“I don’t hate anyone... except for Asians” Residents’ stereotypes of foreign nationalities in the city of Dubrovnik

Frac, Toni

Undergraduate thesis / Završni rad

2021

Degree Grantor / Ustanova koja je dodijelila akademski / stručni stupanj: **RIT Croatia / RIT Croatia**

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:229:990629

Rights / Prava: In copyright / Zaštićeno autorskim pravom.

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-03-29**

Image not found or type unknown *Repository / Repozitorij:*

RIT Croatia Digital repository - Rochester Institute of Technology

zir.nsk.hr Image not found or type unknown

"I don't hate anyone… except for Asians"
Residents' stereotypes of foreign nationalities in the city of Dubrovnik

Toni Farac

RIT Croatia

HSPT 490: Senior Capstone Project

Prof. Vanda Bazdan

May 2021

Abstract:

Stereotypes are defined as oversimplified beliefs about things and people, widely held by a large number of people. They can be fair and reflect the real world but some of them are cruel and come from racist or discriminatory history. This research studies what effect does tourism have on stereotypes and how does it affect local's perception of tourists. A survey was administered to 122 people, asking them for opinions on tourists that visit Dubrovnik the most, and it was compared to a previous research done three years ago. The results suggested that locals form stereotypes based on tourist's behavior and how much do the foreigner's culture differ in relation to locals' own culture. As a city thriving on tourism, Dubrovnik locals encounter people from all over the world, people with different appearance, behavior and culture, and their relationship with the locals is vital to the future of Dubrovnik in tourism, so it is important that these stereotypes do not form into racism and discrimination.
Keywords: stereotypes, tourism, Dubrovnik, discrimination, hospitality, culture, behavior

Introduction

Stereotypes are defined as oversimplified beliefs about things and people, widely held by many people (Bordalo, 2016). They are ever present and influence almost everything, from racial groups and gender, to demographic groups and political parties, for example: Asians are good at math, women are unable to drive, Florida residents are old, and Republicans are always rich. Even activities can be stereotyped, like the stereotype that flying is dangerous.

While some of them are fair and reflect the real world, like the stereotype about the Dutch being tall, some are not very accurate, like all Irishmen being red headed, when only 10% are (Cardwell, 1999). Additionally, they change through time, At the beginning of the 20th century, Jews were viewed as religious and uneducated, while at the end of the century, they were viewed as ambitious and money hungry.

People use stereotypes to categorize groups of people more easily, based on the characteristics every member of the groups possesses. For example, every Hells Angels member wear leather and rides a bike (Mcleod, 2017), so, people do not have to think about every single Hells Angels member's behavior, because they should all act similarly. Stereotypes can help as they give the brain information that humans can use to react to a situation involving a stereotyped group, but stereotypes can also hinder people because they stop seeing people as individuals and stop being able to predict their reactions.

Stereotypes can emphasize a person's group membership in two steps (Nelson, 2002). They can emphasize a person's similarity to a member of the group they identify themselves to belong with, or in-group, or emphasize the difference of the person from the group they perceive to not belong to, or out-group. In society, individuals can use stereotypes to their advantage, within the right context, for example, they can avoid humiliation by blaming their actions on a stereotype, rather than themselves (Burkley and Blanton, 2008).

People create stereotypes of an out-group to justify what their in-group has committed or plans to commit towards that out-group (Turner and Giles, 1985). For example, Europeans stereotyped most Asian nations like the Chinese, Indians and Turks as being unable to achieve any kind of financial success without the help of Europeans, so they can justify colonizing those areas.

Stereotyping can serve as a cognitive function on an interpersonal level, so we can differentiate ourselves as individuals more effectively, but they also have social functions on an intergroup level, meaning we can differentiate our group from another, as well as be able to realize we belong to some groups ourselves (Cox, 2012). For stereotyping to function on an intergroup level, the individual must perceive themselves as being part of that group and the group must be of importance to the individual. The cognitive and social functions stereotypes are best seen when compared with one another, so for example, if you know that Hells Angels members like wearing leather and riding bikes, and if you have these characteristics as well, you might place yourself amongst them (McGarty, 2002). The assumption is that people want their in-group to look better when compared to out-groups, so people want to differentiate their in-group from relevant out-groups in a desirable way (Turner and Giles, 1985).

However, stereotypes are also traditional and familiar symbol clusters, expressing an abstract or complex idea in a convenient way. (Hayakawa, 1950). They are simple translations for gendered, racial, ethnic, and cultural backgrounds and they can become a source for misinformation and delusion. They should most certainly not be a substitute for observation and a misinterpretation of cultural identity.

