

1-1-2015

A Comparative Content Analysis Of African American And Caucasian Role Portrayals In Broadcast Television Entertainment Programming

Scott Evan Burke
Wayne State University,

Follow this and additional works at: http://digitalcommons.wayne.edu/oa_dissertations



Part of the [Communication Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Burke, Scott Evan, "A Comparative Content Analysis Of African American And Caucasian Role Portrayals In Broadcast Television Entertainment Programming" (2015). *Wayne State University Dissertations*. Paper 1306.

This Open Access Dissertation is brought to you for free and open access by DigitalCommons@WayneState. It has been accepted for inclusion in Wayne State University Dissertations by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@WayneState.

**A COMPARATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN
AND CAUCASIAN ROLE PORTRAYALS IN BROADCAST TELEVISION
ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMMING**

by

SCOTT E. BURKE

DISSERTATION

Submitted to the Graduate School

Of Wayne State University,

Detroit, Michigan

In partial fulfillment of the requirements

For the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

2015

MAJOR: COMMUNICATION

Approved by:

Advisor

Date

© COPYRIGHT BY

SCOTT E. BURKE

2015

All Rights Reserved

DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated to my family. My wife, Jennifer, and children Evan and Miranda, have all been incredibly supportive and patient throughout this entire process. I am sure they, like I, never thought it would be over. I could not have done it without you. Thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Completing an endeavor such as the pursuit of an advanced degree requires the assistance of many individuals. My journey was no exception. From my committee members to family and friends, many people have offered me vital assistance that allowed me to finally reach my goal.

First, I would be remiss not to acknowledge the contribution of all the members of my Doctoral Committee. To Dr. Kimmerley Piper-Aiken, Mr. Mark-Anthony Ruiz, and Dr. Heather Dillaway I would like to express my deepest thanks and appreciation. I am especially grateful for your patience through this long process. Committee co-advisor Dr. Pradeep Sopory deserves special acknowledgement for helping to make completion of my Ph.D. possible after I was sure it would not happen. Finally, committee co-advisor Dr. Hayg Oshagan worked with me from my acceptance into the program. I would like to extend to him my most sincere thanks for helping me to develop my plan of work, complete my comprehensive exams, design my study and complete my dissertation. I learned a great deal from you during this almost impossible journey.

Over the years a few notable individuals have offered their valuable assistance to my studies. Classmate Christine Stover offered proofreading services on many occasions. She also acted as my sounding board to help keep me clear headed when things were getting crazy. Thank you, Christine, for all your help. I know you will be writing your acknowledgements soon. Another classmate also offered advice as she progressed through the process ahead of

me. Thanks to Jessie McCabe for being willing to make clear to me the path I was about to travel.

Julie Ruterbusch offered her invaluable assistance analyzing the vast amounts of data collected by my study. After many coffee house meetings and involved telephone calls, I was able to complete the required statistical tests. To Julie, I offer an enthusiastic thank-you for helping a stranger when you most certainly did not need to do so.

Of course a ten year journey cannot be completed without the help and support of one's family. To my in-laws, Dave and Sharon LeFevre, I would like to say thank-you for all the nights and weekends watching the kids so I could attend classes and write papers. To my parents, I offer my thanks for your support and everything you have done for me even when you might not have understood what I was doing.

Finally, I cannot begin to thank my wife, Jennifer, for everything she has done for me. Her love and support played the most vital role in my completion of this endeavor. I could never have done it without you. Thank you.

Scott E. Burke

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DEDICATION	II
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	III
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	V
LIST OF TABLES.....	IX
CHAPTER 1	1
INTRODUCTION	1
ROLE PORTRAYALS.....	4
STAGE AND FILM	6
TELEVISION	9
<i>Portrayals in the News</i>	17
<i>Portrayals in Commercial Advertising</i>	18
<i>Portrayals in Music Videos</i>	21
<i>Portrayals in Prime Time</i>	23
MEDIA USE	28
PURPOSE	34
HYPOTHESES / RESEARCH QUESTIONS	35
CHAPTER 2	39
METHODS.....	39
SAMPLE	39
CODERS.....	42
OPERATIONALIZATION.....	44
INTER-RATER RELIABILITY	46
DATA	46

CHAPTER 3	49
RESULTS.....	49
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA.....	49
PORTRAYAL INDEX.....	55
CHARACTERISTICS.....	58
HYPOTHESES	60
CHAPTER 4	66
DISCUSSION	66
HYPOTHESES AND RESEARCH QUESTIONS	66
ADDITIONAL FINDINGS.....	75
LIMITATIONS.....	78
CONCLUSION.....	79
APPENDIX A - NIELSEN LISTS.....	81
APPENDIX B - SAMPLE PROGRAMMING AND EPISODES.....	83
APPENDIX C - INTER RATER RELIABILITY.....	85
APPENDIX D - CHARACTERS BY AUDIENCE	86
APPENDIX E - CHARACTERS BY ROLE	87
APPENDIX F - CHARACTERS BY GENDER	88
APPENDIX G - CHARACTERS BY AGE	89
APPENDIX H - CHARACTERS & ETHNICITY	90
APPENDIX I - CHARACTERS BY INCOME LEVEL & WORK STATUS.....	91
APPENDIX J - CHARACTERS BY MARITAL & PARENTAL STATUS.....	92

APPENDIX K - GENDER BY VIEWING AUDIENCE	93
APPENDIX L - AGE BY VIEWING AUDIENCE	94
APPENDIX M - HOW ETHNICITY KNOWN BY VIEWING AUDIENCE	95
APPENDIX N - ETHNICITY BY VIEWING AUDIENCE.....	96
APPENDIX O - INCOME AND WORK STATUS BY VIEWING AUDIENCE	97
APPENDIX P - MARITAL & PARENTAL STATUS BY VIEWING AUDIENCE.....	98
APPENDIX Q - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL CODERS.....	99
APPENDIX R - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES AND ALL CODERS.....	100
APPENDIX S - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS– ALL AUDIENCES, BY CODER	101
APPENDIX T - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS– ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS BY PROGRAM LENGTH.....	102
APPENDIX U - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS, 30-MINUTE PROGRAMS.....	103
APPENDIX V - PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS, 60-MINUTE PROGRAMS.....	104
APPENDIX W - INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES AND ALL CODERS	105
APPENDIX X - INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL CODERS, BLACK ROLES	106
APPENDIX Y - INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL CODERS, ALL AUDIENCES, ALL ROLES	107
APPENDIX Z - INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ROLES IN 30-MINUTE PROGRAMMING	108
APPENDIX AA - INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ROLES IN 60-MINUTE PROGRAMMING	109
APPENDIX AB - AFRICAN AMERICAN CHARACTER DEMOGRAPHICS	110
APPENDIX AC - PI ITEM CORRELATIONS.....	112

APPENDIX AD - PI ITEM CORRELATIONS (WHITE AND BLACK CHARACTERS ONLY)...	120
APPENDIX AE - RESEARCH STUDY: WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE STUDENT VOLUNTEERS NEEDED	122
APPENDIX AF - CODER QUESTIONNAIRE	123
APPENDIX AG - CODE BOOK	124
APPENDIX AH - CODE SHEET	131
REFERENCES	134
ABSTRACT	158
AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT.....	160

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1 – Hours Spent with Media	29
Table 2 – Sample Programs.....	40
Table 3 – African American Characters by Audience	61
Table 4 – Characters by Race and Audience.....	62
Table 5 – Characters by Program Length	65

CHAPTER 1

Introduction

The television industry in the United States has grown into a multi-billion dollar industry since the first television prototype was demonstrated in 1925. Early in the television broadcasting history, Lazarsfeld (1940) ascertained in order to appeal to a large audience, the television content provided would avoid conflict and depict the ordinary; “A program must be entertaining and so it avoids anything depressing enough to call for social criticism; it must not alienate its listeners, and hence caters to the prejudices of the audience; it avoids specialization, so that as large an audience as possible will be assured; in order to please everyone it tries to steer clear of controversial issues” (page 332). This assertion was valid for its time, but the television landscape has changed drastically since the 1940’s.

Cable television and the multitude of channels it offers along with new broadcast networks have certainly moved television programming towards audience specialization. With specialization comes the ability to target smaller audiences and welcome social criticism. If program content indeed “caters to the prejudices of the audience,” what does the content used to target these smaller audiences look like? As audiences differ, the prejudices should differ as well. Therefore, programming popular with Caucasians should be different from programming popular with African Americans. This should be especially true with regard to how race is portrayed in television programming.

The portrayal of race in the media is a fertile area of television research. Studies of race portrayals examine the extent to which race is present in

television content as well as the context of the representation. Historically minorities have been underrepresented on television (Poindexter & Stroman, 1981). When African Americans are present, a content analysis conducted by Matabane (1988) found African Americans roles can be characterized in four ways. These are typically (1) cast either in all-Black settings or as the singleton African American person in all-White settings; (2) low income and feature few socially productive persons concerned about social problems; (3) are inclined to be upscale and productive when cast in White settings; and (4) are scripted to use Black English in low-income, all-Black settings. Since the early 1980's, multiple research projects have now shown a trend of an increasing number of minority portrayals on television and in the newspapers, however these portrayals remain mostly stereotypical in nature and largely negative (Greenberg & Collette, 1997; Kubey, Shifflet, Weerakkody, & Ukeiley, 1995; Poindexter & Stroman, 1981; Tan, 1978). On the other hand, according to Greenberg and Collette (1997), and supported more recently, during the 1980's the number of Black character portrayals were in line with the population and during the early 1990's Blacks were actually overrepresented (Li-Vollmer, 2002).

The quantity, representation, and context of the Black characters presented on television can have a profound effect upon viewers. While specific effects on certain individuals are near impossible to predict, researchers have been working to describe, explain, and understand the nature of media effects and the role narrow representations and character portrayals have on the attitudes and social realities of its audience.

If we accept the idea that exposure to media may have an effect on the viewer, it can be assumed that the manner in which audience members utilize the media or the amount of time a person spends with the media should influence the possible effects the media have on individuals. One factor that moderates media effects may be the amount of time individuals spend with the media. One study addressed this issue and looked specifically at heavy television viewing and its effects on stereotypical perceptions of ethnic groups (Lee, Bichard, Irey, Walt, & Carlson, 2009). Results showed that significant differences in stereotypes held were related to heavy television viewing. In addition, television viewing played a larger role in forming perceptions when direct contact with the ethnic group in question is lacking. Overall, use of media is closely related to the possible effects it may have upon the audience.

The literature review regarding African American role portrayals shows that there is a history of stereotypical characterizations of African Americans in television programming. The negative nature of these portrayals is important to consider given the demonstrated possible media effects of television combined with the specific media use habits of African Americans. Cultivation Theory draws attention to the possible consequences of a constant barrage of negative portrayals on viewers of any background.

It is also clear that the television medium itself and the programming available are constantly evolving: the explosion of channel offerings include niche channels, syndication programming and Black-oriented programming. As audience attitudes and preferences change over time and new channels emerge,

entertainment programming must change in order to attract and retain viewers. However, at least one study has suggested that new channel programming offerings do not differ from that of the national broadcasters due to syndication and other programming tactics (Kubey et al., 1995).

Increased representation of African Americans on television does not eliminate the need for research in this area. Questions still abound regarding how the representations have changed, where they appear and how the combined effect of their portrayals may impact viewers of all ethnicities. This study will examine existing role portrayals while taking into account the racial makeup of the viewing audience.

Role Portrayals

Characters are used to tell stories and entertain the viewing audience. Each character is portrayed in a way that adds depth or detail to the story. Sometimes characters need to be presented to the audience quickly and the best method for accomplishing this goal is through the use of stereotypes, or an oversimplified idea of a certain type of person (Stroman, Merritt, & Matabane, 1989). Stereotypes are recognized, however, as both a limitation and a resource (Gandy, 1998).

Stereotypes have a functional utility and are therefore a resource in entertainment programming. They are easy to capture on film, actors can relate to the character easily and they are quickly understood by viewers. This is important because unusual or un-stereotyped characters can sometimes become distracting to viewers and interrupt the pace of the narrative (Gandy, 1998).

On the other hand, stereotypes can certainly be a limitation. They are well established in children's minds before the cognitive ability and flexibility to question or critically evaluate the stereotype's validity or acceptability is developed (Devine, 1989). This means if audiences are unable to understand the motives behind the character in the story, they may simply accept the stereotype as a reflection of reality. If the stereotype is presented in a negative way, the negative view of certain types of people may persist in the audience's mind.

Turning to the historical context in which the portrayals are presented on television, we look more closely at stereotypes of African Americans. These stereotypes have been common throughout the American entertainment industry beginning with the stage and, while evolving with time, continue to present day. Some of the first stereotypes include the "comic Negro" and the "contented slave" (Dates & Barlow, 1993). Harriet Beecher Stowe's *Uncle Tom's Cabin* (1852) featured a host of Black stereotypes including Uncle Tom, the tragic mulattoe, the comic minstrel and the pickaninny child. The misguided rebel slave character was introduced in Stowe's next work, *Dred*. The origins of these stereotypes stemmed from a desire to depict African Americans in a manner that would reflect and support the hierarchy of society (Dates & Barlow, 1993; Gray, 1995; Wilson, Gutierrez, & Chao, 2003). In general, these stereotypes showed Blacks as inferior to Whites (comical, dumb, unclean) and happy with their position in life (contented slave).

Stage and Film

The stage was the primary medium for mass entertainment in America from the middle of the 19th century to the 1920's. African Americans played a role in the development of this mass entertainment but their role was one that reflected the prejudicial attitudes and values of the masses. Audiences expected the heroes to reflect themselves while Black American culture was best represented through music and comedy (Wilson et al., 2003).

Minstrel shows appeared in the 1930's. A White actor named Thomas Dartmouth Rice noticed a slave boy performing a song-and-dance routine on a street corner. The actor decided to take the routine as his own, billed himself as "Daddy" Rice and performed it in blackface (burnt cork applied to the skin) for audiences from New York to London. After a traveling salesman traveled through the United States' South in the 1840's and witnessed Blacks performing at public gatherings for the amusement of Whites, he went back to the North and developed his own caricatures of Black personalities for a variety act. This was the birth of the minstrel show. For decades, Blacks could not attend or perform in these shows however, when they were finally able to perform, they still were required to wear blackface.

Minstrel shows were the most popular form of live entertainment in the United States for 80 years. Typical shows consisted of two acts. Act one included songs, dances, jokes and gags all presented in a rapid-fire manner. Act two was comprised of recitations, monologues, songs, comedy skits and burlesque routines. Act two of the minstrel show later evolved and became known as "vaudeville" which launched the careers of many famous American entertainers

such as George Burns and Abbot and Costello. Another famous entertainer who spanned stage and screen was Al Jolson. He was popular from the turn of the century but was billed as “Mr. Show Business” by 1915. His blackface performances of “Mammy” and “Swanee” were enough to propel him to star in the first “talking” movie *The Jazz Singer* in 1927.

Until 1927 films were projected without sound and the first motion picture with a story line was produced in 1903. Only one year later, *A Bucket of Cream Ale* was released that included depictions of a Black maid working for a White man. The maid was played by a White actress in blackface. In early films, the portrayals of African Americans were overshadowed with White superiority. They were shown as inferior with regard to intellect and morality. Some common traits often applied to Blacks included: low or nonexistent occupational status, poor speech, criminal behavior, and dishonesty. The 1915 epic film *Birth of a Nation* began to institutionalize racial stereotypes. In addition to portraying Blacks as inferior to Whites, it also contained a strong message against sexual contact between the races.

African American portrayals shifted between 1930 and 1945. While White attitudes did not necessarily change, social relationships between Whites and Blacks had evolved. This new relationship required films to portray Blacks in ways that were more credible to what was witnessed by Whites every day. The new portrayals were not more accurate or sensitive towards Blacks; they were still consistent with the prevailing prejudicial notions. They were now cast as domestic workers, waiters, porters, singers and dancers. They were still

portrayed as unequal in status to Whites. In fact, their inferior mental capabilities continued to be utilized in comedic productions.

White attitudes changed dramatically after World War II. Society had changed and with organizations like the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), other civil rights groups, and the Truman administration helping to encourage Hollywood, films began to be produced that illustrated the unfairness of Black discrimination. Films like *Home of the Brave* (1949), *No Way Out* (1950), and *The Defiant Ones* (1958) denounced the evils of prejudice against Blacks.

The 1960's saw the emergence of the sophisticated, Black hero. Actor Sidney Poitier epitomized this role in two films from 1967: *Guess Who's Coming to Dinner* and *In the Heat of the Night*. In fact, Poitier won the Best Actor Oscar in 1963 for his role in *Lilies of the Field*. He played a handyman who builds a chapel for a group of nuns in rural America. This was a drastic departure from the stereotypes of old. Harry Belafonte and Sammy Davis, Jr. were two other notable actors who were able to star in nonthreatening roles during the 1960's.

A short-lived but noteworthy trend in the film industry appeared in the mid 1960's to the early 1970's. Blaxploitation films featured nearly all-Black casts in threatening character roles who took revenge against Caucasians. These films never attracted White audiences and were therefore never very financially successful. Later in the 1970's, films began to attract mixed audiences. Films like 1975's *Cooley High* and *Carwash* (1976) illustrate this trend.

The early 1980's saw a drastic reduction in Black roles followed quickly by a resurgence in the mid to late 1980's. The resurgence was fueled largely, but not entirely, by comedy films and comics like Eddie Murphy and Whoopi Goldberg. Murphy enjoyed racial crossover appeal and appeared in films such as *Trading Places* (1983), *Beverly Hills Cop* (1984), and *Coming to America* (1988). Goldberg debuted in the critically acclaimed *The Color Purple* (1985), and followed with *Jumpin' Jack Flash* (1986), and *Fatal Beauty* (1987). She continued her box office successes well into the 1990's with *Sister Act* (1992), *Sister Act II* (1993) and *Clara's Heart* (1998). Goldberg was able to be successful in both comedic and dramatic roles.

The 1990's saw urban Black films that presented a ghetto edge. This trend coincided with the emergence of Black film directors like Spike Lee, John Singleton and Matty Rich. *Boyz 'N the Hood*, *Jungle Fever* and *New Jack City* all from 1991 illustrate these types of films. By this time, Sidney Poitier was replaced as the leading Black actor by actors such as Denzel Washington and Wesley Snipes. A milestone for Black actors was reached in 2002 when Denzel Washington and Halle Berry swept the Best Actor and Best Actress Oscars for that year. However, the roles they won for were reminiscent of the White superiority promoting stereotypes of old (Wilson et al., 2003).

Television

The original long-standing stereotypes have evolved and new categories developed over time while the number of depictions have grown throughout the entertainment industry in all mediums including stage, film, radio and television

(Dates & Barlow, 1993). For example, the “contented slave” evolved into the “happy servant” while the “militant negro” began to be seen as more Blacks were visible in the media (Dates & Barlow, 1993; Wilson et al., 2003). These evolved and newly introduced stereotypes served the same function of their predecessors; to preserve the status quo in the societal hierarchy. The explosion in the numbers of depictions on television is evident most notably by the chapter subtitles in Donald Bogle’s work, *Primetime Blues* (2001). Each chapter discusses successive decades beginning with the 1950’s. The titles include: scraps, social symbols, jokesters, superstars and free-for-alls. These subtitles illustrate the progression of African American roles on television from a token presence in the 1950’s, through the relatively few superstars of television like Bill Cosby in the 1980’s. The “free-for-alls” title is attributed to the 1990’s when Black roles really seemed to take off on television.

Commercial television became a mass medium in 1948 with the popularity of Milton Berle and his comedy and variety show. African Americans were part of the new medium from the very beginning, appearing in the traditional roles they had been relegated to in films. In fact, the first two decades of Black portrayals on television were the same stereotypical images from film and radio: inferior, lazy, and untrustworthy (Fife, 1974). These stereotypes seem ironic given that Blacks placed more faith in television for being credible and effective in reflecting African American concerns (Dates & Barlow, 1993).

From the beginning, Black stars like Lena Horne, Cab Calloway, Ella Fitzgerald and Sammy David Jr. often appeared as celebrity guests on variety

programs like *Toast of the Town*, (later *The Ed Sullivan Show*) 1948 and *The Tonight Show*, 1954. The first television show with an all-Black cast debuted in 1951 (Knight, 2015). *The Amos 'n' Andy Show* was a popular radio show since 1929 with its White creators playing the main roles. The television version of the show was widely anticipated after a four-year search for the Black actors to star in the program. *Amos 'n' Andy* aired for two years and reruns played through the mid 1960's until pressure from civil rights groups forced the program off the air and CBS withdrew it from sale in 1966.

Despite the fact that some characters were seen as attorneys, business owners, educators and other types of professionals, the overall portrayal of Blacks was that of laziness, unintelligence and shiftlessness (Staples & Jones, 1985). Overall, the few early African American roles were largely subservient and usually portrayed as caricatures of maids (*Beulah*) or butlers (Bogle, 1988). *Beulah* was notable for being the first sitcom to feature an African American star. The show originated on radio in 1945, but ran on television from 1950 to 1953. The main character was the epitome of the mammy figure described as benevolent, perpetually smiling, rotund Black woman who attends the needs of her White employers and reveals little of her own cultural life (Knight, 2015).

Other popular programs of the 1950's include two short-lived variety shows *The Billy Daniels Show* that ran for only a few months in 1952 and *The Nat King Cole Show* that ran one season between 1956 and 1957. *The Little Rascals* debuted in 1955 and included the Buckwheat character. Buckwheat was a typical token Black character that, according to critics, reinforced the

pervasive racist idea that poverty, infantile behavior, and buffoonery were features of Black culture of the time (Knight, 2015).

Non-stereotypical portrayals of African Americans started to appear on television in the 1960's. Black characters brought forth sophistication and class to roles as protagonists and supporting characters on various programs, however, Black culture was rarely represented. These characters were fully assimilated into American culture (Knight, 2015). *I Spy* featured an African American character who was portrayed as intelligent but still "whitewashed" to appeal to the majority audience (Reeves, 1987). Bill Cosby even won three Emmys for his co-starring role in *I Spy*. Other iconic celebrities from this time included Diahann Carroll in *Julia* and James Earl Jones in *The Guiding Light* and *As the World Turns* (Knight, 2015).

