

MISCONCEPTIONS ABOUT SILENCE AND PASSIVITY:
HOW AMERICAN STUDENTS PERCEIVE ASIAN INTERNATIONAL STUDENTS'
USE OF PASSIVITY WITHIN THE CLASSROOM

by

AUDRA K. NURU
B.A. University of Central Florida, 2005

A thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of Master of Arts
in the Nicholson School of Communication
in the College of Sciences
at the University of Central Florida
Orlando, Florida

Fall Term
2008

© 2008 Audra K. Nuru

ABSTRACT

Asian international students (AIS) are becoming increasingly more populous in American universities each year. While AIS are enrolled in the same required classes as American students, it has been observed that frequent interaction between AIS and American students is rather uncommon. Due to obvious social hesitation between the two groups of students during classroom discussion, the study presented was initiated in order to unveil possible reasons for this social integration dilemma. Social Attractiveness, Perceived Homophily and Attributional Confidence scales were selected in order to determine possible factors contributing to this dilemma.

In order to pursue explanations for the dormant socialization between the two groups of students during class, a survey was administered to a convenience sampling of 426 undergraduate students enrolled in upper-level courses at the University of Central Florida. Results indicated that passive classroom behavior was perceived as less socially desirable by American students. In fact, participants determined that students reflecting passive classroom behavior were less socially attractive, less similar, and less predictable than students that demonstrated active classroom behavior. Ethnicity factors did not play a key role in determining social appeal. These findings provide evidence that the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students has much more to do with perceived social behavior and cultural differences regarding classroom behavior than with racial prejudice or ethnicity factors.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to acknowledge the support of my advisor and friend, Dr. Weger. His input and encouragement has made this project a much more feasible task, and I am forever grateful. I would also like to acknowledge my committee members Dr. Katt and Dr. Miller for their generous contributions and insights. Lastly, I would like to thank my mother and my family for always believing in me and encouraging me to the furthest extent.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION.....	1
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW.....	4
Causes of Perceived Passivity.....	4
Power Distance	5
Silence.....	7
Effects of Perceived Passivity.....	10
Social Distance and Stereotypes	10
Social Integration Dilemma	12
Social Attractiveness.....	13
Perceived Homophily.....	14
Attributional Confidence	15
American Perceptions	16
CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY	18
Participants.....	18
Instruments.....	18
Procedure	19
Dependent Variables.....	20
CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS	22
CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS	24
Discussion of Findings.....	24
Limitations	26

Implications for Future Research.....	27
CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS.....	29
APPENDIX A: DEPENDENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS.	31
APPENDIX B: EXPERIMENTAL STIMULI.....	35
APPENDIX C: WAIVER OF INFORMED CONSENT.....	40
APPENDIX D: IRB SUBMISSION FORM	42
APPENXIX E: IRB APPROVAL LETTER.....	46
APPENDIX F: EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER	48
LIST OF REFERENCES.....	50

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics	21
Table 2: MANOVA results table	22

CHAPTER ONE: INTRODUCTION

Each year, universities across America admit more and more international students; and of these accepted students, a large portion come from Asia. According to the Open Doors Report (Institute of International Education, 2007), “the number of international students enrolled in colleges and universities in the United States increased by 3% to a total of 582,984 in the 2006-2007 academic year, of which, Asia remains the largest sending region, accounting for 59% of total U.S. international enrollments.” In fact, at the University of Central Florida (UCF) alone, Asian international students (AIS) represented nearly one-third of all international students admitted in the Fall 2007 semester (Institute of International Education, 2007). Although each year statistics continue to show a larger population of AIS admitted into American Universities, American teachers and students still may be quite unfamiliar with common Asian cultural norms (Braddock et al, 1995; Lin et al, 1997). Additionally, while there is a large population of AIS at UCF, UCF’s American students and teachers seem unreceptive of AIS’s communication patterns, and therefore often misconstrue messages due to cultural differences.

For example, in UCF classrooms, many teachers respect and encourage active speaking roles from their students. In fact, many American teachers perceive verbal response from students as complimentary, and often associate verbal response with comprehension and preparedness (Jenkins, 2000; Liu, 1997; Mulligan, 2000). For American students, this association is widely known and accepted, and American students often strive to discuss something intellectual during class in order to gain recognition from their teachers for being studious. However, most AIS are rarely as comfortable with this particular practice (Hofstede, 2001; Tatar, 2005; Zhou et al, 2005; Jones, 1999; Ladd et al, 1999; Liu, 1997). Although AIS may be just as studious and prepared as their American peers, AIS seem less likely to volunteer their opinions

or ideas during class discussions; in fact, for the most part AIS remain silent (Hwang et al, 2002; Dougherty, 1991; Yang, 1993, Jenkins, 2000). Although their American peers and teachers may perceive this silence as shyness or miscomprehension, they may not know that AIS's silence may often originate from a number of communication devices employed by Asian cultures. Instead of representing timidity, in Asian cultures, silence in the classroom represents a much more complex system of communication. Rather than representing shyness, in Asian cultures silence is used as a respectable means to communicate (Lebra, 1987; Hofstede, 2001; Pan, 2000; Tannen, 1995). With this discrepancy between American perceptions and AIS's communicative intentions, it becomes apparent that cultural definitions of the perception of silence in the classroom make misunderstanding inevitable; and therefore may be the cause of dormant social interaction between the two groups.

Although research studies have focused on silence and Asian students, these studies rarely focus on how American's perceive AIS's passive classroom behavior. Furthermore, even though an abundance of literature features perceptions and stereotypes held by Americans about other ethnic groups, few studies specifically observe the perceptions of AIS's use of silence as a driving force in a growing social gap between American and Asian students. Due to this lack in research, it is necessary to delve into the mind-set of American students in order to explore the attitudes and opinions towards AIS's passive behavior within the classroom.

Advances in this particular field of research are especially important considering that with improved knowledge about American perspectives, universities like UCF can begin to bridge the cultural gap between American and AIS. As universities across America continue to admit larger populations of AIS, the need for a better understanding of how these students communicate becomes increasingly crucial. This study will investigate the perceptions held by

Americans about the passive classroom behavior exhibited by AIS in order to promote better understanding and more effective classroom discussion. The purpose of this study, therefore, is to unveil possible reasons for dormant social integration between AIS and American students by observing perceptions held by American students about AIS. It is hoped that by understanding how American students perceive AIS's silent behavior, universities can employ better practices in order to promote a better cultural understanding of AIS as well as encourage more inclusive communication between AIS and their American peers.

CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE REVIEW

In this chapter, theories about power distance and silence will be presented in order to highlight differences between Asian and American cultures. By presenting these theories, this chapter will explain how fundamental differences between the two cultures fuels misinterpretation and false perceptions about AIS. This chapter will also explore possible reasons for why American students perceive AIS as passive and less social than their American peers, and it will observe theories about stereotypes and social distance in order to explain the effects of this perceived passivity. Furthermore, this chapter will explore social attractiveness, perceived homophily, and attributional confidence as three key perceptions responsible for dormant social interaction between AIS and American students.

Causes of Perceived Passivity

American and Asian societies function at two very distinct levels of operation. In fact, each of the two societies has such distinct cultural norms and such strong cultural ties that when looked at simultaneously one cannot help but compare the two cultures because of their obvious differences. In the sections that follow, theories about power distance and silence will show a multitude of differences between the two cultures that seem to be driving miscomprehension about communicative behaviors. Furthermore, the theories that follow will introduce possible causes for generalized perceptions about AIS held by American students due to these apparent differences between the two cultures.

Power Distance

According to Hofstede (2001), “Culture is defined as collective programming of the mind; it manifests itself not only in values, but in more superficial ways: in symbols, heroes, and rituals” (p. 1). Due to this distinction, Hofstede argues that in order to understand culture, it is necessary to observe and evaluate it from within its own social system. Based on the findings of an extensive research project that observed differences in national culture across more than fifty countries, Hofstede identified five independent dimensions of national culture that should be used as a framework to understand differences between nations. Of these five, power distance proves to be one of the more significant indicators as to why AIS and American students behave differently within the classroom (Hofstede, 2001).

Mulder (1977) explains that power distance “is related to the degree of inequality in power between a less powerful Individual (I) and a more powerful Other (O), in which I and O belong to the same social system” (as cited in Hofstede, 2001, p.83). This research explains that within each society there is a specific understanding between the roles of I and O, and the interactions that occur between these entities are structured and governed by each culture. Likewise, although inequality is indeed inevitable, power distance describes “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations within a country accept and expect that power is distributed unequally” (Hofstede, 2001, p. 98). Due to the fact that power distance is a huge indicator of a population’s collective programming, it becomes obvious that understanding each culture’s level of power distance is inherently important. In order to accurately account for various levels of power distance between cultures, Hofstede developed a Power Distance Index (PDI) which scales fifty countries and three regions, accordingly. Through this scale, Hofstede describes the observed societies by means of either “low-PDI” or “high-PDI”

depending on how each responded to various questions and surveys. Generally, “low-PDI” countries, such as the United States, exhibit a more centralized division of power where the powerless identify closely with those who have power; and there are few communication practices that segregate the privileges available between the two groups. However, “high-PDI” countries, such as China or other Asian societies, generally show more hierarchal themes in which superiors are entitled to privileges unavailable to their subordinates (Hofstede, 2001). For example, according to Hofstede’s research, Hong Kong and the United States are more or less bipolar according to their PDI-scores. Although Hofstede warns that his research should not be used to make dichotomous claims, it is overwhelmingly apparent that the United States and China operate from two distinctly diverse perspectives regarding the issues of power distribution.