In social science, there are three broad approaches to stereotypes (Bordalo, 2016). The economic approach defines stereotypes as manifestations of statistical discrimination. For example, if most of America views men as stronger and more resilient than women, men will ignore illnesses and physical problems more often than women, resulting in men gaining fewer

sick days than women on average. However, this theory is only applicable with stereotypes that are somewhat rational, and some stereotypes simply are not. For example, most Floridians are not old, and flying is usually safe. Additionally, this type of thinking can create a self-fulfilling prophecy, like in the case of Afro-Americans being viewed as less intelligent than the rest of Americans, which resulted in the government underfunding black schools, and Afro-Americans not getting as good of an education when compared to Caucasian Americans. So, if the stereotype wasn't true before, it is true now, because of the stereotype itself.

The second approach is called the sociological approach, and it covers only social groups. It tells us that stereotypes are always derogatory and false generalizations about a minority group, made up by the majority to vilify them and keep them in an unfavorable position in society. This approach tells us that stereotypes always reflect the prejudices people harbor towards the group in question. An example of this approach would be the stereotypes white Americans have towards afro Americans, which were created because of the long history of slavery they had to go through. The problem presented with this approach is that, while some stereotypes are harmful and come from a dark past, some other stereotypes are quite fair and show things for what they really are, without any underlying racist motives behind them, like the Dutch being tall or Swedes being blonde. Moreover, stereotypes are often flattering to groups in question, like Asians being good at math. And as mentioned before, stereotypes change through time, so they do not always have to be rooted in the past. Finally, the third and final approach is called the "social cognition approach." This approach will be used in this paper. It states that stereotypes are created by an individual's brain to process information more quickly and more easily. Instead of analyzing the appearance and behavior of every single individual, the brain finds the biggest differences between us and them, then between other encountered individuals and place them in different groups. These groups are also placed into

different categories based on the most obvious differences between themselves and the groups the initial individual belongs to as well.

Impression Management &Stereotypes

Impression management is a process in which individuals attempt to control other people's impressions of them. The main motivation behind this is that people will perceive and treat others based on the impression they get from them. This can be done for better societal standing, better working conditions and success, and for cultural reasons. Impression management is not just done for self-presentation. Individuals can try to control other people's impression about different objects and things around them, like clothing or businesses and even other people (Leary and Kowalski, 1990). It is, in a way, like a play in a theatre. All of us assume roles we take according to the societal norms and unspoken rules of the culture we live in, which can include stereotypes as well, and create a "front", which is persona that we present to people we are not close to, like going to college, visiting a doctor, or going for a haircut (Goffman, 2019).

Stereotypes can complicate impression management or create a problem to the person trying to manage their impression, because the impression a person wants to project onto others, may clash with the stereotypes that are already in place. Naturally, if the stereotype about the individual is of a positive nature, it will not matter much when it comes to impression management, however if a stereotype is negative, it can be disruptive to the individual. For example, the stereotype that women are bad at mathematics has been known to cause trouble for female students, as they believe it themselves, and self- diminish their skills to uphold the stereotype. People gain their sense of self based on the groups they belong to. Since in-groups tend to better than image in relation to an out-group, there will always be a form of discrimination towards and out-group, because that, in turn is what shapes our identity and sense of self. (Tajfel and Turner, 1986). This can be very disruptive if a hypothetical female

individual wants to leave the impression of being a good mathematician, because being good at mathematics is not the trait of the in-group a woman wants to be in, it clashes with her front. However, good coping skills can be used to reframe the impression people have of an individual and steer it away from the stereotype. For example, women with a high sense of humor can use it as a coping mechanism and not be affected by the beforementioned stereotype and be seen as an "exception" to the stereotype rule (von Hippel, 2005).

Stereotypes and Tourism

Stereotypes are said to be shaped by one's culture and unique perception of the world from the inside out (Monterrubio, 2016). And as each nation carries a unique history and culture, each nation carries its own unique set of stereotypes towards other groups as well (Stephan & Stephan, 2000). And while a lot of research has been done on stereotypes, there has been surprisingly little said about locals harboring stereotypes towards tourists visiting their countries. Tourism affects cultural relations among two or more groups, and stereotypes are either a reflection of these relations or are created by them (Vainikka, 2015). It is generally said that locals will have a positive attitude towards tourists if tourism has a positive impact on the local area, but most of these sources have been studying locals as a homogenous group. There has been no research among different kinds of locals, like their job, whether they work in tourism or not, do they live in a hot spot for tourists or not, and what is their financial status.