These roles also portrayed an elevation in professional status. For example, Black characters were seen as teachers (*Room 222*), agents (*Mission Impossible*), and hosts (Flip Wilson) (Staples & Jones, 1985). Blacks were seen on numerous television programs during this time but they were mostly on variety shows or comedies and were seen by critics to be "token" characters (Wilson et al., 2003).

During the 1970's, the number of Black characters decreased on television (Gerbner & Signorielli, 1979; Hill, 1986; MacDonald, 1983; Northcott, Seggar, & Hinton, 1975; Staples & Jones, 1985). The characters that were present tended to be ghettoized and appear in situation comedies such as *Sanford and Son*, *Good Times*, *What's Happening* and *Different Strokes* (Knight,

2015; Staples & Jones, 1985). It should be noted that from 1953 to 1984 only four shows with predominately Black casts lasted more than one season. All four were in the 1970's and were situation comedies: *Sanford and Son*, *Good Times*, *The Jeffersons*, and *What's Happening* (Wilson et al., 2003).

As opposed to the 1960's, programs in the 1970's began to represent Black culture. Programs like *The Flip Wilson Show*, *Soul Train*, *Sanford and Son*, *Good Times*, and *The Jeffersons* were full of Black culture. *Sanford and Son* aired from 1972 to 1977 and starred Redd Foxx as a junk dealer who lived with his son in the Watts area of Los Angeles. Black-based humor was a central element of this program. Stars such as Lena Horne, Della Reese, and B. B. King were frequent guests on the show. *Good Times* (1974 to 1979) depicted Black life in the Chicago housing projects and addressed hard-hitting issues like racism, poverty and unemployment. Most characters demonstrated mainstream behavior; however, the oldest son J.J. was controversial and considered a parody of Black culture (Knight, 2015).

The Jeffersons made history as the longest running prime-time series with a predominately Black cast running from 1975 to 1985 (Gray, 1986). This program blended imagery of Black popular culture and assimilated culture (Knight, 2015). Created by Norman Lear and Bud Yorkin, the program pushed conventional boundaries along with other shows like *Maude*, *Mary Hartman*, *Mary Hartman*, and *All in the Family*. *The Jeffersons* also portrayed one of television's first interracial couples (Gray, 1986).

The Flip Wilson Show debuted in 1970 and lasted four seasons. This was a variety show hosted by Black comedian Flip Wilson. The program depicted many characters deemed derogatory but were enjoyed by audiences. Characters included a loud-speaking mammy figure named Geraldine Jones, a gospel-shaking pastor, Reverend Leroy, and other inner-city type characters (Knight, 2015).

The prime time miniseries *Roots* also aired in 1977. This series aired over eight consecutive nights and attracted an estimated 130 million viewers. Seven of the eight episodes that comprised the series had between 62% and 68% audience share. The last episode alone attracted 80 million viewers and obtained a 71% share (Hur & Robinson, 1978). The history making series depicted slave life in America from the colonial times through the Civil War. While this was a milestone series in television history, the portrayals were still largely stereotypical.

From the 1980's on, television programming included many representations of Black popular culture and Blacks in innovative and wide ranging roles, many of them successful and progressive. Still, throughout the 1980's most Black roles were present in situation comedies. In 1984, however, Diahann Carroll (who was the first Black female to star in a comedy dramatic series – *Julia*, 1968) was the first Black female to join the regular cast of a prime time soap opera, *Dynasty*. That same year was the debut season for the foremost of Black situation comedies *The Bill Cosby Show*, a show that would top the ratings throughout the 1980's. This program which aired from 1984 to

1992 and presented an idealized notion of a Black upper, middle-class experience (Knight, 2015) paved the way for a number of Black situation comedies that aired well into the early 2000's (Wilson et al., 2003).

Another groundbreaking program debuted on CBS in 1987 but only aired for one season. *Frank's Place* told the story of a Black, Ivy-league educated protagonist who discovers his father's New Orleans. Frank Parish (Tim Reed) is a professor of Italian Renaissance history from Boston who moves to New Orleans when he inherits a restaurant from his estranged father. The cast and crew for this program was 45% African American (Whitt, 2005). According to Gray (1995), this show provided "a moment of displacement, an attempt to push the limits of existing television discourses about Blacks." Obviously, viewers were not ready for pushing the limits since the show lasted only one season.

Finally, the 1980's saw a milestone for African American women on daytime television. Through the 1960's, soap operas only featured Blacks as walk-on characters. The 1970's saw Blacks only as non-feature roles on soap operas (Dates & Barlow, 1993). In 1989 Debbie Morgan became the first African American woman to win the Daytime Drama Emmy for Best Actress for her role in *All My Children* (Larson, 1994).

Diversity on television was still enough of a priority that when The Cable Communications Policy Act of 1984 was enacted, one of the six directives in the legislation was an effort to increase the diversity of sources and information on television. This directive's intention should have translated at least in part to more minority characters on television. It is presented by Kubey et al (1995) that

while cable television has increased channel offerings, the channels themselves are not all that different from the national broadcasters. They credit any diversity available on cable to a relatively low number of niche programming channels.

By 1994, the four major networks were airing 25 programs that either starred or featured Black characters. However, at the time Black and White audiences were not watching the same television programs. According to the *Washington Post* ("A Television Trend: Audiences in Black and White," 1994, November 29) no programs made the top 10 list for both Black and White viewers. Another significant development in the late 1990's was a new television network (UPN) that targeted African American audiences with all-Black comedies like *The Hughleys* and *The Parkers* (Wilson et al., 2003).

One popular program of the 1990's was *The Fresh Prince of Bel-Air*. This program aired from 1990 to 1996 and featured Will Smith as a young troubled teen who is sent to live with relatives in California to get him away from the bad influences in his hometown of Philadelphia. The program served to contrast urban youth and a high society Black family. The parents often affirmed their Black identity however; their children were portrayed as disconnected with Black popular culture (Knight, 2015).

The 2000's brought programs to television that centered on popular Black culture and lively characters. Shows with this model include *The PJ's* (1999 to 2001), *Everybody Hates Chris* (2005 to 2006), *Tyler Perry's House of Payne* (2007 to 2012), and *Meet the Browns* (2009 to 2012). In the 2000's Black actors

are also seen joining predominately White casts on prime time television series however, they are still usually in minor roles (Knight, 2015).

Portrayals in the News

Depiction of minorities has been researched heavily with regard to many different areas of television programming. The portrayal of African Americans in the news has been a rich area of research since the 1970's (Dates & Barlow, 1993; Dixon & Linz, 2000; Johnson, Sears, & McConahay, 1971; Lester, 1992; Martindale, 1986; Pease, 1989; Reynolds, 1994; Roberts, 1970; Sentman, 1983). Studies indicative of this type of research include results regarding: the analysis of the roles played by African Americans such as police officer, offender etc., how the images of African Americans are displayed such as clothing worn or in handcuffs, and how often African Americans are reported committing crimes compared to actual crime rates.

Early news research by Roberts (1975) found that African Americans were seen but not heard on network news. When they were seen they were associated with racialized issues like busing or segregation and relegated to blue-collar roles.

Entman (1990) found that Black criminals on news programs were portrayed as more dangerous and in more demeaning ways than White criminals. He also conducted two studies (1992, 1994) examining Black portrayals in local and national news broadcasts. While national news was found to be less overt than local news, negative portrayals were found to be evident. Part of the negative portrayals includes the fact that Blacks are more likely to be

shown being physically grasped by police officers than Whites. White suspects in the news are more likely to be presented in a pro-defense manner, or in a manner that shows the defense in a favorable way. Blacks, on the other hand, were split evenly between pro-defense and pro-prosecution presentations. Also, Blacks were more likely than Whites to appear as perpetrators in drug and violent crime stories.

Gilens (1996) examined news content between the years 1988 to 1992. This study found that Blacks were overrepresented as poor on the nightly news. Gillian, Iyengar, Simon and Wright (1996) studied news content from the Los Angeles area. They concluded that violent crime by African Americans was overrepresented when compared to actual crime statistics. Interestingly, nonviolent crime by Caucasians was also overrepresented.

Dixon and Linz (2000) found news broadcasts are more likely to portray Blacks as law breakers than would be expected according to crime statistics. However, Dixon, Azocar and Casas (2003) found that African Americans and White law-breakers were shown consistent with perpetration rates. In addition, Whites were more likely to be shown as perpetrators, victims and officers while Blacks were underrepresented as officers. Finally, this study found that while Blacks were overrepresented as news staff, females were underrepresented.

Portrayals in Commercial Advertising

Commercial advertising on television is an interesting area of study. With the annual purchasing power of minorities equaling over 20% of the nation's consumer spending and rising faster than that population (MBDA, 2000,

September) advertisers aggressively targeted this new, profitable market (Holland & Gentry, 1999).

One of the first studies to look at African Americans in commercials analyzed the percentage of ads with Blacks, the type of product being promoted, and the characterization of roles for the years 1967 through 1969 (Dominick & Greenberg, 1970). Results indicated that Black representation tripled during this time with daytime rates increasing from 5% to 12% and prime time rates improving from 4% to 10%. Bush, Solomon, and Hair (1977) repeated Dominick and Greenberg's study taking their sample in a different geographical area and found the prime time rate to be 13%. They also saw major roles for African Americans increase from 13% in 1967 to 47% in 1974. Their study also found that Blacks were more likely to appear in public services ads and, when in product advertisement, to more likely be in ads for personal items like hair care products than in non-personal items like durable goods. By 1986, Zinkhan, Quails and Biswas (1990) found Black presence in 16% of television commercials.

Despite Black representations increasing, Cox (1969) found that early on Blacks were portrayed almost exclusively as unskilled laborers. One study even found that when Blacks were present in advertising they were usually in the background, out of focus, did not speak or touch the product, and were Anglicized to the extent to resemble Whites in appearance and speech (Gitter, O'Connell, & Mostofsky, 1972). By 1984 only 14% of Black depictions in

commercials were of low-skilled laborers, but this was still three times the rate of White low-skilled workers (Humphrey & Schuman, 1984).

Wilkes and Valencia (1989) conducted a content analysis of three hours of prime time television for one week on three major networks. Results showed that commercials with Blacks increased to 26% and Blacks were increasingly likely to be shown in integrated casts. With regard to positioning, they were shown as part of large groups in background or minor roles. Hispanics, on the other hand, were in only 6% of commercials but portrayed similar to Blacks. Overall, Blacks and Hispanics were more often in commercials for food products (27%) than electronic or high-tech products (15%) or alcoholic beverages (14%).

The first study to look at Black occupational portrayals in television commercials was by Licata and Biswas (1993). They found that Blacks were mostly present in institutional and service ads (61% and 56%) but in only 20% of PSA's. Blacks in advertising exceeded that of the population at 12.1%. Finally, Black males were 48% of the African American roles while Black females were only 24%.

According to Elliott (1995) who conducted a content analysis of general media commercials and culturally-targeted commercials (commercials that aired on BET), culturally specific ads contained Blacks at twice the rate of general television commercials. This study also found other differentiations between the two types of commercials. Culturally specific ads showed Blacks in more entertainment-oriented product commercials, in commercials for business

products, in fewer integrated settings, featured in major roles, and in more leisure or social situations.

A few years later in 2002, Meredith Li-Vollmer analyzed race representation in child-targeted commercials. For this segment of commercials results showed that African Americans accounted for 20% of primary the characters. African American characters were most often portrayed as athletes (14%) and musicians (12.9%). Minorities were most visible in Public Service Announcements (65%). Mastro and Stern conducted a study in 2003 that found that Blacks were shown in a diverse and equitable manner at a rate even to that of the population. In addition, they confirmed findings from a 1989 study by Wilkes and Valencia that Asian Americans, Latino, and Native Americans were severely underrepresented in commercials and often portrayed negatively when present.

Portrayals in Music Videos

Another interesting area for portrayal research is music videos seen on a variety of specialty cable television networks such as MTV, VH-1, and BET. These videos are fertile ground for research because, unlike most television content, music videos are produced by, star and consumed for the most part by African Americans (Dixon & Brooks, 2002). In fact, it has been argued that rap music and videos may function as a vehicle to fight the oppression from the existing dominant culture (Rose, 1994; Zillmann et al., 1995). Specifically, however, rap music videos have been shown to provide portrayals that are negative in nature including images of violence, materialism and sex (Baxter, De

Riemer, Landini, Leslie, & Singletary, 1985; Johnson, Jackson, & Gatto, 1995; Kubrin, 2005; Smith, 2005; Zillmann et al., 1995).

Early research in this area showed that video content from the 1980's and 1990's tended to be sexy in nature (McKee & Pardun, 1996; Sherman & Dominick, 1986) and included sex role stereotyping (Vincent, Davis, & Boruszkowski, 1987) but tended to emphasize sexual innuendo rather than displays of overt or explicit sexual depictions (Baxter et al., 1985; Gow, 1990; Sommers-Flanagan, Sommers-Flanagan, & Davis, 1993).

Studies also determined that music videos from the 1990's by African American artists contained higher levels of sexual content than in videos by White artists (Jones, 1997; Tapper, Thorson, & Black, 1994). Later, a 2008 study by Turner confirmed these results for music videos beyond the 1990's. This study also found that characters in videos by African American artists were more likely to appear in provocative clothing than characters in videos by Caucasian artists. This study went one step further and examined music videos available on websites and DVD's. Results showed that these videos contained significantly more sexual content and characters in provocative clothing than videos on cable networks. Additionally, sexual behaviors normally discouraged by society (voyeurism, group sex, etc.) occurred significantly more often than in traditional music videos.

Interesting results have been found in music videos with regard to African American features. Black women in rap videos tend to have more Eurocentric features (smaller noses and lips, straight hair, and lighter skin) while Black males

tend to have more Afro-centric features such as wider noses, thicker lips and darker skin (Conrad, Dixon, & Yuanyuan, 2007; Dixon & Maddox, 2005). This can be a sensitive area for African Americans since possessing Eurocentric features has earned privilege since the days of slavery (Russell, Wilson, & Hall, 1992). Skin tone has even proven to be a factor in education attainment, employment and income for African Americans (Herring, Keith, & Horton, 2004). According to some studies there are even negative associations with Afro-centric features in the media (Dixon & Maddox, 2005) with these associations often equating to Black males shown as involved with criminal behavior. Pressure for Eurocentric features is further exemplified by the marketing of products such as skin-lightening creams and hair-straightening solutions (Russell et al., 1992).

Finally, music videos are very well known for the differential treatment of men and women. African American men tend to be shown in more positive ways while women are often in positions of submission to men (Sommers-Flanagan et al., 1993). Men are also more likely to perpetrate violence while women are shown as victims (Seidman, 1992; Sherman & Dominick, 1986). Overall, it has been found that rap music videos tend to emphasize controversial themes like materialism and misogyny with men being associated with a variety of the themes present. Women, on the other hand, are mostly relegated to positions of objectification (Conrad, Dixon, & Zhang, 2009).

Portrayals in Prime Time

Prime time commercial television is defined as the three hours between 8 pm and 11 pm that is the period when the financial and aesthetic risks for the

television industry are the greatest (Cantor, 1980). In the past, the only place Blacks are likely to be portrayed as equals is in situation comedies (Glascock, 2003; Kubey et al., 1995; Poindexter & Stroman, 1981). In fact, in the 1980's half of all Black characters were found in a handful of family shows (Atkin, 1983). While dramas prove to be the most diverse programming, situation comedies are the least diverse and Blacks are underrepresented in the newer trend of reality programming ("Fall Colors 2003 - 2004: Prime Time Diversity Report," 2004). This program segregation is still a problem.

Early work on prime time television programming focused on women. Tedesco (1974) found when analyzing programming from 1969 to 1972 that females were portrayed as more attractive than males while 64% of males and 40% of females were gainfully employed. Depictions of male employment increased to 68% in the 1980's and 76% in the 1990's (Signorielli, 1989; Signorielli & Kahlenberg, 2001). Female employment did increase to 60% by the 1990's but men were still portrayed with higher status occupations than women (Glascock, 2001). Female representation in prime time television was 28% in the 1960's and went up to 40% by the mid 1990's. This is telling as women account for 51% of the population (Signorielli & Bacue, 1999).

Research into African Americans in prime time television was plentiful in the 1980's. Studies found that Blacks were portrayed as younger than Whites (Baptista-Fernandez & Greenberg, 1980), disproportionately overweight (Kaufman, 1980), less likely to have jobs than Whites and when employed, and less likely to be professional (Baptista-Fernandez & Greenberg, 1980; Signorielli

& Kahlenberg, 2001). They were also found to be six times more likely to be in situation comedies than other types of programming (Wiegel, Loomis, & Soja, 1980), more commonly seen in minor roles, and in lower status occupations than Whites (Poindexter & Stroman, 1981). Close to half of all Black characters appeared in programs that featured all Black casts (Baptista-Fernandez & Greenberg, 1980).

Constructive Black family portrayals arrived on television in earnest in the 1980's (Coleman, 1998; Cummings, 1988) and were shown largely in situation comedies (Berry, 1998; Moore, 1992) with programs like *The Cosby Show* (1984 to 1989), *227* (1985 to 1990), *Charlie & Company* (1985 to 1986), and *Family Matters* (1989 to 1998). These family interactions were overwhelmingly positive with little conflict between family members (Merritt & Stroman, 1993). In contrast, earlier African American families on television were portrayed as struggling and in lower class positions. This was changing by the 1980's as Blacks were shown moving into the middle-class (Dates & Stroman, 2001; Stroman et al., 1989).

Other results for the portrayal of the African American family were found after the 1990's. They were more likely to be presented as an extended family rather than a nuclear family and more often nuclear than a single-parent family (Robinson & Skill, 2001). Sons in Black sitcoms dominated conversations more often than in White sitcoms (Dates & Stroman, 2001) while siblings tended to experience conflict more often than other racial groups (Graves, 1993). Finally, African American wives have conflict with husbands more often, tend to play the

dominate character in the family, and do most of the decision making (Dates & Stroman, 2001; Graves, 1993).

Oliver (1994) conducted a study focused on fictional crime shows. This work showed that crime shows overrepresented both Whites and Blacks as criminal suspects with Whites being overrepresented to a larger degree than Blacks. However, Blacks were underrepresented while Whites were overrepresented as police officers. Finally, Oliver finds that both Blacks and Hispanics were more likely to suffer unarmed physical aggression from officers.

African American representation in prime time television has increased over time. They accounted for 6% of television characters in 1971 and reached 11% in 1993 (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000). Studies by Glascock (2001) and Mastro and Greenberg (2000) both reported for programming from 1996 that African Americans were 14% of speaking characters which actually exceeded the rate of African Americans in the population (12.3%). For programming from 1999, Harwood and Anderson (2002) found that Whites were overrepresented and Blacks were at parity. Hunt and Ryder (2002) found that for 2001 programming Blacks were once again overrepresented in prime time television while at the same time, other minority groups (Hispanic, Latino, Asian) were nearly invisible (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000). Results for programming from 2000 to 2008 show Blacks at parity with the population and still most often in situation comedies while other minorities underrepresented (Signorielli, 2009).

More recent studies have shown that Blacks and Whites are depicted as equivalent in many ways including job status, employment, body weight and

dress (Glascock, 2003). Glascock (2003) conducted an extensive content analysis that included 39 shows (24 comedies, 15 dramas) from the newer networks FOX, UPN, and WB. Interesting results from this study include that female characters were found to be more provocatively dressed while male characters were overrepresented in situations that involved physical aggression. With regard to Black and White characters the study found that they were equivalent in most aspects but program segregation was still an issue.

Over the decades, studies have gotten away from the historical stereotypical depictions and instead focused on negative portrayals. This is a common trend in the research. While the term “stereotype” is still used, it does not often refer to the old “comic negro” or “contented servant.” Instead it refers to the character being portrayed in any negative way such as inferior, lazy, dumb, dishonest, comical, unethical or crooked (Lee et al., 2009). In fact, multiple studies have determined that blacks are currently most often depicted as violent, aggressive, intimidating, hostile and poor (Dixon, 2008; Glascock, 2003; Hunt, 2005; Mastro, Lapinski, Kopacz, & Behm-Morawitz, 2009).

The portrayals of race on television are important because they are constantly broadcast into our homes. We are inundated with these portrayals on a daily basis through a passive medium that simply requires the push of a button. We do, however, have the ability to choose the portrayals we are subjected to by selecting one channel or genre of programming over another. These choices regarding the programs we watch, the time we spend watching, as well as our

reasons for watching help to determine the portrayals we see. In other words, the way we use media determines our exposure to the portrayals presented.

Media Use

Having outlined the different portrayals seen on television, it is now appropriate to review the motivation for why audiences watch television, how many hours they consume during the day, and finally dive deeper into African Americans media use. Beginning with why audiences watch television, Greenberg (1974) developed the following list of motivations for British and American children: learning, habit, companionship, arousal, relaxation, passing time and escape. These motivations cover seemingly harmless (perhaps even beneficial) reasons for media consumption like learning and more troublesome sounding motivations such as companionship. Again, the consumption motivation itself may not be enough to determine the possible media effect but it can help in understanding the potentials.

Seventy-five percent of U.S. households have three or more televisions (Rideout, Foehr, & Roberts, 2005). At least one-third of children under the age of 11 years old have a television in their bedroom (Christakis, Ebel, Rivara, & Zimmerman, 2004; Dennison, Erb, & Jenkins, 2002). At least two-thirds of children ages 11 to 14 years old have a television in their bedroom (Rideout et al., 2005). Is it any wonder that despite numerous media choices today, television still accounts for the most media use (Roberts, et al, 2005). The amount of media consumed has been increasing steadily since the mid 1970's. A 2005 Kaiser Media Use Study (Rideout et al., 2005) compiled the following

daily media consumption amounts (in hours) for individuals eight through 18 years of age:

Table 1

Hours Spent with Media

Time (hours)	Media
3:04	Television
1:44	Music
1:02	Computer
0:49	Video Games
0:43	Reading
0:32	Videos
0:25	Theater
0:14	Prerecorded

This report found that on average children spend almost 6.5 hours a day with media. However, in that 6.5 hour timeframe, they are exposed to over 8.5 hours of media content. This is due to simultaneously consuming different types of media. For example, using the computer while watching television would double media consumption for that time period. Between 1999 and 2004, average time with television remained consistent at just under four hours per day. Rather than reduce time for other new media developed during this time frame, total media time has increased (Rideout et al., 2005).

