American mass media, cartoons, and school textbooks.

The Definitions of Stereotypes

Since the term stereotype was first created by Walter Lippmann in 1922, little agreement has been reached regarding its definition. However, while the concepts of the term have varied considerably, most researchers seem to have viewed stereotypes as generalizations concerning trait attributions made about members of an ethnic group (Brigham, 1973, p. 206).

Lippmann (1922) originally defined stereotype as "a picture in our heads" which takes the form of generalization and undesirable faulty information based in our culture determination. "We do not first see, and then define, we define first and then see; . . . we pick out what our culture has already defined for us, and we tend to
perceive that which we have picked out in the form stereotyped for us by our culture" (Lippmann, 1922, p. 81). Klineberg (1951) defined stereotypes as generalizations, statements, judgments, or opinions regarding the characteristic of a particular national, ethnic, racial, or other type of group. Unlike Lippmann, Klineberg posited that stereotypes are based on an "inductive collection of data, rumor, anecdotes, and on evidence which is insufficient to justify the generalization" (p. 505). According to him, stereotypes are "not grounded on objective facts, and as a consequence they represent a sort of 'autistic thinking' which is relatively unresponsive to external reality. They occasionally contain some truth, but if they do so, it appears to be largely by chance" (Klineberg, 1951, p. 505).

Stereotypes, whether favorable or unfavorable, have been seen by Allport (1954) as "an exaggerated belief associated with a category. Its function is to justify (rationalize) our conduct in relation to that category" (p. 191). Allport further stated that

Stereotype is not identical with a category, it is rather a fixed idea that accompanies the category. . . . It acts both as justificatory device for categorical acceptance or rejection of a group, and as a screening or selective device to maintain simplicity in perception and in thinking. (Allport, 1954, pp. 191-192)

As the previous review of the literature has shown, most researchers viewed stereotypes as a generalization concerning a particular ethnic group which is, most times, not valid. However, as Allport (1954) suggested, there is a difference between a "valid generalization and stereotype." As an example, if a person says "I think Israeli tends to have more terrorists than, let us say, Arabs";
then, that person is giving an opinion in terms of probability. But if a person says "Israeli are not terrorists" or "Arabs are terrorists," then that person is creating a stereotype by overgeneralizing these statements. Lippmann (1922) pointed out:

We do not study a man and judge him to be bad. We see a bad man. We see a dewy morn, a blushing maiden, a sainted priest, a humorless Englishman, a dangerous Red, a carefree Bohemian, a lazy Hindu, a wily Oriental, a dreaming Slav, a volatile Irishman, a greedy Jew, a 100% American. (p. 119)

Origins of Stereotypes

Many studies supported the notion that stereotypes are learned. People are not born with "pictures in our heads." Stereotypes must be learned; stereotypes do not instantly appear through instincts (Rich, 1974). There are many ways in which stereotypes are acquired. Rich (1974) believed that stereotypes may be acquired in our consciousness in three ways. First, stereotypes are learned through personal experience, i.e., when an individual interacts with members of racial, ethnic, and cultural groups different from his or her own group. Through this interaction, the individual tends to generalize to other members of that group with traits that have positively or negatively impressed his or her individuality. Second, stereotypes are learned "through the experience of relevant others." When a person has no personal experience with ethnic groups, he or she will adopt the stereotypes of his or her parents, teachers, or peers, and will follow their suggestions and opinions to characterize ethnic groups. Third, mass media presents people with generalizations about ethnic and racial groups; so, people learn to stereotype through
books, magazines, newspapers, radio, motion pictures, and television (Rich, 1974, pp. 46-47).

Most researchers of stereotypes indicated that mass media have an effective and powerful influence on shaping the individual's perception of other groups. Klineberg (1951) stated, "There can be no doubt that the mass media play a very important role in the dissemination of such stereotypes and that they bear a high degree of responsibility for their wide diffusion" (p. 508). Gilbert (1951) believed that the change in stereotypes among students is related to several factors. Among these factors is the gradual disappearance of stereotyped characterization in communication media and entertainment, more intercultural courses in social sciences which have been used in college curricula, and greater ethnic and financial diversity among post-World War II college youth because of the "GI Bill" and the spread of higher education, generally.

Personal contact was found to be an influence in the formation of stereotypes. Bayton (1941) showed that stereotypes are formed through media such as literature, cartoons, movies, jokes, radio, and theater, as well as personal contact. He believed that media have a greater influence on the notion of stereotypes than personal "face-to-face" contact. Also individuals' personal conflicts play an effective role in the existence of stereotypes. According to Allport (1954):

Stereotypes may or may not originate in a kernel of truth, they aid people in simplifying their categories, they justify hostility, sometimes they serve as projection screens for our personal conflict. But there is an additional, and exceedingly important, reason for their
existence. They are socially supported, continually re­vived and hammered in, by our media of mass communication—by novels, short stories, newspaper items, movies, stage, radio, and television. (p. 200)

Also, language and relationships between governments have had a great influence on stereotypes. Buchanan and Cantril (1953) found that the negative or positive stereotypes between people in two nations are related to the relationship between their governments, whether they are enemies in the past war or allied, and to the language which those people speak. They further stated that:

Friendliness and unfriendliness are found to be related to the predominant stereotypes held in the various countries. This is, once again, evidence that stereotypes should not be thought of as causative, but as symptomatic. The people threaten us, they have fought against us, they are just across our border, we cannot understand what they say, hence they must be cruel, conceited, domineering, etc. (Buchanan & Cantril, 1953, p. 57)

However, Burner and Perlmutter (cited in Gilbert, 1965) disagreed with the above statement. Instead, they have shown that:

The less one knows about a foreign country and its people, the more likely he is to express a stereotyped opinion of general personality traits of citizens of the particular country... The more a person is familiar with a particular country, the less is the likelihood of his expressing a stereotyped opinion about its people. (p. 5)

In summary, the formations of stereotypes are learned through personal experience and interaction with other members of racial, ethnic, social, and national groups. People also learn to stereotype through the experience of their family, school, and peers. Finally, mass media play an affective role in people's perceptions toward other ethnic groups.
Stereotypes of Ethnic and National Groups
Within and Outside the U.S.A.

As mentioned in the first chapter, the early studies of stereotypical attitudes were conducted primarily in the U.S. and dealt with stereotypes held by American ethnic groups toward each other.

The first study of ethnic and national stereotypes was done by Katz and Braly (1933), in which they developed a methodology which has served as a model for most ethnic stereotype studies. In this study 100 Princeton students were given a "checklist" of 84 traits and were asked to select those traits they considered most characteristic for each of the following 10 groups: Germans, English, Jews, Negroes, Turks, Japanese, Americans, Italians, Irish, and Chinese. Subjects were also asked to review the traits which they had chosen for each group and select the five traits they found most typical of each ethnic group. Students showed a high degree of agreement on selected traits of the 10 ethnic groups. The greatest degree of agreement among students was in their perception of Negroes: 84% of the students found Negroes "superstitious," while 75% agreed they were "lazy." Jews were stereotyped as "shrewd" by 79% and "mercenary" by 49%. The highest two traits assigned to Germans were "scientifically-minded" by 78% and "industrious" by 65%. The English were seen as "sportsmanlike" and "intelligent," while Turks were seen as "cruel" and "very religious." Italians were stereotyped as "artistic" and "impulsive." Japanese were described as "intelligent" and "industrious," and Chinese as "superstitious" and "sly," respectively. The authors concluded that
the traits assigned to Americans show a certain objectivity on the part of the students in describing themselves, for the description given is not greatly at variance with stereotypes held by non-Americans. Americans are described as industrious, intelligent, materialistic, ambitious, progressive, and pleasure-loving. (Katz & Braly, 1933, p. 286).

Since 1933, a great number of studies have been conducted to examine a changing of stereotypes among college students. Most of these studies were compared with Katz and Braly (1933) study. Centers (1951) conducted a study at UCLA. The 12 traits which were chosen by Princeton students in 1933 for describing the 10 ethnic and national groups were presented to 120 students. Centers, however, used a different procedure from Katz and Braly. He wrote the 10 ethnic groups on the board and read the set of 12 traits of each group assigned to them by the Princeton students. The subjects were asked to write down the name of the ethnic group they thought the list applied or meant to apply to. He found that the majority of UCLA students correctly assigned the trait lists to the 10 ethnic groups as Princeton students had assigned them 19 years earlier. However, 75% of the students assigned to the Chinese, Japanese, and Turks the same traits which had been assigned to them in 1933 and 95% of the UCLA students described the English and Jews the same as the Princeton students did.

Also at Princeton, Gilbert (1951) repeated Katz and Braly's (1933) study, using the same methodology and an 84-trait list to determine any change in stereotypes of Princeton students toward the 10 national and ethnic groups. American college students, however, who assigned themselves admirable traits in 1932 characterized
themselves more critically in 1951. "They apparently no longer think of Americans as being industrious, intelligent, ambitious, progressive, and alert as they did in Katz and Braly study" (p. 251). The change in the progressive trait was reduced from 27% to 5%. Additionally, American students in 1951 described themselves as "materi­alistic." Also, it was found that the traits most frequently assigned to the 10 ethnic groups in 1933 were similar to traits assigned to them in 1951; but were selected by a far smaller percentage of students than in 1933. In 1933, for example, 84% of the students described Negroes as "superstitious," but in 1951 the percentage had dropped to 41%. Also, Negroes in 1933 were described as "lazy" by 75% of the students, but in the later study the percentage dropped to 31%. In 1933, 79% of the students described Jews as "shrewd"; this dropped to 47% in 1951. Japanese in 1933 were characterized as intelligent by 45%, but in 1951 the percentage dropped to 11%. In 1933, 47% of the students perceived Turks as "cruel"; this dropped to 12% in 1951. Gilbert (1951) concluded that "the present generation of college students are more reluctant than the previous generation to make stereotyped generalizations about the character of ethnic groups, especially those with whom they have had little contact" (p. 252).

At the same institution (Princeton University), another study was undertaken by Karline, Coffman, and Walters (1969) to determine the notion of stereotypes among three Princeton generation students. The authors followed the same method employed by Katz and Braly (1933) and Gilbert (1951). The comparison between the results of the
three studies was provided. The results of this study support Gilbert's (1951) finding, which indicated that younger generations show more careful thinking about the 10 ethnic and national groups generalizations than their counterparts of 1932. Karline et al. (1969) stated that as in 1951, respondents stereotyped Americans as "materialistic"; Chinese were seen as "loyal to family ties"; Negroes were described as "musical"; Japanese were characterized as "industrious"; and Jews, English, Irish, Italians, and Turks have been stereotyped in this study as "ambitious," "conservative," "quick-tempered," "passionate," and "aggressive," respectively.

Meens (1943) conducted two studies at Howard University; 160 black students in 1935 and 137 students in 1942 were asked to describe 10 national and ethnic groups. The results of the two studies were compared, and a large degree of agreement was found among students in the two surveys in attributing traits to the 10 ethnic groups except in the case of Chinese, Japanese, Germans, Turks, and Italians. Chinese, for example, in 1942 were stereotyped more favorable than in 1935. Japanese in 1942 were less favorable than in 1935. Italians, however, were stereotyped in 1942 more favorable than in 1935; this perhaps was due, as Meens stated, to the aggression of Italy against Ethiopia.