Different types of locals will have different types of interactions with tourists (Murphy, 1983). A person that works as an IT technician and lives far from the city will have significantly less interactions with tourists, then, for example, a hotel employee that lives in the destination hot spot. And since the latter will have much more interactions with tourists, the probability of them forming an opinion about the tourist's group is much higher as well, and based on these interactions, stereotypes begin to form. And when stereotypes form, it affects both tourists' satisfaction and employee's emotional behavior.

Method

Purpose

The main purpose behind this project was to research what kind of stereotypes have Dubrovnik locals developed because of tourism in the area. Specifically, to see what shapes the locals' opinions on the tourists that visit their city, and why. The project researched locals' opinions about the British, Germans, Americans, the French, and Spaniards, because according to the Tourist Board of Dubrovnik (TZ, Dubrovnik, 2019), they were the tourists that visited Dubrovnik the most in the last touristic season. Based on their data, a survey was constructed.

Materials

The questionnaire used in this research is a recycled version of a questionnaire used three years ago, called "Common Stereotypes of Tourists in Dubrovnik" by Cvijeto Božović (Božović, 2018) in which he researched the stereotypes that 5-star hotel Dubrovnik employees harbor towards their guests. His survey is a remodeled version of another survey as well, which is a questionnaire created in the research "Ethnic and National Stereotypes: The Princeton Technology" that was conducted in the US (Madon et al., 2001). Some questions were tweaked or formatted differently to better fit the general Dubrovnik population, but the questions that give information about stereotypes themselves remain intact. The survey was distributed digitally via Typeform and posted on social media, additionally, physical copies were made and distributed via the snowballing method to result in 100 participants filling out the survey.

Participants

The participants needed to be as diverse as possible in age, sex, education, occupation, and living location in Dubrovnik. The only important criterium for filling out the survey was to live or have lived in Dubrovnik at some point. The reason behind this is the emphasis on the general Dubrovnik population that has varying degrees of contact with tourists and to research if that has any effect on stereotypes at all. The participants were split 70.24% women and

29.75% men. When it comes to the participants age, 25.61% of participants are from 38 to 47, while 22.31% are between the ages of 19 and 27, followed by 20.66% between the ages of 28 and 37, while 16.52% participants are aged from 48 to 57, and 13.22% of participants were 58 or older. Lastly, 1.65% are 18 or less.

Regarding the participants' education, 41.32% finished high school and 31.19% of participants had a college degree, while 20.66% had some form of education that is higher than high school, lastly, 0.82% of participants only finished middle school and not one participant had an unfinished middle school. When taking their occupation into account, 39.66% of participants were working in hospitality, 37.19% worked in jobs that are hospitality adjacent and 22.31% had jobs that are not related to hospitality at all.

Lastly, 47.93% of participants lived in Gruž, Lapad or Ploče and 14.87% of participants lived in New or Old Mokošica. Coincidentally, 14.87% live in settlements close to Dubrovnik as well, and 19% of participants lived in the Old Town or close to it. Finally, 2.47% of participants live on the islands in the Dubrovnik naval area, like Šipan, Lopud, Kalamota and others.

Results

The results suggested that locals associate tourists from Great Britain, as careful (*M=5.65, SD=1.27),* ambitious *(M=5.50, SD=1.19),* material *(M=5.45, SD=1.23),* traditional *(M=5.35, SD=1.23)* and patriotic *(M=5.30. SD=1.69)*. The respondents describe the British the least as sudden *(M=2.85, SD=1.57)* and uneducated (*M=2.95, SD=1.80)* (Table 1).

Germans were described the most as effective *(M=5.84, SD=0.94)*, ambitious (*M=5.76, SD=0.88)*, hardworking *(M=5.60, SD=1.29)*, progressive *(M=5.56, SD=1.04)* and careful *(M=5.56, SD=1.29)*. They were not associated with being uneducated *(M=2.36, SD=1.25)* and lazy *(M=2.40, SD=1.26)* (Table 2).

For Americans, they were described most often as proud *(M=5.79, SD=0.98)*, materialistic *(M=5.67, SD=1.40)*, patriotic *(M=5.63, SD= 1.50)*, ambitious *(M=5.57, SD=1.16)* and adventurous *(M=5.50, SD=1.25)*. Respondents didn't think that Americans were uncultured *(M=3.21, SD=1.84)* and cruel *(M=3.33, SD=1.95)*. (Table 3).