It is well substantiated that Black youth consume media at higher rates than Whites and other ethnic groups (Bales, 1986; Bickham et al., 2003; Blosser, 1988; Greenberg, 1993). They spend on average five hours and 53 minutes per day with screen media (TV/DVD/Videos) which is higher than Latino (4:37) or White (3:47) youth (Rideout et al., 2005). 39% of Black students even reported

watching television “almost all of the time I’m not in school” compared to 16% for White students (Brown & Pardun, 2004).

Studies have shown that media preferences may vary among individuals and ethnic groups. Some factors that impact the preference for one form of media over another include age, gender, race, education level, and socioeconomic status among others. There has been specific research conducted regarding African Americans and their media preferences in contrast to Caucasian preferences (Bogart, 1972; Pratt, 1993).

Bogart pointed out that Caucasians prefer the print medium while African Americans gravitate more towards television (1972). The rationale for the preference of television has been supported by multiple studies (Bower, 1973; Comstock, 1980; Durand, 1979). What has been uncovered in research is that African Americans tend to believe television to be far more credible than other forms of media. This is especially true for advertising on television. On the other hand, Caucasians believe magazines to be the more credible medium.

Given that African Americans perceive television as the most credible of the available media offers a new and interesting area for further inquiry and research. If viewers believe a certain medium is more credible than an alternative medium, they should be drawn to that medium and thus utilize it more. This would mean television viewing hours would increase for African Americans. The inverse can also be true. If viewers utilize a specific medium more than other, they will begin to see it as more credible. This view has been supported by multiple studies (Bales, 1986; Comstock, 1980; Westley, 1964). The

combination of these two theoretical positions create a feedback effect; as African Americans watch more television, they see it as more credible, as it is seen as more credible, they watch more television. Of course credibility is but one reason African Americans are drawn to television.

Other intriguing factors that serve to explain the preference that African Americans have for television can be examined in the historical context of the development of television as a medium (Comstock, 1980). Since television was the last of the three major forms of traditional mass media to develop, researchers suggest that there may be less hostility towards it than radio or print because print and radio were in existence during the earlier periods of the Black struggle therefore could be associated with aiding in the spread and encouragement of hatred and racism. It has been speculated that the later arrival of television may have saved the medium from a negative association. A related notion is that, television was developed during the era of integration as opposed to segregation. It is argued that African Americans were curious about White society during this time and television provided an insight into the White world that could satisfy that curiosity. Finally, African Americans were drawn to television because their leisure time was limited due to a history of economic disadvantages and societal reasons such as segregation (Snare, 1972). It should be said that television may be attractive to the African American community for one or all of the reasons mentioned above. In fact, specific explanations are most likely dependent on the individual. While precise reasons

for the preference may be in dispute, the preference of African Americans for television is well supported.

With the background of inquiry of the media preferences of African Americans laid out, it is important to explore how and why the television medium is utilized by African Americans. This is an important area to discuss since it is well documented that African Americans have different media-socialization and media-gratification behaviors than Whites. These stem from both social standing and cultural differences between the two groups (Atkin, 1983; Gerson, 1966; Stroman, 1978).

It is important to note that research has demonstrated the tendency of African Americans to watch more television than Caucasians (Bower, 1985; Comstock, 1980; Darden, 1981; Poindexter & Stroman, 1981). According to one study (Gandy, 2001) 24% of African Americans indicated they viewed television two or less hours per day. Another 24% indicated they viewed six or more hours a day. Of the respondents who watched television, 30% indicated they viewed five or more shows that featured a Black cast. It was also indicated by 62% of these African American television viewers that the media presents Black men as violent and threatening. While this is a large percentage of viewers, the heavier viewers of television were less critical of the images presented. On the other hand, viewers with a higher racial identity were more critical of the same images.

The reasons for African American television viewing are different from those of Caucasians and other minorities (Albarran & Umphrey, 1993). Hispanics tend to utilize television for information and entertainment while African Americans

watch for entertainment and diversionary purposes. Another reason cited by African Americans for viewing television is to see other African Americans and to experience immersion into the Black experience (Carey, 1966; Greenberg, 1970). These television viewing motivations manifest themselves in the programming preferences of African Americans. The most common program types for this group include situation comedies, sports programming, police shows and game shows. These program viewing preferences are very different from those of Caucasian television watchers. In fact, seven of the ten programs most watched by African Americans are the least watched by Caucasians (Schement, 1998; Storm, 2000).

Multiple studies exploring the phenomenon of African Americans being heavier television consumers than Whites and other minorities, stumbled upon a common finding. These studies found a correlation between low self-esteem among African Americans and high levels of television viewing, and more specifically entertainment television viewing (Davis & Gandy, 1999; Graves, 1980; Stroman, 1984; Tan, 1979). Additional studies have segmented the African American viewing audience into two types: detached and highly diversified (Frank & Greenberg, 1980). Detached viewers use television as a tool for escapism while highly diversified viewers utilize television for a wide variety of reasons including intellectual stimulation and growth. Detached and highly diversified are only two of many personal attributes that can be studied with respect to television viewing behaviors.

Relationships have been examined between viewing behavior and the following: age, education, socioeconomic status and racial-orientation levels. Older African Americans with a higher socioeconomic status tend to watch news and public affairs programs (Allen & Bielby, 1979; Shosteck, 1969) while younger viewers prefer Black-oriented network programming (Tan & Vaughn, 1976). These younger viewers become more critical of programming as they obtain higher levels of education (Tan, 1978). As younger more educated African Americans obtain higher levels of socioeconomic status they also become more likely to perceive racial bias in television content (Allen & Bielby, 1979). Finally, racial-orientation levels play a role in viewing behavior. Alienated African Americans with a general distrust of Caucasians prefer programs with Black-oriented themes while those with positive views of their culture are not as likely to prefer that type of programming but do tend to be more critical of programming and watch less television (Allen & Bielby, 1979).

Purpose

Previous work examined situation comedies (Atkin, 1983; Kubey et al., 1995; Poindexter & Stroman, 1981), dramas (Oliver, 1994), and news programming (Entman, 1992, 1994). Without diminishing the results of these works, it is important to acknowledge the point made by Webster (1986) regarding viewers creating their own media experience. This point makes clear that that the portrayal does not stand alone; the audience being exposed to the portrayals should also be taken into account. Instead of concentrating on a single genre of television programming as in the above noted research, this study

will examine popular entertainment programming viewed by African American audiences and entertainment programming viewed by Caucasian audiences across genres in an attempt to address television programming as a whole.

The purpose of this study is to better understand the nature of African American and Caucasian roles in entertainment television. More specifically, this study will evaluate the manner in which African American and Caucasian characters are portrayed in entertainment television programming and if any differences are related to the popular viewing audience of specific programs (H1, H3 and RQ1). This study will also examine where African American characters are prevalent on television, again with regard to the viewing audience (H2, H4 and RQ2). These questions are important to ask since the actual viewing audience has not been accounted for in previous research. It is a logical progression to look at programming viewed by African Americans and evaluate the role portrayals present in those programs. Examining portrayals present in programming not as popular with African Americans provides a point of comparison for study.

Hypotheses / Research Questions

It has been found that the number of minority portrayals is increasing on television but are largely negative in nature (Greenberg & Collette, 1997; Kubey et al., 1995; Poindexter & Stroman, 1981; Tan, 1978). It is posited that African American portrayals will be more positive in programs more popular (watched more) by African Americans. This is derived from the tendency of African Americans to watch television for entertainment and diversionary

purposes (Albarran & Umphrey, 1993) combined with the desire to watch the Black experience (Carey, 1966; Greenberg, 1970).

H1: Broadcast shows more popular with African American audiences will have African American characters that are more positively portrayed than African American characters in broadcast shows more popular with Caucasians.

Continuing from H1, studies have also shown that African Americans tend to watch television to see other African Americans and watch the Black experience (Carey, 1966; Greenberg, 1970). Also, Black youngsters especially identify with Black characters (Dates, 1980). We would therefore expect shows depicting the Black experience with more African American characters to be more popular with African American viewers.

H2: Broadcast shows more popular with African American audiences will have a greater number of African American characters than broadcast shows more popular with Caucasians.

H1 and H2 examine the nature and number of African American roles in shows popular with African Americans versus those popular with Caucasians. H3 and H4 also deal with the nature and number of roles but in a different manner. H3 compares the nature of African American roles in shows watched by Caucasians to the nature of Caucasian roles in programs watched by African Americans. This seems a natural extension of H1 given the negative

historical treatment of African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians. How are Caucasian characters treated in programs watched primarily by African Americans? Does the content of the program “cater to the prejudice of the audience” as Lazarsfeld (1940) asserted?

H3: African American characters are more positively portrayed in broadcast shows more popular with Caucasians than Caucasian characters in broadcast shows more popular with African Americans.

H4 uses the same comparison of roles but examines the number of roles present rather than the nature of the roles. According to Dates (1980), Black and White youngsters can identify with Black characters. The opposite is not true; they do not both identify with White characters. If this is the case then White characters would not be expected to be as prevalent in shows popular with African American viewers.

H4: African American characters will be greater in number in broadcast shows more popular with Caucasians than Caucasian characters in broadcast shows more popular with African Americans.

In order to examine individual characteristics of character portrayals, additional items are taken from Mastro and Greenberg (2000): Physical characteristics (thin/obese, tall/short, light hair/dark hair, fair skin/dark skin, no accent/heavy accent), behavioral characteristics (articulate/inarticulate, quiet/loud, passive/aggressive, motivated/lazy, respected/ridiculed, smart/dumb),

and appearance characteristics (no makeup/excessive makeup, no accessories/excessive accessories, conservative attire/provocative attire, professional attire/casual attire, well-groomed/disheveled, clean/dirty). Finally, the Five Factor Model personality traits (extroversion/introversion, neuroticism/stability, agreeableness/antagonism, conscientiousness/undirectedness, openness/non-openness) as generally accepted in the field of psychology will also be coded (Norman, 1936).

RQ1: How are African Americans generally portrayed in popular programs on broadcast television?

Are African American characters found in programs watched by Caucasians or by African Americans? Are there more African American Characters in 30-minute programs or 60-minute programs? While Greenberg and Worell (2007) address these questions, their results are limited by the focus on new programming descriptions in *TV Guide Magazine*. They neglected to look at the larger picture with regard to the television viewing audience. Who is watching these programs? The authors practically acknowledge this fact when they propose the examination of programming later in the season within the conclusion of the study. This study will, instead, focus on the most popular programs among African American and Caucasian viewers regardless of genre.

RQ2: Where are portrayals of African Americans found on television?

CHAPTER 2

Methods

In order to investigate African American and Caucasian role portrayals on television, this study utilized a content analysis approach. Content analysis allows for the operationalization of role characteristics followed by statistical analysis of those characteristics. This study involved the recording of television programs from “over-the-air” broadcast television networks. Television programs were utilized to code aspects of role portrayals. Volunteer coders conducted the coding of all speaking characters in the obtained sample.

Sample

In an effort to determine the television programs popular with African Americans and those popular with Caucasians, Nielsen Media Research was consulted. Nielsen Media Research is a company that measures television viewing audiences through Nielsen ratings that, for years, have been the standard for deciding if programs should be renewed or cancelled. Nielsen provided (for a fee) two lists of programs for the period from September 22, 2008 to August 30, 2009: the top 70 programs as viewed by African Americans and the top 70 programs as viewed by a majority Caucasian audience (“HOH Race = Black,” 2009; “Total Coomposite,” 2009). For the purposes of this study, the “majority Caucasian audience” list was considered equal to “Caucasian” audiences. Both complete lists can be found in (Appendix A). All news programs, reality programming and sporting events were eliminated from consideration. These programs were eliminated in an effort to retain only those

programs that present completely fictional characters. Characters as seen in news, reality and sporting programs are not scripted characters and were not the intended focus of this study. Comparing the broadcast programs most popular among African Americans to those most popular among Caucasian audiences, programs common to both groups were eliminated in order to determine programs unique to each group. Six original programs for each group were obtained. It was necessary to use the top 60 programs from each list in order to have six programs unique to each list after all the eliminations were complete. The top ranked programs after eliminations and the networks of original airing are as follows:

Table 2

Sample Programs

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Network</u>	<u>Audience</u>
Two and a Half Men	CBS	Caucasian
Boston Legal	ABC	Caucasian
Big Bang Theory	CBS	Caucasian
Rules of Engagement	CBS	Caucasian
Lost	ABC	Caucasian
Bones	FOX	Caucasian
Ugly Betty	ABC	African American
Flashpoint	CBS	African American
Law & Order	NBC	African American
Fringe	FOX	African American
The Game	CW	African American
Knight Rider	NBC	African American

Programs popular with Caucasian audiences include three dramas and three situation comedies. The first drama, *Bones*, is a crime drama that follows the death cases investigated by a female forensic anthropologist and male FBI agent. *Lost* tells the story of a group of survivors from an airplane crash who try

to survive and solve the mysteries found on the tropical island where they find themselves. The final drama, *Boston Legal*, is a spinoff of *The Practice*, that depicts a law practice and its many attorneys who specialize in Civil Law cases.

The first comedy, *Two and a Half Men* is about a well-off jingle writer who allows his recently divorced brother and nephew to move in with him. *Rules of Engagement* shows the adventures of two couples and their single friend dealing with dating, commitment, and marriage from different stages of their relationships. Lastly, *The Big Bang Theory* follows the life of two brilliant but socially awkward physicists, their two scientist colleagues and their female neighbor.

Programs popular with African American audiences include five dramas and only one situation comedy. *Flashpoint*, a drama, depicts the personal trials and missions of a Toronto based police tactical unit. *Ugly Betty* tells the story of a young, smart woman trying to find her inner beauty despite being less than beautiful on the outside. *Knight Rider*, is an updated version of a series with the same name from the early 1980's that follows the adventures of an artificially intelligent car and its pilot. *Fringe* centers around the investigations in unexplained phenomena by a female FBI agent and an institutionalized scientist she is forced to work with. *Law and Order* follows murder cases from police investigation through prosecution of the crime in court. Finally, the only comedy in the African American audience category is *The Game*. This show is a spinoff of the show *Girlfriends* and features a group of women who have relationships with professional football players.

Instances of these top programs for each group (African American and the full population) were collected via DVR machine for a three week period during non-sweeps weeks starting on June 8, 2010. Some programs not currently airing on broadcast television were obtained through internet download and subsequent burning to DVD. Non-sweeps weeks were chosen in order to obtain a sample that reflects the viewing choices that reach the widest possible audience on any given day without specials or other viewer attracting techniques that could affect the study.

Broadcast recordings and internet downloads were collected until a minimum of five episodes were obtained for each program. In the case of some broadcast recordings, up to ten episodes were obtained due to the frequency of episodes airing during the collection time frame. All program episodes were then assigned numbers as a unique identifier. A random number generator was used to choose three episodes from each of the 12 programs. This process resulted in 36 original broadcast program episodes for coding purposes (Appendix B).

Coders

Volunteer coders were recruited from graduate students at Wayne State University. Eleven coders were recruited through the posting of flyers (Appendix AE) in Manoogian Hall, State Hall, Graduate Library, and Student Union. Of the eleven coders, six coders volunteered for the study. Of the six coders, all were female while three were African American and three were Caucasian. Approval from the Wayne State University Institutional Review Board (IRB) was obtained (IRB Protocol #1010008983).

In order to orient the coders to the data required, a training session was conducted at Wayne State University. The coding training consisted of group exercises that provided coders an orientation to, and practice utilizing the code sheet. As a group, the coders conducted coding activities while viewing a full episode of a program not used in the study to determine that they were well acquainted with the codes and coding procedures. This data collected was not used in the study. All coders expressed their comfort with the code book and code sheets. Coders were asked to complete a Coder Questionnaire (Appendix AF) to determine their familiarity with the programs in question before texts were distributed for coding. Coders were not given programs that they were overly familiar with in order to avoid any bias that may arise from coding programs with a high level of knowledge. Each coder left the training session assigned with six to seven episodes. Four of the episodes had two coders assigned so that inter-rater reliability could be tested once all the data was received.

For each program, at every program break all speaking characters were coded on a single code sheet. At the end of the program, coders then completed a demographic information sheet for each speaking character. Initial data on the code sheet was completed by the researcher before being distributed to individual coders along with the appropriate DVD's. Information completed by the researcher included: program name, episode name, break time and character name. Coders were given codebooks (Appendix AG) containing example code sheets and directions. Coding was completed at the coder's place of residence.

Operationalization

In order to determine how roles were portrayed, it was necessary to develop an operationalization tool. This tool would allow coders to evaluate the different aspects of a character's portrayal and assign values for each. Rather than designing an original tool for this study, tools from previous studies were used in combination to create the final code sheet (Appendix AH).

Initial coding items for this analysis were derived from a study originally conducted by Dates (1980). Nine evaluative semantic differential items, that we will call the Portrayal Index (honest/dishonest, nice/awful, attractive/ugly, fair/unfair, brave/cowardly, good/bad, successful/unsuccessful, mature/childish, thoughtful/thoughtless) were used by Dates to assess perceptions of television characters. This study adds a tenth item (warm/cold) to this scale. During the analysis the index score was calculated two different ways. First, with only the original nine items and secondly with the introduction of the tenth item (warm/cold). Tested with both nine (Cronbach's $\alpha = .942$) and ten (Cronbach's $\alpha = .950$) items confirmed high reliabilities.

Additional items were taken from Mastro and Greenberg (2000) in order to examine physical characteristics (thin/obese, tall/short, light hair/dark hair, fair skin/dark skin, no accent/heavy accent), behavioral characteristics (articulate/inarticulate, quiet/loud, passive/aggressive, motivated/lazy, respected/ridiculed, smart/dumb), and appearance characteristics (no makeup/excessive makeup, no accessories/excessive accessories, conservative attire/provocative attire, professional attire/casual attire, well-groomed/disheveled, clean/dirty). Finally, five personality traits used to describe

human personality (extroversion/introversion, neuroticism/stability, agreeableness/antagonism, conscientiousness/undirectedness, openness/non-openness) known as the Five Factor Model (FFM) from the field of psychology were also coded (Norman, 1936). The 32, five-point items were divided into five sections including Portrayal Index, Five Factor Model, Physical Characteristics, Behavioral Characteristics, and Appearance Characteristics. The items from Dates (1980) were summed to calculate an evaluative score for each speaking character. This evaluative score indicated the Portrayal Index (PI) for each character. A higher score indicates a more negatively evaluated character. The remaining sections from Mastro and Greenberg (2000) as well as the FFM traits were analyzed on an individual basis.

In addition to the 32 semantic differential items, coders were also asked to indicate the gender (male/female), ethnicity (Caucasian/African American/Hispanic/Asian-Pacific Islander/Native American/other), age (less than 20/20-35/35-50/51 and over/unknown (Greenberg & Worrell, 2007)), income level (high/middle/low/unknown (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000)), work role (white collar/blue collar/service/professional/unknown (Lauzen, Dozier, & Horan, 2008)), marital status (never married/married/divorced/married 2 or more times/unknown), parental status (biological children/adopted children/no children/unknown (Glascok, 2003)), and role type of each character (lead/secondary (Mastro & Greenberg, 2000)) for purposes of possible future investigations. Coders also indicated the nature of knowing the characters' ethnicity by indicating "implied" or "stated." Implied knowledge indicated the

ethnicity is inferred through visual or other means while “stated” indicated the ethnicity is specifically mentioned within the program.

Inter-rater Reliability

Inter-rater reliability is important to calculate in order to determine that all coders are familiar with the coding tool, are using it correctly and using it in a similar manner. In this study, four programs and a total of 79 characters were double coded. An Intraclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) was calculated for all characters across each personality trait category (Portrayal Index, Five Factor Model, Physical Characteristics, Behavioral Characteristics and Appearance Characteristics), (Appendix C).

While some individual ICC values were in the low .5 to .7 range, the majority were strong in the .8 to .9 range. Averaging ICC values across programs and trait categories resulted in acceptable values in the .7 to .8 range for all but the Behavioral Characteristics category. For this reason, it was necessary to exclude the Behavioral Characteristics category from this study.

Data

This study involved 36 programs with a total of 577 speaking characters. Each of these characters was coded for 34 different attributes and nine demographic factors. This makes for a minimum of 24,811 data points. Data was originally collected for each character at every program break. This collection method was utilized in an attempt to determine if character portrayals evolved throughout the program. The resulting data set (around 100,000 data

points) was unusually cumbersome with some characters having up to seven measurements while others had only one.

Analysis was conducted to determine if portrayals did indeed evolve or if the multiple measurements could be eliminated. For the 394 cases that included at least two recorded Portrayal Indexes, a paired *t*-test was conducted comparing the first and last Portrayal Index measurements. There was a significant difference in the scores for first ($M = 22.37$, $SD = 10.47$) and last ($M = 23.45$, $SD = 9.73$) Portrayal Index measurements; $t(393) = -2.6$, $p = .010$. While the difference is statistically significant, the mean difference between first and last Portrayal Index measurements was only -1.07 . Given that the Portrayal Index is a 50 point scale, the difference is determined to not be practically significant. Accordingly, all characters with multiple measurements were averaged to result in all characters having one measurement per program.

To address the hypotheses and research questions of this study, different tests were conducted. First, H1 and H3 are similar in that they are comparing the portrayal of characters in programs watched by different audiences. H1 is concerned with African American portrayals in programs watched by African Americans versus programs watched by Caucasians. H3 compares African American portrayals watched by Caucasians and Caucasian portrayals watched by African Americans. For each hypothesis, independent sample *t*-tests were used to analyze the corresponding Portrayal Index scores.

H2 and H4 are concerned with raw numbers of characters present in programs watched by different audiences. H2 looks at the number of African

American characters in programs watched by African Americans versus programs watched by Caucasians. H4 compares the number of African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians to the number of Caucasian characters in programs watched by African Americans. For each hypothesis, raw numbers are presented and then z-scores calculated to determine statistical significance.

CHAPTER 3

Results

This study resulted in a large amount of raw data. This chapter presents the data for all items that were operationalized. First, summary statistics are used to present the demographic data. This will provide an overall idea of the number of cases and how they break down by a number of classifications including: ethnicity, age, role type, income etc. Second, Portrayal Index comparisons for different groups will determine the presence of negative portrayals. Finally, the remaining characteristics will be analyzed on an individual basis.