In fact, according to Hofstede’s research, Chinese students and American students are programmed to accept and expect dissimilar patterns of interaction at school simply because of their cultural beliefs about power distance. He explains that students from high-PDI countries, like China, view teachers as separate and more superior individuals who are to be treated with respect both inside and outside of class. He continues by explaining that in these societies, teachers are considered “gurus who transfer personal wisdom” (Hofstede, 2001, p.107). In fact, in many Asian countries, direct communication from student to teacher is viewed as inappropriate due to the fact that subordinates are never expected to address their superiors. Instead, the proper and valued response of a respectable student would be to remain silent to show their appreciation for their teachers. While students from low-PDI countries, like the United States, may indeed respect their teachers, it is often the case that both teachers and students alike are treated as equals. Unlike Chinese classrooms, which emphasize teacher-centered education in which teachers are expected to initiate all communication in class,

American classrooms are predominantly student-centered and encourage free-thinking and student discourse. American students are not only encouraged to converse with their teachers during class, but more so, they are often rewarded for doing so. Unlike high-PDI countries that believe that the quality of learning “depends on excellence of teachers” and their ability to transfer their wisdom, low-PDI countries like the United States view quality of learning as dependant “on two-way communication and excellence of students” (Hofstede, 2001, p.107).

With this said, it becomes clear that culturally-shaped beliefs about power distance play a key role in explaining behavioral differences between Chinese students and American students within the classroom. Due to the fact that culturally-derived ideas about appropriate behavior within the classroom differ between Asian cultures and American cultures, it is no surprise that Asian students studying within American classrooms may have difficulty accustoming to American practices. In fact, it is plausible that because of their contrasting mannerisms, American students perceive AIS as less socially appealing due to a misunderstanding of their culturally derived classroom behavior. Additionally, while power distance may prove to be a driving force behind perceptions of passivity, behaviors such as silence rather than dominant conversation may be equally responsible for instilling perceptions of passivity within the mindsets of American students.

Silence

In American culture, silence is often defined and understood as an absence of something, particularly, as an absence of sound and therefore, an absence in communication. In fact, according to American linguistics, “silence has traditionally been ignored except for its boundary-marking function, delimiting the beginning and end of utterances” (Saville-Troike,

1985, p.3). While Americans employ silence during regular conversation, often these silences are used to communicate negative messages such as “I’m annoyed with you” (Saville-Troike, 1985, p. 9), or to specifically note an unwillingness to talk. In fact, for the most part, Americans are uncomfortable in moments of silence. According to Malinowski (1923), English-speaking societies often feel the need to break the silence by using phrases such as ‘Nice day today’ in order to “get over the strange and unpleasant tension which [is felt] when facing each other in silence”(p.314). In fact, silence in general is something that Americans desperately strive to avoid. According to Goffman’s observations (1967), “undue lulls come to be potential signs of having nothing in common, or of being insufficiently self-possessed to create something to say, and hence must be avoided” (p. 36). In this, it becomes overwhelmingly clear that in American cultures, silence in conversation is undoubtedly assumed to hold negative implications.

On the other hand, in Asian cultures, “silence is a sign of good manners, and it is failure to keep silent that is negatively evaluated” (Pan, 2000, p.84). In fact, Asian cultures often promote silence not only as a sign of respect, but more so, as an indicator of character. In Asian cultures, silent individuals are considered to be sincere and honest. Thus, a man of few words is often trusted more than a man of many (Lebra, 1987).

According to Clancy, unlike American culture, Asian cultures like the Japanese typically do not associate negativity with being silent. In fact, in her study, Clancy explores the socially positive values associated with silence according to Japanese culture. She explains that in Japan, children are raised with traditional and common sayings such as “*Iwana ga hana*” which, when translated, means “silence is better than speech” (1986, p. 213-214). This, she argues, is representative of a very diverse and interesting system of communication that is employed by the Japanese culture. In this system of communication, indirectness is valued as a means to avoid

social confrontation. In fact, in reference to the Japanese culture, Lebra (1987) illustrates that silence can be used as a form of social discretion. Lebra states that this type of silence is “considered necessary or desirable in order to gain social acceptance or to avoid social penalty”(p. 347). Like the Japanese, several Asian countries employ silence as a means to communicate without risking embarrassment. Furthermore, considering the hierarchical themes presented within several Asian cultures, remaining silent is often a means to communicate with superiors without offending them.

According to Loveday (1982), Japanese students are taught to avoid articulating their contrasting viewpoints, and quite often their silence is perceived as a noteworthy and admirable characteristic. Unlike American students that are encouraged to speak directly with their professors and express contradictory ideas; Asian students are taught to avoid confrontation and therefore, are encouraged to remain silent. Furthermore, Asian students often use “silence as a sign of respect for authority and concern for others” (Tatar, 2005, p.290). Unlike their American peers who frequently take on active speaking roles during class discussion to show appreciation for the subject of study; Asian students “do not volunteer much [because] whoever volunteers is seen as someone who has no sense of other people, trying to show off” (Beykont, 2002, p. 35). Instead, Asian students typically take on more subdued roles that allow them to show appreciation for the subject matter by being quiet and respectful recipients of knowledge (Chandler, 1983).

Evidently, Asians and Americans perceive the notion of silence quite differently. While Americans dread and avoid silence, Asians encourage and respect it. While American culture perceives silence as a failure or void in conversation, Asian cultures believe that “silence can be a matter of saying nothing and meaning something” (Tannen, 1985, p. 97). The fact of the

matter is that due to these differences in perception of silence, communication styles between the two cultures are bound to conflict. Although these communication differences can be identified and miscommunication between the two cultures can be limited and prevented; one cannot help but wonder if these differences in definition of silence are causing American students to perceive AIS as less socially appealing. Considering that American students try to avoid silence (Malinowski, 1923), it becomes clear that perhaps these different definitions of silence are fueling perceptions of passivity, and thus causing hesitation of social interaction between AIS and American students.

Effects of Perceived Passivity

Social Distance and Stereotypes

It is well known that over the past few decades American universities have become increasingly diverse. Just a few years ago, universities were predominately comprised of white, American, men; however, today American universities not only encourage but insist on cultural diversity. Nonetheless, even though universities are becoming more culturally diverse, it is surprisingly apparent that stereotypes continue to affect groups of college students (Sydell & Nelson, 2000; Corcoran & Thompson, 2004, Hall, 2002). Due to the fact that Asian and Asian American students comprise a large percentage of college students and a greater proportional representation than any other ethnic group attending American universities (Hune, 2002), the importance of understanding prevalent stereotypes and misconceptions about Asian students is essential in order to promote effective classroom learning.

Since his study conducted in 1926, Bogardus has been cited as widely influential in the study of stereotypes and social distance. Seeking to measure racial attitudes, Bogardus formulated a scale that empirically measures the degree to which people willingly interact with members of different ethnic or racial groups. This scale, commonly referred to as ‘the Bogardus scale,’ became a widely used and accepted method to measure what came to be known as “social distance.”

According to Bogardus (1959), social distance is “the degree of sympathetic understanding that functions between person and person, between person and group, and between groups” (p.7). Its influence within the social science field is significant due to the fact that by understanding social distance, one can generally measure or gauge ethnic prejudice (Levin, 1991; Marger, 1994; McLemore & Romo, 1998; Schaefer, 1996; Simpson & Yinger, 1972; Weaver, 2008). In an effort to measure the level of acceptance that Americans feel towards members of the most common ethnic groups in the United States, Bogardus and consequently several other researchers since, have employed social distance scales. Although the more common studies employing ethnic distance scales reflect a 65-year trend of decreasing prejudices between other ethnic groups, attitudes towards Asians have changed only slightly (Bogardus, 1967, McLemore & Romo, 1998; Owen et al., 1981; Parrillo & Donoghue, 2005). Taking into consideration that the earlier studies were heavily influenced by external factors, such as World War II and the Korean War; it is no surprise that more recent studies do reflect a higher level of social acceptance between Asians and Americans than their earlier counterparts. Nonetheless, when ranked from most socially accepted to least socially accepted, Asian cultures are still falling within the bottom half of the scale; meaning that Americans perceive them as less socially acceptable than they do other ethnic groups (Parrillo, 2005).