The respondents agreed the most that the French are proud *(M=5.57, SD=1.02)*, prone to complain *(M=5.52, SD=1.25),* music lovers *(M=5.54, SD=1.17),* patriotic *(M=5.29, SD=1.42)* and boastful *(M=5.19, SD=1.37),* while they disagreed that they are uneducated *(M=3.48, SD=1.50)* and racist *(M=3.57, SD=1.57)* (Table 4).

Finally, the respondents described Spaniards as loud *(M=6.56, SD= 0.81),* flirtatious *(M=6.23, SD=0.96),* music lovers *(M=6.13, SD=1.09)*, open *(M=6.06, SD=1.26)* and adventurous *(M=5.77, SD=1.09),* they disagreed the most that Spaniards are racist *(M=3.00, SD= 1.81)* and cruel *(M=3.10, SD= 1.50* (Table 5).

Preferred guests

Additional two questions asking respondents to name where their favorite and least favorite guests come from and why yielded the following results. The most beloved nation are Americans, with 19.8 % of respondents choosing them, and the most hated nations are a mix of various Eastern Asian nations, with a percentage totaling to 41.3% (Table 6), (Table 7).

To find out the reason behind the favorite and least favorite nations, post coding was used to assign each of the participants responses to three groups- behavior, money, and culture.

The main reason behind liking a certain nation is behavior, with 53.7% participants stating a reason attached to behavior as to why they like someone, the second reason was money with 17.4% of participants choosing it, and culture came in last at 16.5% (Table 8).

Moving on to least favorite nation, the main reason behind disliking a certain nation is behavior as well, with 43% of participants. The second reason is culture, with 29.8% of responses, and money was last, with 5.8% (Table 8).

Differences between demographics

There are some visible differences in the reasons behind the favorite and least favorite nations, and this can be attributed to the demographic differences between participants. The second most stated reason for liking a particular nation is money, while the second highest reasons for not liking a particular nation is culture. Since 22.31% of participants have stated that they do not work in positions that are related to tourism at all, they do not depend on the money coming from guests, and their paying power does not matter to them at all. Only 4.5% of respondents not working in tourism have stated money as a reason $X^2 (1, N=106) =4.5, p< 0.040$ (Table 9).

There have also been some slight differences in male and female degree in agreement with traits describing nations, like women agreeing with Germans being arrogant more, but these differences don't have any statistic relevance.

Comparison to previous study

When comparing this study to the one done three years ago, it is visible that there is very little difference, not enough to have any statistical relevance, but it is worthy to note that stereotypes are more prominent and visible in this study. This slight difference can maybe be attributed to the COVID-19 pandemic making locals more distrustful of foreigners (Table 11).

Discussion

The research overall tells us that the general Dubrovnik public does hold stereotypes and it is largely affected by tourism in the area. Generally, the British are perceived to be cautious, ambitious, and patriotic, Germans as productive, efficient, and direct, Americans as proud, patriotic, and outgoing the French as liberal and open and Spaniards as loud, flirtatious music lovers.

Stereotypes are an innate part of the human experience, and their formation is a natural occurrence in society, and while some of them are fair and reflect how things are, some of them can border on prejudice, like for example the rise in the opinion of Americans being uneducated as opposed to other nations, and Spaniards being loud and obnoxious.
A notable fact is that people care less about stereotypes if it affects them less than some other people, which means that the less contact there is between two groups, the less stereotypes are formed.

Moving on to the results covering the favorite and least favorite nations, it can be assumed that people will like other people more if they can benefit from them, explaining why people that work in tourism like the nations they like the most because they "tip the most" and "spend the most" as stated by some participants.

Continuing this topic, the more foreign and different one culture is perceived to be in relation to another one, the more prejudice will appear, resulting in Asian nations being the least favored in Dubrovnik, with no difference in spending power at all.

This can potentially become a big problem, as it is not in anyone's interest to make tourists feel unwanted or disliked. Since stereotypes are natural in society, there is not much that can be done to stop them, but there needs to be a line drawn when it starts turning into prejudice and discrimination. People in all occupation should be educated more on

interpersonal behavior and what is okay to do or not. In a globalized world, everyone should be able to learn how to treat people that differ in culture, language, or behavior.