Demographic Data

In total there were 577 occurrences of characters coded across 36 episodes. A similar number of character occurrences were coded between those shows watched primarily by Caucasians (242 characters or 41.9% of all characters) compared to those watched primarily by African Americans (335 characters or 58.1% of all characters) (Appendix D). Of the character occurrences recorded, 25.6% were seen as a lead role and the remaining 74.4% were secondary roles (Appendix E). The high percentage of secondary roles is to be expected given that eight of the twelve shows are 60-minute programs of the drama, mystery, crime genres which typically have a greater number of secondary characters.

Interestingly, of the episodes viewed, gender is not representative of the United States population (Appendix F). Females represent 35.9% of the

occurrences whereas males represent a much larger percentage at 64.1%. However, in the Census of 2010 (Howden & Meyer, May 2011), females represent 50.8% of the population which is slightly higher than the male population of 49.2%.

The age of the characters, as observed by the coders, is concentrated between the ages of 20 to 50 with 416 (72.1%) of the total 577 character occurrences present in this range. Those 416 occurrences are further broken down by the ages of 20- 35 having 214 (37.1%) occurrences and the ages of 36 – 50 having 202 (35%) occurrences. Typically these shows did not have many characters that were less than 20 years of age, as only 27 (4.7%) of the 577 occurrences fell into this range. The range covering a large age span of those over the age of 51 had 120 (20.8%) occurrences (Appendix G).

The discussion of ethnicity starts with an understanding that the coders documented 52 (9%) actual statements of ethnic origin, meaning characters verbally acknowledged their ethnicity. As typical of everyday life, the determination of ethnic origin was determined primarily by the coder observing the character. The mix of ethnicity of the character occurrences leaned more heavily to Caucasian at 74% compared to African American at 14.2%, Hispanic at 4.3%, Asian-Pacific Islander at 2.4%, and Native American at 0.3% (Appendix H). The ethnic characteristic will be explored further as it is a foundational element of the entire study. However, it is remarkable that even though half of the programming used in this study was identified as watched primarily by African Americans, the characters observed were three-fourths Caucasian across all the

shows watched. Another interesting point is that this distribution does not represent the US population according to the 2010 Census. The instances of Caucasian character occurrences is approximately two percentage points higher in this study than compared to the U.S. Census in 2010 (Hixson, Hepler, & Kim, September 2011). Similarly, the instances of African American character occurrences are two percentage points higher in this study than compared to the U.S. Census in 2010 (Rastogi, Johnson, Hoeffel, & Drewery, September 2011). In sharp contrast, Hispanics are underrepresented in this study by 12 percentage points when compared to the U.S. Census in 2010 (Ennis, Rios-Vargas, & Albert, May 2011).

The income distribution is relevant in that the middle and upper are over represented capturing a combined 340 (58.9%) of the 577 observations. In contrast to the reality of the United States based upon the U.S. Census in 2010 (DeNavas-Walt, Proctor, & Smith, 2011) which showed a poverty rate of 15.1% , the lower income observation had only 28 observations or a mere 4.9%.

With regard to the type of work observed for the 577 characters, 202 (35%) were thought to be professionals and another 57 (9.9%) were coded as white collar. The blue collar category totaled 49 (8.5%) observations and the service sector totaled 58 (10.1%) observations (Appendix I). In both categories, just over one third of the observations were noted as “Unknown” meaning neither the income level nor the occupation of the characters was clearly observed.

Finally for the entire data set, there are two characteristics, marital status and parental status, which do not appear to be a major component of the story

lines within the episodes coded (Appendix J). This is based upon the high percentage of observations being unknown, 81.3% for marital status and 80.1% for parental status.

Comparing the characteristics between characters in programs watched primarily by Caucasians to characters in programs watched primarily by African Americans, the first characteristic to be discussed is gender. As was the case with overall characters, a lower percentage of female character occurrences than what is the current mix of the U.S. population is shown in programs watched by both audiences. However, on a percentage basis, the programs watched by African Americans have a slightly higher female percentage at 37.0% compared to 34.3% females in the Caucasian programs (Appendix K).

Age distribution of characters in programs watched by African Americans and characters in programs watched by Caucasians is similar to that of all characters (Appendix L). There are slight differences in the “36 – 50” and the “51 and over” age brackets. While not a large difference, those shows watched primarily by Caucasians have a slightly younger character age with 38.8% of the occurrences in the “36 – 50” age bracket compared to 32.2% of the African American shows and 32.3% of all characters. Totals for the “51 and over” age range result in the African American programming at 23.0% compared to 17.8% for Caucasians programs and 20.0% overall.

From the previous comparison of all characters regarding ethnicity, it was noted that a small percentage (9%) of character occurrences were coded as having stated their ethnic background. While a small percentage, it is interesting

to note that 60% of those stated ethnicities were from programs most popular with African Americans (Appendix M).

As noted in the discussion on all characters, the ethnicity mix was not representative of the United States population as of the 2010 Census. Furthermore, it is intriguing to note the shift in ethnic mix between those shows primarily watched by African Americans and the Caucasian shows (Appendix N). Utilizing the U.S. 2010 Census as a baseline, programming popular with African Americans overrepresented African Americans by almost six percentage points (Rastogi et al., September 2011) and slightly underrepresented Caucasians by approximately three percentage points (Hixson et al., September 2011). On the other hand, programming popular with Caucasians overrepresented Caucasians by 8.6 percentage points and underrepresented African Americans by almost four percentage points.

While not a component of this study, it is noteworthy that the overall representation of Hispanics was significantly lower than the US population by 12.1 percentage points (Ennis et al., May 2011). Comparing programs watched by Caucasians and shows watched by African Americans, popular Caucasian shows underrepresented Hispanics by 14.3 percentage points and popular African American shows underrepresented Hispanics by only 9.7 percentage points.

In the review of the income and work type categories there are differences between popular Caucasian and popular African American programming (Appendix O). Specifically, popular African American shows had a higher percentage of

middle income and lower income characters as compared to all characters. The middle income category rose from 31.5% to 41.5% and the lower income category increased from 4.9% to 6.3%. The high income category decreased slightly from 27.4% for all characters to 24.5% for characters in popular African American shows. In contrast, popular Caucasian programming yielded an increase in the higher income bracket and decreases in both the middle and lower income brackets. The high income bracket increased from 27.4% to 31.4%, the middle income bracket decreased from 31.5% to 17.8% and the lower income bracket decreased from 4.9% to 2.9%. The unknown income category in popular Caucasian shows was 11.2% higher for all characters while that same category in popular African American shows was 8% lower.

The work classification of white collar, blue collar, service, professional and unknown resulted in an increase of all classifications for the character occurrences in popular African American shows as compared to all characters, with the exception of the unknown category. This is in contrast to a decrease in all categories with the exception of unknown in popular Caucasian programs. The unknown work category increased for those character occurrences in popular Caucasian shows from 35.7% in the total to 45% in the popular Caucasian shows.

Both programming popular with Caucasians (78.9%, 75.6%) and African Americans (83%, 83.3%) had a high percentage of “unknown” for marital status and parental status (Appendix P). For Caucasian audiences, the next highest rating was 9.5% (Never married) for marital status and 15.3% (No children) for

parental status. For African American audiences, the next highest were 8.1% (Married) marital status and 9.3% (Biological children) parental status.

Portrayal Index

The Portrayal Index consists of 10 individual attributes that operationalize how a character is portrayed. While final index results were used to address the specific hypotheses in the study, *t*-tests were also run on individual items in order to illuminate areas of disparity.

The first evaluation examined Black roles in White shows compared to Black roles in Black shows (Appendix Q). Here we find there was statistical difference in how Black roles were portrayed in shows watched by Blacks versus shows watched by Whites but only with respect to the Attractive $t(80) = 1.996, p < .05$, and Mature $t(80) = -2.128, p < .05$. These results were mixed in that Black characters in shows watched by Caucasians were seen as less attractive while Black characters in shows watched by African Americans were less mature. In another comparison looking at only lead, Black roles in Black popular programming versus White popular programming, the attributes of Attractive and Mature were not found to be statistically different.

We also looked for statistical differences of White roles in shows watched by Blacks versus shows watched by Whites. Again, the attributes of Attractive $t(424) = -2.139, p < .05$ and Mature $t(424) = 2.011, p < .05$, were found to have statistical difference. In this case, White characters are seen as less attractive in programs watched by African Americans and less mature in programs watched by Caucasians.

Another examination compared all Black characters to all White characters (Appendix R). The only attribute which shows statistical difference is Attractive $t(506) = 4.511, p < .05$, with Caucasian characters being seen as less attractive than African American characters. Lead roles (those essential to the evolution of the story) were also compared which resulted in no significant differences.

Comparisons were conducted in order to understand perceptions of race between Black and White coders (Appendix S). When looking at the results for Black coders of Black and White roles, Attractive $t(243) = 2.564, p < .05$ is statistically different indicating that Black coders found Caucasian characters to be more unattractive. When comparing only lead roles, Attractive was no longer statistically different.

Now switching to White coders and Black versus White roles, Attractive $t(261) = 4.346, p < .01$, and Successful $t(261) = 2.30, p < .05$, were both shown to be statistically different. In this case, White coders found Caucasian characters less attractive and less successful. Comparing only lead roles, Fair $t(50) = -2.790, p < .05$, and Mature $t(50) = -2.279, p < .05$, are statistically different. This means White coders found African American lead roles to be less fair and less mature.

The Portrayal Index and its individual items were also compared between 30 and 60 minute shows (Appendix T) to determine if there was a difference in representation according to length of programming. All characters between 30 and 60 minute programs resulted in Attractive $t(574) = -3.289, p < .05$, Mature

$t(574) = 5.056, p < .01$, and Thoughtful $t(574) = 2.298, p < .05$ as significantly different. These results show that characters in 60 minute programs are less attractive than those in 30 minute programs while characters in 30 minute programs are less mature and less thoughtful than characters in 60 minute programs.

The Portrayal Index and its individual items for Black versus White roles in 30 minute shows were compared (Appendix U). The overall PI index is significant $t(101) = -3.508, p < .05$ meaning Black characters were portrayed less positively than White characters in 30 minute programs. The following individual items within the Portrayal Index were statistically significant: Fair $t(101) = -3.776, p < .01$, Brave $t(101) = -2.881, p < .01$, Good $t(101) = -3.467, p < .05$, Mature $t(101) = -2.198, p < .05$, Thoughtful $t(101) = -3.023, p < .01$, Warm $t(101) = -2.384, p < .05$. For every one of these attributes, African American characters were seen as possessing less of each quality.

Moving from 30 minute programming to 60 minute programming and looking for the differences in Black and White characters the overall Portrayal Index was significant $t(403) = 3.026, p < .01$ (Appendix V). In this case Caucasian characters in 60 minute programs were portrayed less positively. Six individual attributes were significant including: Nice $t(403) = 2.819, p < .01$, Attractive $t(403) = 5.812, p < .01$, Good $t(403) = 2.069, p < .05$, Successful $t(403) = 2.975, p < .01$, Mature $t(403) = 2.810, p < .01$. In 60 minute programs, Caucasian characters were seen as having less of each quality.

Characteristics

The remaining personality characteristics were divided into four areas: Five Factor Model, Physical Characteristics, Behavioral Characteristics, and Appearance Characteristics. These areas were simply for organizational purposes. Each area is not intended to be treated as an index. Since this is the case, *t*-tests were run on each item to determine statistically significant differences.

The comparisons pertain to Black versus White characters in all shows. Only four of the 22 characteristics were significant (Appendix W). Difference in Hair was significant $t(497) = -11.623, p < .01$, with African American's having darker hair. Also, Skin was significant $t(506) = -30.173, p < .01$, with African American's having darker skin. Makeup significant as well $t(504) = -3.591, p < .01$, with African American's having more make-up. And finally, Accessories was also significant $t(503) = -4.398, p < .01$, with African American's wearing more accessories.

Next, Black characters were compared between shows watched by Black audiences and shows watched by White audiences. When comparing this subset, four characteristics are statistically significant (Appendix X). Makeup was found to be significant $t(80) = -4.609, p < .01$. Black characters in shows watched by black audiences had more makeup. Also, Accessories were significant $t(80) = -2.869, p < .01$, with African American characters wearing more accessories in shows watched by African Americans. Also, significant was Groomed $t(80) = 2.309, p < .05$, with Black characters watched in shows by Caucasians being less well groomed. Finally, Clean was significant $t(80) = 2.514, p < .05$, with Black characters watched in shows by Caucasians being less clean.

All characters were then compared between 30 minute programming and 60 minute programming (Appendix Y). Fourteen characteristics were found to be significantly different between characters in 30 minute shows versus characters in 60 minute shows. The first three were Extrovert $t(571) = -3.004, p < .01$; Openness $t(574) = -3.318, p < .01$; Tall $t(473) = -1.996, p < .05$. The results showed characters in 60 minutes programs were less extroverted, less open and shorter. The remaining eleven were Hair $t(563) = 2.340, p < .05$; Skin $t(572) = 3.769, p < .01$; Makeup $t(572) = 3.041, p < .01$; Accessories $t(571) = 2.032, p < .05$; Conservative Attire $t(570) = 4.959, p < .01$; Professional Attire $t(572) = 4.988, p < .01$. Resulting in characters in 30 minutes shows having darker hair, darker skin, more makeup, more accessories, far less conservative attire and far less professional attire.

When looking at just the 30 minute programming, Black versus White roles where compared (Appendix Z). Twelve out of the 22 characteristics are found to be statistically significant. Agreeableness was significant $t(101) = -3.414, p < .01$, with African American characters being less agreeable. Conscientiousness was significant $t(101) = -4.342, p < .01$, with African American characters being less conscientiousness. Openness was significant $t(101) = -4.331, p < .01$, with African American characters being less open. Hair was significant $t(99) = -5.226, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker hair. Skin was significant $t(100) = -19.536, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker skin. Accessories was significant $t(100) = -2.627, p < .05$, with African American characters wearing more accessories. Professional Attire was significant $t(100) = 2.481, p < .01$, with Caucasian characters having less professional attire. Groomed was significant $t(100) = 2.786, p < .01$, with

Caucasian characters being less groomed. Clean was significant $t(100) = 2.663, p < .01$, with Caucasian characters being less clean.

Finally, Black roles versus White roles were then compared in only 60 minute programming (Appendix AA). In this comparison only five attributes were significantly different. Hair was significant $t(396) = -9.759, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker hair. Skin was significant $t(404) = -22.913, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker skin. Makeup was significant $t(402) = -2.691, p < .01$, with African American characters wearing more makeup. Accessories was significant $t(401) = -3.270, p < .01$, with African American characters wearing more accessories.

Hypotheses

The first hypothesis predicted that African American characters will be more positively portrayed in programs watched by African Americans than in programs watched by Caucasians. In order to test this hypothesis, an independent sample t -test was conducted comparing the Portrayal Index ratings of African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians to those of African American characters in programs watched by African Americans. In this case the result was not found to be statistically significant $t(80) = -.883, p > .05$, indicating the hypothesis is not supported. This means African American characters were not portrayed differently in programs watched by African Americans and programs watched by Caucasians.

The second hypothesis predicted programs watched by African Americans will have more African American characters than programs watched by Caucasians. To test this hypothesis it is first necessary to look at the raw numbers of African American

characters in programs watched by African Americans and in those watched by Caucasians. The raw numbers supported the hypothesis.

Table 3

African American Characters by Audience

<u>Audience</u>	<u>African American Characters</u>	<u>Total Characters</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
African American Audience	61	335	18.2
Caucasian Audience	21	242	8.7

Programs watched by African Americans had a larger percentage of African American characters than shows watched by Caucasians. In fact, in African American programs Black characters are overrepresented when compared to the population. In Caucasian programs, Black characters are seriously underrepresented.

While the raw numbers support the hypothesis it is important to determine if the raw number difference is significant. In order to make this determination a z-score was calculated. This score confirmed the numbers are significantly different and supports the hypothesis ($z = 3.22, p < 0.01$).

The third hypothesis compares the portrayal of African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians to Caucasian characters in programs watched by African Americans and predicts the African American characters will be portrayed more positively. As in hypothesis 1, testing this hypothesis was achieved through a *t*-test comparing Portrayal Index ratings. This hypothesis was not supported $t(249) = -.816, p > .05$ meaning the African American characters and Caucasian characters were not portrayed differently.

The final hypothesis predicted African American characters to be more plentiful in programs popular with Caucasians than Caucasian characters in programs watched by African Americans. As with hypothesis two, we can look at raw numbers to begin to test the hypothesis.

Table 4

Characters by Race and Audience

<u>Role Type</u>	<u>Roles</u>	<u>Total Characters</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
African American Roles in Caucasian Programs	21	241	8.7
Caucasian Roles in African American Programs	231	335	69

These raw numbers do not support hypothesis. To further determine that the difference is significant in not supporting the hypothesis, a z-score was calculated and significance was confirmed ($z = -14.39$, $p < 0.01$). Results show that African American characters are not more plentiful in Caucasian programs than Caucasian characters in African American programs.

Research question one asks the general question, how are African Americans portrayed on broadcast television? The first way to see how African American characters are portrayed is through demographics (Appendix AB). This study found that 51.2% of Black characters were male (48.8% female) and most characters were between the ages of 20 and 50 with 47.6% between 20 and 35, and 39% between 36 and 50. African Americans were portrayed as high on the income scale with 38.3% in the "High" (37.8%) or "Middle" (30.5%) categories. Work status for African American characters was overwhelmingly in the "Professional" category at 47.6% with "Unknown"

being the next highest at 19.5%. Finally, with regard to marital status and parental status, the dominate category is “Unknown” at 87.8% for both.

The answer to this question can be also found by completing comparisons using the Portrayal Index, its individual attributes as well as the other 22 characteristics. The first statistically different portrayal of African American characters versus Caucasian characters is found in 30 minute programs. The Portrayal Index was significant $t(101) = -3.508, p < .05$, meaning African American characters were portrayed as less positive than Caucasian characters in 30 minute programs. The following individual items within the PI were also statistically significant: Fair $t(101) = -3.776, p < .01$, Brave $t(101) = -2.881, p < .01$, Good $t(101) = -3.467, p < .05$, Mature $t(101) = -2.198, p < .05$, Thoughtful $t(101) = -3.023, p < .01$, Warm $t(101) = -2.384, p < .05$. These scores indicate African American characters are portrayed as less positive with regard to these attributes.

Thirty minute programs also portrayed African American characters differently with regard to the following attributes: Agreeableness $t(101) = -3.414, p < .01$, with African American characters being less agreeable, Conscientiousness $t(101) = -4.342, p < .01$, with African American characters being less conscientiousness, Openness $t(101) = -4.331, p < .01$, with African American characters being less open, Hair $t(99) = -5.226, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker hair, Skin $t(100) = -19.536, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker skin, and Accessories $t(100) = -2.627, p < .05$, with African American characters wearing more accessories.

In 60 minutes shows, African Americans were portrayed differently from Caucasian characters with regard to a few attributes. Hair was significant $t(396) = -9.759, p < .01$, with African American characters having darker hair. Skin was

significant $t(404) = -22.913$, $p < .01$, with African American characters having darker skin. Makeup was significant $t(402) = -2.691$, $p < .01$, with African American characters wearing more makeup. Accessories was significant $t(401) = -3.270$, $p < .01$, with African American characters wearing more accessories.

African Americans are portrayed differently in programs watched by Caucasians and programs watched by African Americans. Blacks were found less Attractive $t(80) = 1.996$, $p < .05$, less Groomed $t(80) = 2.309$, $p < .05$, and less Clean $t(80) = 2.514$, $p < .05$, in programs watched by Whites but less Mature $t(80) = -2.128$, $p < .05$, more Makeup $t(80) = -4.609$, $p < .01$, and more Accessories $t(80) = -2.869$, $p < .01$, in programs watched by African Americans.

Overall, African American characters are only portrayed differently to Caucasian characters in a few characteristics. Hair was significant $t(497) = -11.623$, $p < .01$, with African American's having darker hair, skin was significant $t(506) = -30.173$, $p < .01$, with African American's having darker skin, Makeup significant as well $t(504) = -3.591$, $p < .01$, with African American's having more make-up, and finally, Accessories also significant $t(503) = -4.398$, $p < .01$, with African American's wearing more accessories.

Research question two asks, where are portrayals of African Americans found on television? While this question seems to be an all-encompassing question, the data collected from the study provides a few valuable insights. We have previously addressed in hypothesis two that there are more African American characters in programming popular with African Americans. And in these shows, African Americans are over-represented compared to the population.

Lead roles (those roles essential to the evolution of the story) were 20.7% of all African American portrayals while 79.3% were secondary roles. Overall, African Americans had 17 instances (11.5%) of all lead roles and 65 instances (15.2%) of secondary roles.

Comparing 30 minute programming and 60 minute programming, as a percentage of the cast there are more African Americans in 30 minute programming than in 60 minute programming. Determining the z-score confirms the difference is significant ($z = 3.68$, $p < 0.05$).

Table 5

<i>Characters by Program Length</i>			
<u>Program Length</u>	<u>African American Characters</u>	<u>Total Characters</u>	<u>Percentage</u>
30minute programming	28	111	25.2%
60 minute programming	54	464	11.6%

CHAPTER 4

Discussion

This study was conducted to test four hypotheses which deal with the portrayal of African Americans on broadcast entertainment television. While this has been an area of focus in previous studies such as McDonald (1983), Glascock (2003), Kubey, Shifflet, Weerakkody, & Ukeiley (1995), and Poindexter & Stroman, (1981), this study's focus is a logical progression of those studies taking into consideration the viewing audience which has not been accounted for in previous research. The first area of focus evaluates the manner in which African American and Caucasian characters are portrayed in entertainment television programming and if any differences are related to the popular viewing audience of specific programs (H1 and H3). The second area examines where African American characters are prevalent on television, again with regard to the viewing audience (H2 and H4).

Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesis one and hypothesis three analyze how characters are portrayed in programs viewed by audiences of different races. Hypothesis one predicted that African American characters will be more positively portrayed in programs watched by African Americans than in programs watched by Caucasians. This hypothesis tried to determine if the viewing audience of a program might influence the way characters are portrayed in that program. Given the history of stereotypical treatment of African Americans in the media, this hypothesis predicted that shows popular with Caucasian audiences would portray African American characters in a more negative manner than programs popular with African Americans. This position was hypothesized with the

understanding that modern stereotypes (lazy, dumb, inferior) may still be the case with regard to African American characters in programs popular with Caucasians. However, African American audiences would most likely avoid these negative portrayals and prefer to watch more positive portrayals of characters that resemble themselves.

Since this hypothesis was not supported, we must conclude that African American character portrayals are not more negative in programs watched by Caucasians than in programs watched by African Americans. It may seem that the negative stereotypes of African Americans on television, at least the overt ones, may be gone. While the stereotypical “comic negro” and “contented servant” have slowly disappeared from television, the new stereotypes of African Americans as inferior, lazy, dumb, dishonest, comical, unethical or crooked became prominent. These results show that even these stereotypical portrayals of African American characters are no longer common.

The third hypothesis compared the portrayal of African American characters in programs popular with Caucasians to Caucasian characters in programs popular with African Americans and predicts the African American characters will be portrayed more positively. This hypothesis was meant to test how programs portray characters that are not of the same ethnicity as the main viewing audience. For instance, it would be expected that shows more popular with Caucasians would portray African Americans differently as in the past. The same may be true for shows popular with African Americans the portrayal of Caucasian characters. This was an important construct to test in order to see if after a history of underrepresentation and stereotypical portrayals of themselves, African American viewers were now being presented with significantly

different portrayals of Caucasians. Since this hypothesis was not supported, Caucasian characters are not being portrayed differently in programs watched by African Americans than African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians.

This determination, together with the fact that African American characters are not portrayed in a negative manner in hypothesis one, leads us to believe that the portrayal of these two racial groups may be becoming normalized, at least with regard to overall portrayals. In other words, African American characters are not portrayed negatively for Caucasian audiences and Caucasians are not portrayed negatively for African American audiences.

Cultivation theory provides an interesting explanation for how the portrayals of African American and Caucasian characters have evolved over time to be relatively similar. Introduced by George Gerbner (Gerbner, 1967, 1969a, 1969b, 1973). Cultivation Theory argues that heavy television viewers are more likely to see the world around them in the same way it is portrayed on the screen. Or, as described by Hawkins and Pingree (1981), the bias of television determines how the individual constructs his or her beliefs about the world. A later development in the theory was the idea of Mainstreaming. Mainstreaming argues that heavy television viewing may bring disparate groups, who otherwise would hold polarized opinions, into a kind of American middle ground on issues and ideas (Shanahan & Morgan, 1999). The normalizing of Black and White portrayals in this context can be seen as an effort to show racial harmony in American society.

Hypothesis two and hypothesis four examined raw numbers of African American and Caucasian characters. The second hypothesis predicted programs watched by

African Americans would have more African American characters than programs watched by Caucasians. This hypothesis was supported in that African American characters were more plentiful in programs viewed by African Americans than in programs viewed by Caucasians. This result was expected based on the idea from Uses & Gratifications Theory that viewers pick the media they consume based on meeting personal needs and African Americans would choose to watch images of characters that look like themselves.

Hypothesis four looked at African American characters in programs watched by Caucasians versus Caucasian characters in programs watched by African Americans. It was hypothesized that there would be fewer Caucasian characters in the shows popular with African Americans, but this was not supported. This hypothesis was developed with the belief that African Americans would rather watch programs with characters that resemble themselves as explained by Uses & Gratifications Theory. Instead, there were not fewer Caucasian characters in programs watched by African Americans. In retrospect, this result is also understandable given the programming choices available to African Americans. There are only so many programs available to African Americans with majority Black casts. In fact, this study's sample only included one program with a majority Black cast. This means African Americans, while able to choose programs with acceptable portrayals, must still select programming dominated by White characters.

Since both hypothesis two and four involved Uses & Gratifications Theory, a review of the theory is necessary. Uses & Gratifications theory (Katz, Blumler, & Gurevitch, 1974) describes individuals as actively seeking out specific media and

content in order to satisfy a personal need or obtain desired gratifications. This theory is based on the premise of an active media as well as an active consumer. The basic question for Uses and Gratification Theory researchers is “What do consumers do with the media” (West & Turner, 2004).

There are five basic assumptions of Uses and Gratifications Theory: an active audience with goal oriented media use, choosing media for need gratification is up to the audience member, media sources compete for need satisfaction, audience members understand their interests and motives well enough to provide researchers with information regarding media use, and media content judgements can only be made by the audience (Katz et al., 1974). Audience needs and gratifications as categorized in the early 1970's include diversion (escaping routines or daily troubles), personal relationships (substituting the media for human companionship), personal identity (reinforcing personal values), and surveillance (information on how to accomplish goals) (McQuail, Blumler, & Brown, 1972).

With this understanding of an active African American audience provided by Uses and Gratification Theory, the results of hypothesis two are made clear. If African American television viewers are choosing the programs they watch to satisfy a personal need such as personal identity, then the programs they watch will have more Black characters. In reverse, Caucasian viewers would choose programming with more Caucasian characters.

While three out of the four hypotheses in this study were not supported, the implications of these results are that character portrayals of African Americans and Caucasians are not being presented in a negative manner despite the race of the

viewing audience. This demonstrates a continued progression of the nature of character portrayals from the literature review presented earlier. African Americans do tend to watch programs that have more Black characters than programs popular with Caucasians, however even these programs are dominated by White characters.

Research question one asks the general question, how are African Americans portrayed on broadcast television? While hypothesis one showed there are not significant differences in the overall portrayals, research question one requires a deeper examination of demographics and individual attributes to see where differences are present. With regard to demographics, the most common African American character is male, between the ages of 20 and 35, a middle to high income earner in a professional position and viewers do not know if he is married or has children. This description paints a rather different picture than that of the everyday African American when compared to the African American population that is 53.4% female, has a median income of \$32,000, and has a median age of 32 (*Annual Estimates of Resident Population by Sex, Age, Race and Hispanic Origin for the United States and States: April 1, 2010 to July 1, 2013*, June 2014; DeNavas-Walt et al., 2011).

Another appropriate comparison to the most common African American character portrayal is the most common Caucasian character portrayal. According to the data from this study, Caucasian characters are overwhelmingly male (66.5%), between the ages of 20 and 50, a middle income professional with marital and parental status unknown. This description is similar to that of African American characters with regard to being overly male, middle income professional and unknown marital or parental status. Caucasian characters, however, are more varied with regard to age than African

American characters. African Americans fall mostly between the ages of 20 and 35 while Caucasians fall between the ages of 20 and 50 years of age.

In 30 minute programs African American characters are portrayed more negatively than Caucasian characters according to Portrayal Index testing. In addition, African Americans in 30 minute programs are portrayed as less agreeable, less conscientious, less open, and with more accessories than Caucasian characters. This indicates that while overall African American characters are not portrayed more negatively on broadcast entertainment television, (see hypothesis one) situation comedies still contain evidence of stereotypical portrayals of African American characters.

In contrast to 30 minute programs, 60 minute programs do a better job portraying African American characters. While they are not portrayed more negatively according to Portrayal Index testing, they are portrayed with more makeup and accessories. These two attributes are not necessarily negative in nature but they may allow for a stereotypical image if overdone. Since the overall comparison from hypothesis one showed no significant difference in African American character portrayals, it seems the portrayals of African American characters in 60 minute programs outweighs the negative portrayals present in 30 minute programming.

The negative portrayals present in 30 minute programming could be the result of the nature of those programs. 30 minute programs are shorter and have less time to present characters and tell a story. As noted by Gandy (1998), stereotypes can be used as shorthand to have characters quickly understood by viewers which helps with time constraints. Stereotypes, even negative ones, can often be funny, and therefore

aid in presenting humor as required of situation comedies that make up most of 30 minute programming. What neither of these explanations addresses is the fact that Black characters are portrayed in a more negative manner. The utility of stereotypes would be just as effective with White characters.

Black characters are portrayed differently in programs watched by Whites and programs watched by African Americans. White audiences see African Americans portrayed as less attractive, less groomed and less clean. Black audiences see African American characters as less mature, more makeup and more accessories. The contrast here is interesting. White audiences see Black characters with three negative characteristics while Black audiences only see one (makeup and accessories are not necessarily negative).

Overall individual character attributes for African American characters only differ from Caucasian characters in four areas: hair, skin, makeup, and accessories. While the first two are expected due to African American's natural skin and hair color, the second two give pause for thought. African American characters were depicted more often with excessive makeup and accessories. This seems to indicate that there is at least some remnant of stereotypical African American portrayals present on television. A closer look at these results reveals that these two portrayal attributes are more readily applied to female characters who are more likely to wear makeup or adorn accessories like scarves and jewelry. Therefore, maybe the leap can be made that African American males have largely escaped stereotypical portrayals in entertainment programming while African American females still have some progress to make.

Research question two asks, where are portrayals of African Americans found on television? This question was asked in order to determine the sources of African American portrayals which would then provide insight as to the viewing audience of the portrayals. To answer this question, African American character representations in 30 minute and 60 minute programs were examined. Results showed underrepresentation in 60-minute programs and overrepresentation in 30 minute programs. While the underrepresentation according to population is only by approximately one percentage point, this result confirms that African Americans are still mostly found in situation comedies which make up the bulk of 30 minute programming.

In addition, African American characters are overrepresented in programs watched by African Americans. This indicates that African Americans may be actively choosing programs with more African American characters as discussed earlier regarding Uses and Gratifications Theory. Finally, African American characters make up 11.5% (17 of 148) of all lead roles (those essential to the evolution of the story) on television. This percentage is within one percentage point of the African American population rate of 12.6% (Rastogi, Johnson, Hoeffel, & Drewery, September 2011). This is an important fact to note because it shows that African American characters are being represented in lead roles and not always relegated to background or supporting roles on television.

The research questions in this study asked how and where African American characters are portrayed on broadcast television entertainment programming. The answers to these questions provide a description of the typical African American character on television, an understanding of where African American characters are still

portrayed negatively, where they are over or underrepresented when compared to the population and their representation in lead roles on television. These results provide both a snapshot of the portrayal of African American characters on television at this time and a baseline for future comparisons.

Additional Findings

Additional analysis led to findings with respect to programming trends, unknown character information, representation of African American with respect to the population and in lead roles, other minorities' portrayals, and Caucasian portrayals.

Interesting findings became evident while comparing Nielsen Ratings lists for African Americans versus Caucasian audiences and speak to the trends in programming. It has been noted that African Americans and Caucasians tend to watch different types of programming (Bogart, 1972; Pratt, 1993). According to Nielsen lists, this is arguably not the case any longer ("HOH Race = Black," 2009; "Total Composite," 2009). When comparing these lists to eliminate common programs and find six shows original to each audience, it required comparing the top 60 programs from each list. If African Americans and Caucasians still watched different programming then the lists would have fewer programs in common and the task could have been completed without having to delve so deeply into the lists.

Since this study focused on broadcast entertainment television, niche programming on smaller cable networks was not included. The determination that African Americans and Caucasians no longer watch different types of programming may not hold true for programming on smaller cable networks which, by definition, do not

require the same large audiences the broadcast networks require. This difference in audience size requirement allows cable networks to cater to smaller audiences while the broadcast networks must attract larger audiences in order to be successful. This means cable networks such as BET could easily attract only African American to programming not viewed by Caucasians.

Switching to the information not known about characters we watch on television, a number of categories were consistently not known regardless of race. For example in this study, "Work" and "Income" categories included simple classifications available for characters. "Work" included "White Collar," "Blue Collar," "Service," "Professional," and "Unknown" while "Income" included "High," "Middle," "Low," and "Unknown." However, for both of these categories, "Unknown" was the most common response at 35.7% (206 of 577) and 35.5 % (205 of 577) respectively (Appendix I). "Marital Status" and "Parental Status" categories were even higher. Each of these categories had 80% or more of the characters as "Unknown" (Appendix J). While habitual viewers of these programs may learn more information about the characters over many episodes, it is clear that certain information about the characters we watch on television is not vital to our viewing experience of individual episodes.

The data from this study revealed that overall, African American and Caucasian characters are portrayed rather consistently for programming watched by both audiences. Additionally, African Americans are overrepresented on television (14.2%) compared to their proportion (12.6%) in society (Rastogi, Johnson, Hoeffel, & Drewery, September 2011). However, this is only true when taking into account all programming. In this study's sample, programs viewed by Caucasians underrepresented African

Americans (8.7% versus 12.6%) while programs watched by African Americans overrepresented (18.2% versus 12.6%) them. As mentioned in the discussion of research question two above, this indicates that African Americans may be actively choosing programs with more African American characters.

Other populations did not fare as well as African Americans on entertainment television according to this study. Both women and Hispanics were severely underrepresented. Women are currently just over 50% (Howden & Meyer, May 2011) of the population in the United States while this study sample only included 35.9% women (Appendix F). Hispanics are represented even less than women. They are currently 17% of the population but on television they are only 4.3% of the characters (Appendix H). In fact, the category "Other" outperforms Hispanic at 4.7% of television characters.

Finally, while not the purpose of this study a number of findings regarding Caucasian portrayals were identified. Throughout all programming in the sample, Caucasian characters were portrayed as less attractive than African American characters according to the results of the individual Portrayal Index items. Caucasians were also less attractive in programs watched by African Americans. The finding of less attractive Caucasian characters was also present for Black coders, White coders, and 60 minute programs. Less attractive Caucasian roles in all of these situations could indicate a higher standard with regard to appearance for Black actors than White Actors. For example, White characters were found to make up 74% (427 of 577) of the characters on television while African Americans were 14.2% (82 of 577). At 74% of the characters on television, it is easier to have some of the White characters be less

attractive supporting characters. At 14.2%, there are fewer opportunities to have these types of roles for African American characters.

Caucasian characters had a number of other negative findings. They were found to be less mature in 60 minute programming as well as shows watched by Caucasians. White coders found Caucasian characters less successful, which was also the case in 60 minute programs. In addition, 60 minute programs also found less positive portrayals of Caucasians with regard to nice and good attributes. Thirty minute programs indicated Caucasian characters had less professional attire, were less groomed and less clean. The fact that Caucasian characters have negative attributes is an indication that having some negative aspects is acceptable for White television characters. In other words, while it is proper to examine the differences between White and Black portrayals, the goal is not for there to be only positive characteristics.

Limitations

Two issues arose in this study that caused some data to be omitted. First, was the existence of bald characters. The problem did not become evident until data was being entered into SPSS from the original data sheets. It was noticed that on some code sheets the "Hair" attribute was left blank. It was determined that these characters were bald and the attribute was entered as "Missing Data."

Second, all six coders, both African American and Caucasian, were female. This means all conclusions derived from this study come from a female's perspective. Again, this does not change the results of the study however, just as it was

advantageous to compare results from White coders and Black coders it would be beneficial to replicate this study with a mix of male and female coders.

Conclusion

The most disturbing findings of this study were outside the parameters of the hypotheses and research questions regarding the serious underrepresentation of female and Hispanic portrayals. It should be mentioned that as of the completion date of this study there are a number of female led dramas on prime time television that may alleviate the shortfalls evident in female character portrayals. Vehicles for the improvement of Hispanic portrayals and representation are not as visible.

The purpose of this study was to examine the portrayals of African American characters on broadcast television entertainment programming and compare them to the portrayals of Caucasian characters. While three of four hypotheses were not supported, those hypotheses were developed with the assumption that historical stereotypes of African American characters were still prevalent on television. While the negative stereotypes are fading, they are not entirely gone. Situation comedies were found to portray African American characters in a more negative manner than Caucasian characters. This study provides evidence that stereotypes are continuing to fade from the television content but are still present in certain types of programming.

African American characters on broadcast television have come a long way since the early days of the medium that provided little to no representation. This study found that African American characters are currently overrepresented on television as compared to their portion of the population. This result is encouraging but there is a

caveat. African American characters are underrepresented in programs popular with Caucasians and overrepresented in programs popular with African Americans. It seems that while programming as a whole overrepresents African Americans, there is enough programming available that viewers can significantly alter their exposure to types and numbers of character portrayals.

This results of this study show that progress is being made with regard to African American character portrayals in broadcast entertainment television programming. However, the journey is not complete.

APPENDIX A
NIELSEN LISTS

Program Ranking By Audience

<u>Ranking</u>	<u>Composite Audience</u>	<u>African American Audience</u>
1	American Idol – Wed	NBC Sunday Night Football
2	American Idol – Tue	American Idol – Wed
3	Dancing With The Stars	American Idol – Tue
4	Dancing With The Stars Results	Dancing With The Stars
5	NBC Sunday Night Football	The OT
6	NCIS	Dancing With The Stars Results
7	CSI	CSI: Miami
8	The Mentalist	Sunday night NFL Pre-Kick
9	60 Minutes	Eleventh Hour
10	Two And A Half Men	60 Minutes
11	CSI: Miami	CSI: NY
12	Desperate Housewives	CSI
13	Criminal Minds	Without A Trace
14	Eleventh Hour	The Mentalist
15	The OT	The Unit
16	America's Got Talent – Tue	Criminal Minds
17	Without A Trace	NCIS
18	America's Got Talent – Wed	Law And Order: SVU
19	CSI: NY	Lie To Me
20	Survivor: Gabon	Cold Case
21	The Bachelor	Football Night In America PT 3
22	Sunday Night NFL Pre-Kick	Desperate Housewives
23	The Mentalist – Tuesday	24
24	America's Got Talent – Wed 9PM	Grey's Anatomy – Thu 9PM
25	Grey's Anatomy – Thu 9PM	Amazing Race 13
26	Survivor: Tocantins	America's Got Talent – Tue
27	Cold Case	America's Got Talent – Wed
28	FOX NASCAR Sprint Cup	Ugly Betty
29	Amazing Race 13	Harper's Island
30	Worst Week	America's Top Model 5
31	Law And Order: SVU	The Mentalist – Tue
32	24	Extreme Makeover: HM ED 7PM
33	ER	Saturday Night Football
34	Lie To Me	Numb3rs
35	Brothers & Sisters	Flashpoint
36	House	Friday Night Smackdown
37	Biggest Loser 7	Law And Order
38	Amazing Race 14	So You think You Can Dance –

39	The Unit	Wed
40	Boston Legal	Superstars Of Dance
41	The Big Bang Theory	48 Hours Mystery – Tue
42	Harper's Island	Fringe
43	Extreme Makeover: HM ED – 8PM	Brothers & Sisters
44	Rules Of Engagement	Primetime: Family Secret
45	Football NT America PT 3	Ghost Whisperer
		So You Think You Can Dance – Thu
46	Ghost Whisperer	America's Top Model 6
47	Sat Night Football	The Bachelor
48	Numb3rs	America's Got Talent – Wed 9PM
49	48 Hour Mystery – Tue	World News Tonight
50	Lost	AMW: America Fights Back
51	Million Dollar Password	House
52	Superstars Of Dance	The Game
53	Biggest Loser 6	Law And Order: SVU 9PM
54	Deal Or No Deal – Wed	Survivor: Gabon
55	Apprentice 8	Knight Rider
56	Fringe	Deal Or No Deal – Wed
57	Bones	Family Guy
58	Flashpoint	Two And A Half Men
59	The Bachelorette	Extreme Makeover: HM ED – 8PM
60	Samantha Who?	Primetime: What Would You Do
61	How I Met Your Mother	Opportunity Knocks
62	Castle	Law And Order: SVU – Wed 9PM
63	Law And Order	Private Practice
64	True Beauty	America's Got Talent – Tue 8PM
65	So You Think You Can Dance – Thu	Amazing Race 14
66	Medium	Hell's Kitchen
67	America's Got Talent – Tue 8PM	20/20 Fri
68	World News Tonight	Law And Order – Wed 8PM
69	Ugly Betty	Samantha Who?
70	Private Practice	Homeland Security USA

APPENDIX B
SAMPLE PROGRAMMING AND EPISODES

Sample Programs and Episodes – African American Audience

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Genre</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Episode Name</u>
Ugly Betty	African American	Comedy, Drama	60 minutes	The Sex Issue A Mother of a Problem Back in Her Place
Flashpoint	African American	Action, Crime, Drama	60 minutes	Coming to You Live Behind the Blue Line Never Let You Down
Law and Order	African American	Crime, Drama, Mystery	60 minutes	Seed All in the Family Performance
Fringe	African American	Drama, Mystery, Sci-Fi	60 minutes	Northwest Passage Over There, Part 1 The Man From the Other Side
The Game	African American	Comedy, Drama, Romance	30 minutes	Put a Ring On It Truth and Consequences The Side Part, Under
Knight Rider	African American	Mystery, Thriller	60 minutes	Knight and the City Fight Knight I Love the Knight Life

Sample Programs and Episodes – Caucasian Audience

<u>Program Name</u>	<u>Audience</u>	<u>Genre</u>	<u>Length</u>	<u>Episode Name</u>
Two and a Half Men	Caucasian	Comedy	30 minutes	My Damn Stalker Release the Dogs Crude and Uncalled For
Boston Legal	Caucasian	Comedy, Crime, Drama	60 minutes	Breast in Show Guardians and Gatekeepers Finding Nimmo The Cushion
The Big Bang Theory	Caucasian	Comedy	30 minutes	Saturation The Financial Permeability The Large Hadron Collision
Rules of Engagement	Caucasian	Comedy, Romance	30 minutes	Indian Giver House Money Flirting
Lost	Caucasian	Adventure, Drama, Fantasy	60 minutes	The Variable LaFleur Jughead
Bones	Caucasian	Comedy, Crime, Drama	60 minutes	Mother and Child in the Bay The Titan on the tracks The Man with the Bone

APPENDIX C
INTER RATER RELIABILITY

Interclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) Including BC Items

<u>Program #</u>	<u>PI</u>	<u>FFM</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>BC</u>	<u>AC</u>	<u>Average</u>
19	.764	.532	.916	.839	.848	.780
17	.753	.866	.893	.270	.854	.727
14	.502	.548	.846	-.605	.915	.441
6	.880	.908	.896	.865	.837	.877
Average	.725	.714	.888	.342	.864	