Since stereotypes are indeed a large contributor to attitudes and perceptions of others, it should be noted that even seemingly positive stereotypes can affect social interaction. According to recent studies, Asian Americans have been typically stereotyped as the “model minority” due to the fact that Americans seem to perceive them as being highly competent and hardworking (Leong, 1997; Lin et al., 2005). Unfortunately, due to their apparent quietness, Americans tend to also believe that Asians and Asian-Americans lack interpersonal skills (Lin et al, 2005). In fact, studies have shown that since 1933, Asians have been repetitively characterized as being competent yet unsociable. While they are perceived as being intelligent, efficient and industrious, they are seemingly faulted as being quiet, humorless, and conservative (Karlins, 1969; Katz, 1933). Consequently, as noted in several social distance studies, these stereotypes not only breed misconceptions and unrealistic ideals about the group, but more so, they perpetuate a social gap between the two cultures.

Social Integration Dilemma

Due to the fact that scholarly literature regarding American students’ perceptions of passivity as a social barrier is rather scarce, it is plausible that one reason for dormant social integration between AIS and American students can be linked with how Americans perceive desirable social partners. While stereotypes about AIS and the uncertainty associated with foreign students may influence how Americans chose their social partners, perceived passivity could play a vital role in this social integration dilemma. In fact, it is plausible that the challenges AIS face in making social connections and creating social networks with American students very

well could be attributed to their perceived passivity, their being foreign, or some combination of both.

Social Attractiveness

Social Attractiveness refers to the notion that individuals are more likely to engage in social interaction with members whom they find attractive rather than those members whom they find unattractive. In fact, scholars have noted that interpersonal attraction is largely based on three dimensions: “a social or personal liking property; a physical dimension based on dress and physical features; and a task-orientation dimension related to how easy or worthwhile working with someone would be” (McCroskey & McCain, 1974, p.266). It is suggested here that members of a social system use these dimensions not only to evaluate how attractive another member may be, but more so, they use this information in order to negotiate the degree to which they will engage in social interaction with others. In this regard, it is feasible that social attractiveness is related to social distancing due to the fact that one’s perception of another shapes the means in which they chose, or neglect, to engage in social interaction.

In reference to the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students, it becomes questionable as to whether or not social attraction contributes to the apparent social gap facing these two groups of students. Due to the fact that American students may perceive AIS as less socially attractive because of their foreignness and variation in classroom behavior, it is possible that American students avoid social integration with AIS. In fact, because social attraction does influence the selectivity of social partners, one might wonder if the dormant socialization between AIS and American students is in part caused by a lack of social attraction.

For this reason, it is questionable as to whether or not American students perceive AIS as less attractive based on their classroom behavior.

RQ1a: Does passive behavior in the classroom lead to AIS being perceived as less socially attractive by American students?

Perceived Homophily

The key principle behind perceived homophily suggests that members of a given social system seek to connect and network with others whom they perceive as being similar to themselves (McPherson et al, 2001). The notion here is that social networks are predominantly comprised of individuals with goals, sociodemographic statuses, behaviors, or other characteristics that are similar in some capacity. In fact, in this line of research, scholars have argued that “people’s perceptions of other people determine to a major extent whether there is a communication attempt made, and have a major impact on the results of any communication encounter” (McCroskey et al, 1975, p. 323). In this, it is explained that one’s perception of another greatly influences the manner and means to which they decide, or dismiss, a social interaction. Therefore, it is possible that perhaps an additional reason for high levels of social distance between Americans and Asians could be related to their perceived similarity to each other. Hence, it is possible that perceived homophily could be related to social distancing due to the fact that perceived similarity drives social interaction while perceived dissimilarity often prohibits social engagement.

In regards to the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students, one might wonder if perceived homophily may contribute to the dormant socialization between the two

groups. Due to the fact that Americans may perceive AIS as perhaps dissimilar or different, it becomes questionable as to whether or not American students choose not to socially engage with AIS based on their perceptions about AIS in general. Thus, it is proposed that perhaps perceived homophily, or lack thereof, could be a driving force in regards to the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students.

RQ1b: Does passive behavior in the classroom lead to AIS being perceived as less similar by American students?

Attributional Confidence

Attributional confidence refers to the idea that members of a social system often predict the behaviors of unknown others based on their possession of a particular characteristic in which the member has previously assigned some attribute or trait. In fact, when engaging in social interaction with strangers, individuals often rely on attributional characteristics in order to predict how the conversation will unfold (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, Jones & Nisbett, 1972, Nisbett et al., 1973). Through this process, individuals use gathered information about their social partner in order to predict their future behaviors. While this process is not exclusively limited to interactions with strangers, it is often the case that when interacting with unknown others, individuals must rely on attributional cues in order to predict and interpret how a social exchange will occur. Since Americans consistently rate Asian cultures as less socially acceptable than they do other ethnic groups (Bogardus, 1967, McLemore & Romo, 1998; Owen et al., 1981; Parrillo & Donoghue, 2005); it becomes questionable as to whether or not Americans are rating

Asian cultures as less socially acceptable based on the fact that they are uncertain as to how an interaction would actually occur. Perhaps one reason Americans rate Asian cultures as less socially acceptable, is due in part to their lack of ability to predict how that particular social situation would unfold.

In reference to the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students, one might wonder if uncertainty or a lack of observance in attributional cues could be a cause of dormant socialization between the two groups of students. Given that AIS typically display more reserved classroom behavior than their American peers (Hofstede, 2001; Chandler, 1983), it is questionable as to whether or not Americans are capable of using attributional cues in order to predict and interpret how social exchanges with AIS will occur. Moreover, due to the possibility that Americans may not be capable of making predictions about social exchanges with AIS due to their silent classroom behavior, it is wondered if American students avoid conversation with AIS due to increased levels of uncertainty about their behavior.

RQ1c: Does passive behavior in the classroom lead to AIS being perceived as less predictable by American students?

American Perceptions

Bearing in mind that social attractiveness, perceived homophily and attributional predictability all seem to use stereotypes and other peripheral cues to help negotiate the value of potential social partners; one cannot help but wonder if social activity itself could be a contributor to how each social partner is perceived, thus contributing and influencing the manner

in which social partners are selected. Furthermore, considering that an individual's level of social activity could be a determining factor regarding the selection of social partners, one cannot help but question whether that level of activity is being perceived similarly amongst various groups of individuals. In other words, if Americans are choosing not to interact with AIS based on their apparent passive classroom behavior, do they also choose not to interact with American students whom exhibit similar mannerisms?

RQ2a: Do American students judge passive classroom behavior to be less socially attractive depending on whether the passive behavior is attributed to an AIS or an American student?

RQ2b: Do American students judge passive classroom behavior to be less similar depending on whether the passive behavior is attributed to an AIS or an American student?

RQ2c: Do American students judge passive classroom behavior to be less predictable depending on whether the passive behavior is attributed to an AIS or an American student?

CHAPTER THREE: METHODOLOGY

Participants

After obtaining IRB approval (Appendix E), 426 participants were recruited from upper-level, undergraduate, core classes in the Nicholson School of Communication as well as in the College of Education at the University of Central Florida. Permission to access these student populations was first obtained through email response between the researcher and each faculty member (Appendix F), and in accordance with IRB standards, written consent to conduct research was obtained by each faculty member prior to administering the survey instrument.

Participants consisted predominantly of White, American students, holding a junior or senior status and were found to have a mean age of 21. Each participant was informed that their participation was voluntary, and they were offered no incentive for their participation.

Instruments

The survey instrument (Appendix A) contained four demographic questions, a stimulus paragraph featuring one of eight fictional characters (Appendix B), ten questions on a likert scale geared to measure social attraction, eight questions scaled to measure perceived homophily (McCroskey et al, 1975), and seven questions aimed to determine attributional confidence (Clatterbuck, 1979). Participants were asked to use the provided descriptive paragraph in order to answer the survey questions. The stimulus paragraphs were randomly assigned, and were designed to describe either an active student or a reserved student. While there were only two basic forms of the paragraph, either active or reserved, each of the descriptive paragraphs

featured either an American or Asian student who was either male or female. The paragraphs were worded identically varying only the gender, ethnicity, or activity of the portrayed character.

Procedure

After obtaining IRB approval (Appendix E), the survey instrument was administered to a convenience sampling of undergraduate college students enrolled in upper division courses at the University of Central Florida. Prior to distribution, the researcher was introduced to each class by the professor as a graduate student seeking to fulfill the thesis requirement as stated by the Nicholson School of Communication. The experimenter explained the purpose behind the research while appropriately concealing topics that might have biased participants' responses.

The researcher proceeded to distribute the survey making sure to note both verbally and through a written statement (Appendix C) that participation was completely voluntary and cooperation or lack thereof would not affect their final grade. The participants were assured that their anonymity would be secured due to the fact that any identifying data, such as name or student identification number, would not be collected. Furthermore, it was explained that because the survey was administered with a waiver of consent, signatures were not required and would not influence the participants' anonymity.