Limitations and Further Studies

The limitation of this study is the that the sample could have been bigger to get the bigger picture of people's opinions. Instead of a hundred participants, a thousand or ten thousand would have given a clearer picture, especially in a study that puts so much importance on demographic differences. Stereotypes are very easily spreadable, and people that do not work in tourism or live in Dubrovnik touristic hot spot most probably have a significant number of points of contact anyway, as it is very hard to find a person in Dubrovnik with no ties to tourism and hospitality at all, since it is the only relevant industry. For further studies, maybe a city with very little touristic activities would give more insight on the demographic of people that have no contact with tourists.

References

Bordalo, P., Coffman, K., Gennaioli, N., & Shleifer, A. (2016). Stereotypes. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, *131*(4), 1753–1794. https://doi.org/10.1093/qje/qjw029

Božović, C. (2018, May 3). *Common Stereotypes of Tourists in Dubrovnik*. Repository.acmt.hr. https://urn.nsk.hr/urn:nbn:hr:229:163057

Burkley, M., & Blanton, H. (2008). Endorsing a negative in-group stereotype as a self-protective strategy: Sacrificing the group to save the self. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *44*(1), 37–49. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2007.01.008

Cardwell, M. (1999). *Dictionary of psychology*. Chicago (Ill.) Fitzroy Dearborn Publ.

Cox, W. T. L., Abramson, L. Y., Devine, P. G., & Hollon, S. D. (2012). Stereotypes, Prejudice, and Depression. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *7*(5), 427–449. https://doi.org/10.1177/1745691612455204

Erving Goffman. (2019). Pdx.edu. http://web.pdx.edu/~tothm/theory/Presentation%20of%20Self.htm

HAYAKAWA, S. I. (1950). RECOGNIZING STEREOTYPES AS SUBSTITUTES FOR THOUGHT. *ETC: A Review of General Semantics*, *7*(3), 208–210. https://www.jstor.org/stable/42581302?seq=1

Leary, M. R., & Kowalski, R. M. (1990). Impression management: A literature review and two-component model. *Psychological Bulletin*, *107*(1), 34–47. https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.107.1.34

Madon, S., Guyll, M., Aboufadel, K., Montiel, E., Smith, A., Palumbo, P., & Jussim, L. (2001). Ethnic and National Stereotypes: The Princeton Trilogy Revisited and Revised. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *27*(8), 996–1010. https://doi.org/10.1177/0146167201278007

McGarty, C., Yzerbyt, V., Spears, R., & Library Genesis. (2002). Stereotypes as explanations: the formation of meaningful beliefs about social groups. In *Internet Archive*. London; New York: Cambridge University Press. https://archive.org/details/stereotypesasexp00mcga

Mcleod, S. (2015, October 24). *Stereotypes | simply psychology*. Simplypsychology.org. https://www.simplypsychology.org/katz-braly.html

Monterrubio, C. (2016). Tourist stereotypes and servers' attitudes: a combined theoretical approach. *Journal of Tourism and Cultural Change*, *16*(1), 57–74. https://doi.org/10.1080/14766825.2016.1237518

Murphy, P. E. (1983). Perceptions and Attitudes of Decision-making Groups in Tourism Centres. *Journal of Travel Research*, *21*(3), 8–12. https://doi.org/10.1177/004728758302100302

Nelson, T. D. (2002). *Ageism: stereotyping and prejudice against older persons*. MIT Press.

Stephan, W., & Stephan, C. (2000). *Reducing Prejudice and Discrimination*. Routledge.

Turner, J. C., & Giles, H. (1985). *Intergroup behaviour*. Blackwell.

Vainikka, V. (2015). Stereotypes and Professional Reflections on Mass Tourism: Focusing on Tour Operators, Mass Tourism Destinations and Mass Tourists. *Études Caribéennes*, *31-32*. https://doi.org/10.4000/etudescaribeennes.7609

von Hippel, W., von Hippel, C., Conway, L., Preacher, K. J., Schooler, J. W., & Radvansky, G. A. (2005). Coping with Stereotype Threat: Denial as an Impression Management Strategy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *89*(1), 22–35. https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.89.1.22