Note: 4 Double Coded Programs = 79 Characters

Due to how data was double coded a weighted kappa statistic would not work

Interclass Correlation Coefficient (ICC) Excluding BC Items

<u>Program #</u>	<u>PI</u>	<u>FFM</u>	<u>PC</u>	<u>AC</u>	<u>Average</u>
19	.764	.532	.916	.848	.761
17	.753	.866	.893	.854	.842
14	.502	.548	.846	.915	.703
6	.880	.908	.896	.837	.880
Average	.725	.714	.888	.864	

APPENDIX D
CHARACTERS BY AUDIENCE

Characters By Audience

<u>Audience</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caucasian	242	41.9
African American	335	58.1
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX E
CHARACTERS BY ROLE

Characters By Role

<u>Role Type</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Lead	148	25.6
Secondary	429	74.4
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX F
CHARACTERS BY GENDER

Characters By Gender

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	370	64.1
Female	207	35.9
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX G
CHARACTERS BY AGE

Characters By Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 20	27	4.7
20 - 35	214	37.1
36 – 50	202	35.0
51 and over	120	20.8
Unknown	10	1.7
Total	573	99.3
Missing	4	.7
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX H
CHARACTERS & ETHNICITY

How Ethnicity Known

<u>Manner Known</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Implied	525	91.0
Stated	52	9.0
Total	577	100.0

Characters By Ethnicity

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caucasian	427	74.0
African American	82	14.2
Hispanic	25	4.3
Asian-Pacific Islander	14	2.4
Native American	2	.3
Other	27	4.7
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX I
CHARACTERS BY INCOME LEVEL & WORK STATUS

Characters By Income

<u>Income Level</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	158	27.4
Middle	182	31.5
Low	28	4.9
Unknown	205	35.5
Total	573	99.3
Missing	4	.7
Total	577	100.0

Characters By Work Status

<u>Work Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White Collar	57	9.9
Blue Collar	49	8.5
Service	58	10.1
Professional	202	35.0
Unknown	206	35.7
Total	572	99.1
Missing	5	.9
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX J
CHARACTERS BY MARITAL & PARENTAL STATUS

Characters By Marital Status

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never Married	45	7.8
Married	46	8.0
Divorced	15	2.6
Married 2 or more times	2	.3
Unknown	469	81.3
Total	577	100.0

Characters By Parental Status

<u>Parental Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Biological Children	53	9.2
Adopted Children	1	.2
No Children	61	10.6
Unknown	462	80.1
Total	577	100.0

APPENDIX K
GENDER BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

Gender in Caucasian Programming

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	159	65.7
Female	83	34.3
Total	242	100.0

Gender in African American Audience Programming

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	211	63.0
Female	124	37.0
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX L
AGE BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

Age in Caucasian Programming

<u>Age</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 20	11	4.5
20 - 35	87	36.0
36 – 50	94	38.8
51 and over	43	17.8
Unknown	4	1.7
Total	239	98.8
Missing	3	1.2
Total	242	100.0

Age in African American Audience Programming

<u>Age</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 20	16	4.8
20 - 35	127	37.9
36 – 50	108	32.3
51 and over	77	23.0
Unknown	6	1.8
Total	334	99.7
Missing	1	.3
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX M
HOW ETHNICITY KNOWN BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

How Ethnicity Known in Caucasian Programming

<u>Manner Known</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Implied	221	91.3
Stated	21	8.7
Total	242	100.0

How Ethnicity Known in African American Programming

<u>Manner Known</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Implied	304	90.7
Stated	31	9.3
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX N
ETHNICITY BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

Ethnicity in Caucasian Programming

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caucasian	196	81.0
African American	21	8.7
Hispanic	4	1.7
Asian-Pacific Islander	10	4.1
Native American	2	.8
Other	9	3.7
Total	242	100.0

Ethnicity in African American Programming

<u>Ethnicity</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Caucasian	231	69.0
African American	61	18.2
Hispanic	21	6.3
Asian-Pacific Islander	4	1.2
Other	18	5.4
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX O
INCOME AND WORK STATUS BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

Income in Caucasian Programming

<u>Income Level</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	76	31.4
Middle	43	17.8
Low	7	2.9
Unknown	113	46.7
Total	239	98.8
Missing	3	1.2
Total	242	100.0

Income in African American Programming

<u>Income Level</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	82	24.5
Middle	139	41.5
Low	21	6.3
Unknown	92	27.5
Total	334	99.7
Missing	1	.3
Total	334	100.0

Work Status in Caucasian Programming

<u>Work Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White Collar	18	7.4
Blue Collar	12	5.0
Service	18	7.4
Professional	82	33.9
Unknown	109	45.0
Total	239	98.8
Missing	3	1.2
Total	242	100.0

Work Status in African American Programming

<u>Work Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White Collar	39	11.6
Blue Collar	37	11.0
Service	40	11.9
Professional	120	35.8
Unknown	97	29.0
Total	333	99.4
Missing	2	.6
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX P
MARITAL & PARENTAL STATUS BY VIEWING AUDIENCE

Marital Status in Caucasian Programming

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never Married	23	9.5
Married	19	7.9
Divorced	7	2.9
Married 2 or more times	2	.8
Unknown	191	78.9
Total	242	100.0

Marital Status in African American Programming

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never Married	22	6.6
Married	27	8.1
Divorced	8	2.4
Unknown	278	83.0
Total	335	100.0

Parental Status in Caucasian Programming

<u>Parental Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Biological Children	22	9.1
No Children	37	15.3
Unknown	183	75.6
Total	242	100.0

Parental Status in African American Programming

<u>Parental Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Biological Children	31	9.3
Adopted Children	1	.3
No Children	24	7.2
Unknown	279	83.3
Total	335	100.0

APPENDIX Q
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL CODERS

Portrayal Index – Role Comparison

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p-value</u>
Black Roles: Comparing African American & Caucasian Audiences	Attractive	.049*
	Mature	.039*
White Roles: Comparing African American & Caucasian Audiences	Attractive	.033*
	Mature	.045*
Black, Lead Roles: Comparing African American & Caucasian Audiences	Fair	.066
	Brave	.067

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX R
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES AND ALL CODERS

Portrayal Index – Role Comparison

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
Comparing African American & Caucasian Roles	Attractive	.000**
Comparing African American & Caucasian Lead Roles	Attractive	.092
	Thoughtful	.056

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX S
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS– ALL AUDIENCES, BY CODER

Portrayal Index Items – Role Comparison By Coder

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
Black Coders: Comparing African American & Caucasian Roles	Attractive	.013*
White Coders: Comparing African American & Caucasian Roles	Nice Attractive	.087 .000**
Black Coders, Lead Roles: Comparing African American & Caucasian Roles	Successful	.022*
White Coders, Lead Roles: Comparing African American & Caucasian Roles	none Fair Good Mature Thoughtful	 .015* .073 .027* .061

*Note: *p < .05, **p<.001*

APPENDIX T
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS– ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS BY PROGRAM
LENGTH

Portrayal Index Items – Role Comparison By Program Length

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant</u> <u>Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
All Audiences, All Coders: Comparing All Characters in 30 minutes programming and All Character in 60 minutes programming	Attractive	.001**
	Mature	.000**
	Thoughtful	.022*

*Note: *p < .05, **p<.001*

APPENDIX U
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS, 30-MINUTE
PROGRAMS

African American & Caucasian Roles in 30-Minute Programs

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
30-Minute Programming: Comparing African American and Caucasian roles	Nice	.005*
	Fair	.000**
	Brave	.005*
	Good	.001**
	Mature	.030*
	Thoughtful	.030*
	Warm	.019*
	Original PI	.001**
	PI with Warm	.001**

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX V
PORTRAYAL INDEX ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES, ALL CODERS, 60-MINUTE
PROGRAMS

African American & Caucasian Roles in 60-Minute Programs

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant</u> <u>Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Nice	.006*
	Attractive	.000**
60-Minute Programming: Comparing African American and Caucasian roles	Good	.042*
	Successful	.004*
	Mature	.006*
	Original PI	.002*
	PI with Warm	.003*

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX W
INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL AUDIENCES AND ALL CODERS

African American and Caucasian Roles

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Hair	.000**
Comparing African American and Caucasian roles	Skin	.000**
	Makeup	.001*
	Accessories	.000**

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX X
INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL CODERS, BLACK ROLES

Black Roles By Audience

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Makeup	.000**
Black Roles: Comparing African American and All Audiences	Accessories	.005*
	Groomed	.031*
	Clean	.021*

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX Y
INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ALL CODERS, ALL AUDIENCES, ALL ROLES

All Roles By Program Length

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Extrovert	.003*
	Open	.001**
	Tall	.049*
	Hair	.029*
	Skin	.000**
	Articulate	.029*
All Roles: Comparing 30 minute and 60 minutes programming	Quiet	.047*
	Motivated	.023*
	Respected	.045*
	Smart	.013*
	Makeup	.003*
	Accessories	.044*
	Conservative Attire	.000**
	Professional Attire	.000**

*Note: *p < .05, **p<.001*

APPENDIX Z
INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ROLES IN 30-MINUTE PROGRAMMING

All Roles in 30-Minute Programs

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Agreeable	.001**
	Conscientiousness	.000**
	Open	.000**
	Hair	.000**
	Skin	.000**
30-Minute Programming: Comparing African American and Caucasian roles	Quiet	.007*
	Passive	.002*
	Smart	.001**
	Accessories	.004*
	Professional Attire	.017*
	Groomed	.000**
	Clean	.000**

*Note: *p < .05, **p < .001*

APPENDIX AA
INDIVIDUAL ITEMS – ROLES IN 60-MINUTE PROGRAMMING

All Roles in 30-Minute Programs

<u>T-Test</u>	<u>Significant Attributes</u>	<u>p value</u>
	Hair	.000**
	Skin	.000**
60-Minute Programming: Comparing African American and Caucasian roles	Respected	.003*
	Makeup	.009*
	Accessories	.002*

*Note: *p < .05, **p<.001*

APPENDIX AB
AFRICAN AMERICAN CHARACTER DEMOGRAPHICS

African American Characters By Gender

<u>Gender</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Male	42	51.2
Female	40	48.8
Total	82	100.0

African American Characters By Age

<u>Age</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Less than 20	1	1.2
20 - 35	39	47.6
36 – 50	32	39.0
51 and over	8	9.8
Unknown	1	1.2
Total	81	98.8
Missing	1	1.2
Total	82	100.0

African American Characters By Income

<u>Income Level</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
High	31	37.8
Middle	25	30.5
Low	6	7.3
Unknown	19	23.2
Total	81	98.8
Missing	1	1.2
Total	82	100.0

African American Characters By Work Status

<u>Work Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
White Collar	4	4.9
Blue Collar	9	11.0
Service	13	15.9
Professional	39	47.6
Unknown	16	19.5
Total	81	98.8
Missing	1	1.2
Total	82	100.0

African American Characters By Marital Status

<u>Marital Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Never Married	5	6.1
Married	4	4.9
Divorced	1	1.2
Unknown	72	87.8
Total	82	100.0

African American Characters By Parental Status

<u>Parental Status</u>	<u>Frequency</u>	<u>Percent</u>
Biological Children	5	6.1
No Children	5	6.1
Unknown	72	87.8
Total	82	100.0

APPENDIX AC
PI ITEM CORRELATIONS

Variable	Variable	Corr.
Role	Audience	.136**
Income	Audience	-.116**
Work	Audience	-.175**
Hair	Audience	.102*
Skin	Audience	.099*
PC Total	Audience	.110**
Makeup	Audience	.116**
Conservative Attire	Audience	-.082*
Groomed	Audience	-.126**
Clean	Audience	-.216
AC Total	Audience	-.086*
Age	Gender	-.154**
Work	Gender	.141**
Marital Status	Gender	-.090*
Parental Status	Gender	-.111**
PI Total	Gender	-.160**
Extrovert	Gender	-.093*
Conscientiousness	Gender	-.100*
Openness	Gender	-.159**
FFM Total	Gender	-.138**
Thin	Gender	-.197**
Hair	Gender	-.111**
PC Total	Gender	-.095*

Articulate	Gender	-.097*
Smart	Gender	-.096*
BC Total	Gender	-.102*
Makeup	Gender	.655**
Accessories	Gender	.415**
Conservative Attire	Gender	.209**
Professional Attire	Gender	.114**
Groomed	Gender	-.099*
Clean	Gender	-.097*
AC Total	Gender	.331**
Income	Age	-.238**
Work	Age	-.094*
Marital Status	Age	.100*
Thin	Age	.278**
Hair	Age	-.168**
Skin	Age	-.086*
Articulate	Age	-.112**
Passive	Age	.103*
Respected	Age	-.122**
Smart	Age	-.124**
Makeup	Age	-.164**
Conservative Attire	Age	-.261**
Professional Attire	Age	-.342
Groomed	Age	-.106*

AC Total	Age	-.327**
Income	Role	.199**
Marital Status	Role	.244**
Parental Status	Role	.174**
PI Average	Role	.097*
Openness	Role	.138**
Thin	Role	.097*
Skin	Role	.087*
Articulate	Role	.120**
Quiet	Role	-.100*
Passive	Role	-.174**
Motivated	Role	.163**
Smart	Role	.139**
Clean	Role	-.107*
Extroversion	Ethnicity	.094*
Neuroticism	Ethnicity	.085*
Thin	Ethnicity	-.091*
Hair	Ethnicity	.326**
Skin	Ethnicity	.324**
Accent	Ethnicity	.355**
PC Total	Ethnicity	.373**
Quiet	Ethnicity	-.095*
Conservative Attire	Ethnicity	.104*
Clean	Ethnicity	.135**
AC Total	Ethnicity	.110**
Marital Status	Ethnicity	-.169**

	Known	
Neuroticism	Ethnicity	.105*
	Known	
Tall	Ethnicity	.085*
	Known	
Skin	Ethnicity	.167**
	Known	
Accent	Ethnicity	.152**
	Known	
PC Total	Ethnicity	.169**
	Known	
Conservative Attire	Ethnicity	.152**
	Known	
Professional Attire	Ethnicity	.119**
	Known	
Groomed	Ethnicity	.214**
	Known	
Clean	Ethnicity	.189**
	Known	
AC Total	Ethnicity	.166**
	Known	
Work	Income	.399**
Agreeableness	Income	-.098*
Articulate	Income	.216**
Quiet	Income	-.172**
Passive	Income	-.175

Motivated	Income	.116**
Conservative Attire	Income	.263**
Professional Attire	Income	.338**
Groomed	Income	.189**
Clean	Income	.201**
AC Total	Income	.300**
Marital Status	Work	-.087*
Parental Status	Work	-.160**
Accent	Work	.100*
Articulate	Work	.089*
Conservative Attire	Work	.151**
Professional Attire	Work	.291**
Groomed	Work	.158**
Clean	Work	.130**
AC Total	Work	.276**
Parental Status	Marital Status	.372**
Open	Marital Status	.132**
Professional Attire	Marital Status	-.253**
AC Total	Marital Status	-.169**
Extroversion	Parental Status	-.108**
Neuroticism	Parental Status	.094*
Accent	Parental Status	-.107*
Professional Attire	Parental Status	-.223**
Groomed	Parental Status	-.110**
AC Total	Parental Status	-.164**
Extroversion	PI Average	.413**

Neuroticism	PI Average	-.584**
Agreeableness	PI Average	.677**
Conscientiousness	PI Average	.779**
Open	PI Average	.574**
FFM Total	PI Average	.692**
Thin	PI Average	.301**
Tall	PI Average	.374**
Hair	PI Average	-.106*
PC Total	PI Average	.200**
Articulate	PI Average	.351**
Quiet	PI Average	.506**
Passive	PI Average	.444**
Motivated	PI Average	.551**
Respected	PI Average	.715**
Smart	PI Average	.761**
BC Total	PI Average	.813**
Groomed	PI Average	.203**
Clean	PI Average	.088*
Neuroticism	Extroversion	-.258**
Agreeableness	Extroversion	.323**
Conscientiousness	Extroversion	.413**
Open	Extroversion	.430**
FFM Total	Extroversion	.691**
Thin	Extroversion	.222**
PC Total	Extroversion	.140**
Articulate	Extroversion	.381**

Quiet	Extroversion	.086*
Passive	Extroversion	.122**
Motivated	Extroversion	.401**
Respected	Extroversion	.269**
Smart	Extroversion	.268**
BC Total	Extroversion	.351**
Groomed	Extroversion	.203**
Clean	Extroversion	.157**
AC Total	Extroversion	.121**
Agreeableness	Neuroticism	-.460**
Conscientiousness	Neuroticism	-.606**
Open	Neuroticism	-.449**
FFM Total	Neuroticism	-.322**
Hair	Neuroticism	.089*
PC Total	Neuroticism	-.104*
Articulate	Neuroticism	-.214**
Quiet	Neuroticism	-.313**
Passive	Neuroticism	-.180**
Motivated	Neuroticism	-.433**
Respected	Neuroticism	-.528**
Smart	Neuroticism	-.557**
BC Total	Neuroticism	-.540**
Groomed	Neuroticism	-.177**
Clean	Neuroticism	-.093*
Conscientiousness	Agreeableness	.675**
Open	Agreeableness	.516**

FFM Total	Agreeableness	.764**
Thin	Agreeableness	.245**
Tall	Agreeableness	.330**
Skin	Agreeableness	.096*
PC Total	Agreeableness	.223**
Articulate	Agreeableness	.181**
Quiet	Agreeableness	.539**
Passive	Agreeableness	.506**
Motivated	Agreeableness	.352**
Respected	Agreeableness	.508**
Smart	Agreeableness	.501**
BC Total	Agreeableness	.643**
Makeup	Agreeableness	.092*
Accessories	Agreeableness	.150**
Conservative Attire	Agreeableness	-.113**
Open	Conscientiousness	.649**
FFM Total	Conscientiousness	.790**
Thin	Conscientiousness	.197**
Tall	Conscientiousness	.268**
Skin	Conscientiousness	.094*
PC Total	Conscientiousness	.180**

	ess	
Articulate	Conscientiousness	.339**
	ess	
Quiet	Conscientiousness	.419**
	ess	
Passive	Conscientiousness	.344**
	ess	
Motivated	Conscientiousness	.475**
	ess	
Respected	Conscientiousness	.587**
	ess	
Smart	Conscientiousness	.613**
	ess	
BC Total	Conscientiousness	.676**
	ess	
Makeup	Conscientiousness	.090*
	ess	
Accessories	Conscientiousness	.129**
	ess	
Groomed	Conscientiousness	.133**
	ess	
FFM Total	Openness	.801**
Thin	Openness	.230**
Tall	Openness	.206**
Skin	Openness	.192**
PC Total	Openness	.257**

Articulate	Openness	.341**
Quiet	Openness	.181**
Passive	Openness	.147**
Motivated	Openness	.363**
Respected	Openness	.386**
Smart	Openness	.412**
BC Total	Openness	.436**
Conservative Attire	Openness	-.143**
Professional Attire	Openness	-.126**
Thin	FFM Total	.242**
Tall	FFM Total	.295**
Skin	FFM Total	.151**
PC Total	FFM Total	.245**
Articulate	FFM Total	.368**
Quiet	FFM Total	.352**
Passive	FFM Total	.361**
Motivated	FFM Total	.426**
Respected	FFM Total	.469**
Smart	FFM Total	.468**
BC Total	FFM Total	.586**
Accessories	FFM Total	.140**
Conservative Attire	FFM Total	-.108**
Groomed	FFM Total	.105*
Tall	Thin	.379**
PC Total	Thin	.478**
Articulate	Thin	.128**

Quiet	Thin	.200**
Passive	Thin	.195**
Motivated	Thin	.250**
Respected	Thin	.208**
Smart	Thin	.213**
BC Total	Thin	.289**
Makeup	Thin	-.169**
Conservative Attire	Thin	-.230**
Professional Attire	Thin	-.159**
AC Total	Thin	-.195**
PC Total	Tall	.460**
Articulate	Tall	.111**
Quiet	Tall	.263**
Passive	Tall	.224**
Motivated	Tall	.336**
Respected	Tall	.372**
Smart	Tall	.313**
BC Total	Tall	.394**
Conservative Attire	Tall	-.128**
Groomed	Tall	.116**
Skin	Hair	.427**
Accent	Hair	.106*
PC Total	Hair	.640**
Accent	Skin	.111**
PC Total	Skin	.674**
Articulate	Skin	.122**

Makeup	Skin	.180**
Accessories	Skin	.226**
Professional Attire	Skin	-.116**
PC Total	Accent	.409**
Groomed	Accent	.091*
Articulate	PC Total	.160**
Quiet	PC Total	.123**
Passive	PC Total	.122**
Motivated	PC Total	.193**
Respected	PC Total	.154**
Smart	PC Total	.170**
BC Total	PC Total	.218**
Accessories	PC Total	.095*
Conservative Attire	PC Total	-.145**
Motivated	Articulate	.486**
Respected	Articulate	.315**
Smart	Articulate	.386**
BC Total	Articulate	.468**
Accessories	Articulate	.129**
Groomed	Articulate	.234**
Clean	Articulate	.228**
AC Total	Articulate	.179**
Passive	Quiet	.758**
Motivated	Quiet	.224**
Respected	Quiet	.410**
Smart	Quiet	.397**

BC Total	Quiet	.715**
Makeup	Quiet	.117**
Accessories	Quiet	.157**
Conservative Attire	Quiet	-.083*
Groomed	Quiet	.082*
Respected	Passive	.254**
Smart	Passive	.232**
BC Total	Passive	.583**
Makeup	Passive	.083*
Accessories	Passive	.136**
Conservative Attire	Passive	-.089*
Respected	Motivated	.597**
Smart	Motivated	.632**
BC Total	Motivated	.688**
Makeup	Motivated	.094*
Accessories	Motivated	.143**
Groomed	Motivated	.212**
Clean	Motivated	.097*
AC Total	Motivated	.179**
Smart	Respected	.767**
BC Total	Respected	.822**
Accessories	Respected	.131**
Professional Attire	Respected	.116**
Groomed	Respected	.235**
Clean	Respected	.095*
AC Total	Respected	.172**

BC Total	Smart	.827**
Accessories	Smart	.103*
Professional Attire	Smart	.154**
Groomed	Smart	.239**
Clean	Smart	.087*
AC Total	Smart	.194**
Makeup	BC Total	.106*
Accessories	BC Total	.190**
Groomed	BC Total	.254**
Clean	BC Total	.132**
AC Total	BC Total	.182**
Accessories	Makeup	.728**
Conservative Attire	Makeup	.251**
Groomed	Makeup	-.176**
Clean	Makeup	-.177**
AC Total	Makeup	.418**
Conservative Attire	Accessories	.227**
Groomed	Accessories	-.141**
Clean	Accessories	-.132**
AC Total	Accessories	.403**
Professional Attire	Conservative Attire	.484**
Groomed	Conservative Attire	.297**
Clean	Conservative Attire	.307**

AC Total	Conservative Attire	.758**
Groomed	Professional Attire	.437**
Clean	Professional Attire	.299**
AC Total	Professional	.762**

	Attire	
Clean	Groomed	.792**
AC Total	Groomed	.590**
AC Total	Clean	.534**

Note: * = 0.05 level, ** = 0.01level

APPENDIX AD
PI ITEM CORRELATIONS (WHITE AND BLACK CHARACTERS ONLY)

Variable	Variable	Corr
Honest	Nice	.598
Honest	Attractive	.146
Honest	Fair	.619
Honest	Brave	.533
Honest	Good	.639
Honest	Successful	.495
Honest	Mature	.446
Honest	Thoughtful	.591
Honest	Warm	.513
Honest	PI Original	.685
Honest	PI Average	.182
Nice	Attractive	.507
Nice	Fair	.888
Nice	Brave	.720
Nice	Good	.897
Nice	Successful	.529
Nice	Mature	.727
Nice	Thoughtful	.897

Nice	Warm	.852
Nice	PI Original	.921
Nice	PI Average	.928
Attractive	Fair	.434
Attractive	Brave	.455
Attractive	Good	.455
Attractive	Successful	.370
Attractive	Mature	.377
Attractive	Thoughtful	.449
Attractive	Warm	.495
Attractive	PI Original	.578
Attractive	PI Average	.577
Fair	Brave	.730
Fair	Good	.886
Fair	Successful	.572
Fair	Mature	.739
Fair	Thoughtful	.892
Fair	Warm	.802
Fair	PI Original	.922

Fair	PI Average	.920
Brave	Good	.780
Brave	Successful	.613
Brave	Mature	.713
Brave	Thoughtful	.711
Brave	Warm	.623
Brave	PI Original	.850
Brave	PI Average	.835
Good	Successful	.592
Good	Mature	.766
Good	Thoughtful	.877
Good	Warm	.780
Good	PI Original	.940
Good	PI Average	.934
Successful	Mature	.611

Successful	Thoughtful	.571
Successful	Warm	.496
Successful	PI Original	.718
Successful	PI Average	.704
Mature	Thoughtful	.769
Mature	Warm	.618
Mature	PI Original	.838
Mature	PI Average	.826
Thoughtful	Warm	.856
Thoughtful	PI Original	.923
Thoughtful	PI Average	.932
Warm	PI Original	.824
Warm	PI Average	.858
PI Original	PI Average	.996

Note: All significant at 0.01 level



APPENDIX AE

RESEARCH STUDY: WAYNE STATE UNIVERSITY GRADUATE STUDENT VOLUNTEERS NEEDED

Looking for volunteers to watch television programs and answer questions about the characters seen in the programs.