Ehrlich (1962) conducted a study using different procedures to explore the relationship between stereotyping and stereotype assignment to Jews and blacks. Seventy-one categorical statements about people in general were given to 366 white undergraduate students at The Ohio State University and Wesleyan University. Forty-seven
statements out of the 71 were unfavorable or negative; for example, "There is little hope of correcting human defects since these defects are simply in the blood." The other 24 statements were generally positive, for example: "Many favorable sentiments toward most people stem from their social life." Students were asked to go over the 71 statements which had been randomly distributed on the questionnaire, and circle letter "N" if they thought the statement categorized Negroes, letter "J" if the statement applied to Jews, letter "B" if the statement applied to both groups, and letter "Q" if they thought the statement did not describe either of the two groups. It was found that out of the 47 negative stereotype statements a mean of 9 statements were assigned to Jews and 7 statements were assigned to Negroes. A mean of 23 statements was assigned to the neither category, and 8 statements were assigned to both. Our of the 24 positive statements a mean of 3 statements was assigned to both groups, and an equal mean of 9 statements was assigned to both and neither categories. It was also found that the two sets of stereotypes are "clear-cut and independent." In his relations with others, the Jew was stereotyped as "aggressive, exploitative, distinctive, exclusive, ethnocentric, and cohesive economic elite," while the Negro was stereotyped as "classic, lazy, irresponsible, and ignorant" (Ehrlich, 1962, p. 174).

A study was done by Ogawa (1971) to determine the stereotype white Americans hold of black, Mexican, and Japanese Americans in group discussion. A 57-trait list was drawn from Katz and Braly (1933) as well as words describing the three ethnic groups appearing.
in newspapers, magazines, and books. One hundred UCLA students were asked to chose from the trait-list the words they thought described the communicative behaviors of each of the three groups. It was found that the five traits most often attributed to black Americans were "argumentative," "emotional," "aggressive," "straightforward," and "critical." Mexican-Americans were stereotyped as "emotional," "argumentative," "sensitive," "straightforward," and "talkative." Japanese-Americans were seen as "intelligent," "courteous," "industrious," "quiet," and "soft-spoken."

Rich (1972) conducted a study to determine whether stereotypical traits assigned to blacks by whites differ from those traits assigned to whites by blacks. She found that the 100 black students tested in her study held primarily negative stereotype of whites. For example, 40.5% of the black students agreed that whites are "evasive." However, blacks in this study described whites with traits such as: "critical," "conservative," "ignorant," "boastful," and "aggressive." Blacks also stereotyped Japanese-Americans as "intelligent," "industrious," "soft-speaking," "reserved," and "nonmilitant," and Mexican-Americans as "emotional," "radical," "talkative," "argumentative," and "loud" (p. 58).

Bayton (1941) conducted a study at Virginia State College using 100 black students. His subjects were asked to select from 85 traits 10 that they thought most characterized the "typical Negro" student at their college. Results were compared with Katz and Braly's (1933) study. It was found that whites in 1933 attributed to Negroes traits as "ignorant," "naive," "stupid," "slovenly," and "physically dirty,"
while blacks attributed to themselves traits such as "progressive," "faithful," "imitative," and "intelligent." According to Bayton, "the traits these Negro college students assign to themselves must have been derived on the basis of their personal contacts with their fellow-students" (p. 102). Another study was conducted by Maykovich (1972) to investigate the stereotypes held by blacks, whites, and Japanese-Americans toward each other, as well as toward themselves.

Three hundred combination subjects from the three ethnic groups were asked to chose five traits from Katz and Braly's trait-list that they considered most typical for describing each of the three groups. In this study whites were described by blacks and Japanese as "pleasure loving," "materialistic," "aggressive," and "ambitious." Whites and Japanese described blacks as "musical," "pleasure loving," "loud," and "lazy," while Japanese-Americans were described by the other two groups as "loyal to family," "ambitious," "courteous," and "industrious." The three racial groups' self-images were also determined in this study. Blacks saw themselves as "pleasure loving," "materialistic," "aggressive," "ambitious," and "practical." Japanese perceived themselves as "industrious," "practical," "loyal to family," "neat," and "conservative." Whites described themselves as "pleasure-loving," "materialistic," "aggressive," "ambitious," and "progressive." The most interesting thing about stereotype studies, especially those which dealt with self-images, is that when an individual was asked to rate or assign traits to his or her own race, this person tended to avoid negative attributes and describe himself or herself with positive traits. It is indeed as Lippmann (1922)
pointed out:

Whatever we recognize as familiar we tend, if we are not very careful, to visualize with the aid of images already in our mind. Thus in the American view of Progress and Success there is a definite picture of human nature and of society. It is the kind of human nature and the kind of society which logically produce the kind of progress that is regarded as ideal. And then, when we seek to describe or explain actually successful men, and events that have really happened, we read back into them the qualities that are presupposed in the stereotypes. (p. 116)

Although many research studies concerning stereotypes have been conducted outside the U.S., these studies were concentrated on how members of one nation stereotyped the members of another nation. The UNESCO sponsored a study of cross-national stereotypes which was done by Buchanan and Cantril (1953) to investigate how nations stereotyped each other. One thousand subjects from each of the following countries, Australia, U.S.A., France, Italy, Germany, Britain, Netherlands, and Norway, were given a list of 12 adjective traits and were asked to select the traits which seemed to them to describe: Americans, Russians, French, British, and Chinese. It was found that Americans were stereotyped as "practical and progressive," Russians were seen as "domineering and cruel," British were described as "intelligent and self-controlled," and the French were stereotyped as "intelligent and conceited," while Chinese were described as "hard-working and backward."

Gardner, Kirby, and Arboleda (1973) conducted a study on how of college students in the Philippines stereotyped Chinese. Their data were collected by using 40 adjectives of semantic differential scales, and subjects were asked to rate the Chinese in the
Philippines on a 7-point scale. They found that the most polarized
five scales assigned to Chinese by students were businesslike,
wealthy, adventurous, hardworking, and ambitious.

When Gardner, Taylor, and Feenstra (1970) conducted their study
to determine the role of parents in children's stereotypes toward
French-speaking and English-speaking people in Canada, they found
that subjects characterized English-speaking people positively (self-
image) as "proud," "pleasant," "loyal," "intelligent," "active,"
"likable," "kind," "artistic," and "important." French-speaking
people were characterized as "religious," "emotional," "short,"
"active," "colourful," "proud," and "sensitive."

Also, another study was conducted in Canada by Gardner,
Wonnacott, and Taylor (1968) to assess the ethnic stereotypes held by
English Canadians toward French Canadians. The investigators be-
lieved that the stereotypical attitudes between the English and
French Canadians in Canada are the same as the attitudinal reactions
between blacks and whites in the U.S. In their study 108 college
students were asked to rate French Canadians in 39 bipolar adjective
scales. Data were analyzed by the mean, variance, and t distribution
on each scale. Their findings indicated that French Canadians were
perceived to be talkative, reserved, proud, irreligious, and insensitive.

In India, Sinha and Upadhyay (1960) did a study to explore the
stereotypes held by Indian university students toward Americans,
Chinese, English, French, Germans, Russians, Negroes, Pakistani,
and Indians. It was found that subjects attributed negative traits
to Negroes and Pakistanese, while they attributed positive traits to the other ethnic groups. The three most frequently expressed traits assigned to Negroes were "backward," "uncultured," and "dull," and to Pakistanese the traits of "cruel," "selfish," and "war-monger."

Another study was also carried out in India by Chandra (1967) to determine whether stereotypes among college students persist or change over a period of time. Subjects were asked to select from 29 traits the most typical characteristics of five ethnic groups, English, Russian, Chinese, Indians, and Americans. The results indicated that students had positive attitudes toward Englishmen, Americans, and Russians, but negative attitudes towards the Chinese. Ambivalent attitudes were reported by students toward themselves.

Chandra compared the results of his study with Sinha and Upadhyay's (1960) study. He found that Chinese in 1960 were stereotyped as "artistic," "religious," "industrious," "brave," "friendly," and "honest," while they were stereotyped in 1967 negatively and they were assigned with traits such as "aggressive," "jealous," "quarrelsome," "selfish," "stupid," and "rude." He concluded that the negative stereotype of Chinese was a result of China's attack on India. Their images in the Indian's minds were completely changed from positive to negative due to this attack and to the Indian's mass media which enhanced the negative images toward them.

In East Pakistan (Pangaladish), Zaidi and Ahmad (1958) conducted a study to investigate the stereotypes held by Pakistani Muslim students toward Arabs and eight other national groups. Arabs in this study were stereotyped as "hospitable," "religious," and "hardy." In
regard to the other national groups, the three most frequently assigned traits to each group were: to Americans, "friendly," "generous," and "open-minded"; to British, "aggressive," "conservative," and "cunning"; to French, "artistic," "aggressive," and "showy"; to Russians, "hardy," "aggressive," and "faithless"; to Indians, "religious," "superstitious," and "emotional"; to Turks, "brave," "patriotic," and "hardy"; to Chinese, "artistic," "hardy," and "patriotic"; and to Germans, subjects assigned the traits of "brave," "intelligent," and "hardy."

In a study involving 100 students from American University at Beirut, Prothro and Melikian (1954) examined the stereotypes held by Arabs toward 13 national groups. Results showed a similarity between American College students and Arab students in attributing stereotype traits to Germans, Americans, Negroes, Italians, Jews, and English. Americans were stereotyped as "industrial," "democratic," and "rich," while blacks were seen as "simple," "ignorant," and "poor." The subjects attributed to themselves the traits of "sectarian," "mercantile," and "materialistic."

Also at American University at Beirut, Diab (1962) investigated whether religious factors have an affect on the nature of stereotypes. From a list of 99 traits, 60 Muslim and 46 Christian students from Arab countries were asked to chose what they considered most typical traits for categorizing the following national groups: French, Lebanese, Irish, Negroes, Germans, Italians, English, Americans, Jews, Chinese, Greeks, Turks, and Russians. The results of the study indicated that significant differences were found between the
two groups. Christian students assigned more favorable stereotypical traits to Jews and French than did Muslims, while both groups had considerable similarity in stereotypes regarding other national groups.

Several studies indicated that ethnic stereotypes were created by age, sex, and educational level. Dodd, Vasi, and Moulin (1969) reexamined some stereotypical statements assigned to Negroes by white and black American males and females. They found that white male college students were agreed on the statement that labeled Negroes to be "more prone to violence than whites," twice as much as white female students did. Also it was found that there were significant differences between the male Negroes' opinions and Negro females' opinions concerning the statement of "Negroes have natural athletic ability."

Sinha and Upadhyay (1960) conducted a study to explore the differences between stereotypes of male and female students toward Americans, Russians, English, Chinese, French, Germans, Indians, Negroes, and Pakistani. Two hundred subjects were subdivided according to their sex and were given a list of 80 adjectives to select from. In addition, subjects were asked to rate on 3-point scales the desirability of the nine national groups. In terms of stereotypes, no significant differences were found between the two groups, but differences were found on the basis of groups' desirability. Females assigned maximum desirable adjectives to Indians, Chinese, and Russians and minimum desirable adjectives to Negroes and Pakistani; while males assigned the maximum desirable adjectives to Chinese and Russians and minimum desirable adjectives to Pakistani.
Other studies have found that there is a relationship between the age of the individual and his or her stereotypical attitudes toward ethnic groups. Klineberg (1951) studied the image white Americans held toward blacks. A picture represented a number of seated people in a subway. In front of those people two men were standing; one was Negro and the other was white who was wearing working clothes and holding in his hand an open razor. This picture was showed to one subject who in turn described what he saw in the picture to a second subject. The second one told a third what the first had told him, the third told the fourth what the second had told him, and so on. It was found that "half of the groups who served as subjects for these experiments before the end of the series of reproductions had been reached, the razor had moved from the white man's hand to the Negro's" (p. 507). Moreover, the Negro in this experiment "was even represented as brandishing the razor violently in the face of the white man" (p. 507). Klineberg concluded that "when the reproductions were made by young children, the razor was never reported as being in the possession of the Negro. Not having the stereotype, the children showed no distortion of the kind which occurred so frequently among the adult subjects" (p. 508).

Another study was done by Gardner et al. (1970) to investigate the role of parents in children's stereotype attitudes toward two ethnic groups in Canada. Their finding indicated that in regard to English-speaking people the general stereotypical attitude of teenagers reflect those of their parents, but in regard to French-speaking people, their stereotypes are not highly associated with their
parents' stereotypes. Maykovich (1972) determined that there was a significant difference between adults (40 years) and college students in their racial images and stereotypes regarding white and black Americans as well as Japanese-Americans. In this study college students were found to be much less stereotypical of the three ethnic groups than adults.