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Careful	20	4	7	5.65	1.268
Ambitious	20	3	7	5.50	1.192
Material	20	3	7	5.45	1.234
Traditional	20	2	7	5.35	1.531
Patriots	20	2	7	5.30	1.689
Prone to complain	20	3	7	5.25	1.446
Music lovers	20	2	7	5.15	1.565
Proud	20	3	7	5.05	1.146
Progessive	20	3	7	5.00	1.298
Effective	20	2	7	5.00	1.338
Inteligent	20	1	7	4.95	1.468
Boastful	20	2	7	4.65	1.599
Extreme nationalist	20	2	7	4.65	1.424
Spoiled	20	2	7	4.60	1.667
Politically active	20	1	6	4.60	1.353
Democraticly oriented	20	3	7	4.55	1.504
Curious	20	1	7	4.45	1.731
Competitive	20	2	6	4.40	1.273
Practical	20	2	7	4.40	1.231
Open	20	2	7	4.35	1.694
Adventurous	20	1	7	4.35	1.843
Liberal	20	2	7	4.30	1.302
Hard-headed	20	2	7	4.30	1.780
Flirtatious	20	1	7	4.25	1.773
Hard working	20	0	7	4.20	1.795
Keep to themselves	20	1	7	4.15	1.663
Independent	20	2	7	4.05	1.356
Lazy	20	2	7	4.00	1.589
Greedy	20	2	7	4.00	1.338
Cool	20	1	7	3.95	1.820
Emotional	20	1	7	3.95	2.188
Sport oriented	20	1	7	3.95	1.538
Loud	20	1	7	3.85	2.059
Individualistic	20	2	7	3.80	1.240
Shallow	20	2	6	3.75	1.020
Agressive	20	1	6	3.70	1.559
Arrogant	20	1	7	3.60	1.930
Rebellious	20	1	7	3.55	1.905
Direct	20	1	7	3.55	1.877
Self-oriented	20	1	6	3.50	1.318
Racist	20	1	7	3.35	1.755
Uncultured	20	1	7	3.25	1.803
Cruel	20	1	7	3.10	1.518
Uneducated	20	1	7	2.95	1.701
Sudden	20	1	7	2.85	1.565
Valid N (listwise)	20				

a. Nationality = Great Britain

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Effective	25	4	7	5.84	.943
Ambitious	25	4	7	5.76	.879
Hard working	25	3	7	5.60	1.258
Progessive	25	4	7	5.56	1.044
Careful	25	2	7	5.56	1.294
Proud	25	2	7	5.24	1.422
Practical	25	2	7	5.24	1.165
Curious	25	3	7	5.20	1.323
Material	25	3	7	5.04	1.098
Competitive	25	3	7	5.00	1.080
Inteligent	25	3	7	4.96	1.136
Independent	25	1	7	4.96	1.567
Direct	25	2	7	4.84	1.281
Adventurous	25	2	7	4.80	1.323
Patriots	25	2	7	4.76	1.562
Self-oriented	25	2	7	4.76	1.300
Music lovers	25	2	7	4.72	1.021
Individualistic	25	2	7	4.64	1.186
Open	25	2	7	4.56	1.417
Liberal	25	3	7	4.48	1.005
Democraticly oriented	25	1	7	4.48	1.159
Hard-headed	25	1	7	4.48	1.447
Keep to themselves	25	1	7	4.44	1.474
Traditional	25	2	7	4.44	1.417
Loud	25	1	7	4.36	1.777
Prone to complain	25	2	7	4.16	1.179
Politically active	25	1	7	4.08	1.256
Rebellious	25	2	7	4.00	1.155
Sport oriented	24	2	6	4.00	1.022
Boastful	25	2	7	3.96	1.306
Arrogant	25	1	7	3.92	1.730
Cool	25	1	7	3.88	1.394
Agressive	25	1	7	3.72	1.568
Extreme nationalist	25	1	7	3.56	1.710
Cruel	25	1	7	3.48	1.584
Flirtatious	25	1	7	3.40	1.528
Emotional	25	1	7	3.40	1.414
Spoiled	25	1	7	3.36	1.705
Greedy	25	1	5	3.36	1.150
Sudden	25	1	5	3.20	1.323
Racist	25	1	7	3.20	1.780
Uncultured	25	1	6	3.16	1.519
Shallow	24	1	6	3.04	1.301
Lazy	25	1	5	2.40	1.258
Uneducated	25	1	5	2.36	1.254
Valid N (listwise)	23				