WHO: Wayne State University graduate students, age 20 to 45

WHAT: This study examines characters from popular broadcast television programs. The nature of African American and Caucasian character portrayals will be compared from shows popular with African Americans versus portrayals in shows popular with Caucasians. This study is unique in that it examines characters not according to program genre but according to the viewing audience.

Volunteers will be trained with the coding instrument for approximately 2 hours. During this training volunteers will complete a short Coder Questionnaire to determine their familiarity with the programs being coded. Volunteers will not be asked to code programs that they are too familiar with. After training, all volunteers will receive a packet containing all the coding materials (code sheets, instructions and DVD's) necessary. Volunteers will complete coding activities in the privacy of their residence and return all materials when complete.

The students will be instructed to watch 7 television programs and at each program break (commercial break) complete a code sheet for each speaking character observed during that portion of the program.

Training will last approximately 2 hours. Coding is anticipated to last 20 hours.

PAYMENT: Volunteers will receive \$25 cash for completing training and \$75 for turning in completed coding materials.

RISKS: There are no known risks at this time to participation in this study.

BENEFITS: As a participant in this research study, there will be no direct benefit for you; however, information from this study may benefit other people now or in the future. Participating graduate students may gain a greater understanding of the content analysis research methodology.

WHERE: Training will be in Manoogian Hall on the campus of Wayne State University. Individual coding will be done on your own in a location of your choice.

CONTACT: Scott E. Burke
Graduate Student, Department of Communication
313-570-9191 or sburke@wayne.edu

Principal Investigator: Scott E. Burke

IRB protocol #: 1010008983

APPENDIX AF
CODER QUESTIONNAIRE

Name: _____

Phone Number: _____

Email Address: _____

Gender:

- Male
- Female

Age:

- Less than 20
- 20-35
- 36-50
- 51 and over

Ethnicity: (choose one of the following)

- Caucasian
- African American

How familiar are you with the following programs? (1 = not at all familiar, 5 = very familiar)

Rules of Engagement	1	2	3	4	5
Flashpoint	1	2	3	4	5
Law and Order	1	2	3	4	5
Lost	1	2	3	4	5
Knight Rider	1	2	3	4	5
Fringe	1	2	3	4	5
Ugly Betty	1	2	3	4	5
Bones	1	2	3	4	5
Boston Legal	1	2	3	4	5
Two and a Half Men	1	2	3	4	5
The Game	1	2	3	4	5
The Big Bang Theory	1	2	3	4	5

Assigned Coder Number: _____

APPENDIX AG

CODE BOOK

Introduction

This codebook is to be used for coding roles on programs popular with African-Americans and Caucasians during a non-sweeps week period from a number of broadcast/cable channels. Roles will be coded according to how they are portrayed.

Directions

Coders should prepare a quiet and neat workspace that includes a television with DVD player and/or computer with DVD drive. Each DVD provided by the researcher represents one program. Each data packet accompanying the DVD represents one character from the program. Only one character will be coded per data packet. All speaking roles per program will be coded.

The top part of the code sheet which includes program name, episode name, and character name will be completed by the researcher before delivery to the coder. The coder should begin by watching one program supplied by the researcher until the first program break. This break time is also noted at the top of the code sheet and will be prepared by the researcher. The coder should fill in Coder Number and Coding Date at the top of the sheet. When the break is reached, pause the program and fill out the semantic differential scales for each speaking character present during that portion of the program. The first set of semantic differential items should be totaled. This process is repeated for each program break until the entire show has been watched. At this time the general information code sheet should be completed for each speaking character present in the entire program. Once this is complete for one program, the process can be repeated for the next program. Upon completion of coding, all materials (DVD's and code sheets) should be returned to the researcher.

Codes

In order to complete the 26 semantic differential items as well as other items in this analysis, coders should review the following definitions before beginning the coding procedure:

Honest – honorable in principles, intentions, and actions; upright and fair

Nice – pleasing; agreeable; delightful

Attractive – providing pleasure or delight, esp. in appearance or manner; pleasing; charming; alluring

Fair – free from bias, dishonesty, or injustice

Brave – possessing or exhibiting courage or courageous endurance

Good – morally excellent; virtuous; righteous; pious

Successful – having attained wealth, position, honors, or the like

Mature – fully developed in body or mind, as a person

Thoughtful – showing consideration for others; considerate

Warm – characterized by or showing lively feelings, passions, emotions, sympathies, etc.

Extroversion – the state of being concerned primarily with things outside the self, with the external environment rather than with one's own thoughts and feelings

Neuroticism – the state of having feelings of anxiety, obsessional thoughts, compulsive acts, and physical complaints without objective evidence of disease, in various degrees and patterns

Agreeableness – being willing or ready to agree or consent

Conscientiousness - controlled by or done according to the inner sense of what is right or wrong in one's conduct or motives, impelling one toward right action

Openness – being unreserved, candid, or frank, as persons or their speech

Thin – having little flesh; spare; lean

Tall – having a relatively great height; of more than average stature

Light Hair – hair that is pale, whitish, or not deep or dark in color

Fair Skin – skin of a light hue; not dark

Accent – a mode of pronunciation, as pitch or tone, emphasis pattern, or intonation, characteristic of or peculiar to the speech of a particular person, group, or locality

Articulate – using language easily and fluently; having facility with words

Quiet – restrained in speech, manner, etc.; saying little

Passive – influenced, acted upon, or affected by some external force, cause, or agency; being the object of action rather than causing action

Motivated – Full of incentive; moved to action; impelled

Respected – shown esteem for or a sense of the worth or excellence of a person, a personal quality or ability, or something considered as a manifestation of a personal quality or ability

Smart – having good understanding or a high mental capacity; quick to comprehend

Makeup – facial cosmetics, as eye shadow or lipstick

Accessories – an article or set of articles of dress, as gloves, earrings, or a scarf, that adds completeness, convenience, attractiveness, etc., to one's basic outfit

Conservative Attire – clothing that is traditional in style or manner; avoiding novelty or showiness

Professional Attire – clothing appropriate for the type of work conducted

Well-Groomed – having the hair, skin, etc., well cared for; clean, and neat

Clean - free from dirt; unsoiled; unstained

Lead Character – essential to the evolution of the story line for the given episode

Secondary Character - involved but not integral to the episode's story line

White Collar - office and professional workers whose jobs generally do not involve manual labor or the wearing of a uniform or work clothes

Blue Collar - wage-earning workers who wear work clothes or other specialized clothing on the job

Service - positions focused on providing a service for a person or company, rather than producing a product

Professional – positions that require formal qualifications based upon education, apprenticeship, and/or examinations

Code sheet Directions / Example

Please use the following worksheet to code characters from the provided programs. The first thing you should do is create a comfortable area in which to work. Some DVD's will require a DVD player to view the programs and others will require a computer with a DVD drive. Make sure you can view the provided discs and fill out paperwork at regular intervals comfortably. When ready, begin to watch the first program. At each program break you will pause the playback and complete a code sheet for each speaking character. Enter your name and date in the spaces provided. Next, complete the 26 evaluative semantic differential items for the character summing the first section (Portrayal Index). If you feel you need to view the portion of program again, you may do so. However, discontinue coding activity while you watch the program segment in its entirety, and then return to coding. Also, make note in the comments section on the code sheet that you watched that portion a second time. Any questions that arise should be brought to the researcher's attention immediately. This process will be repeated for each speaking character during each program break. Break times are indicated at the top of the coding sheet. At the end of the program you will complete the final page of the code sheet for each character. This page asks you to indicate a gender, age, role type, ethnicity and method of knowledge of ethnicity (for example, "implied" means ethnicity was determined by appearance or other subjective method, "Stated" means the characters' ethnicity was specifically referenced within the program), income level, work role, marital status, parental status.

Program: The Office

Episode: Andy's Play

Character Name: Michael Scott

Coder Number: 1

Coding Date: 9/22/2010

General Information:

Gender:

- Male
 Female

Age:

- Less than 20
 20-35
 36-50
 51 and over
 Unknown

Role Type:

- Lead
 Secondary

Ethnicity: (choose one of the following)

- Caucasian
 African American
 Hispanic
 Asian-Pacific Islander
 Native American
 Other:

Ethnicity Known: (choose one)

- Implied
 Stated

Income Level:

- High
 Middle
 Low
 Unknown

Work Role:

- White Collar
 Blue Collar
 Service
 Professional
 Unknown

Marital Status:

- Never Married
 Married
 Divorced
 Married 2 or more times
 Unknown

Parental Status:

- Biological Children
 Adopted Children
 No Children
 Unknown

Comments/Questions:

A blank code sheet begins on the next page.

APPENDIX AH

CODE SHEET

Program: _____ Episode: _____ Character Name: _____
 Coder Number: _____ Coding Date: _____
 Break #: _____ Time of Break: _____

Semantic Differential Scales: (circle one number per scale)

Portrayal Index:

Honest	1	2	3	4	5	Dishonest
Nice	1	2	3	4	5	Awful
Attractive	1	2	3	4	5	Ugly
Fair	1	2	3	4	5	Unfair
Brave	1	2	3	4	5	Cowardly
Good	1	2	3	4	5	Bad
Successful	1	2	3	4	5	Unsuccessful
Mature	1	2	3	4	5	Childish
Thoughtful	1	2	3	4	5	Thoughtless
Warm	1	2	3	4	5	Cold
TOTAL _____						

Five Factor Model:

Extroversion	1	2	3	4	5	Introversion
Neuroticism	1	2	3	4	5	Stability
Agreeableness	1	2	3	4	5	Antagonism
Conscientiousness	1	2	3	4	5	Undirectedness
Openness	1	2	3	4	5	Nonopenness

Physical Characteristics:

Thin	1	2	3	4	5	Obese
Tall	1	2	3	4	5	Short
Light Hair	1	2	3	4	5	Dark Hair
Fair Skin	1	2	3	4	5	Dark Skin
No Accent	1	2	3	4	5	Heavy Accent

Behavioral Characteristics:

Articulate	1	2	3	4	5	Inarticulate
Quiet	1	2	3	4	5	Loud
Passive	1	2	3	4	5	Aggressive
Motivated	1	2	3	4	5	Lazy
Respected	1	2	3	4	5	Ridiculed
Smart	1	2	3	4	5	Dumb

Appearance Characteristics:

No Makeup	1	2	3	4	5	Excessive Makeup
No Accessories	1	2	3	4	5	Excessive Accessories
Conservative Attire	1	2	3	4	5	Provocative Attire
Professional Attire	1	2	3	4	5	Casual Attire
Well-Groomed	1	2	3	4	5	Disheveled
Clean	1	2	3	4	5	Dirty

Program: _____ Episode: _____ Character Name: _____
 Coder Number: _____ Coding Date: _____

General Information:

Gender:

- Male
 Female

Age:

- Less than 20
 20-35
 36-50
 51 and over
 Unknown

Role Type:

- Lead
 Secondary

Ethnicity: (choose one of the following)

- Caucasian
 African American
 Hispanic
 Asian-Pacific Islander
 Native American
 Other:

Ethnicity Known: (choose one)

- Implied
 Stated

Income Level:

- High
 Middle
 Low
 Unknown

Work Role:

- White Collar
 Blue Collar
 Service
 Professional
 Unknown

Marital Status:

- Never Married
 Married
 Divorced
 Married 2 or more times
 Unknown

Parental Status:

- Biological Children
 Adopted Children
 No Children
 Unknown

Comments/Questions:

REFERENCES

- ALBARRAN, A. B., & UMPHREY, D. (1993). AN EXAMINATION OF TELEVISION MOTIVATIONS AND PROGRAM PREFERENCES BY HISPANICS, BLACKS, AND WHITES. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 37.
- ALLEN, R. L., & BIELBY, W. T. (1979). BLACKS' ATTITUDES AND BEHAVIORS TOWARD TELEVISION. *COMMUNICATION RESEARCH*, 6, 437 - 462.
- ANNUAL ESTIMATES OF RESIDENT POPULATION BY SEX, AGE, RACE AND HISPANIC ORIGIN FOR THE UNITED STATES AND STATES: APRIL 1, 2010 TO JULY 1, 2013. (JUNE 2014).
- ATKIN, C. K., GREENBERG, B. S., & MCDERMOTT, S. (1983). TELEVISION AND RACE ROLE SOCIALIZATION. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 60, 407-414.
- BALES, F. (1986). TELEVISION USE AND CONFIDENCE IN TELEVISION BY BLACKS AND WHITES IN FOUR SELECTED YEARS. *JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES*, 16, 283-291.
- BAPTISTA-FERNANDEZ, P., & GREENBERG, B. S. (1980). THE CONTEXT, CHARACTERISTICS AND COMMUNICATION BEHAVIORS OF BLACKS ON TELEVISION. IN B. GREENBERG (ED.), *LIFE ON TELEVISION: CONTENT ANALYSIS OF US TV DRAMA* (PP. 13-21). NORWOOD, NJ: ALEX.

- BAXTER, R. L., DE RIEMER, C., LANDINI, A., LESLIE, L., & SINGLETARY, M. W. (1985). A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF MUSIC VIDEOS. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 29(3), 333-340.
- BERRY, G. L. (1998). BLACK FAMILY LIFE ON TELEVISION AND THE SOCIALIZATION OF THE AFRICAN AMERICAN CHILD: IMAGES OF MARGINALITY. *JOURNAL OF COMPARATIVE FAMILY STUDIES*, 29, 233-242.
- BICKHAM, D. S., VANDEWATER, E. A., HUSTON, A. C., LEE, J. H., CAPLOVITZ, A. G., & WRIGHT, J. C. (2003). PREDICTORS OF CHILDREN'S ELECTRONIC MEDIA USE: AN EXAMINATION OF THREE ETHNIC GROUPS. *MEDIA PSYCHOLOGY*, 5(2), 107-137.
- BLOSSER, B. J. (1988). ETHNIC DIFFERENCES IN CHILDREN'S MEDIA USE. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 32(4), 453 - 470.
- BOGART, L. (1972). NEGRO AND WHITE EXPOSURE: NEW EVIDENCE. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 49, 15-21.
- BOGLE, D. (1988). BLACKS IN AMERICAN FILMS AND TELEVISION: AN ENCYCLOPEDIA. NEW YORK: GARLAND.
- BOGLE, D. (2001). PRIMETIME BLUES: AFRICAN AMERICANS ON NETWORK TELEVISION (1 ED.). NEW YORK: FARRAR, STRAUS AND GIROUX.

- BOWER, R. (1973). TELEVISION AND THE PUBLIC. NEW YORK: HOLT, RINEHART & WINSTON.
- BOWER, R. (1985). THE CHANGING TELEVISION AUDIENCE IN AMERICA. NEW YORK: COLUMBIA UNIVERSITY PRESS.
- BROWN, J. D., & PARDUN, C. J. (2004). LITTLE IN COMMON: RACIAL AND GENDER DIFFERENCES IN ADOLESCENTS' TELEVISION DIETS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 48(2), 266-278.
- BUSH, R. F., SOLOMON, P. J., & HAIR, J. F. (1977). THERE ARE MORE BLACKS IN TV COMMERCIALS. JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING RESEARCH, 17(1), 21-25.
- CAREY, J. W. (1966). VARIATIONS IN NEGRO/WHITE TELEVISION PREFERENCES. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, 10, 199-212.
- CHRISTAKIS, D. A., EBEL, B. E., RIVARA, F. P., & ZIMMERMAN, F. J. (2004). TELEVISION, VIDEO, AND COMPUTER GAME USAGE IN CHILDREN UNDER 11 YEARS OF AGE. THE JOURNAL OF PEDIATRICS, 145(5), 652-656.
- COLEMAN, R. R. M. (1998). AFRICAN AMERICAN VIEWERS AND THE BLACK SITUATION COMEDY: SITUATING RACIAL HUMOR: TAYLOR & FRANCIS.
- COMSTOCK, G. (1980). TELEVISION IN AMERICA. BEVERLY HILLS, CA: SAGE.

- CONRAD, K., DIXON, T., & YUANYUAN, Z. (2007). AN EXAMINATION OF HOW RAP AND R&B MUSIC VIDEOS INFLUENCE AFRICAN AMERICAN SELF IDENTITY. [ARTICLE]. CONFERENCE PAPERS -- NATIONAL COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION, 1.
- CONRAD, K., DIXON, T. L., & ZHANG, Y. (2009). CONTROVERSIAL RAP THEMES, GENDER PORTRAYALS AND SKIN TONE DISTORTION: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF RAP MUSIC VIDEOS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 53(1), 134-156.
- COX, K. K. (1969). CHANGES IN STEREOTYPING OF NEGROES AND WHITES IN MAGAZINE ADVERTISEMENTS. PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 603-606.
- CUMMINGS, M. S. (1988). THE CHANGING IMAGE OF THE BLACK FAMILY ON TELEVISION. JOURNAL OF POPULAR CULTURE(22), 75-85.
- DARDEN, D. K., & DARDEN, W. R. (1981). MIDDLE-CLASS FEMALES' MEDIA USAGE HABITS. JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, 11, 421-434.
- DATES, J. (1980). RACE, RACIAL ATTITUDES, AND ADOLESCENTS' PERCEPTIONS OF BLACK CHARACTERS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, 24, 549 - 560.
- DATES, J. I., & BARLOW, W. (1993). SPLIT IMAGE: AFRICAN AMERICANS IN THE MASS MEDIA (2ND ED.). WASHINGTON DC: HOWARD UNIVERSITY PRESS.