After completion of the survey, each participant placed their survey, either answered or unanswered, in a manila envelope in the front of the class. As ensured by the written statement, no record was kept guaranteeing that there would be no connectivity between the student and the survey. Responses were then immediately entered into the SPSS program, and all data were locked and stored in order to secure privacy.

Dependent Variables

After reading the stimulus scenarios, participants responded to various questions designed to measure Social Attractiveness, Perceived Homophily, and Attributional Confidence. Table 1 illustrates the mean findings.

Social Attractiveness was measured by using a variation of the Interpersonal Attraction Scale created and employed by McCroskey and McCain (1974). The original 7-point, 15-item, Likert scale was adapted to include only 10-items which focused exclusively on social and personal liking factors (e.g. “This person is friendly,” “This person is likeable,” “This person is warm,” see Appendix A). The reliability of the original scale is significant due the fact that it has a reported coefficient alpha of .86 for the social attraction dimension (McCroskey & McCain, 1974). The alpha reliability found in the present data set is .92. Similar results have been reported by various researchers (Ayres, 1989; Brandt, 1979; Duran & Kelly, 1988; Wheelers, Frymier & Thompson, 1992).

Perceived homophily was measured using the Perceived Homophily Measure created by McCroskey, Richmond, and Daly (1975). The 7-point semantic differential scale, which represents two dimensions of homophily, was employed to measure how similar the participants felt they were to the character portrayed in the stimulus paragraph (Appendix A). As observed by several researchers, the reliability of this instrument is significant due to the fact that it has a reported coefficient alpha of .71 for background factors affecting homophily and a coefficient alpha of .88 for attitude factors affecting homophily (Elliot, 1979; Gudykunst, 1985; Gudykunst, et al., 1985). The alpha reliability found in the present data set is .72.

Attributional Confidence, or predictability, was measured using the Attributional Confidence Scale developed by Clatterbuck (1976). The 7-question scale (Appendix A), which asks respondents to rate their confidence on a scale of 0% to 100%, was employed to measure how confident participants felt they were able to predict certain facts or behaviors about the character described in the stimulus paragraph. This measure is deemed reliable considering it has reported Cronbach alphas ranging from .76 to .97 (Clatterbuck, 1979; Gudykunst, 1985; Kellermann & Reynolds, 1990; Wheelless & Williams, 1992). The data for this study produced an alpha reliability coefficient of .89.

Table 1: Descriptive Statistics

	Experimental Ethnicity	Experimental Condition	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Social Attractiveness	Asian	Passive	2.98	1.05	105
		Active	5.07	1.20	110
	American	Passive	2.98	1.23	105
		Active	5.00	0.99	105
Perceived Homophily	Asian	Passive	3.42	1.05	105
		Active	4.01	0.93	110
	American	Passive	3.44	1.13	106
		Active	4.09	0.30	105
Attributional Confidence	Asian	Passive	43.18	23.25	105
		Active	56.71	23.75	110
	American	Passive	41.60	24.08	106
		Active	52.19	24.92	105

CHAPTER FOUR: FINDINGS

Research questions 1a, 2a, and 3a asked whether or not the level of classroom activity predicted socially attractiveness, homophily, or predictability, respectively. Research questions 1, 2, and 3 were examined by computing a 2 (Asian v. American) by 2 (Active v. Passive) Multivariate Analysis of Variance (MANOVA) with social attractiveness, perceived homophily and predictability as dependent variables. A significant multivariate effect was found for level of classroom activity, Pillai's Trace = .463, $F(3, 413) = 118.75$, $p < .0001$, $\eta^2 = .463$. Follow up analysis of simple effects indicate that passive AIS students are perceived to be less socially attractive, $t(213) = -13.49$, $p < .001$, less similar, $t(213) = -4.32$, $p < .001$, and less predictable $t(213) = -4.12$, $p < .001$ than active AIS students.

Research questions 2a, 2b, and 2c examined whether or not American students judge passive AIS students differently than they do American students that behave in the same passive manner. The MANOVA produced no significant results for the Target Ethnicity X Activity interaction, Pillai's Trace = .001, $F(3, 420) = .195$, $p = .90$ (See Table 2 for summary of MANOVA results). In order to ensure that none of the results in this analysis were qualified by target sex, a 2 (Target Sex) X 2 (Target Ethnicity) X 2 (Level of Activity) MANOVA was performed. None of the interactions were significant; therefore, sex of target will not be considered further.

Table 2: MANOVA results table

Source of Variance	Dependent Variable	SS ²	df	<i>F</i>	<i>p</i>	Partial η^2
Ethnicity	Social Attractiveness Perceived	0.16	1.00	0.13	0.72	0.00
	Homophily	0.31	1.00	0.32	0.57	0.00
	Predictability	1108.46	1.00	1.92	0.17	0.01
Activity	Social Attractiveness Perceived	449.27	1.00	351.30	0.00	0.45
	Homophily	40.68	1.00	41.56	0.00	0.09
	Predictability	15031.67	1.00	26.08	0.00	0.06
Ethnicity X Activity	Social Attractiveness Perceived	0.14	1.00	0.11	0.74	0.00
	Homophily	0.11	1.00	0.11	0.74	0.00
	Predictability	177.27	1.00	0.31	0.58	0.00
Error	Social Attractiveness Perceived	539.68	422.00			
	Homophily	413.05	422.00			
	Predictability	243271.19	422.00			

CHAPTER FIVE: DISCUSSION AND LIMITATIONS

Discussion of Findings

Due to the fact that findings suggest that passivity, or less active social behavior is perceived as less desirable than active social behavior regardless of ethnicity, the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students seems to have less to do with negative bias or ethnic prejudice and more to do with an overall hesitation to converse with introverted individuals. Considering that American students perceived both the American character and the AIS character in the passive role as equally undesirable, findings suggest that American students generally prefer social partners that exhibit active classroom behavior. In fact, American students perceived the characters, both AIS and American students, in the active role as more socially attractive than those characters portrayed in a passive role. Likewise, American students perceived themselves as more similarly linked to those characters portrayed in an active role than those portrayed in reserved or passive ones. Furthermore, American students perceived the characters in passive roles as less predictable than those in active roles, regardless of whether the characters were AIS or American students. In this, it is illustrated that ethnicity plays a rather insignificant role in the selection of desirable social partners; and therefore, does not significantly contribute to the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students.

Nonetheless, while American students may not exclude AIS as possible social partners based on their ethnicity alone, social interaction between AIS and American students remains idle. It is suggested that an underlying reason behind this phenomenon is directly linked with contrasting cultural views as to what acceptable classroom behavior should be. As previously

noted, Asian students are expected and encouraged to demonstrate passivity during class (Hofstede, 2001; Saville-Troike, 1985; Malinowski, 1923; Pan, 2000; Lebra, 1987, Tatar, 2005, Beykont, 2002). For this reason, AIS are typically more reserved during class discussion than their American peers simply because their typical pattern of classroom behavior has been defined by a different set of cultural codes (Hofstede, 2001). Unfortunately, Americans view passivity as a social deterrent. Therefore, because AIS typically display passive roles within the classroom, American students are less likely to engage in social interaction with them simply because American students do not find passive individuals socially appealing. Hence, the social integration dilemma persists.

One way to aid in the relief of this social dilemma is to create in-class social activities that help AIS become more active during classroom discussion. Considering that American students find individuals that display active social roles to be more socially appealing, if AIS take on more active social roles during classroom discussion, American students should perceive them as more socially appealing, and therefore, will be more likely to engage in social interaction. In other words, one way to extinguish the social dilemma facing AIS and American students is to encourage AIS to become more vocal during classroom discussion by creating and employing classroom activities that promote socialization between AIS and American students. Also, clubs and organizations should be created in order to aid AIS in building social networks with American students. Furthermore, increased awareness about this social dilemma should be made public in order to encourage American students to learn about these social barriers and hopefully show American students that passive classroom behavior does not necessarily signify poor social interaction skills.

Limitations

Some of the methodological limitations associated with this study involve the fact that while the descriptive paragraphs were identical in wording, and indeed portrayed AIS and American students in both the passive and active condition, it is possible that the participants did not fully grasp that the portrayed characters were indeed AIS students or American students depending on the condition they received. Considering that the only means to distinguish ethnicity between characters was by reading whether the character was called by a typical Asian name, or a typical American name, it is not certain that the participants assumed that the characters belonged to either group. While the likelihood that they did gather the character's ethnicity is assumed, it must be observed that no language describing the ethnicity of the participant, other than the name itself, was used. Therefore, it is a possibility that the manipulation check did not work as sufficiently as expected. In fact, it is possible that the participants did not gather that the characters were AIS based solely on their name, thus accounting for the reported levels of perceived homophily found amongst Asian students and American students alike.