a. Nationality = Germany

Table 2

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Proud	24	4	7	5.79	.977
Material	24	1	7	5.67	1.404
Patriots	24	1	7	5.63	1.498
Ambitious	23	3	7	5.57	1.161
Adventurous	24	3	7	5.50	1.251
Open	24	3	7	5.46	1.285
Loud	24	3	7	5.46	1.351
Direct	24	1	7	5.42	1.530
Curious	24	2	7	5.29	1.488
Music lovers	24	3	7	5.29	1.197
Emotional	24	3	7	5.25	1.294
Competitive	24	3	7	5.13	1.296
Progessive	24	3	7	5.08	1.176
Practical	24	2	7	5.08	1.412
Hard working	24	3	7	5.04	1.334
Sport oriented	24	2	7	4.87	1.569
Effective	24	3	7	4.83	1.129
Liberal	24	1	7	4.83	1.465
Careful	24	2	7	4.83	1.404
Boastful	24	1	7	4.79	1.769
Flirtatious	24	3	7	4.71	1.083
Democraticly oriented	24	2	7	4.67	1.435
Independent	24	1	7	4.63	1.740
Self-oriented	24	1	7	4.58	1.442
Spoiled	24	1	7	4.58	1.954
Hard-headed	24	1	7	4.54	1.382
Prone to complain	24	1	7	4.50	2.226
Arrogant	24	1	7	4.46	2.187
Cool	24	1	7	4.42	1.717
Politically active	24	1	7	4.25	1.567
Shallow	24	1	7	4.08	1.792
Racist	24	1	7	4.08	2.125
Inteligent	24	1	7	4.04	1.574
Keep to themselves	24	1	7	3.92	1.442
Sudden	24	1	6	3.92	1.717
Agressive	24	1	7	3.88	1.624
Greedy	24	1	7	3.79	1.841
Uneducated	24	1	7	3.71	1.922
Traditional	23	1	7	3.70	1.717
Lazy	24	1	6	3.67	1.711
Rebellious	24	1	7	3.63	1.439
Individualistic	24	1	6	3.54	1.444
Extreme nationalist	24	1	7	3.46	2.167
Cruel	24	1	7	3.33	1.949
Uncultured	24	1	6	3.21	1.841
Valid N (listwise)	22				

a. Nationality = USA

Table 3

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Proud	21	4	7	5.57	1.028
Prone to complain	21	2	7	5.52	1.250
Music lovers	21	4	7	5.43	1.165
Patriots	21	2	7	5.29	1.419
Boastful	21	3	7	5.19	1.365
Careful	21	2	7	5.14	1.493
Curious	21	2	7	5.14	1.352
Hard-headed	21	3	7	5.14	1.276
Flirtatious	21	2	7	5.14	1.389
Ambitious	21	2	7	5.14	1.276
Adventurous	21	3	7	5.05	1.284
Open	21	2	7	5.05	1.396
Loud	21	2	7	5.00	1.342
Independent	21	1	7	4.95	1.465
Progessive	21	3	7	4.90	1.091
Liberal	21	2	7	4.86	1.389
Emotional	21	2	7	4.86	1.352
Self-oriented	20	2	7	4.85	1.387
Material	21	2	7	4.76	1.375
Spoiled	21	2	7	4.76	1.758
Extreme nationalist	21	1	7	4.71	1.736
Shallow	21	2	7	4.71	1.648
Direct	21	2	7	4.71	1.707
Arrogant	20	2	7	4.65	1.599
Politically active	21	2	7	4.62	1.284
Inteligent	21	1	7	4.62	1.774
Keep to themselves	21	3	7	4.57	1.165
Individualistic	21	2	7	4.57	1.469
Democraticly oriented	21	2	6	4.57	1.121
Uncultured	21	2	7	4.52	1.806
Practical	21	2	7	4.52	1.504
Traditional	21	2	7	4.48	1.537
Competitive	21	2	7	4.48	1.365
Effective	21	1	7	4.43	1.630
Sport oriented	21	1	7	4.33	1.461
Cool	21	1	7	4.29	1.927
Hard working	21	2	6	4.24	1.375
Greedy	21	2	7	4.19	1.436
Rebellious	21	1	7	4.10	1.411
Cruel	21	2	6	4.00	1.414
Lazy	21	2	7	3.95	1.284
Agressive	21	1	6	3.90	1.578
Sudden	21	1	6	3.76	1.411
Racist	21	1	7	3.57	1.568
Uneducated	21	1	7	3.48	1.504
Valid N (listwise)	19				

a. Nationality = France

Table 5

Descriptive Statistics[a]