Blake and Dennis (1943) conducted a study to explore the stereotypes held by grades 4-11 students toward blacks and whites. In their study, 324 students from a Virginia school for white children were asked to compare whites with blacks in regard to 60 adjective traits. Their results indicated that a high degree of agreement was found among senior high school students in regard to which ethnic group was assigned with more of the traits, while a lower degree of agreement was found among younger students. For example, younger students characterized blacks as being "less religious and less cheerful than whites," while high school grade level students assigned those traits to whites. Blake and Dennis concluded "that a young white child acquires first of all a generally unfavorable attitude toward the Negro, which makes him unwilling to attribute to the Negro any "good" traits. With increased age and experience, the child gradually learns to apply the adult stereotypes" (p. 531).

The study by Guichard and Connolly (1977) which was conducted to determine the stereotypes held by adult and teenage blacks and whites toward blacks, Chicanos, Indian-Americans, Asians, and whites indicated that there was a difference between the opinions of teenagers and adults in attributing to the five ethnic groups certain traits,
such as industrious, intelligent, artistic, sportsmanlike, and cruel. However, the teenagers' opinions were in closer agreement to black adults than white adults by a nearly 3 to 1 ratio.

Level of education was found to have a great influence in the formation of stereotypes. In a poll which was analyzed by Slade (1981), a stratified random sample of 600 Americans conducted by telephone were asked to describe Arabs in 60 trait-related questions. She found that respondents having college educations and in higher income brackets tended to stereotype Arabs more positively than respondents who were younger, women, and less educated. It also was found that the low opinion of Arabs seemed to be due to the perception that Arabs are anti-Christian and militantly unfriendly toward the U.S. In addition, a large percentage of respondents perceived Arabs as "barbaric," "cruel," "treacherous," "cunning," "mistreat women," "warlike," and "bloodthirsty."

Also, Geoffrey (1982) conducted a study to explore to what extent an individual's level of education and personal contacts affect his or her stereotypes toward Americans, English, and Arabs. Subjects were drawn from three Iranian occupational groups: university lecturers, factory workers, and taxi drivers. Subjects were asked to rate the three national groups on 22-adjective scales, each scale containing a 7-point category. It was found that Americans received the highest favorable traits as "industrious" and "progressive" of all the three national groups. English in the study were stereotyped in less positive traits, while Arabs were associated with highly unfavorable traits. Geoffrey concluded that "low
education and little personal contact lead to more extreme hetero-
stereotypes, the reverse being true for negative autostereotypes" (p. 86).

Another study was conducted by David (1982) to examine the Arab stereotypes as portrayed in high school world history textbooks and in the attitudes of students and teachers in Detroit Public Schools. Subjects were drawn from two areas in Detroit, an area less populated with Arabs and an area mostly populated with Arabs. Data were collected by means of a questionnaire. The results indicated that more negative characteristic traits were assigned to Arabs by both students and teachers. A mixture of attitudes was found in the students who learned about Arabs through personal contact, those students relied more heavily on mass media information than those who had less contact with Arabs. It was also found that students who are taking classes with Arabs were the least likely to stereotype Arabs negatively. Also the study found that teachers in the area which had fewer Arabs checked less negative traits in describing Arabs than teachers in the area that was more populated by Arabs.

The Stereotypes of Arabs in American Mass Media

Most studies supported the fact that mass media had an effective role in the formation of stereotypes; moreover, these studies indicated that mass media has a tremendous power in the existence and change of individuals' stereotypical attitudes toward members of national or ethnical groups (Gilbert, 1951; Klineberg, 1951).
In recent years, Arabs have been victimized by American mass media. According to American Broadcasting Company (ABC) newsmen, Bell (cited in Shaheen, 1984a), "The Arab is no doubt a current victim of stereotyping not only on television, but throughout the mass media in the United States" (p. 11). Many studies reflected the fact that Arabs have been unrealistically portrayed on the mass media. Slade (1981) stated that the Americans' media have frequently portrayed the Arabs as threatening our political, as well as economic security. In the majority of press articles, the Arabs are still the antagonists. Moreover, the perception of the Arabs as threatening the peace and security has been grossly caricatured on television. (p. 143)

Slade (1981) went on to add:

Without the ethical obligation of objectivity, the entertainment media have given us the most extremely stereotyped image of the Arabs present in our culture. The Arabs remain one of the few ethnic groups who can still be slandered with impunity in America. (p. 143)

Also, Morris (1980) discussed some examples of the negative stereotypes of Arabs in the Western media. He indicated that when the program "Death of a Princess," was televised, the accusation was not only of what the West calls "feudalism," but the Arabs were accused of offering bribes in order to stop the program from airing, which was a report that began as pure rumor in a London tavern. He continued to say that mass media can easily "give flesh and bone to rumor." Morris felt that people view things based on their own national attitudes, and then tend to forget their obligations to other nations in our rapidly shrinking world. Morris (1980) further stated that "surely we need a new responsibility in the mass media."
This must become clear to fair-minded people whenever they look at
the journalists' habit of too often inflaming rather than informing" (p. 57).

Not all journalists are "inflaming," some write articles about
Arabs in a fair and objective manner. Lamb (1984), the editorial
writer for the Los Angeles Times, unlike many American journalists,
who reinforced the negative images of Arabs, responded to some of
Americans' misconception statements toward Arabs which described
Arabs and their societies as violent, their religion as radical,
their support for terrorism as uncivilized, and their political
philosophy as anti-American.

In responding to the first statement, Lamb (1984) pointed out
that Arab cities usually have less violence and crime than other
cities. In Cairo, for example, a city of approximately 14 million,
crimes against individuals are unheard of. Also, in Saudi Arabian
cities, one could leave a $100 bill on the street with one's name
attached to it and reasonably expect it to be returned to his or her
hotel room. Lamb further stated that Islam is not radical. The
radicalism becomes present from those who pervert the religion. Like
Christianity, Islam "has pillars of compassion, allegiance to God,
respect for elders, and things of this nature" (Section 4, p. 2).
The Kor'an, the Muslim Holy Book tells believers to "keep to forgive-
ness, enjoin kindness, and turn away from the ignorant" (Section 4,
p. 2).

In response to the statement, "Arab support for terrorism is
uncivilized," Lamb (1984) wrote:
Terrorism is as abhorred in the Arab world as it is in the West. More acts of terrorism, in fact, are committed in Europe than in the Middle East, and according to the international experts, the organization that carries out the most terrorist attacks is the Irish Republican Army. (Section 4, p. 2).

In responding to the statement which labeled Arabs as being anti-American, Lamb (1984) concluded that the majority of educated Arabs like American people and admire the United States greatly. He went on to add that "most Arabs are capitalists, politically moderate, anticommunist and willing to accept Israel's permanent presence in the region" (Section 4, p. 2).

Several studies supported the importance of television in influencing the viewer's perceptions toward other people. Television is the most powerful tool of all mass media because it reaches the majority of the U.S. citizens.

American stereotypical attitudes and images regarding Arabs have been formed over many years. Shaheen (1984a) published a book called *The TV Arab* which is an outcome of 8 years which he spent viewing American television. More than 100 different popular entertainment programs, cartoons, and major documentaries containing nearly 200 Arab-related incidents were documented in this book. Shaheen (1984a) suggested that the stereotypes of Arabs in recent time can be traced to the motion picture of the 1920s, "The Sheik." In this film, Arabs were portrayed as people who were interested in women and living in desert tents where young ladies were abducted and confined. "Television has replaced the movie's seductive Sheik of the 1920s with the hedonistic oil Sheik of the 1980s," said Shaheen, "In today's films
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and television shows, Arabs do not only pursue women, but a host of things, like American real estate, businesses, and government officials" (p. 13).

A great number of movies and television programs have been aired on American major networks. In these programs, Arabs were portrayed in an unfavorable stereotypical fashion. Here are a few representative samples paraphrased from Shaheen (1978):

"Evening in Byzantium": This four-hour, two-part 1978 television miniseries presented a distorted image of Arabs as being oil-rich desert sheiks who had no integrity, were blackmailers, and were terrorists. Ironically, this television special, which attracted over 20 million viewers, was adapted from Irwin Shaw's best-selling novel, *Evening in Byzantium*, which was a sensitive love story; however, it never mentioned Arabs within the novel.

Professional wrestling: Akbar is shown as an Arab wrestler who gains pleasure from hearing bones crack. The announcer describes him as an ugly Arab from Saudi Arabia. Another dirty fighter is Abdullah the Butcher, who takes pleasure in causing other wrestlers pain. His promoters claim he is an Arab from the Sudan. In both cases those "scourges of the Middle East" are in actuality from the U.S., and both are hated by American wrestling fans (Shaheen, 1978).

"Fantasy Island": One episode portrays a schoolteacher's fantasy to become a sheik and have a harem. The harem belongs to a "real sheik," who arranges to have the teacher take his place because there are people who want to assassinate the sheik. "This show not only perpetuates the false Arab-harem image, but shows Arabs as
assassins that are easily outwitted by a bashful teacher" (Shaheen, 1978, p. 1214).

"Charlie's Angels": A 1977 two-hour special that shows Arab against Arab. Six dissidents try to assassinate their fellow Arabs in a crowded auditorium. What distinguishes this episode from others is the lack of table manners that the Arabs have. This episode shows the dissidents preparing to use weapons that are able to kill thousands of innocent people in less than 2 seconds. Yet, the Arabs are shown as inept fighters. Actor Phil Silvers menacingly growls at one of the captured dissidents: "You ain't so tough--you camel-eater!" (Shaheen, 1978, p. 1214).

Indeed, Arabs are the current victims of television. They are described night after night as rich, killers, terrorists, and belly dancers. Shaheen (1984b) stated that the only images of Arabs that Americans ever see show Arabs as billionaires, bombers, and belly dancers. He went on to add that "our perceptions come from four myths about Arabs: They are fabulously wealthy, they are barbaric and uncultured, they are sex maniacs with a penchant for white slavery, and they are prone to terrorist acts" (p. 52).

Many movies and television shows aired on American television support the four myths discussed by Shaheen (1984b). An example of such movies is "Protocol," a 1984 film, where an assassination attempt is made on an Arab emir; however, it was foiled by Sunny Davis (Goldie Hawn), a cocktail waitress. Then the emir is smitten with her, and she becomes a government protocol officer. Her job is to seduce the emir in providing a base for the U.S. military in his
country. This film is an insult to Arabs, their values, and cultures. The emir was portrayed as a rich, stupid Arab who did not care about money and handed out Rolls Royces.

Another example, and a very recent one, is "Under Siege," a 3-hour offensive film telecast on NBC February 9, 1986, at 8:00 p.m. (the television prime time). Abu Ladeen (spelled backward, it is a typical Arab's name) and his group blew airplanes out of the sky, attacked a U.S. military base with a suicide driver, attacked the U.S. capitol by RPJ missiles, and opened gunfire against people in Washington streets and hotel dining rooms. Finally, they caught him in Dearborn, Michigan, the home of the largest group of Arabs in the U.S.

Finally, the 1985 movie, "Back to the Future" describes Arabs as a "camel disaster" who were stealing plutonium, hiring a scientist to make a bomb for them, being outwitted by the scientist who gives them a casing filled with used pinball parts, and killing the scientist who cheated them.