Furthermore, considering that the research used stimulus paragraphs in lieu of actual human examples, there could be some variance in how participants interpreted the paragraph and how they might actually interpret the behavior if observed in daily life. While it is believed to have been minimized in the conducted study, it is a concern and should not be ruled out as a possible limitation.

Lastly, considering participants were gathered mainly from programs that do not typically have large numbers of AIS enrolled, it is possible that the participants may not be as familiar

with the interactions between AIS and American students as other programs of study. For example, programs including Engineering, Computer Science, Mathematics, Business, or Physical Science, typically have larger populations of AIS enrolled than do programs such as Communication or Education. It is possible that participants recruited from these programs may perceive AIS classroom behavior differently due to increased exposure. Furthermore, considering that the dynamic of these classrooms may operate differently than those found within Communication or Education classes, one limitation facing this research is the fact that these programs were not incorporated into the study.

Implications for Future Research

In an effort to progress knowledge and understanding surrounding the aspect of AIS and their relationships within American institutions, the following avenues of research should be explored:

First, while the study sought to investigate the perspectives of American students towards AIS' use of silence and passivity within American classrooms, it did not inquire about the perspectives of American teachers and their observations about the social dilemma facing AIS and American students. In fact, it would be interesting to incorporate the perceptions of teachers in order to unveil perhaps additional explanations concerning the social integration dilemma and perhaps by doing so more effective classroom discussion could emerge due to development of effective socialization activities and practices.

Secondly, although the findings of this study do enhance our understanding about the social gap between AIS and American students, there are still many questions unanswered that

could be explored more thoroughly by using a mix-mode method of both qualitative and quantitative research. Due to the fact that this type of research requires exploring the perceptions of American students, it is suggested that focus groups, interviews, and other qualitative research is initiated in order to further develop the findings of this study.

Also, future researchers may want to explore the mindsets of AIS in order to determine how they feel they are being perceived or misunderstood by American students and teachers. These studies, which could conduct interviews with AIS and American students alike, may wish to explore the experiences of AIS passivity and inquire about their perception of American student's classroom behavior.

Lastly, research focusing on specific interactions between American students and AIS could deeply influence the literature within this realm of research. In fact, by understanding specific interactions and exchanges between AIS and American students, researchers could explore more challenges facing AIS and American students and can propose better practices to close the social gap between these two groups. Furthermore, these studies could lead to a better understanding of how these cultures perceive each other, and therefore could help in the progression of more exploratory studies focusing on AIS.

CHAPTER SIX: CONCLUSIONS

This study served as a starting point to a hopefully prosperous research endeavor aimed at unveiling and exploring factors contributing to a social integration dilemma faced by AIS and American students. While the findings of this study show that culturally shaped differences in acceptability of student passivity during classroom discussion is a main cause of dormant socialization between AIS and American students, progress towards remedying this problem is still an enduring struggle that American universities should take into consideration. Although the study shows that this social barrier excludes the possibility of racial prejudice as a significant contributor, it should be noted that while American students are open to conversing with all ethnicities, they are hindering themselves by choosing not to socialize with individuals portraying passive classroom behavior; hence, avoiding conversation with AIS. By doing this, American students are depriving themselves of enriching and didactic communication that is necessary in order to understand and function in an ever-growing global society.

Due to the fact that “American society is more diverse now than at any previous time”(Keller, 2001); the importance behind bridging cultural gaps is not only a necessary means to promote a better understanding within the classroom, but more so, it is becoming increasingly more essential in order to aid students in their future career endeavors. There is no doubt that international students contribute to the college experience by introducing diverse patterns of behavior and new ideas based on cultural differences, however, what is perhaps most significant about the integration of international students into university settings is that it provides for an enlightening realm in which students can develop into culturally competent individuals with the ability to work effectively with various cultures and societies (Carnevale, 1999; Mori, 2000; Tan, 1994; Sandhu, 1995; Smith & Schonfeld, 2000; Zhao et al., 2005). Unfortunately, due to the

social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students, the efforts behind blending these communities are lamentably being wasted.

The efforts behind this study strongly suggest that socialization workshops or other socially encouraging activities need to be more adamantly incorporated within university classrooms. American universities need to find ways to dilute the avoidance of passive students by American students by introducing classroom activities that encourage social interaction between passive and active students, and therefore, encourage socialization between AIS and American students. Furthermore, this study suggests that further research is essential in order to extinguish the social integration dilemma facing AIS and American students.

APPENDIX A: DEPENDENT AND DEMOGRAPHIC MEASUREMENT INSTRUMENTS

*****If you have already participated in this survey, please DO NOT continue.**

Instead, return this survey UNANSWERED.***

1. What is your age in years? _____

2. Please circle your class standing at UCF:

Freshman Sophomore Junior Senior Graduate

3. Please circle your gender: MALE FEMALE

4. Please circle the race below that most accurately describes you:

Black or African-American

American Indian or Alaskan Native

Asian or Asian-American (includes Chinese, Japanese, Korean, Filipino)

White or Caucasian

Hispanic or Latin American Ethnicity

Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander

Multiracial, please specify: _____

Other race, please specify: _____

5. Please read the description below and then answer the following questions to the best of your ability.

Meifeng sits in the first row of her class. During the class lecture, she often raises her hand to answer the teacher's questions and almost always has something to add from the course book. She is vocal in her opinions, and during class discussions she often references the class readings in support of her claims. She works well in groups and often takes on the role of "team leader." When she realizes that her group has been making a mistake, she not only adamantly points the problem out, but also, she invites her group to extend their meetings at her apartment in order to fix the problem. Between lectures, Meifeng often makes small-talk with nearby classmates and seems to have a lot of "in class" friends. After receiving a test grade that is lower than expected, Meifeng approaches her professor after class to discuss the grade. She then makes appointments with her professor during office hours to discuss confusing notes or subjects that may be on the next test.

6. Please rate your agreement with each statement while keeping in mind the person described in the paragraph above.

1. This person is friendly.	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
2. This person is likeable.	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
3. This person is warm.	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
4. This person is approachable	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
5. I would ask this person for advice	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
6. I would like this person as a coworker	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
7. I would like this person as a roommate	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
8. I would like to be friends with this person	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
9. This person is similar to me	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree
10. This person is knowledgeable	Very Strongly Disagree 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 Very Strongly Agree

7. Instructions: On the scale below, please indicate your feelings about the character portrayed in the above classroom scenario. Circle the number that best represents your feelings. Numbers “1” and “7” indicate a *very strong feeling*. Numbers “2” and “6” indicate a *strong feeling*. Numbers “3” and “5” indicate a *fairly weak feeling*. Number “4” indicates you are *undecided* or *don’t know*. Please work quickly. There are no right or wrong answers

Doesn't think like me From social class similar to mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Thinks like me From social class different from mine
Behaves like me Economic situation different from mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Doesn't behave like me Economic situation like mine
Similar to me	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Different from me
Status like mine Unlike me Background different from mine	1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Status different from mine Like me Background similar to mine

8. Instructions: The questions which follow will ask you to express how confident you are that you know a particular fact about the person who is described in the above classroom scenario. On these questions, the answers should be written as a percentage, anywhere from 0% to 100%. For example, if you are totally confident that you know a particular fact, you might write 100%. If you were slightly less confident, you might put a number like 93%. On the other hand, if you were not at all confident you might place a very low percentage, like 5% in the answer blank. If you absolutely are unable to answer a question, and the answer would be a guess for which you had no basis at all, you might put 0%. Remember, you may use any evidence as basis for your guess, even if the person has not explicitly told you the answer. We are interested in your confidence in the guess only; do not give the actual answer to the question.