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Loud	31	4	7	6.55	.810
Flirtatious	31	4	7	6.23	.956
Music lovers	31	4	7	6.13	1.088
Open	31	2	7	6.06	1.263
Adventurous	31	3	7	5.77	1.087
Proud	31	2	7	5.61	1.202
Curious	31	3	7	5.55	1.091
Emotional	30	1	7	5.53	1.358
Self-oriented	31	4	7	5.52	1.092
Traditional	31	1	7	5.39	1.706
Direct	31	1	7	5.23	1.499
Hard-headed	31	3	7	5.19	1.223
Rebellious	31	2	7	5.10	1.446
Patriots	31	3	7	5.06	1.209
Competitive	31	2	7	5.06	1.365
Boastful	31	2	7	5.03	1.197
Sudden	31	1	7	5.03	1.643
Cool	31	1	7	4.94	1.526
Practical	31	3	7	4.87	1.056
Independent	31	2	7	4.77	1.564
Liberal	31	1	7	4.68	1.447
Inteligent	31	3	7	4.65	1.170
Prone to complain	31	1	7	4.58	1.785
Ambitious	31	3	7	4.55	1.150
Agressive	31	1	7	4.55	1.786
Keep to themselves	30	3	7	4.50	.900
Lazy	31	1	7	4.45	1.804
Sport oriented	31	1	7	4.35	1.496
Material	31	1	7	4.29	1.716
Careful	31	1	7	4.29	1.488
Hard working	31	1	7	4.29	1.442
Individualistic	31	2	7	4.26	1.365
Uncultured	31	1	7	4.19	1.701
Progessive	31	2	7	4.16	1.241
Democraticly oriented	31	1	7	4.13	1.522
Arrogant	31	1	7	4.06	1.914
Shallow	31	1	7	4.00	1.183
Effective	31	2	6	3.97	1.080
Politically active	31	1	7	3.94	1.750
Spoiled	30	1	7	3.87	1.548
Extreme nationalist	31	1	7	3.42	1.945
Greedy	31	1	6	3.35	1.644
Uneducated	31	1	7	3.19	1.721
Cruel	31	1	6	3.10	1.491
Racist	31	1	7	3.00	1.807
Valid N (listwise)	28				

a. Nationality = Spain

Table 6

Favorite nations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Americans	24	19.8	19.8	19.8
	I love all	23	19.0	19.0	38.8
	C.Europe	22	18.2	18.2	57.0
	British	14	11.6	11.6	68.6
	Hispanic	13	10.7	10.7	79.3
	Asians	9	7.4	7.4	86.8
	Skandinavians	9	7.4	7.4	94.2
	Russians	4	3.3	3.3	97.5
	Australians	3	2.5	2.5	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Table 7

Least favorite nations

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Asians	50	41.3	41.3	41.3
	Do not want to say	28	23.1	23.1	64.5
	C.Europe	20	16.5	16.5	81.0
	Hispanics	11	9.1	9.1	90.1
	Americans	6	5.0	5.0	95.0
	British	3	2.5	2.5	97.5
	Australians	2	1.7	1.7	99.2
	Russians	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	121	100.0	100.0	

Table 8

Crosstab

			Favorite nations in numbers			
			Behaviour	Money	Culture	Total
How connected their occupation is to tourism	Working in tourism	Count	26	10	7	43
		% within How connected their occupation is to tourism	60.5%	23.3%	16.3%	100.0%
	Working in jobs related to tourism	Count	26	10	4	40
		% within How connected their occupation is to tourism	65.0%	25.0%	10.0%	100.0%
	Not working in tourism at all	Count	13	1	8	22
		% within How connected their occupation is to tourism	59.1%	4.5%	36.4%	100.0%
	4	Count	0	0	1	1
		% within How connected their occupation is to tourism	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%	100.0%
Total		Count	65	21	20	106
		% within How connected their occupation is to tourism	61.3%	19.8%	18.9%	100.0%

Table 9

Chi-Square Tests

	Value	df	Asymptotic Significance (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	13.189[a]	6	.040
Likelihood Ratio	12.938	6	.044
Linear-by-Linear Association	1.529	1	.216
N of Valid Cases	106		

a. 5 cells (41.7%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .19.

Table 10

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
									95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	Lower	Upper
Stereotypes	Equal variances assumed	4.854	.029	.649	198	.517	2.02435	3.12066	-4.12964	8.17834
	Equal variances not assumed			.663	197.144	.508	2.02435	3.05561	-4.00152	8.05023

Table 11

Independent Samples Effect Sizes

		Standardizer[a]	Point Estimate	95% Confidence Interval	
				Lower	Upper
Stereotypes	Cohen's d	21.90692	.092	-.187	.372
	Hedges' correction	21.99034	.092	-.186	.370
	Glass's delta	19.69479	.103	-.177	.382

a. The denominator used in estimating the effect sizes.
Cohen's d uses the pooled standard deviation.
Hedges' correction uses the pooled standard deviation, plus a correction factor.
Glass's delta uses the sample standard deviation of the control group.