Along with films and television shows, television news and reports portray Arabs as belligerent and blood-thirsty, especially when they cover Israeli-Arab conflicts. Ghareeb (1983) proposed that some news media inaccurately blamed Arabs for beginning the 1948, the 1956, the 1967, and the 1973 wars. Ghareeb also stated that "When Israel attacks Lebanese villages, or civilian Palestinian camps, it is not mentioned in the media, while the Palestinian commando attack against Israel; targets either inside or outside Israel, is flashed all over the television screens and on the front pages of newspapers"
Ghareeb's (1983) point of view and concern were supported in the findings of a study that was published in *TV Guide*, entitled "Blind Spot in the Middle East: Why You Don't See More Palestinians on TV," by Weisman (1981), who reviewed the nightly television newscasts for a period of 10 months. His findings indicated that:

There were 38 reports of raids and retaliations by both sides. 24 of the 38 were Israeli raids on Palestinian targets in Southern Lebanon. Only three of these reports for a total of one minute, ten seconds showed pictures of the effects of the Israeli attacks. None showed any Palestinian victims. On the other hand, of the 14 reports of Palestinian raids and attacks on Israel during the period, 11 included pictures of Israeli victims, and the filmed reports totaled some 17 minutes. (p. 15)

Undoubtedly, television shapes the perception of viewers and presents racial and ethnic groups as "types," positively or negatively. The strongest impact of television is on children. According to Goodman (cited in Cortes, 1979, p. 476), when children reach school age, their stereotypes and attitudes about members of ethnic groups are developed and well-formed. Also, Bradley (cited in Cortes, 1979) found that most white children believe that television comedies such as "Sanford and Son" and "The Jeffersons" are accurate portrayals of black family life.

Shaheen (1982) indicated that in November of 1979 millions of children saw the favorite cartoon character, Dennis the Menace, make fun of Arabs. Dennis complained on Thanksgiving Day that his friend Dewey and his family were going to eat meatloaf on Thanksgiving. Dennis's father replied that some Arab was eating Dewey's family's turkey. In another cartoon, "Broom Hilda," several Arabs sing of
Greed to the tune of "Mother."

G is for the gold in our closets,
R is for the rubies in our hands,
E is for the ears hurt by your cursing us,
E is for our earning power so grand;
D is for dirty prices that we charge,
Y is for your dollars misery,

Put them all together they spell GREEDY, the word that fills our hearts with glee. (p. 328)

Ghareeb (1982) believed that:

The emergence of OPEC as a major economic power and the rise of oil prices during the 1970s brought about the picture of the greedy, grasping and crooked Arabs. It updates the traditional image of the Arab with harem and dancing girls by focusing on the purportedly boundless appetite of Arabs for material goods and ostentatious living. Cadillacs and oil rigs have supplanted the camels and palm trees. (p. 71)

Ghareeb gave a further example of this in a cartoon which appeared in the Chicago Tribune during the summer of 1981. This cartoon portrayed an Arab wearing dark glasses, and he had a nasty grin on his face. He was seated behind a huge desk with the sign "OPEC" in front of him and a number of oil rigs outside the window. A second sign sat on the desk. It read, "Buy American" only the "n" had been scratched out. This gives graphic expression to the highly publicized stories that Arabs are using their oil wealth to take control of the American economy by buying real estate and American companies (Ghareeb, 1982, p. 71).

Along with television shows and movies, American songs promote and reinforce stereotypical attitudes toward Arab people. An example
of this is the song, "Ahab the Arab," written and sung by Ray Stevens. This song was popular on many radio stations in the late 1960s. In the lyrics of the song are found many of the common perceptions of Arabs held by Americans. "Let me tell you about Ahab, the Ay-rab, the sheik of the burning sands. He has emeralds and rubies just dripping off of him, and rings on every finger of his hands." The singer used in his song, terms and phrases such as "sheik," "rubies," "turban," "camels," "sultan," "veils," "dancers," and so forth.

Also, American textbooks treat and stereotype Arabs negatively. Following are examples of inaccurate negative statements about Arabs that can be found in American textbooks:

There is nothing the Bedouin liked better than fighting.

Arabs spread Islam by warring against their neighbors.

Everywhere in Middle Eastern villages and cities there are millions of flies. They breed filth and spread dysentery.

The mosque and the veiled women are symbols of Islamic culture.

By Arab law, a man may have four wives. (Al-Qazzaz, cited in Otero, 1975, p. 57)

Following are other examples of inaccurate statements from textbooks cited by Shaheen (1982): "Jerusalem is the capital of Israel. One out of four Arabs is a Bedouin. Arab teens are not expected to have fun" (p. 90).

Not only do textbooks teach stereotyping to young people and adults, but also children's dictionaries and reference books
negatively stereotype Arabs by defining Arab to mean: "vagabond," "vagrant," "tramp," or "bum." In the Oxford Children's Reference Library (cited in Shaheen, 1982), the Arab world asks, "What is an Arab?" The author gives several answers: "the baggy-trousered workman asleep on the corner of the pavement, and not bothered at all whether he finishes his work today, tomorrow, or ever. A peasant— who rides a donkey, while his wife, in a long black robe, walks behind carrying the bundles" concludes the author, "all these people are Arabs" (p. 90).

A great deal of bias and false information of Arabs and their societies are found in the mass media. NBC correspondent Robinson (cited in Ghareeb, 1983) believed that there is a great deal of anti-Arab bias in American media, especially in magazines. She further stated that "I will never forget when Newsweek magazine came out with an Arab on the cover who had a gasoline tank in his hand and he was grinning in such a way as to scare the public" (p. 44).

Another example of inaccurate and false information was found in an article published in U.S. News and World Report by Watson (1984) entitled "Arab World: Where Troubles for U.S. Never End." The writer claimed that worse inflation faced the U.S., and the first American oil crisis and the marines who were killed and wounded in Beirut were caused by Arabs. He also said that all the 21 Arab countries are ambitious and complicate efforts of the U.S. to achieve peace in the Middle East. The article included collaborating countries such as Egypt, a part to the peace efforts in the Camp David Accord.
Not only do TV news media give biased and false information on Arabs, but also newspaper articles and headlines mislead the American public and give them wrong information that distorts and injures the images of Arabs. For example, on January 21, 1986, an article was published in the *Kalamazoo Gazette* entitled, "All Libyan Students Get Terror Training." The theme of the article told something completely different from the title. The article indicated that only one Libyan high school with 2,000 students had commando training. This generalized title gave the reader the impression that without exception, all Libyan students, even those who are studying in the U.S. or other countries, are terrorists. Another example was published in *U.S. News and World Report* on September 1, 1980. The title of the article said one thing; however, the theme said something different. The headline of the article was "Radical Arabs Take Aim at Latin America." Migdail, the writer, claimed that radical Arab nations and the PLO have an influence over Latin America, which is a "dangerous catalyst for increased instability in the region and eventual emergence there of national policies hostile to U.S. interests" (p. 27). In fact, the theme of the article presented only two Arab countries plus the PLO who had offered aid to Latin America. Rather than name these countries, the headline stereotyped by generalizing "radical Arab nations."

The power of the headlines in the media is prominent enough to attract many readers and affect them positively or negatively. According to Suleiman (cited in Ghareeb, 1983), various headlines in American media try to raise the spectre of an Arab take-over of the
United States. Examples of such headlines were "Arabs Buy up Plush Real Estate in Hollywood," "Arabs Are Taking Over Banks in the U.S.,” and "Does Arab Cash Imperil U.S.?" (p. 342).

In reality, many headlines are based on inaccurate information. An example was given by Pine (1981), when Kuwait announced its plan to buy a U.S. oil drilling company, the Santa Fe International Corporation. Many articles and headlines in the American media attacked Arab investments in the U.S. and inaccurately described Arabs as people who want to buy up America. Others questioned Saudi Arabia's interest in and ability to take over Chrysler or General Motors. Furthermore, U.S. officials felt threatened by Arab investments. According to Rosenthal (cited in Pine, 1981), "The Arabs might eventually be able to get a stranglehold on the U.S. economy and use it for political purposes" (p. 26).

In fact, as Pine (1981) indicated, the amount invested in the U.S. by the Organization of Petroleum Exporting Countries (OPEC) is less than 1% of the total foreign investments. (Of the 13 OPEC member countries, the Arab members are only 7.) "Despite flashy headlines about Arab sheiks buying shopping centers" said Pine (1981), the Wall Street Journal writer, "the aggregate is minuscule, OPEC investors hold a scant one hundredth of 1% of all direct investment in this country" (p. 26).

Many United States governmental officials accept and have been affected by the negative stereotypes given Arabs. "It is an unattractive reflection on society that a resort to crude stereotypes should be so acceptable and so effective at the upper reaches of
An example of this is the Arab Scam (Abscam) operation which was created by the FBI in 1978. In this operation, two FBI agents were dressed in Arab garb and posed as Arab rich sheiks from Oman and Lebanon. They offered bribes to U.S. congressmen and senators in return for political and investment favors. Several congressmen were caught and video taped by the FBI when they accepted the bribes from the agents. Even though there were no Arabs involved in "Abscam," television programs, newspapers, and comedians blamed Arabs for this operation and inaccurately provided the American public with the false impression that Arabs, not FBI agents, were corrupting their country by offering the bribes to congressmen.

Shaheen (1984a) cited many examples of obscene jokes from the Senate cloakroom to the "Tonight Show" with Johnny Carson:

The Washington Post reported that a Democratic senator sardonically asked his aide one day, "Any mail from Abdul Enterprises?"

And Johnny Carson chuckled "They say the bribes were filmed and recorded. Now, see, there's a lesson to be learned. Never accept a bribe from an Arab who asks you to talk into his camel's hump." "The politicians should have known they were dealing with the FBI and not Arabian sheiks. Nobody wears a burnoose with wingtipped shoes." (p. 55)

Another example was cited by Shaheen (1984a) from Alan King's Thanksgiving special. In the show, the skit, "What Have We Got to Be Thankful For?" was done. In the skit, "MASH" star MacLean Stevenson plays the role of Congressman Hutton, who denies any involvement with Arabs and who must appear at a congressional hearing; then, FBI videotapes show Congressman Hutton with two FBI agents who were
dressed in Arab traditional robes and sunglasses. One acts as Sheik Mustafa and the other as the sheik's spokesman. Hutton offers the sheik a drink, the spokesman (agent) and the congressman have the following dialogue:

Agent: Sheik Mustafa does not partake of liquor, it's against his religion.

Hutton: Oh, well, with a little taste of the sauce here, he can start a new religion.

Agent: Sheik Mustafa is interested in making some very large purchases.

Hutton: Tell him there's two congressmen and a mayor for sale... What kind of investments did you wanna make?

Agent: Real estate. He would like to buy Nevada... Sheik Mustafa might one day seek asylum in the United States. He's having trouble at home.

Hutton: Hey, who wouldn't with 37 wives? (He laughs.)

Agent: He needs you to introduce a private bill in Congress to ensure his permanent residence in this country. Can you do it? (Shaheen, 1984a, p. 56)

Congressman Hutton agreed, and the videotape ended by showing him taking the money from the sheik. He pleads with the investigating committee: "OPEC has been rippin' us off on this oil deal, and I thought it only patriotic to get some of the money back" (Shaheen, 1984a, p. 56).

"Abscam still inspires imitators" (Moffett, 1984, p. 10) said the editorial writer of the Wall Street Journal, who gave an example of this in other operations which were undertaken in New Jersey. When the Atlantic City, New Jersey, Police Department wanted to become strict and crack down on prostitution, police officers rented a stretch limousine and posed and dressed like Arabs. Within 6
hours, 40 prostitutes were caught, and the operation was ended because the jail was full (Moffett, 1984, p. 10).

Perhaps due to the apprehension of using a new "Abscam," or from the "fear of offending American Jews" as Moffett (1984) suggested, American politicians who are running for public offices or for presidential nomination stay away from Arabs and anything connected or related to them. According to Moffett (1984), Arabs have been snubbed by politicians, especially in the case of the former Democratic presidential contender, Gary Hart. He paid off his $700,000 loan from First American Bank in Washington after he discovered that the bank had been purchased by Arab investors. "We did not know it was an Arab bank" said a Hart aide. "We got him out as soon as we knew" (p. 10).