How confident are you of your general ability to predict how she will behave? _____

How certain are you that she likes you? _____

How accurate are you at predicting the values she holds? _____

How accurate are you at predicting her attitudes? _____

How well can you predict her feelings and emotions? _____

How much can you empathize with (share) the way she feels about himself? _____

How well do you know her? _____

APPENDIX B: EXPERIMENTAL STIMULI

Target Ethnicity	Target Sex	Active	Passive
American	Male	<p>Peter sits in the first row of his class. During the class lecture, he often raises his hand to answer the teacher's questions and almost always has something to add from the course book. He is vocal in his opinions, and during class discussions he often references the class readings in support of his claims. He works well in groups and often takes on the role of "team leader." When he realizes that his group has been making a mistake, he not only adamantly points the problem out, but also, he invites his group to extend their meetings at his apartment in order to fix the problem. Between lectures, Peter often makes small-talk with nearby classmates and seems to have a lot of "in class" friends. After receiving a test grade that is lower than expected, Peter approaches his professor after class to discuss the grade. He then makes appointments with his professor during office hours to discuss confusing notes or subjects that may be on the next test</p>	<p>Peter sits in the last rows of his class. He usually does not talk too much with his peers before class starts, and while he is in class he remains quiet as he takes notes. He rarely makes eye contact with the professor, and when he does, it is only in short bursts. He never raises his hand to answer the professor's questions even if he knows he has the right answer. When his professor assigns group work, he is the last to join a group and often remains quiet and isolated until his peers invite him into a group. While working with his peers, he often remains quiet spending the majority of the time listening and writing down notes while the group discusses. After working with the group for several days, he realizes that his group may be making a mistake according to the class syllabus. He starts to bring attention to the mistake, but after a couple of his peers disagreed with him he quickly ceases to discuss the topic in order to avoid confrontation. At the end of class the professor hands out graded tests from the week before. To Peter's surprise, he received a grade that was much lower than expected. Although he is on the brink of failing, he does not disclose his grade to any of his peers and does not approach his professor for possible studying tips. Instead, he remains quiet and hides his test inside his folder and quietly exits the classroom.</p>

American	Female	<p>Megan sits in the first row of her class. During the class lecture, she often raises her hand to answer the teacher's questions and almost always has something to add from the course book. She is vocal in her opinions, and during class discussions she often references the class readings in support of her claims. She works well in groups and often takes on the role of "team leader." When she realizes that her group has been making a mistake, she not only adamantly points the problem out, but also, she invites her group to extend their meetings at her apartment in order to fix the problem. Between lectures, Megan often makes small-talk with nearby classmates and seems to have a lot of "in class" friends. After receiving a test grade that is lower than expected, Megan approaches her professor after class to discuss the grade. She then makes appointments with her professor during office hours to discuss confusing notes or subjects that may be on the next test.</p>	<p>Megan sits in the last rows of her class. She usually does not talk too much with her peers before class starts, and while she is in class she remains quiet as she takes notes. She rarely makes eye contact with the professor, and when she does, it is only in short bursts. She never raises her hand to answer the professor's questions even if she has the right answer. When her professor assigns group work, she is the last to join a group and often remains quiet and isolated until her peers invite her into a group. While working with her peers, she often remains quiet spending the majority of the time listening and writing down notes while the group discusses. After working with the group for several days, she realizes that her group may be making a mistake according to the class syllabus. She starts to bring attention to the mistake, but after a couple of her peers disagreed with her she quickly ceases to discuss the topic in order to avoid confrontation. At the end of class the professor hands out graded tests from the week before. To Megan's surprise, she received a grade that was much lower than expected. Although she is on the brink of failing, she does not disclose her grade to any of her peers and does not approach her professor for possible studying tips. Instead, she remains quiet and hides her test inside her folder and quietly exits the classroom.</p>
----------	--------	---	--

Asian	Male	<p>Zhong sits in the first row of his class. During the class lecture, he often raises his hand to answer the teacher's questions and almost always has something to add from the course book. He is vocal in his opinions, and during class discussions he often references the class readings in support of his claims. He works well in groups and often takes on the role of "team leader." When he realizes that his group has been making a mistake, he not only adamantly points the problem out, but also, he invites his group to extend their meetings at his apartment in order to fix the problem. Between lectures, Zhong often makes small-talk with nearby classmates and seems to have a lot of "in class" friends. After receiving a test grade that is lower than expected, Zhong approaches his professor after class to discuss the grade. He then makes appointments with his professor during office hours to discuss confusing notes or subjects that may be on the next test.</p>	<p>Zhong sits in the last rows of his class. He usually does not talk too much with his peers before class starts, and while he is in class he remains quiet as he takes notes. He rarely makes eye contact with the professor, and when he does, it is only in short bursts. He never raises his hand to answer the professor's questions even if he knows he has the right answer. When his professor assigns group work, he is the last to join a group and often remains quiet and isolated until his peers invite him into a group. While working with his peers, he often remains quiet spending the majority of the time listening and writing down notes while the group discusses. After working with the group for several days, he realizes that his group may be making a mistake according to the class syllabus. He starts to bring attention to the mistake, but after a couple of his peers disagreed with him he quickly ceases to discuss the topic in order to avoid confrontation. At the end of class the professor hands out graded tests from the week before. To Zhong's surprise, he received a grade that was much lower than expected. Although he is on the brink of failing, he does not disclose his grade to any of his peers and does not approach his professor for possible studying tips. Instead, he remains quiet and hides his test inside his folder and quietly exits the classroom.</p>
-------	------	---	--

Asian	Female	<p>Meifeng sits in the first row of her class. During the class lecture, she often raises her hand to answer the teacher's questions and almost always has something to add from the course book. She is vocal in her opinions, and during class discussions she often references the class readings in support of her claims. She works well in groups and often takes on the role of "team leader." When she realizes that her group has been making a mistake, she not only adamantly points the problem out, but also, she invites her group to extend their meetings at her apartment in order to fix the problem. Between lectures, Meifeng often makes small-talk with nearby classmates and seems to have a lot of "in class" friends. After receiving a test grade that is lower than expected, Meifeng approaches her professor after class to discuss the grade. She then makes appointments with her professor during office hours to discuss confusing notes or subjects that may be on the next test.</p>	<p>Meifeng sits in the last rows of her class. She usually does not talk too much with her peers before class starts, and while she is in class she remains quiet as she takes notes. She rarely makes eye contact with the professor, and when she does, it is only in short bursts. She never raises her hand to answer the professor's questions even if she has the right answer. When her professor assigns group work, she is the last to join a group and often remains quiet and isolated until her peers invite her into a group. While working with her peers, she often remains quiet spending the majority of the time listening and writing down notes while the group discusses. After working with the group for several days, she realizes that her group may be making a mistake according to the class syllabus. She starts to bring attention to the mistake, but after a couple of her peers disagreed with her she quickly ceases to discuss the topic in order to avoid confrontation. At the end of class the professor hands out graded tests from the week before. To Meifeng's surprise, she received a grade that was much lower than expected. Although she is on the brink of failing, she does not disclose her grade to any of her peers and does not approach her professor for possible studying tips. Instead, she remains quiet and hides her test inside her folder and quietly exits the classroom.</p>
-------	--------	---	--

APPENDIX C: WAIVER OF INFORMED CONSENT

Informed Consent

Date

Dear Student,

I, Audra Nuru, am a graduate student at the University of Central Florida. As part of my coursework, I am conducting a research study in which I am asking for your participation. **The purpose of this study is to observe your feelings and expectations of the characters portrayed in the given scenario.** Any information you provide will be used in fulfillment for the Master's requirement for the Fall 2008 semester at the Nicholson School of Communication and in any subsequent academic publications.

To participate in this study, you will be asked to complete a survey which will take approximately 15 minutes to complete. **You must be 18 years of age or older to participate in this study, and you may not have previously participated.** There are no other requirements for participation in this survey, and you will not be contacted about your participation. You can be assured that your anonymity will be secured due to the fact that your identity will not be revealed at any point in the survey. Your identity will not be matched to the survey at any time. Your responses will be input and stored anonymously in a locked filing cabinet. Once input into digital format, the data will be stored in a password-protected file. Individual responses will not be included in the thesis or any other publication.

There are no anticipated risks, compensation or other direct benefits to you as a participant in this survey. Your participation or non-participation on this survey will not affect your class grade. Your professor will not be informed as to your participation or non-participation in this study. You may discontinue your participation in the survey at any time without consequence. You may also choose to leave any questions on the survey blank if you do not wish to answer.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at (321) 754-1147 or by my email at anuru784@yahoo.com. My faculty supervisor, Dr. Harry Weger, may be contacted at (407) 823-6355 or by email at hwweger@pegasus.cc.ucf.edu. Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to:

**Institutional Review Board Office, IRB Coordinator
University of Central Florida
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida, 32826-0150
Telephone number:(407) 823-2901**

If you agree to voluntarily participate in this survey as described **and are over the age of 18**, please indicate your agreement by completing and returning the attached survey. **Please retain this page for your reference.** Thank you for your participation in this research.

APPENDIX D: IRB SUBMISSION FORM



UCF IRB Protocol Submission Form

Initial Resubmission of IRB # _____

Please type this form using the MicroSoft Word document. Expand as needed. Allow a minimum of 2-3 weeks for the approval process. A letter of approval will be mailed to you once approved. Information on this form must match information on the grant application, dissertation or thesis, consent forms or letters, and flyers for recruitment. **There are no deadlines for submission of minimal risk studies as they are reviewed at least weekly.** If it is deemed by the IRB that the study involves greater than minimal risk or extenuating factors, the complete IRB packet must be submitted by the 1st business day of the month for consideration at that monthly IRB meeting. At title note if investigator is Student, Masters Candidate or Doctoral Candidate.

1. Title of Protocol: Misconceptions about Silence: How American students perceive Asian international students' use of silence within the classroom.