Furthermore, politicians do not dare to accept any campaign contributions even from Arab-Americans. Mondale, the Democratic presidential nominee, for example,

returned $5,000 in contributions that he had received from four Arab-Americans. A fifth contribution was returned to a woman with an Arab-American surname. ... Philadelphia Mayor Wilson Goode also returned a $2,700 campaign contribution from an Arab-American. (Moffett, 1984, p. 10)

Summary

The reviewed literature in this chapter was divided into four sections. The summary of each section is as follows:

1. The definitions of stereotypes have been viewed as a generalization concerning trait or statement of attributions made about the member of a particular ethnic or national group.
2. Stereotypes are learned through personal experiences and interaction with other racial, ethnic, and national groups. Stereotypes are also learned through the experience of family, friends, schools, and teachers. Finally, stereotypes are learned through mass media which have an effective role in creating perceptions toward other ethnic groups.

3. Many reviewed studies of stereotypes that were undertaken within and outside the U.S. supported the presented research hypotheses in Chapter I.

4. Many examples of how American mass media stereotype Arabs were cited as well as how the U.S. governmental officials accepted the stereotype of Arabs as a real thing.

The study design and methodology are found in the next chapter.
CHAPTER III

DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This chapter comprises and outlines the methodology which was used to conduct the study. The basic purposes of the methodology, as Kerlinger (1973 stated, are: "to provide answers to research questions and to control variance" (p. 300). These purposes were of major concern while conducting this research.

The methodology is described in this chapter as follows: instrumentation, population and sample, data collection, and data analysis.

Instrumentation

As stated in Chapter I, the general purpose of this study was to examine the differences between American students attending Western Michigan University (WMU) regarding their age, grade level, race, and sex and their stereotypical attitudes toward Arabs. The instrument survey of the study contained two parts (see Appendix B). The first part was composed of personal data or demographic information to measure the five independent variables. The personal data obtained were the age, sex, level of education, and how he or she learned about Arabs; to determine the race of the respondent, the researcher used two different color-coded questionnaires. The second part of the survey was composed of 25 polar opposite adjectives.
There have been two major methods developed to measure ethnic stereotypes. First, the traditional method developed by Katz and Braly (1933), which requires subjects to select from a checklist of 84 traits those which seemed to them the most typical for characterizing the ethnic groups under investigation. The stereotype is defined in terms of those traits which are most frequently selected by subjects.

The second method of stereotype which has been used in numerous studies is the semantic differential technique, developed by Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957). This technique is described as:

essentially a combination of control association and scaling procedures. We provide the subject with a concept to be differentiated and a set of bipolar adjectival scales against which to do it, his only task being to indicate, for each item (pairing of a concept with a scale) the direction of his association and its intensity on a seven-step scale. (Osgood et al., 1957, p. 20)

For the present study the semantic differential technique was used to measure American stereotypes toward Arabs. Osgood et al. (1957) reported reliability test-retest coefficients ranging from .87 to .93 with a mean r of .91. "Validity measures were obtained by comparing a SD with the Thurstone and Guttman scales, which yielded correlations of .90 and .79, respectively" (cited in Clay, 1973, p. 26). Many researchers consider this technique the most appropriate one for determining ethnic stereotypes because it requires judgments of the extent to which one or the other end of a scale is applicable or relevant to the concept being rated. . . . Since individual judgments are made on each scale, this technique permits an evaluation of the correlates of the judgments. (Gardner et al., 1968, p. 36)
In order to obtain the data for this study, a questionnaire of 25 bipolar adjective scales relevant to the present research problem was developed. These particular 25 polar pairs were selected on the basis of results obtained from different studies of stereotypes which were the most relevant pairs in describing ethnic groups. These pairs of adjectives were drawn from the related literature review (Gardner et al., 1968, 1970; Newsom, 1982; Osgood et al., 1957; Otero, 1975). Subjects were asked to express their judgment on each of 7-point categories for each of the 25 bipolar adjectives, if they thought it was related to or described Arabs. The order of the 25 adjective scales was randomly selected and the negative and positive side of the polarity words was also randomized.

Population and Sample

The target population of this study was the American students attending Western Michigan University during the Winter Semester of 1986. The sample was drawn from the following strata: (a) race, either white or black only, no foreign or other American minority students were included in the sample; (b) sex; (c) grade level; and (d) age, which will be related to students' grade level. "The ultimate function of stratification is to organize the population into homogeneous subsets (with heterogeneity between subsets) and to select the appropriate number of elements from each" (Babbie, 1973, p. 94). The sample was selected from the Winter 1986 computer printout list of WMU students. The list was obtained from The Graduate College, Western Michigan University, and was drawn from student
academic records through use of services at The Graduate College. The name, address, grade level, and telephone numbers of all American students were provided in this list. A complete up-to-date list of black students' names and addresses was obtained from the University Minority Students Services. A sample of 400 subjects was selected for this study based on the "table for determining sample size from a given population" (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970, p. 608).

Prior to the sampling procedure, the population of this study was subdivided into two strata: students' race and grade level. This was done after the foreign students were subtracted from university total population. Approximately 75% of the sample (N = 12,000) were undergraduates, 19% (N = 3,000) were graduates, and 6% (N = 1,000) were black students. The numbers of male and female students were almost equal to the population. A proportional "allocation" was used in determining numbers of samples included from a grade level stratum. "With proportional allocation, each stratum contributes to the sample the number of members proportional to its size in the population" (Hinkle, Wiersma, & Jurs, 1979, p. 125). Since the black stratum was too small, a disproportional sampling was used to increase black students' representation. If the first method was used, the results of this study because of the small size stratum would be very misleading. "In rough terms, statistical tests require a minimum of 30 subjects for group category analysis" (Balian, 1982, p. 102).

The systematic sampling procedure (Hinkle et al., 1979) was used for drawing the sample from the two lists. After the drawing samples
were matched, six duplicated names were found in both samples. These names were omitted. Table 1 shows the approximate total population and the sample size of white graduate and undergraduate students and black students included in the present study.

Table 1

Approximate Total Population and Sample Size

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample group</th>
<th>Approximate Population</th>
<th>Size of Sample Selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Graduate student</td>
<td>3,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>12,000</td>
<td>200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blacks</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>400</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Data Collection

After the sample was randomly selected, it was found that 119 students out of the 400 were living in WMU dormitories. An American girl was hired to hand deliver the instrument to the subjects in order to increase the response rate. In February of 1986, questionnaires were mailed to 281 WMU students who were living off campus. A cover letter (see Appendix C) and a self-addressed, stamped envelope were provided with the questionnaires. The cover letter explained the purposes of the study as well as the importance of the response in the success of the study. Because the investigator is Arabian, in
order to eliminate biased responses from the subjects, a familiar American name was used for signing the cover and follow-up letters. For this purpose, the name of Cathy Davis was chosen. The investigator first checked with the Western Michigan University computer and the Kalamazoo telephone directory to make sure that no similar name was found; then, the researcher used this name for signing the letters. A copy of the cover letter and the questionnaire were submitted to the Human Subjects Institutional Review Board for approval. Anonymity was guaranteed for all respondents and no information about any individual will be released or cited. Subjects were assured that all information received from them will be held confidentially. To determine the race of the subjects, the questionnaire was divided into two colors; yellow colored questionnaires were sent or given to black students and white colored questionnaires were sent or given to white students. Each questionnaire had been numbered on the top for the purpose of follow-up procedures. In order to enhance the respondents' participation, the investigator hired an American girl to deliver the questionnaires to those students who were living in the dormitories. Since answering the questionnaire takes less than 5 minutes, the deliverer was instructed to wait until the respondent completed his or her questionnaire, or write down a convenient time to return and pick up the completed questionnaire. In March of 1986, after 2 weeks from the initial mailing of the questionnaires, a follow-up letter was sent to 132 students who had not responded, urging them to respond immediately. A new questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope was provided with the follow-up letter.
copy of the follow-up letter may be found in Appendix D.

Of the 400 questionnaires, 304 were returned. Eight uncompleted questionnaires were returned with comments or criticisms (see Appendix E). The final number of completed questionnaires returned and used was 296. The rate of return was 74%.

Data Analysis

The data collected were transformed by the researcher into computer answer sheet form. Then they were taken to Western Michigan University's Computer Center for analysis using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences: Batch System (1982) program.

The researcher looked for a relationship between the dependent and independent variables of the study. In a general sense, it is said that "the values of the dependent variables are dependent upon the independent variables" (Wiersma, 1980, p. 25). The following independent variables were used within this study: (a) race, (b) sex, (c) educational level, (d) age, and (e) origins of stereotypes.

The dependent variables were the subjects' overall values across the 25 adjective pairs as measured on a 7-point scale. The value of 7 was assigned to the positive end of the adjective pole and 1 was assigned to the negative end. Some of the polar words were reversed, the negative adjective was on the left side and the positive one on the right. The greater the score or the mean, the more positive the stereotypical attitude.

The stereotypes toward Arabs were assessed by means of polarity. As suggested by Gardner et al., (1973), the stereotype is defined in
terms of extreme polarization for each scale, assuming an underlying normal distribution. Since subjects were expected to rate Arabs on one end of the 7-point scale, the stereotype would be present when the mean deviated significantly from the natural mean of the scale = 4.

The research hypotheses tested in this study were found in Chapter I. Based on these hypotheses, the following null hypotheses were defined:

1. There will be no difference between black and white American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

2. There will be no difference between male and female American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

3. There will be no difference between graduate and undergraduate American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

4. There will be no difference in the stereotypes of American students in regard to Arabs based on their age.

5. There will be no difference in the origins of American students' stereotypes of Arabs.

The data were analyzed on Part 1 of the questionnaire by utilizing frequencies, percentages, and means for describing the demographic characteristics of the sample.

In Part 2, the means, percentages, and frequencies were also used for analyzing the stereotypes of respondents toward Arabs.

In Part 3, the $t$ test was used in testing the first three hypotheses to determine the differences or likenesses between the mean scores of blacks versus whites, males versus females, and
graduates versus undergraduates on each of the 25 polar adjective scales. A one-way analysis of variance was used for testing the fourth and fifth hypotheses.

The level of significance was set at .05. Based on the value which was obtained from the t test and the ANOVA, the researcher either retained or rejected the null hypotheses.

Summary

Chapter III presented the methodology and the design of the study. Instrumentation, procedures for selecting the sample, method of data collection, and data analysis were discussed in detail.

The research findings are presented in Chapter IV.
CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS

Introduction

The purpose of this study was to identify stereotypes that WMU's American students had about Arabs and to determine if there were differences in these stereotypes when students were classified by race, sex, level of education, age, and source of stereotypes. The population of the study was black and white American students attending Western Michigan University during the Winter Term of 1986. From this population, 400 students were randomly selected based on their race, sex, and grade level. A questionnaire was mailed to 281 off-campus students. One hundred and nineteen students who were living in Western Michigan University's dormitories were handed the questionnaire by an American girl. From a total of 304 students responding, only 296 questionnaires were completed and used in data analysis. The rate of return was 74%.

The purpose of this chapter is to present the findings of the study. The chapter contains three sections; the first section provides a profile of respondents' characteristics in terms of race, sex, level of education, age, and the origins of stereotypes. The second section provides answers for the first research question on how respondents, in general, stereotyped Arabs. In this section, data are tabulated and respondents' frequency, percentages, and means...
are discussed. The third section in this chapter reports the results of the hypotheses tested utilizing the $t$ test for the first three hypotheses and one-way analysis of variance to test the last two hypotheses.

Characteristics of Respondents

Out of 400 respondents, 304 returned their questionnaires. Eight of the returned questionnaires were received blank but with comments or criticism (see Appendix E). Only a total of 296 questionnaires were usable, making the response rate 74%. Table 2 displays the numbers of distributed questionnaires and the respondents included in this study.

Table 2

Numbers of Distributed and Returned Questionnaires Included in the Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Number distributed</th>
<th>Number returned</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White graduate students</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>77.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White undergraduate students</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>147</td>
<td>73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black graduate students</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>66.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black undergraduate students</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>73.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>400</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>74.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Following is a description of the demographic data of the respondents.
Race

As shown in Table 3, 24.3% of the respondents were black students (N = 72) and 75.7% were white students (N = 223).

Table 3
Race of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Race</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>24.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>223</td>
<td>75.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Sex

As illustrated in Table 4, slightly more than half (53.4%) of the respondents were male and 46.6% were female. (The distribution of male and female students were 51% male and 49% female.)

Level of Education

The majority of respondents (67.9%) were undergraduate students, while 31.8% were graduate students. One missing case was reported (see Table 5).
Table 4

Sex of the Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>138</td>
<td>46.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

Level of Education of Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education level</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>67.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>31.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age

It can be observed in Table 6 that over 50% of the respondents were between 20 and 30 years of age. The lowest percentage of respondents (less than 2%) was represented by the group of over 51 years of age. As indicated in Table 6, 15.2% of the respondents were
under 20 years, 24.1% were in the 31-40 age group, and 8.1% of the respondents were between 41 and 50 years of age.

Table 6
Frequency and Percentage of Respondents' Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 years and over</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Origins of Stereotypes

Respondents were asked to indicate how they learned about Arabs. A great majority, 121 respondents (40.9%), checked television as a primary source. Another 19.9% of the respondents based their knowledge of Arabs on newspapers, while 20.3% based their information on magazines (see Table 7).

Respondents' Stereotypes of Arabs

To measure the respondents' stereotypes, and as it was described in Chapter III, subjects were asked to rate Arabs on 25 bipolar adjective scales. Each adjective pair composed a 7-point scale,
Table 7

Respondents' Source of Information About Arabs

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>No. of respondents</th>
<th>Percent of total</th>
<th>Cumulative percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>40.9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Total 296 100.0

ranging from 1 to 7. A value of 1 was assigned to the negative side (left) of the pole and 7 to the positive side (right). Thus, the higher the means the more favorable or positive the stereotypes. If the mean deviated from the natural point (4) either way, the stereotype exists. The means and standard deviation on each of the 25 polar adjective scales were computed for the total groups and are presented in Table 8. The sample's means' rating (stereotyping) of Arabs were ranked in order from the negative to the positive. The means ranged from 2.82 to 4.56.

As shown in Table 8, the sample means on 11 adjective pairs out of the 25 were on the negative side of the pole, while the rest were on the positive side. It can be said that Western Michigan University black and white American students had mixed (negative and positive) attitudes toward Arabs. A large percentage of students tended
to describe Arabs as rich (65.5%) and anti-American (64.5%). Furthermore, Arabs were described as slightly autocratic by 60.8% and radical by 60.1% of the respondents. Arabs were stereotyped as intelligent by 53.4% of the students, while 44.6% and 43.6% of the respondents described Arabs as knowledgeable and hardworking, respectively. Frequencies and percentages are found in Appendix F and means profile of the total sample in each of the 25 adjective scales are presented in Appendix G (Figure 2).

Table 8
Comparative Differences in Means and Standard Deviations on Each of the 25 Polar Adjective Scales for the Total Sample, Ranked in Order From Lowest to Highest

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair no.</th>
<th>Adjective scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*Rich-poor</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>*Anti-American-pro-American</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>1.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Autocratic-democratic</td>
<td>3.07</td>
<td>1.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*Radical-conservative</td>
<td>3.09</td>
<td>1.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*Terrorists-nonterrorists</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Greedy-generous</td>
<td>3.53</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>*Belligerent-peace-loving</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>1.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*Dirty-clean</td>
<td>3.63</td>
<td>1.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*Unfair-fair</td>
<td>3.77</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*Follower-leader</td>
<td>3.94</td>
<td>1.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>*Unreliable-reliable</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Undependable-dependable*</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pair no.</th>
<th>Adjective scale</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Dishonest-honest*</td>
<td>4.02</td>
<td>1.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Ugly-beautiful*</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Dull-exciting*</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>1.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Unlikable-likable*</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>1.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Primitive-civilized*</td>
<td>4.09</td>
<td>1.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Unkind-kind*</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bad-good*</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Weak-powerful*</td>
<td>4.17</td>
<td>1.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Weak-strong*</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Lazy-hardworking*</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Ignorant-knowledgeable*</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Cowardly-brave*</td>
<td>4.45</td>
<td>1.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Stupid-intelligent*</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>1.26</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** A mean score below the 4.00 natural mean of the scale demonstrates negative stereotypes. The mean score refers to the adjective indicated with an asterisk.

**Hypothesis Testing**

For testing all of the hypotheses of the study, the inferential statistical techniques were used. The $t$ test for independent means was used for testing the first three hypotheses to compare the differences in the means response of black students versus the means response of white students, male versus female, and graduate versus
undergraduate on each of the 25 bipolar adjective scales. One-way ANOVA was used to test the last two hypotheses. A .05 probability of committing a Type I error was used for testing all five hypotheses.

In order to choose which variance estimate (pooled or separate) would be used for evaluating the result of the t test on each of the 25 polarity scales, the researcher looked first at the probability. If it was < .05, pooled variance estimate was used. If the probability was \( \leq .05 \), then the separate variance estimate was used.

**Hypothesis 1**

There will be a difference between black and white American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

The t test revealed that black and white American students have a significant difference in their stereotypes of Arabs on 7 out of the 25 polar adjective scales at the .05 level. The significant differences between both groups were found in Adjective Scales 1, 5, 6, 8, 10, 12, and 13. However, more black students stereotyped Arabs as hardworking, knowledgeable, beautiful, rich, strong, brave, and peace-loving than white students did. As indicated in Table 9, the mean scores of black students on 8 of the 25 adjectives were on the negative side of the scale, while 14 of the white students' mean scores were on the negative side. However, white students described Arabs as slightly undependable, follower, unreliable, and dishonest, while black students had neutral attitudes in attributing these adjectives to Arabs. In general, black students had higher mean scores which deviated toward the positive side of the pole in all of
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Black students (N = 72)</th>
<th>White students (N = 223)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lazy-hardworking</td>
<td>4.72 1.34</td>
<td>4.19 1.44</td>
<td>2.74</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autocratic-democratic</td>
<td>3.17 1.21</td>
<td>3.03 1.22</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.443</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unfair-fair</td>
<td>3.82 1.14</td>
<td>3.75 1.44</td>
<td>0.43</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unkind-kind</td>
<td>4.18 1.33</td>
<td>4.07 1.47</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ignorant-knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.66 1.30</td>
<td>4.28 1.38</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.041*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ugly-beautiful</td>
<td>4.44 1.45</td>
<td>3.91 1.46</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.008*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stupid-intelligent</td>
<td>4.76 1.17</td>
<td>4.50 1.29</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rich-poor</td>
<td>2.32 1.40</td>
<td>3.00 1.25</td>
<td>-3.87</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dirty-clean</td>
<td>3.75 1.79</td>
<td>3.60 1.52</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak-strong</td>
<td>4.51 1.36</td>
<td>4.16 1.22</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.040*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bad-good</td>
<td>4.36 1.29</td>
<td>4.03 1.75</td>
<td>1.90</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cowardly-brave</td>
<td>4.91 1.26</td>
<td>4.30 1.40</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Belligerent-peace-loving</td>
<td>4.16 1.69</td>
<td>3.32 1.56</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Mean Black students (N = 72)</td>
<td>SD Black students</td>
<td>Mean White students (N = 223)</td>
<td>SD White students</td>
<td>t value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Unlikable-likable</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>-0.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Greedy-generous</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dishonest-honest</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>3.97</td>
<td>1.46</td>
<td>0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follower-leader</td>
<td>4.19</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Terrorist-nonterrorist</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Undependable-dependable</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unreliable-reliable</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Anti-American-pro-American</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Radical-conservative</td>
<td>3.01</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>-0.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Weak-powerful</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dull-exciting</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Primitive-civilized</td>
<td>4.36</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>4.01</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>100.37</td>
<td>19.59</td>
<td>95.17</td>
<td>21.35</td>
<td>1.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
the 25 adjectives except radical, anti-American, and terrorists adjectives, where white students were higher than black students. The average mean score of black students in all scales was 4, while the white students average mean was 3.80. The overall comparison indicated that there was no significant difference between WMU black and white students in the way they stereotyped Arabs. The first null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, the research hypothesis was not accepted. It can be concluded that there was no difference between black and white American students attending Western Michigan University in their stereotype of Arabs with the exception of the seven adjectives, where black students had more favorable attitudes than white students. The $t$ test value and the comparison between black students' and white students' means on the polarity of 25 scales are shown in Table 9. The mean profiles of both groups for each of the adjective scales are presented in Appendix G (Figure 3).

Hypothesis 2

There will be a difference between male and female American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

The $t$ test revealed a significant difference in the stereotypes that male and female students held toward Arabs in only 2 of the 25 adjective polarity scales (7 and 8) at the .05 level. But since the overall probability obtained (.671) exceeded the stated alpha level (.05), the null hypothesis was not rejected. Thus, Research Hypothesis 2 was not supported. The $t$ test value for the comparison between the two group means on each of the 25 polarity scales are presented
in Table 10, and the mean profiles for the two groups are found in Appendix G (Figure 4).

Inspection of the data in Table 10 revealed that most male students described Arabs as rich more than female students did. Arabs were described as slightly autocratic, powerful, dirty, strong, greedy, terrorist, anti-American, brave, and radical by both male and female students. It may be concluded that male and female American students do not differ in their stereotypes of Arabs except in Adjectives 7 and 8.

Hypothesis 3

There will be a difference between the graduate and undergraduate American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

The t test statistics revealed significant differences in the stereotypes of graduate and undergraduate students held toward Arabs on 6 of the 25 polarity adjective words. Since only 6 adjectives out of the 25 polar adjectives supported the hypothesis at the .05 level, the hypothesis was not accepted. The significant difference between the two groups were found in Scales 1, 3, 6, 8, 21, and 22, where undergraduate students described Arabs as lazy, unfair, ugly, rich, anti-American, and radical more than graduate students did. As shown in Table 11, out of the 25 polar adjectives, 13 mean scores of undergraduate students were on the negative side of the scales and only 10 adjective mean scores of the graduate students were on the same negative side of the pole. Inspection of the data in Table 11 reveals that both graduate and undergraduate students stereotyped
### Table 10

Means, Variance, and t Test for Differences Between the Means of Male and Female Students on Each of the 25 Polarity Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Male students (N = 158)</th>
<th>Female students (N = 138)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lazy-hardworking</td>
<td>4.22 1.51</td>
<td>4.43 1.34</td>
<td>-1.28</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autocratic-democratic</td>
<td>3.18 1.30</td>
<td>2.94 1.18</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unfair-fair</td>
<td>3.83 1.42</td>
<td>3.69 1.31</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unkind-kind</td>
<td>4.07 1.49</td>
<td>4.13 1.37</td>
<td>-0.37</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ignorant-knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.31 1.47</td>
<td>4.47 1.24</td>
<td>-1.02</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ugly-beautiful</td>
<td>3.94 1.62</td>
<td>4.18 1.30</td>
<td>-1.40</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stupid-intelligent</td>
<td>4.41 1.41</td>
<td>4.73 1.03</td>
<td>-2.20</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>.029*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rich-poor</td>
<td>2.61 1.34</td>
<td>3.06 1.25</td>
<td>-2.97</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.003*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dirty-clean</td>
<td>3.55 1.65</td>
<td>3.73 1.48</td>
<td>-0.95</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak-strong</td>
<td>4.14 1.27</td>
<td>4.35 1.24</td>
<td>-1.42</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bad-good</td>
<td>4.12 1.39</td>
<td>4.10 1.15</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cowardly-brave</td>
<td>4.45 1.44</td>
<td>4.46 1.33</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Belligerent-peace-loving</td>
<td>3.55 1.79</td>
<td>3.52 1.45</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>292</td>
<td>.879</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 10—Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Male students (N = 158)</th>
<th>Female students (N = 138)</th>
<th>t value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14. Unlikable-likable</td>
<td>4.05 1.49</td>
<td>4.10 1.40</td>
<td>-0.31</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.760</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Greedy-generous</td>
<td>3.44 1.45</td>
<td>3.62 1.52</td>
<td>-1.00</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dishonest-honest</td>
<td>4.16 1.58</td>
<td>3.86 1.37</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follower-leader</td>
<td>3.94 1.38</td>
<td>3.94 1.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Terrorist-nonterrorist</td>
<td>3.48 1.65</td>
<td>3.36 1.31</td>
<td>0.69</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>.492</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Undependable-dependable</td>
<td>4.10 1.45</td>
<td>3.90 1.46</td>
<td>1.15</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.251</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unreliable-reliable</td>
<td>4.00 1.38</td>
<td>3.92 1.43</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Anti-American-pro-American</td>
<td>2.94 1.46</td>
<td>2.96 1.35</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Radical-conservative</td>
<td>3.03 1.27</td>
<td>3.15 1.37</td>
<td>-0.83</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.407</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Weak-powerful</td>
<td>4.07 1.12</td>
<td>4.29 0.97</td>
<td>-1.79</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dull-exciting</td>
<td>4.10 1.27</td>
<td>4.05 1.34</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Primitive-civilized</td>
<td>4.18 1.66</td>
<td>3.98 1.58</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.297</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>95.98 21.85</td>
<td>97.02 20.03</td>
<td>-0.43</td>
<td>294</td>
<td>.671</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Table 11