2. Principal Investigator:

Signature:

Name: **Audra Nuru**

Mr./Ms./Mrs./Dr. (choose one) **Ms.**

E-Mail: **anuru784@yahoo.com**

Employee ID or Student PID #: **A1183601**

Degree: **M.A. candidate**

Title: **Student**

Department: **Communication**

College: **Sciences**

Telephone: **813-629-3702**

Facsimile: **none**

Home Telephone: **813-949-0360**

Co-Investigator: Dr. Harry Weger

Signature:

Name: **Harry Weger**

Mr./Ms./Mrs./Dr. (choose one) **Dr.**

E-Mail: **hweger@mail.ucf.edu**

Student PID #: **H**

Degree: **Ph.D.**

Title: **Professor**

Department: **Communication**

College: **Sciences**

Telephone: **407-823-2859**

Facsimile: **407-823-6360**

Home Telephone: **407-823-2859**

3. Supervisor:

Signature:

Name: **Dr. Harry Weger**

4. Collaborating institution(s) and researcher(s)

University of Central Florida

5. Dates of proposed project (cannot be retroactive) From: **IRB approval** To: **10/30/08**

6. Source of funding for the project (project title, agency, account/proposal # or “Unfunded”):
Unfunded

7. Scientific purpose of the investigation:

The purpose of this investigation is to determine if American students expect different classroom behavior from Asian international students than they do from their American peers; and, if so, to observe whether or not these expectations influence the perceived social attractiveness of the Asian international students.

8. Describe the research methodology in non-technical language.

Methodology will be quantitative and will include examining survey responses of American students about a given scenario that will either depict an active student or a reserved student. All “active student” descriptions will be worded exactly the same; also, all “reserved student” descriptions will be worded identically. The only changing factor between the scenarios will be whether or not the character being portrayed is an American or an Asian international student, and whether or not the character is male or female. Surveys will be distributed to various students enrolled in general education classes held at the University of Central Florida. Survey responses will be data entered and empirically analyzed. Participants will remain completely anonymous, and their responses will be secured so that there will be no further connection between the participant and the survey.

9. Describe the potential benefits and anticipated risks and the steps that will be taken to minimize risks and protect participants.

There are no direct benefits or risks of this study. The identity of the participants will remain completely anonymous. There will be no connection between the participant and the survey. In fact, a waiver of informed consent will be used to ensure that connectivity between the participant and the survey remains unrecognized. In order to ensure protection of anonymity and privacy, the participants’ identities will not be revealed in any resulting papers or publications. The surveys will be stored in a locked filing cabinet for three years, and any files containing data about the survey will be stored in password protected files.

10. Describe how participants will be recruited, how many you hope to recruit, the age of participants, and proposed compensation.

Participants will be recruited from undergraduate, general education speech classes in the Fall 2008 semester. Participants will be at least 18 years of age and enrolled in general education classes held at the Nicholson School of Communication. Written permission to conduct this study has been obtained from professors of the following classes:

11. Describe the informed consent process.

Participants will be given the waiver of informed consent form for review prior to administration of the survey. The participants will be informed both verbally and on the typed waiver of consent form that by responding to the survey indicates consent. After either filling out the survey, or turning in a blank survey, participants will retain the waiver of consent form which will clearly state appropriate contact information as well as the purpose of the study. Please see attachments.

12. Describe any protected health information (PHI) you plan to obtain from a HIPAA-covered medical facility or UCF designated HIPAA component.

None.

I approve this protocol for submission to the UCF IRB.

_____/

Department Chair/Director Date

Cooperating Department (if more than one Dept. involved)

_____/

Department Chair/Director Date

Note: If required signatures are missing, the form will be returned to the PI unprocessed.

APPENDIX E: IRB APPROVAL LETTER



University of Central Florida Institutional Review Board
Office of Research & Commercialization
12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501
Orlando, Florida 32826-3246
Telephone: 407-823-2901, 407-882-2012 or 407-882-2276
www.research.ucf.edu/compliance/irb.html

Notice of Expedited Initial Review and Approval

From : UCF Institutional Review Board
FWA00000351, Exp. 6/24/11, IRB00001138

To : Audra Nuru

Date : September 29, 2008

IRB Number: SBE-08-05818

Study Title: **Misconceptions About Silence: How American Students Perceive Asian International Students' Use of Silence within the room**

Dear Researcher:

Your research protocol noted above was approved by **expedited** review by the UCF IRB Vice-chair on 9/26/2008. **The expiration date is 9/25/2009.** Your study was determined to be minimal risk for human subjects and expeditable per federal regulations, 45 CFR 46.110. The category for which this study qualifies as expeditable research is as follows:

7. Research on individual or group characteristics or behavior (including, but not limited to, research on perception, cognition, motivation, identity, language, communication, cultural beliefs or practices, and social behavior) or research employing survey, interview, oral history, focus group, program evaluation, human factors evaluation, or quality assurance methodologies.

A **waiver of documentation of consent** has been approved for all subjects. Participants do not have to sign a consent form, but the IRB requires that you give participants a copy of the IRB-approved consent form, letter, information sheet, or statement of voluntary consent at the top of the survey.

All data, which may include signed consent form documents, must be retained in a locked file cabinet for a minimum of three years (six if HIPAA applies) past the completion of this research. Any links to the identification of participants should be maintained on a password-protected computer if electronic information is used. Additional requirements may be imposed by your funding agency, your department, or other entities. Access to data is limited to authorized individuals listed as key study personnel.

To continue this research beyond the expiration date, a Continuing Review Form must be submitted 2 – 4 weeks prior to the expiration date. Advise the IRB if you receive a subpoena for the release of this information, or if a breach of confidentiality occurs. Also report any unanticipated problems or serious adverse events (within 5 working days). Do not make changes to the protocol methodology or consent form before obtaining IRB approval. Changes can be submitted for IRB review using the Addendum/Modification Request Form. An Addendum/Modification Request Form **cannot** be used to extend the approval period of a study. All forms may be completed and submitted online at <http://iris.research.ucf.edu>.

Failure to provide a continuing review report could lead to study suspension, a loss of funding and/or publication possibilities, or reporting of noncompliance to sponsors or funding agencies. The IRB maintains the authority under 45 CFR 46.110(e) to observe or have a third party observe the consent process and the research.

On behalf of Tracy Dietz, Ph.D., UCF IRB Chair, this letter is signed by:

Signature applied by Janice Turchin on 09/29/2008 02:27:35 PM EDT

IRB Coordinator

APPENDIX F: EMAIL RECRUITMENT LETTER

Dear Professor,

I am conducting a study as part of the thesis requirements in order to obtain a Master's degree from the Nicholson School of Communication. I am hoping that you can help me fulfill this requirement by allowing me to come and administer a quick survey in your class. The survey should take somewhere between 15-20 minutes of the class period. Participation is completely voluntary and does not present any risks or benefits to the participants. The survey will involve a quick description of a classroom scenario coupled with questions pertaining to that description. The purpose of this study is simply to observe students' feelings and expectations of the character portrayed in the given scenario. I realize that this may be a hectic time for many of you, however, I would be incredibly grateful if you can spare just a few minutes of your class time to help me complete this project.

If you have any questions about this research project, please contact me at (321) 754-1147 or by my email at anuru784@yahoo.com. My faculty supervisor, Dr. Harry Weger, may be contacted at (407) 823-6355 or by email at hwweger@pegasus.cc.ucf.edu. Research at the University of Central Florida involving human participants is carried out under the oversight of the Institutional Review Board (IRB). Questions or concerns about research participants' rights may be directed to:

Institutional Review Board Office, IRB Coordinator

University of Central Florida

Office of Research & Commercialization

12201 Research Parkway, Suite 501

Orlando, Florida, 32826-0150

Telephone number: (407) 823-2901

Thank you,

Audra Nuru

ANuru784@yahoo.com

LIST OF REFERENCES

- Ayers, J. (1989). The impact of communication apprehension and interaction structure on initial interactions. *Communication Monographs*, 5, 4-14.
- Beykont, Z.F., & Daiute, C. (2002). Inclusiveness in higher education courses: International student perspectives. *Equity & Excellence in Education*. 35, 35-41.
- Bogardus, E.S. (1959). Social distance. *Yellow Springs*. OH: Antioch.
- Bogardus, E.S. (1967). *A forty-year racial distance study*. Los Angeles: University of Southern California Press.
- Braddock, R., Roberts, P., Zheng, C., & Guzman, T. (1995). *Survey on skill development in intercultural teaching of international students*. Macquarie University, Asia Pacific Research Institute.
- Brandt, D.R. (1979). On linking social performance with social competence: Some relations between communication style and attributions of interpersonal attractiveness and effectiveness. *Human Communication Research*, 5, 223-227.
- Carnevale, A.P. (1999). Diversity in higher education: Why corporate America cares. *Diversity Digest*. Washington, DC: Association of American Colleges and Universities [Online]. Available: <http://www.diversityweb.org/Digest/Sp99/corporate.html>
- Chandler, D. (1983). *A history of Cambodia*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Clancy, P. (1986). The acquisition of communicative style in Japanese. In B. Schieffelin & E. Ochs (Eds.), *Language and Socialization across Cultures* (p.213-250). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Clatterbuck, G.W. (1976). Attributional confidence and uncertainty in initial interaction. *Human Communication Research*, 2, 33-50.

- Corcoran, C.B., & Thompson, A.R. (2004). 'What's race got to do with it?': Denial of racism on predominantly white college campuses. In J.L. Chin (Ed.), *The psychology of prejudice and discrimination: Racism in America* (Vol. 1) (pp. 137-176). Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Duran, R.L., & Kelly, L. (1988). The influence of communicative competence on perceived task, social, and physical attraction. *Communication Quarterly*, 36, 41-49.
- Dougherty, T.W., & Wall, J.A. (1991). Teaching in China during the age of reform. *Journal of Management Education*, 15(2), 232-243.
- Elliott, S. (1979). Perceived homophily as a predictor of classroom learning. *Communication Yearbook*, 3, 585-602.
- Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction Ritual*. Pantheon: New York.
- Gudykunst, W.B., & Kim, Y.Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. New York: Newbery Award Records, Inc.
- Gudykunst, W. B. (1985). The influence of cultural similarity, type of relationship, and self-monitoring on uncertainty reduction processes. *Communication Monographs*, 52, 203-217.
- Gudykunst, W. B., Yang, S.M., & Nishida, T. (1985). A cross-cultural test of uncertainty reduction theory: Comparisons of acquaintances, friends, and dating relationships in Japan, Korea, and the United States. *Human Communication Research*, 11, 407-454.
- Hall, R. (2002). Pseudo-racism among Chicano(a), Asian and African Americans: Implications of the black/white dichotomy. *The Social Science Journal*, 39, 109-112.
- Hofstede, G. H. (2001). *Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

- Hune, S. (2002). Demographics and diversity of Asian American college students. In M.K. McEwen, C.M. Kodama, A.N. Alvarez, S. Lee, and C.T.H. Liang (Eds.), *New directions for student services* (pp.11-20). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Hwang, A., Ang, S., & Francesco, A. (2002). The silent Chinese: The influence of face and kiasuism on student feedback-seeking behaviors. *Journal of Management Education*, 26, 70-98.
- Institute of International Education , (2007, November 12). Fall 2007 International Student Enrollment Survey: Survey Report. Retrieved March 27, 2008, from IIENetwork.org
Web site: <http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=Fall2007Survey>
- Jenkins, S. (2000). Cultural and linguistic miscues: A case study of international teaching assistant and academic faculty miscommunication. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 24(4), 477-501.
- Jones, E., & Nisbett, R. (1972). *The actor and the observer*. Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press.
- Jones, J. (1999). From silence to talk: Cross cultural ideas on students' participation in academic group discussion. *English for Specific Purposes*, 18, 243-259.
- Karlins, M., Coffman, T., & Walters, G. (1969). On the fading of social stereotypes: Studies in three generations of college students. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 13, 1-16.
- Katz, D., & Braly, K.W. (1933). Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. *Journal Of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 30, 175-193.
- Keller, G. (2001). The new demographics of higher education. *Review of Higher Education*, 24(3), 219-235.

- Kellermann, K., & Reynolds, R. (1990). When ignorance is bliss: The role of motivation to reduce uncertainty in uncertainty reduction theory. *Human Communication Research, 17*, 5-75.
- Ladd, P., & Ruby, R. (1999). Learning styles and adjustment issues of international students. *Journal of Education for Business, 74*, 363-368.
- Lebra, T.S. (1987). The cultural significance of silence in Japanese communication. *Multilingua, 6*(4), 343-357.
- Leong, F., & Schneller, G. (1997). White Americans. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development, 25*, 68-78.
- Levin, J. (1981). *The functions of prejudice and discrimination*. New York: HarperCollins.
- Lin, J.G., & Yi, J.K. (1997). Asian international students' adjustment: Issues and program suggestions. *College Student Journal, 31*, 473-480.
- Lin, M.H., Kwan, V.S., Cheung, A., & Fiske, S.T. (2005). Stereotypes content model explains prejudice for an envied outgroup: Scale of anti-Asian American stereotypes. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31*, 34-47.
- Liu, N., & Littlewood, W. (1997). Why do many students appear reluctant to participate in classroom learning discourse. *System, 25*, 371-384.
- Loveday, L. (1982). *The sociolinguistics of learning and using a non-native language*. Oxford: Pergamon.
- Malinowski, B. (1923). The problem of meaning in primitive languages. In Ogden, C. and Richards, I. (Eds.), *The meaning of meaning*. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 296-336.
- Marger, M.N. (1994). *Race and ethnic relations: American and global perspectives* (3rd ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

- McCroskey, J. C., & McCain, T. A. (1974). The measurement of attraction. *Speech Monographs*, 41, 261-266.
- McCroskey, J.C., Richmond, V.P., & Daly, J.A. (1975). The development of a measure of perceived homophily in interpersonal communication. *Human Communication Research*, 1, 323-332.
- McLemore, S.D., & Romo, H.D. (1998). *Racial and ethnic relations in America* (5th ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- McPherson, M., Smith-Lovin, L., & Cook, J.M. (2001). Birds of a feather: Homophily in social networks. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 27, 415-444.
- Mori, S. (2000). Addressing the mental health concerns of international students. *Journal of Counseling & Development*, 78, 137-144.
- Mulligan, D., & Kirkpatrick, A. (2000). How much do they understand? Lectures, students and comprehension. *Higher Education & Development*, 19, 311-335.
- Nisbett, R., Caputo, C., Legant, P., & Marecek, J. (1973). Behavior as seen by the actor and as seen by the observer. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 27, 154-165.
- Owen, C.A., Eisner, H.C., & McFaul, T.R. (1981). A half-century of social distance research: National replication of the Bogardus studies. *Sociology and Social Research*, 66, 80-98.
- Parillo, V.N., & Donoghue, C. (2005). Updating the Bogardus scale distance studies: A new national survey. *Social Science Journal*, 42, 257-273.
- Pan, Y. (2000). *Politeness in Chinese face-to-face interaction*. Stamford: Ablex.
- Sandhu, D.S. (1995). An examination of the psychological needs of the international students: Implications for counseling and psychotherapy. *International Journal for the Advancement of Counseling*, 17, 229-239.

- Saville-Troike, M. (1985). The place of silence in an integrated theory of communication. In Tannen, D. and Saville-Troike, M. (Eds.), *Perspectives on silence*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex, 3-18.
- Schaefer, R.T. (1996). *Racial and ethnic groups* (6th ed.). New York: HarperCollins.
- Simpson, G.E., & Yinger, J.M. (1972). *Racial and cultural minorities: An analysis of prejudice and discrimination* (4th ed.). New York: Harper & Row.
- Smith, T., Bowman, R., & Hsu, S. (2007). Racial attitudes among Asian and European American college students. *College Student Journal*, 41, 436-443.
- Smith, D.G., & Schondfeld, N.B. (2000). The benefits of diversity: What the research tells us. *About Campus*, 5(5), 16-23.
- Sydell, E., & Nelson, S. (2000). Modern racism on campus: A survey of attitudes and perceptions. *Social Science Journal*, 37, 627-635.
- Tan, D.L. (1994). Uniqueness of the Asian-American experience in higher education. *College Student Journal*, 4, 412-421.
- Tannen, D. (1985). Silence: Anything but. In Tannen, D. & Saville-Troike, M. (Eds.), *Perspectives on Silence*. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.
- Tatar, S (2005). Why keep silent? The classroom participation experiences of non-native-English-speaking students. *Language and Intercultural Communication*, 5, 284-293.
- Weaver, C. (2008). Social distance as a measure of prejudice among ethnic groups in the United States. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 38, 779-795.
- Wheless, L.R., Frymier, A.B., & Thompson, C.A. (1992). A comparison of verbal output and receptivity in relation to attraction and communication satisfaction in interpersonal relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, 40, 102-115.

- Wheeless, L.R., & Williamson, A.M. (1992). State-communication apprehension and uncertainty in continuing initial interactions. *Southern Communication Journal*, 57, 249-259.
- Yang, K.S. (1993). Chinese social orientation: An integrative analysis. In Cheng, L.Y., Cheung, F.M.C., & Chen, C.N. (Eds.), *Psychotherapy for the Chinese: Selected papers from the first international conference* (pp.19-56). Hong Kong: The Chinese University of Hong Kong.
- Zhao, C.M., Kuh, G.D., & Carini, R.M. (2005). A comparison of international student and American student engagement in effective educational practices. *The Journal of Higher Education*, 76, 209-231.
- Zhou, Y.R., Knoke, D., & Sakamoto, I. (2005). Rethinking silence in the classroom: Chinese students' experiences of sharing indigenous knowledge. *International Journal of Inclusive Education*, 9, 287-311.