Means, Variance, and $t$ Test for Differences Between the Means of Graduate and Undergraduate Students on Each of the 25 Polarity Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Graduates ($N = 94$)</th>
<th>Undergraduates ($N = 201$)</th>
<th>$t$ value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>2-tailed prob.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Lazy-hardworking</td>
<td>4.56 1.20</td>
<td>4.19 1.62</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>.027*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Autocratic-democratic</td>
<td>2.98 1.40</td>
<td>3.11 1.17</td>
<td>-0.78</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>.436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Unfair-fair</td>
<td>4.07 1.30</td>
<td>3.61 1.36</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.006*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Unkind-kind</td>
<td>4.20 1.27</td>
<td>4.04 1.49</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.379</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ignorant-knowledgeable</td>
<td>4.55 1.24</td>
<td>4.29 1.42</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Ugly-beautiful</td>
<td>4.44 1.21</td>
<td>3.86 1.56</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>.001*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Stupid-intelligent</td>
<td>4.72 1.17</td>
<td>4.48 1.29</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Rich-poor</td>
<td>3.05 1.13</td>
<td>2.72 1.38</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>.033*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Dirty-clean</td>
<td>3.84 1.53</td>
<td>3.53 1.58</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Weak-strong</td>
<td>4.28 1.18</td>
<td>4.21 1.30</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.643</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Bad-good</td>
<td>4.22 1.10</td>
<td>4.05 1.35</td>
<td>1.10</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>.274</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cowardly-brave</td>
<td>4.41 1.14</td>
<td>4.47 1.49</td>
<td>-0.36</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Belligerent-peace-loving</td>
<td>3.54 1.47</td>
<td>3.51 1.70</td>
<td>0.12</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.902</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td>Graduates (N = 94)</td>
<td>Undergraduates (N = 201)</td>
<td>t value</td>
<td>df</td>
<td>2-tailed prob.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Unlikable-likable</td>
<td>4.23 1.33</td>
<td>3.99 1.48</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Greedy-generous</td>
<td>3.65 1.23</td>
<td>3.45 1.58</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>.234</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16. Dishonest-honest</td>
<td>4.06 1.31</td>
<td>4.00 1.57</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>.715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17. Follower-leader</td>
<td>4.07 1.25</td>
<td>3.87 1.34</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>193</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18. Terrorist-nonterrorist</td>
<td>3.46 1.39</td>
<td>3.39 1.55</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19. Undependable-dependable</td>
<td>3.96 1.36</td>
<td>4.01 1.50</td>
<td>-0.28</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.776</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20. Unreliable-reliable</td>
<td>3.86 1.28</td>
<td>4.00 1.45</td>
<td>-0.82</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.415</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21. Anti-American-pro-American</td>
<td>3.22 1.32</td>
<td>2.82 1.43</td>
<td>2.27</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.024*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22. Radical-conservative</td>
<td>3.36 1.31</td>
<td>2.95 1.30</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.013*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23. Weak-powerful</td>
<td>4.07 0.97</td>
<td>4.21 1.09</td>
<td>-1.09</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24. Dull-exciting</td>
<td>4.26 1.25</td>
<td>3.98 1.31</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.079</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25. Primitive-civilized</td>
<td>4.04 1.59</td>
<td>4.10 1.64</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>.761</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>99.21 19.60</td>
<td>94.97 21.35</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at the .05 level.
Arabs as slightly autocratic, hardworking, belligerent, knowledgeable, terrorist, and anti-American. The average mean of the graduate students in the polarity scales was 3.96, while it was 3.80 for the undergraduate students. It may be concluded that graduate and undergraduate students do not differ in their stereotypes of Arabs on the 25 scales except on Scales 1, 3, 6, 8, 21, and 22, which were previously discussed. The \( t \) test value and the differences between both groups' means on each of the 25 scales are presented in Table 11, and the two groups' mean profiles are found in Appendix G (Figure 5).

**Hypothesis 4**

The mean group scores on the SD used in this study will differ among students who are under 20 years, 20-30 years, 31-40 years, 41-50 years, and over 50 years.

Prior to testing this hypothesis and since there were only 4 students who were over 50 years of age, this group was combined with the 41-50 years of age group and these two groups became over 40 years. The 4 groups were analyzed using a one-way analysis of variance.

The analysis of variance for Hypothesis 4 as shown in Table 12 indicated that there was a relationship between the students' age group and their stereotypes of Arabs as measured on the SD.

The \( p \) value showed a significant difference between the means of the groups (less than .05). The null hypothesis was rejected.

To determine which difference or differences between the sample means were statistically significant or which pairs of the four
groups exceeded the critical value (1.96), the protected LSD method was used. The PLSD procedure is presented in Table 13.

Table 12

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Students' Age With Regard to Their Scores on the SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2601.81</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>418.49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 20 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>23.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-30 years</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td>21.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>17.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 40 years</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>102.11</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*P < .05.

As shown in Table 13, the sex comparisons between pairs of means indicated that there were significant differences between students under 20 years, 20-30 years, and over 40 years. The lowest group score with the most unfavorable stereotypes toward Arabs was the group of students under 20 years. The highest group score on SD was that of students who were over 40 years.

The hypothesis was supported in only the three comparisons between Groups 1, 2, and 3. All other comparisons contradicted the
research hypothesis. It may be concluded that a student's age had an effect on his or her stereotype toward Arabs, the younger the person the more negative the stereotypes.

Table 13
The PLSD Comparison Between Pairs for Hypothesis 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Under 20 years</th>
<th>20-30 years</th>
<th>31-40 years</th>
<th>Over 40 years</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean scores</td>
<td>84.71</td>
<td>97.75</td>
<td>98.97</td>
<td>102.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>23.66</td>
<td>21.30</td>
<td>17.61</td>
<td>16.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.756 *
3.638 *
3.532 *
0.415
1.234
0.886

Note. The t value of PLSD, comparison between pairs of means are shown above the line.

*Significant pair of means at .05.

Hypothesis 5

The mean group scores on the SD used in this study will differ among students who based their information about Arabs on television, newspaper, magazines, and other.
The analysis of variance revealed that the sources of information American students based their information about Arabs on were related to their stereotypes of Arabs as measured on the SD.

The null hypothesis, as shown in Table 14, was rejected because the one-way analysis of variance showed a $p$ value less than .05. Since the null hypothesis was rejected, and in order to determine which difference or differences between the pairs of groups were statistically significant, the PLSD procedure was used. As shown in Table 15, the results of PLSD indicated that in the 10 comparisons between pairs of means only 5 supported the research hypothesis. All others were less than the critical value. It was shown that the groups of students who based their information about Arabs on television were significantly different in their stereotypes of Arabs from those who relied on newspapers, magazines, and personal contacts as their sources of information. Also, the students who learned about Arabs from newspapers and magazines were different in their stereotypes from those students who learned about Arabs through personal contact.

Summary

This chapter was divided into three sections: The first section presented the respondents' characteristics in terms of race, sex, level of education, and age. The number of respondents who participated in this study was discussed. The second section provided answers to the first question of this study. The last section of this chapter was focused in testing the research hypotheses by
utilizing the $t$ test and one-way analysis of variance.

A summary, conclusions, and recommendations are presented in Chapter V.

Table 14

One-Way Analysis of Variance of Students' Sources of Information About Arabs With Regard to Their Scores on the SD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>$F$</th>
<th>$P$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3417.47</td>
<td>8.55</td>
<td>.000*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within groups</td>
<td>291</td>
<td>399.77</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Television</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>89.38</td>
<td>21.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>17.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Magazine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.13</td>
<td>14.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal contact</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>108.10</td>
<td>24.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>98.33</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .05$. 
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Table 15

The PLSD Comparison for Hypothesis 5

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Television</th>
<th>Newspaper</th>
<th>Magazine</th>
<th>Personal contact</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mean score</td>
<td>89.38</td>
<td>97.25</td>
<td>100.13</td>
<td>108.10</td>
<td>98.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard deviation</td>
<td>21.68</td>
<td>17.64</td>
<td>14.66</td>
<td>24.05</td>
<td>13.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample size</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2.479 *
3.485 *
5.563 *
0.786
2.550 *
2.076 *

*Significant pairs of means at .05.

Note. The t value of PLSD, the comparison between pairs of means are shown above the line.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Summary

The major purpose of this study was to explore and identify the stereotypes that Western Michigan University black and white American students held toward Arabs. Specifically, this study was conducted in order to answer the following questions:

1. How do Western Michigan University black and white American students stereotype Arabs.

2. Is there a significant difference between black and white American students in their stereotypes of Arabs?

3. Is there a significant difference in the stereotyping of Arabs between the male and female American students?

4. Is there a difference between graduate and undergraduate American students in their stereotypes of Arabs.

5. Is there a difference between the age of the student and his or her stereotype of Arabs?

6. Is there a difference in the origins of the American students' stereotypes of Arabs?

Many studies relevant to the present research problem were reviewed and cited. The related literature was divided into four sections: (a) the definition of stereotypes, (b) origins of stereotypes, (c) stereotypes of ethnic and national groups within and
outside the United States, and (d) the stereotypes of Arabs in American mass media.

The survey instrument used in this study consisted of two parts. The first part contained demographic data about the subjects. The second part of the instrument was "The Semantic Differential" which was developed by Osgood et al. (1957). This instrument was used to adopt subjects' stereotypes of Arabs. In this part, subjects were asked to rate Arabs on 7-point scales for each of 25 bipolar adjective categories. The pairs of polar adjectives used in this study were chosen from Gardner (1968), Gardner et al. (1968), Osgood et al. (1957), and Terry (1982).

The target population of this study was black and white American students attending WMU during the Winter Semester of 1986. From this population, 400 students were randomly selected based on their race, sex, and grade level. A cover letter along with the questionnaire were mailed to 281 off-campus students. To get the appropriate response from subjects, an American girl's name was chosen for signing the cover letter. One hundred and nineteen of the 400 subjects were living in WMU's dormitories; an American girl was hired to hand out the questionnaires to them. The completed questionnaires that were received and used in data analysis were 296. The return rate was 74%. To analyze the data, each of the 25 adjective scales consisted of 7-point categories ranging from 1 to 7. A value of 1 was assigned to the negative end of the pole and 7 to the positive end. The stereotypes of Arabs were assessed by means of polarity. The subjects' mean scores were the sum of the overall values across the
25-adjective pairs. Thus, the higher the scores the more positive or favorable the stereotypes. The t-test for independent means was used for testing the first three hypotheses to compare the differences in the mean response of black students versus mean responses of white students, male versus female students, and graduate versus undergraduate students on each of the 25 adjective pairs. One-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to test the last two hypotheses.

All hypotheses were tested at .05 level of probability of committing a Type I error. It was found that Western Michigan University students had mixed negative and positive stereotypical attitudes toward Arabs. Of the 25 adjective pairs, 11 were on the negative side of the scale and 14 were on the positive side of the scale. No differences were found between black and white students in their stereotypes of Arabs with the exceptions of 7 out of the 25 polar pairs. However, male and female students significantly differed on 2 adjectives. Also, significant differences were found between graduate and undergraduate students in the way they stereotyped Arabs on only 6 of the 25 polar adjective pairs. Results also indicated that the age of the students and the source students based their information of Arabs on had an effect on their stereotypes of Arabs.

Conclusions

As was indicated in Chapter I, one of the purposes of this study was to determine the differences between WMU black and white American students, male and female, graduate and undergraduate, in their stereotypes of Arabs. The overall finding of this study showed no
significant differences between the groups. This may be as Child and Doob (1943) suggested, that national stereotypes, like all other stereotypes and most human behavior, vary among groups in the society as a function of culture and personality. "People who live together in a society tend to have the same stereotypes concerning their own and other countries" (Child & Doob, 1943, p. 203).

Based on the findings of the study, the following conclusions can be drawn:

1. American students at Western Michigan University stereotyped Arabs as quite rich and anti-American. They also described them as slightly autocratic, radical, terrorist, hardworking, knowledgeable, and intelligent. However, the test did not adequately discriminate between extremes.

2. Black students had significantly more favorable attitudes toward Arabs in 7 of the 25 adjective scales. They described Arabs as being hardworking, knowledgeable, beautiful, rich, strong, brave, and peace-loving more than white students. In addition, black students' mean scores on most of the scales were higher (but not significantly different at .05) than white students' mean scores.

3. The sex of the students has been found to have no effect on the way students stereotyped Arabs except in terms of 2 adjective scales where most male students described Arabs as rich more than female students did.

4. Graduate students tended to score higher than undergraduate students on rating Arabs on most of the 25 adjective scales. The differences between the two groups significantly existed on 6 scales
where undergraduate students have more unfavorable attitudes toward Arabs and described them as lazy, unfair, ugly, rich, anti-American, and radical.

5. Age of the students has been found to have a significant influence on their stereotypes of Arabs. The younger students held more unfavorable stereotypes, while the older students held the more favorable stereotypes toward Arabs.

6. The source of information on which students based their opinions about Arabs was found to have a significant influence on their stereotypes. The group with the most unfavorable stereotypes of Arabs were those who based their information about Arabs on television, while students who know Arabs through personal contact stereotyped Arabs most favorably.

Recommendations

The League of the Arab States must act and spend money in advertising in mass media, especially in television (the primary source of American people's knowledge about Arabs), to show documentaries on Arab culture, humanities, development of their countries, and interviews with Americans who visit Arabian countries. By doing this, Americans, who see these documentaries, will have a chance to compare the fictional items with the real thing and facts; then he or she will be able to differentiate between prototypes and stereotypes.

The Arab countries' information offices, embassies, and Arab representatives to the United States also have responsibilities in increased publications sent to American journalists' public opinion.
leaders. Also, officials and decision makers in Arab countries have to send knowledgeable people who represent their countries who can demonstrate the use of English language, know public relations techniques, and have the ability to work with people and through people in order to represent their case effectively and induce the public or the communicators to change the image of "dirty Arabs," "belligerent," and "anti-American."

The Arab countries have to provide the Arab-American organizations in the United States, such as The American-Arab Affairs Council, the American-Arab Anti-Discrimination Committee, The National Association of Arab-Americans, and The Association of Arab-American University Graduates, with unlimited financial support. These organizations have a tremendous responsibility and are doing a great job in defending and fighting back against any bad images that hurt Arabs either in or by media or U.S. officials. Also, the League of Arab Countries have to financially sponsor seminars, conferences, and workshops dealing with the distorted image of Arabs in the West, particularly in the U.S. Professional people either from Arab countries or pro-Arab American journalists and communicators should be invited. Prior to establishing such a program, they have to contact highly educated Arab-Americans, who have the awareness of the American media's function, publishes books, pamphlets, and other material related to American-Arab's relations and who have the enthusiasm, initiative, and the loyalty toward their "roots" to take charge of these seminars and conferences. A great number of well-known Arab-American professionals with reputations could help, such as Edward
Said, Edmond Ghareeb, Jack Shaheen, Michael Suleiman, and so forth. The Arab countries must follow the proposals, recommendations, and suggestions of these conferences or seminars.

It is the responsibility of Arabs who are living in the U.S. to refute the stereotypes. This could be done by writing letters to editors or defending Arabs' true heritage and cultures, and educating the mass media and governmental officials. Presently, little of this is being done, but it is very necessary in order to diminish stereotypical attitudes which are present in people and in the media.

Because of the lack of research on the American stereotypes of Arabs, further investigation in this area is very important in order to break down the communication barriers between the people of the United States, the Arab people, and the Arab-Americans.
Appendix A

Map of Arab Countries
Figure 1. Map of Arab Countries.
Appendix B

Instrument
STUDENTS PERSONAL DATA QUESTIONNAIRE

I. First, please complete the following personal questionnaire:

1. Sex: Male _______ Female _______

2. Level of education: a: Graduate _______ Undergraduate _______

3. Age: (a) Under 20 years____ (b) 20-30 years____ (c) 31-40 years____
   (d) 41-50 years ____ (e) 51 years and over____

4. I learn about Arabs from (please check one as the primary source):
   T.V. _____ Newspapers ____ Magazines ____ Personal Contact ____
   Other (please specify)---------------------------------------------------

II. On the next page you will find 25 pairs of words which may describe Arabs. Please answer all of them by placing an "X" in one of the seven scales between each word pair where it shows how the word best describes your feeling about Arabs. Please follow this example:

Educated ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uneducated

If you think Arabs are extremely educated, place an "X" near educated:

Educated X : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ Uneducated

Or if you think Arabs are extremely uneducated, place an "X" near uneducated:

Educated ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : ___ : X Uneducated

If you don't believe Arabs are either extremely educated or extremely uneducated, then you should place your check mark closer to the middle, depending upon the side you favor.
ARABS ARE

Appendix C

Cover Letter
February 28, 1986

Dear Student:

Along with people of other nations, we are carrying in our heads a picture of others who are different from our own cultural, racial, and social group. These mental pictures are called "stereotypes."

As part of a sample drawn from WMU students, you have been randomly selected to help me in the data collection for my dissertation project. The purpose of this study is to determine what types of images and stereotypical attitudes Americans hold toward Arabs.

I realize that your time is very important. However, your response is essential for the success of this study. So please help me by taking just a few minutes from your invaluable time to fill out the enclosed questionnaire.

The gathered information received from you will be held confidential. Anonymity will be guaranteed for all respondents and no information about any individual will be released or cited. The numbers on the top of the questionnaire are used only to determine responses in order to exclude your name from follow-up procedures.

With this mailing, a self-addressed stamped envelope is provided for returning your completed questionnaire. I thank you very much for your help.

Sincerely,

Cathy Davis
Appendix D

Follow-up Letter
March 13, 1986

Dear Student:

Two weeks ago, I sent you a questionnaire which was intended to determine the images and stereotypical attitudes Americans hold toward Arabs.

According to my records, your response has not been received yet. Therefore, a new questionnaire and a self-addressed stamped envelope is enclosed with this letter in case your questionnaire was misplaced.

As I stated in the first letter, the gathered information received from you will be held confidential. Anonymity will be guaranteed for all respondents and no information about any individual will be released or cited. The numbers on the top of the questionnaire are used only to determine responses in order to exclude your name from follow-up procedures.

If you have already sent your completed questionnaire, please disregard this letter and consider it as a thank you. If you have not, please do so today because your response is very important for the success of my dissertation. Your help is greatly appreciated.

Sincerely,

Cathy Davis
Appendix E

Respondents' Comments
This section includes a number of comments received from respondents who refused to participate in this study or who participated and sent their completed questionnaire but with some reservations about them. Most of the comments revealed that students tended to avoid generalizations about Arabs. The following are comments received from the respondents:

These responses were made on the basis of "forced choice." Actually, I feel that I cannot judge these people because I know relatively little about them and because doing so violates my value system. Also, there must be tremendous variation among them within their culture.

I can only comment on events or people I have met—I assume all the above attributes are present in the Arab population—to what degree I am not knowledgeable enough to say. I have been favorably impressed by the Arabs at WMU.

I simply cannot generalize about "Arabs." I have known three or four. I liked them and found them no different from me or you. If I participate in this survey, even if all my responses are X's in the middle, I would agree that I think of "Arabs" in these contexts.

I'm sorry but stereotypes are something I try to avoid in my life especially those that bombard the American public. Two stereotypes that you will come across in your study that pervade the American public (I'm sure you already know) are that Arabs are very rich and terrorists by nature. Somehow I have a hard time categorizing all Arabs in this mode simply because I'm sure that somewhere in those countries there are still people who are content with their lives and still children who die with an empty stomach.

This type of labeling is not fair to judge the Arab people any more than Americans. I will not answer it.

I am not familiar with any Arabs and I am not one to judge a group of people by what is put on television. Sorry I couldn't be more helpful.

I find this questionnaire extremely difficult to answer. I have a very hard time categorizing people as groups. Therefore, I can only place my checks in the middle of the
column. Bad experiences, or even good experiences, may or may not be accurate generalizations.

This is an insult to many Arab people. How dare you do this!
Appendix F

Frequencies and Percentages
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Polar words</th>
<th>Negative responses</th>
<th>Positive responses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>188</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>37.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>22.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>25.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>65.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>45.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>21.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>22.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowardly</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerent</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>49.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikable</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>31.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>44.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>28.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>53.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>27.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polar words</td>
<td>Negative responses</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Freq.</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>60.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>18.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix G

Mean Profiles
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td>Stupid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td>'Weak'</td>
<td>Bad</td>
<td>Cowardly</td>
<td>Belligerent</td>
<td>Unlikable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td>Follower</td>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td>Anti-American</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td>Weak</td>
<td>Dull</td>
<td>Primitive</td>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td>Fair</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>Clean</td>
<td>Strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Brave</td>
<td>Peace-loving</td>
<td>Likable</td>
<td>Generous</td>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonterrorists</td>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td>Exciting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 2. Means Profile of the Total 296 Sample in the Way They Stereotyped Arabs as Measured by the 25-Adjective J3D Scale.

Note. The polar pairs were reversed from negative left side to the positive right side, different from the original survey where the adjective pairs were arranged randomly.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lazy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autocratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unkind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ignorant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ugly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stupid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rich</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dirty</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bad</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cowardly</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belligerent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greedy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dishonest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terrorists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unreliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radical</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weak</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dull</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Primitive</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hardworking</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Democratic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kind</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beautiful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intelligent</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clean</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brave</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peace-loving</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonterrorists</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dependable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reliable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pro-American</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Powerful</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exciting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civilized</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3. Mean Profiles of Black (-----) and White (--------) Students in Their Stereotypes of Arabs in Each of the 25 Adjective Pairs.

Note. The polar pairs were reversed from negative left side to the positive right side, different from the original survey where the adjective pairs were arranged randomly.
Figure 4. Mean Profiles of Male (-----) and Female (-----) Students Concerning Their Stereotypes of Arabs.

Note. The polar pairs were reversed from negative left side to the positive right side, different from the original survey where the adjective pairs were arranged randomly.
Figure 5. Mean Profiles of Graduate (-----) and Undergraduate (--------) Students in Regard to Their Stereotypes Toward Arabs.

Note. The polar pairs were reversed from negative left side to the positive right side, different from the original survey where the adjective pairs were arranged randomly.
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