- DATES, J. L., & STROMAN, C. A. (2001). PORTRAYALS OF FAMILIES OF COLOR ON TELEVISION. IN J. BRYANT (ED.), TELEVISION AND THE AMERICAN FAMILY (2ND ED., PP. 207-228). LONDON: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES.
- DAVIS, J. L., & GANDY, O. H. (1999). RACIAL IDENTITY AND MEDIA ORIENTATION: EXPLORING THE NATURE OF CONSTRAINT. JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, 29(3), 367 - 397.
- DENAVAS-WALT, C., PROCTOR, B. D., & SMITH, J. C. (2011). INCOME, POVERTY, AND HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE IN THE UNITED STATES: 2010. (P60-239). WASHINGTON, DC: U.S. CENSUS BUREAU.
- DENNISON, B. A., ERB, T. A., & JENKINS, P. L. (2002). TELEVISION VIEWING AND TELEVISION IN BEDROOM ASSOCIATED WITH OVERWEIGHT RISK AMONG LOW-INCOME PRESCHOOL CHILDREN. PEDIATRICS, 109(6), 1028-1035.
- DEVINE, P. G. (1989). STEREOTYPES AND PREJUDICE: THEIR AUTOMATIC AND CONTROLLED COMPONENTS. JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 56(1), 5.
- DIXON, T., & BROOKS, T. (2002). RAP MUSIC AND RAP AUDIENCES: PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS AND POLITICAL RESISTANCE. AFRICAN AMERICAN RESEARCH PERSPECTIVES, 8(2), 106-116.
- DIXON, T. L. (2008). NETWORK NEWS AND RACIAL BELIEFS: EXPLORING THE CONNECTION BETWEEN NATIONAL TELEVISION NEWS

- EXPOSURE AND STEREOTYPICAL PERCEPTIONS OF AFRICAN AMERICANS. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 58, 321-337.
- DIXON, T. L., AZOCAR, C. L., & CASAS, M. (2003). THE PORTRAYAL OF RACE AND CRIME ON TELEVISION NETWORK NEWS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 47(4), 498-523.
- DIXON, T. L., & LINZ, D. (2000). OVERREPRESENTATION AND UNDERREPRESENTATION OF AFRICAN AMERICANS AND LATINOS AS LAWBREAKERS ON TELEVISION NEWS. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 50, 131 - 154.
- DIXON, T. L., & MADDOX, K. B. (2005). SKIN TONE, CRIME NEWS, AND SOCIAL REALITY JUDGMENTS: PRIMING THE STEREOTYPE OF THE DARK AND DANGEROUS BLACK CRIMINAL¹. JOURNAL OF APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 35(8), 1555-1570.
- DOMINICK, J., & GREENBERG, B. S. (1970). THREE SEASONS OF BLACKS ON TELEVISION. JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING RESEARCH, 26, 160-173.
- DURAND, R. M., TEEL, J. E. & BEARDEN, W. O. (1979). RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN PERCEPTIONS OF MEDIA ADVERTISING CREDIBILITY. JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 56, 562-566.
- ELLIOTT, M. T. (1995). DIFFERENCES IN THE PORTRAYAL OF BLACKS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF GENERAL MEDIA VERSUS CULTURALLY-

- TARGETED COMMERCIALS. JOURNAL OF CURRENT ISSUES & RESEARCH IN ADVERTISING, 17(1), 75-86.
- ENNIS, S. R., RIOS-VARGAS, M., & ALBERT, N. G. (MAY 2011). THE HISPANIC POPULATION: 2010. U. S. CENSUS BUREAU.
- ENTMAN, R. M. (1990). MODERN RACISM AND THE IMAGES OF BLACKS IN LOCAL TELEVISION NEWS. CRITICAL STUDIES IN MEDIA COMMUNICATION, 7(4), 332-345.
- ENTMAN, R. M. (1992). BLACKS IN THE NEWS: TELEVISION, MODERN RACISM AND CULTURAL CHANGE. JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 69(2), 341 - 361.
- ENTMAN, R. M. (1994). REPRESENTATION AND REALITY IN THE PORTRAYAL OF BLACKS ON NETWORK TELEVISION NEWS. JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 71(3), 509 - 520.
- [FALL COLORS 2003 - 2004: PRIME TIME DIVERSITY REPORT] (2004).
- FIFE, M. D. (1974). BLACK IMAGE IN AMERICAN TV: THE FIRST TWO DECADES. THE BLACK SCHOLAR, 6(3), 7-15.
- FRANK, R., & GREENBERG, M. (1980). THE PUBLIC'S USE OF TELEVISION: WHO WATCHES AND WHY. BEVERLY HILLS, CA: SAGE.
- GANDY, O. (1998). COMMUNICATION AND RACE. LONDON/NEW YORK: ARNOLD/OXFORD.

- GANDY, O. (2001). RACIAL IDENTITY, MEDIA USE, AND THE SOCIAL CONSTRUCTION OF RISK AMONG AFRICAN AMERICANS. JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES, 31, 600-618.
- GERBNER, G. (1967). AN INSTITUTIONAL APPROACH TO MASS COMMUNICATIONS RESEARCH. IN L. THAYER (ED.), COMMUNICATION THEORY AND RESEARCH: PROCEEDINGS OF THE FIRST INTERNATIONAL SYMPOSIUM (PP. 429-445). SPRINGFIELD, IL: CHARLES C. THOMAS.
- GERBNER, G. (1969A). TOWARD "CULTURAL INDICATOR": THE ANALYSIS OF MASS MEDIATED PUBLIC MESSAGE SYSTEMS. IN G. GERBNER, O. HOLSIT, K. KRIPPENDORFF, W. J. PAISLEY & P. J. STONE (EDS.), THE ANALYSIS OF COMMUNICATION CONTENT: DEVELOPMENTS IN SCIENTIFIC THEORIES AND COMPUTER TECHNIQUES (PP. 123-132). NEW YORK, NY: JOHN WILEY & SONS.
- GERBNER, G. (1969B). TOWARD "CULTURAL INDICATORS": THE ANALYSIS OF MASS MEDIATED PUBLIC MESSAGE SYSTEMES. AV COMMUNICATION REVIEW, 12(2), 137-148.
- GERBNER, G. (1973). CULTURAL INDICATORS: THE THIRD VOICE. IN G. GERBNER, L. P. GROSS & W. H. MELODY (EDS.), COMMUNICATION TECHNOLOGY AND SOCIAL POLICY (PP. 555-573). NEW YORK, NY: JOHN WILEY & SONS.

- GERBNER, G., & SIGNORIELLI, N. (1979). WOMEN AND MINORITIES IN TELEVISION DRAMA, 1969-1978. ANNENBERG SCHOOL, UNIVERSITY OF PENNSYLVANIA IN COLLABORATION WITH THE SCREEN ACTORS GUILD: AFL-CIO.
- GERSON, W. (1966). MASS MEDIA SOCIALIZATION BEHAVIOR: NEGRO-WHITE DIFFERENCES. SOCIAL FORCES, 45, 40-50.
- GILENS, M. (1996). RACE AND POVERTY IN AMERICA PUBLIC MISPERCEPTIONS AND THE AMERICAN NEWS MEDIA. PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 60(4), 515-541.
- GITTER, A. G., O'CONNELL, S. M., & MOSTOFSKY, D. (1972). TRENDS IN APPEARANCE OF MODELS IN EBONY ADS OVER 17 YEARS. JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 49(3), 547-550.
- GLASCOCK, J. (2001). GENDER ROLES ON PRIME-TIME NETWORK TELEVISION: DEMOGRAPHICS AND BEHAVIORS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 45(4), 656-669.
- GLASCOCK, J. (2003). GENDER, RACE, AND AGGRESSION IN NEWER TV NETWORKS' PRIMETIME PROGRAMMING. COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 51(1), 90-100.
- GOW, J. (1990). THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN VIOLENT AND SEXUAL IMAGES AND THE POPULARITY OF MUSIC VIDEOS. POPULAR MUSIC & SOCIETY, 14(4), 1-9.

- GRAVES, S. B. (1980). PSYCHOLOGICAL EFFECTS OF BLACK PORTRAYALS ON TELEVISION. IN S. B. WITHEY, & ABELES, R. P. (ED.), TELEVISION AND SOCIAL BEHAVIOR: BEYOND VIOLENCE AND CHILDREN (PP. 259-289). HILLSDALE, NJ: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM.
- GRAVES, S. B. (1993). TELEVISION, THE PORTRAYAL OF AFRICAN AMERICANS, AND THE DEVELOPMENT OF CHILDREN'S ATTITUDES. IN G. BERRY & J. ASAMEN (EDS.), CHILDREN AND TELEVISION: IMAGES IN A CHANGING SOCIO-CULTURAL WORLD. NEWBURY PARK, CA: SAGE PUBLICATIONS.
- GRAY, H. (1986). TELEVISION AND THE NEW BLACK MAN: BLACK MALE IMAGES IN PRIME-TIME SITUATION COMEDY. MEDIA, CULTURE & SOCIETY, 8(2), 223-242.
- GRAY, H. (1995). WATCHING RACE: TELEVISION AND THE STRUGGLE FOR "BLACKNESS". MINNEAPOLIS: UNIVERSITY OF MINNESOTA PRESS.
- GREENBERG, B. (1993). RACE DIFFERENCES IN TELEVISION AND MOVIE BEHAVIORS. IN B. S. GREENBERG, J. D. BROWN & N. BUERKEL-ROTHFUSS (EDS.), MEDIA, SEX, AND THE ADOLESCENT (PP. 145-152). CRESKILL, NJ: HAMPTON PRESS.
- GREENBERG, B. S. (1974). GRATIFICATIONS OF TELEVISION VIEWING AND THEIR CORRELATES FOR BRITISH CHILDREN. THE USES OF

- MASS COMMUNICATIONS: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON GRATIFICATIONS RESEARCH, 3, 71-92.
- GREENBERG, B. S., & HANNEMAN, G. J. (1970). RACIAL ATTITUDES AND THE IMPACT OF TV BLACKS. EDUCATIONAL BROADCASTING REVIEW, 4, 27-34.
- GREENBERG, B. S., & COLLETTE, L. (1997). THE CHANGING FACES ON TV: A DEMOGRAPHIC ANALYSIS OF NETWORK TELEVISION'S NEW SEASONS, 1966 - 1992. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING AND ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 41, 1 - 13.
- GREENBERG, B. S., & WORRELL, T. R. (2007). NEW FACES ON TELEVISION: A 12-SEASON REPLICATION. THE HOWARD JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATIONS, 18, 277 - 290.
- HARWOOD, J., & ANDERSON, K. (2002). THE PRESENCE AND PORTRAYAL OF SOCIAL GROUPS ON PRIME-TIME TELEVISION. COMMUNICATION REPORTS, 15(2), 81-97.
- HAWKINS, R., & PINGREE, S. (1981). USING TELEVISION TO CONSTRUCT SOCIAL REALITY. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, 25, 347-364.
- HERRING, C., KEITH, V., & HORTON, H. D. (2004). SKIN DEEP: HOW RACE AND COMPLEXION MATTER IN THE "COLOR-BLIND" ERA: UNIVERSITY OF ILLINOIS PRESS.
- HILL, G. H. (1986). EBONY IMAGES: BLACK AMERICANS AND TELEVISION. CARSON, CA: DAYSTAR.

- HIXSON, L., HEPLER, B. B., & KIM, M. O. (SEPTEMBER 2011). THE WHITE POPULATION: 2010. U. S. CENSUS BUREAU.
- . HOH RACE = BLACK. (2009): NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH.
- HOLLAND, J., & GENTRY, J. W. (1999). ETHNIC CONSUMER REACTION TO TARGETED MARKETING: A THEORY OF INTERCULTURAL ACCOMMODATION. JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING, 28(1), 65-77.
- HOWDEN, L. M., & MEYER, J. A. (MAY 2011). AGE AND SEX COMPOSITION: 2010. U. S. CENSUS BUREAU.
- HUMPHREY, R., & SCHUMAN, H. (1984). THE PORTRAYAL OF BLACKS IN MAGAZINE ADVERTISEMENTS: 1950–1982. PUBLIC OPINION QUARTERLY, 48(3), 551-563.
- HUNT, D., & RYDER, U. K. (2002). PRIME TIME IN BLACK AND WHITE: MAKING SENSE OF THE 2001 FALL SEASON. UCLA CENTER FOR AFRICAN AMERICAN STUDIES RESEARCH REPORT, 1(1), 1-11.
- HUNT, D. M. (2005). MAKING SENSE OF BLACKNESS ON TELEVISION. IN D. M. HUNT (ED.), CHANNELING BLACKNESS: STUDIES ON TELEVISION AND RACE IN AMERICA (PP. 320). NEW YORK: OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS.
- HUR, K. K., & ROBINSON, J. P. (1978). THE SOCIAL IMPACT OF "ROOTS". JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 55(1), 19-24, 83.
- JOHNSON, J. D., JACKSON, L. A., & GATTO, L. (1995). VIOLENT ATTITUDES AND DEFERRED ACADEMIC ASPIRATIONS: DELETERIOUS EFFECTS

- OF EXPOSURE TO RAP MUSIC. BASIC AND APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY, 16(1-2), 27-41.
- JOHNSON, P. B., SEARS, D. O., & MCCONAHAY, J. B. (1971). BLACK INVISIBILITY, THE PRESS, AND THE LOS ANGELES RIOT. AMERICAN JOURNAL OF SOCIOLOGY, 76, 698-721.
- JONES, I. (1997). MIXING QUALITATIVE AND QUANTITATIVE METHODS IN SPORTS FAN RESEARCH. THE QUALITATIVE REPORT, 3(4).
- KATZ, E., BLUMLER, J. G., & GUREVITCH, M. (1974). THE USES OF MASS COMMUNICATIONS: CURRENT PERSPECTIVES ON GRATIFICATION RESEARCH. BEVERLY HILLS: SAGE.
- KAUFMAN, L. (1980). PRIME-TIME NUTRITION. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 30(3), 37-46.
- KNIGHT, G. L. (2015). AFRICAN AMERICANS IN TELEVISION. THE AMERICAN MOSAIC: THE AFRICAN AMERICAN EXPERIENCE. RETRIEVED FROM [HTTP://AFRICANAMERICAN2.ABC-CLIO.COM/](http://AFRICANAMERICAN2.ABC-CLIO.COM/)
- KUBEY, R., SHIFFLET, M., WEERAKKODY, N., & UKEILEY, S. (1995). DEMOGRAPHIC DIVERSITY ON CABLE - HAVE THE NEW CABLE CHANNELS MADE A DIFFERENCE IN THE REPRESENTATION OF GENDER, RACE, AND AGE? JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 39, 459 - 471.

- KUBRIN, C. E. (2005). GANGSTAS, THUGS, AND HUSTLAS: IDENTITY AND THE CODE OF THE STREET IN RAP MUSIC. *SOCIAL PROBLEMS*, 52(3), 360-378.
- LARSON, S. G. (1994). BLACK WOMEN ON ALL MY CHILDREN. *JOURNAL OF POPULAR FILM AND TELEVISION*, 22(1), 44-48.
- LAUZEN, M. M., DOZIER, D. M., & HORAN, N. (2008). CONSTRUCTING GENDER STEREOTYPES THROUGH SOCIAL ROLES IN PRIME-TIME TELEVISION. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 52(2), 200-214.
- LAZARFELD, P. (1940). RADIO AND THE PRINTED PAGE: AN INTRODUCTION TO THE STUDY OF RADIO AND IT'S ROLE IN THE COMMUNICATION OF IDEAS. NEW YORK: DUELL, SLOAN, AND PEARCE.
- LEE, M. J., BICHARD, S. L., IREY, M. S., WALT, H. M., & CARLSON, A. J. (2009). TELEVISION VIEWING AND ETHNIC STEREOTYPES: DO COLLEGE STUDENTS FORM STERETYPICAL PERCEPTIONS OF ETHNIC GROUPS AS A RESULT OF HEAVY TELEVISION CONSUMPTION? *HOWARD JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATIONS*, 20(1), 95-110.
- LESTER, P. M. (1992). BLACK PHOTO COVERAGE IN FOUR U. S. NEWSPAPERS, 1937-1990. PAPER PRESENTED AT THE

- ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION IN JOURNALISM AND MASS COMMUNICATION MEETING, MONTREAL, QUEBEC, CANADA.
- LI-VOLLMER, M. (2002). RACE REPRESENTATION IN CHILD-TARGETED TELEVISION COMMERCIALS. *MASS COMMUNICATION & SOCIETY*, 5(2), 207-228.
- LICATA, J. W., & BISWAS, A. (1993). REPRESENTATION, ROLES, AND OCCUPATIONAL STATUS OF BLACK MODELS IN TELEVISION ADVERTISEMENTS. *JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY*, 70(4), 868-882.
- MACDONALD, J. F. (1983). *BLACKS AND WHITE TV: AFRO-AMERICANS IN TELEVISION SINCE 1948*: NELSON-HALL.
- MARTINDALE, C. (1986). *THE WHITE PRESS AND BLACK AMERICA*. NEW YORK: GREENWOOD PRESS.
- MASTRO, D., LAPINSKI, M. K., KOPACZ, M. A., & BEHM-MORAWITZ, E. (2009). THE INFLUENCE OF EXPOSURE TO DEPICTIONS OF RACE AND CRIME IN TV NEWS ON VIEWER'S SOCIAL JUDGEMENTS. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 53(4), 615-635.
- MASTRO, D. E., & GREENBERG, B. S. (2000). THE PORTRAYAL OF RACIAL MINORITIES ON PRIME TIME TELEVISION. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 44(4), 690-703.

- MASTRO, D. E., & STERN, S. R. (2003). REPRESENTATIONS OF RACE IN TELEVISION COMMERCIALS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PRIME-TIME ADVERTISING. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 47(4), 638-647.
- MATABANE, P. (1988). TELEVISION AND THE BLACK AUDIENCE: CULTIVATING MODERATE PERSPECTIVES ON RACIAL INTEGRATION. *JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION*, 38, 21-31.
- MBDA. (2000, SEPTEMBER). THE EMERGING MINORITY MARKETPLACE: MINORITY PURCHASING POWER 2000-2045. WASHINGTON D.C.: U. S. GOVERNMENT PRINTING.
- MCKEE, K. B., & PARDUN, C. J. (1996). MIXED MESSAGES: THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN SEXUAL AND RELIGIOUS IMAGERY IN ROCK, COUNTRY, AND CHRISTIAN VIDEOS. *COMMUNICATION REPORTS*, 9(2), 163-171.
- MCQUAIL, D., BLUMLER, J. G., & BROWN, J. (1972). THE TELEVISION AUDIENCE: A REVISED PERSPECTIVE. IN D. MCQUAIL (ED.), *SOCIOLOGY OF MASS COMMUNICATION* (PP. 135-165). HARMONDSWORTH, ENGLAND: PENGUIN BOOKS.
- MERRITT, B., & STROMAN, C. A. (1993). BLACK FAMILY IMAGERY AND INTERACTIONS ON TELEVISION. *JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES*, 23(4), 492-499.

- MOORE, M. L. (1992). THE FAMILY AS PORTRAYED ON PRIME-TIME TELEVISION, 1947–1990: STRUCTURE AND CHARACTERISTICS. *SEX ROLES*, 26(1-2), 41-61.
- NORMAN, W. T. (1936). TOWARD AN ADEQUATE TAXONOMY OF PERSONALITY ATTRIBUTES: REPLICATED FACTOR STRUCTURE IN PEER NOMINATION PERSONALITY RATINGS. *JOURNAL OF ABNORMAL AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 66, 574-583.
- NORTHCOTT, H. C., SEGGAR, J., & HINTON, J. (1975). TRENDS IN TV PORTRAYAL OF BLACKS AND WOMEN. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 42, 741-744.
- OLIVER, M. B. (1994). PORTRAYALS OF CRIME, RACE, AND AGGRESSION IN "REALITY-BASED" POLICE SHOWS: A CONTENT ANALYSIS. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA*, 38.
- PEASE, E. C. (1989). KERNER PLUS 20: MINORITY NEWS COVERAGE IN THE COLUMBUS DISPATCH—ACOMPARATIVE CONTENT STUDY. *NEWSPAPERRESEARCH JOURNAL*, 10(3), 17-37.
- POINDEXTER, P. M., & STROMAN, C. A. (1981). BLACKS AND TELEVISION: A REVIEW OF THE RESEARCH LITERATURE. *JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING*, 25, 103 - 121.
- PRATT, C. (1993). A CROSS-CULTURAL STUDY OF NEWS MEDIA PREFERENCES: AFRICAN VERSUS WHITE U.S. STUDENTS. *JOURNAL OF BLACK STUDIES*, 23, 314-331.

- RASTOGI, S., JOHNSON, T. D., HOFFEL, E. M., & DREWERY, M. P.
(SEPTEMBER 2011). THE BLACK POPULATION: 2010. U. S. CENSUS
BUREAU.
- REEVES, J. (1987). TELEVISION STARS: THE CASE OF MR. T. TELEVISION:
THE CRITICAL VIEW, 4, 445-454.
- REYNOLDS, P. (1994). FROM "BURN BABY BURN" TO "NO JUSTICE, NO
PEACE": HOW THE LOS ANGELES TIMES COVERED THE LOS
ANGELES RIOTS OF 1965 AND 1992. PAPER PRESENTED AT THE
ASSOCIATION FOR EDUCATION IN JOURNALISM AND MASS
COMMUNICATION MEETING, ATLANTA, GEORGIA.
- RIDEOUT, V. J., FOEHR, U. G., & ROBERTS, D. F. (2005). GENERATION M:
MEDIA IN THE LIVES OF 8-TO 18-YEAR-OLDS. MENLO PARK, CA:
KAISER FAMILY FOUNDATION.
- ROBERTS, C. (1970). THE PORTRAYAL OF BLACKS ON NETWORK
TELEVISION. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA,
15(1), 45-54.
- ROBERTS, C. (1975). THE PRESENTATION OF BLACKS IN TELEVISION
NETWORK NEWSCASTS. JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 52(1), 50-55.
- ROBINSON, J. D., & SKILL, T. (2001). FIVE DECADES OF FAMILIES ON
TELEVISION: FROM THE 1950S THROUGH THE 1990S. IN J. BRYANT
& J. BRYANT (EDS.), TELEVISION AND THE AMERICAN FAMILY (2
ED., PP. 139-162). LONDON: LAWRENCE ERLBAUM ASSOCIATES.

- ROSE, T. (1994). BLACK NOISE: RAP MUSIC AND BLACK CULTURE IN CONTEMPORARY AMERICA (VOL. 6): WESLEYAN UNIVERSITY PRESS HANOVER, NH.
- RUSSELL, K., WILSON, M., & HALL, R. E. (1992). THE COLOR COMPLEX: THE POLITICS OF SKIN COLOR AMONG AFRICAN AMERICANS: ANCHOR.
- SCHEMENT, J. (1998). THROUGH AMERICANS: MINORITIES AND THE NEW MEDIA. IN A. GARNER (ED.), INVESTING IN DIVERSITY: ADVANCING OPPORTUNITIES FOR MINORITIES AND THE MEDIA. WASHINGTON, D.C.: ASPEN INSTITUTE.
- SEIDMAN, S. A. (1992). PROFILE: AN INVESTIGATION OF SEX-ROLE STEREOTYPING IN MUSIC VIDEOS. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 36(2), 209-216.
- SENTMAN, M. A. (1983). BLACK AND WHITE: DISPARITY IN COVERAGE BY LIFE MAGAZINE FROM 1937 TO 1972. JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 60(3), 501-508.
- SHANAHAN, J., & MORGAN, M. (1999). TELEVISION AND ITS VIEWERS. CULTIVATION THEORY AND RESEARCH. CAMBRIDGE, UK: CAMBRIDGE UNIVERSITY PRESS.
- SHERMAN, B. L., & DOMINICK, J. K. (1986). VIOLENCE AND SEX IN MUSIC VIDEOS: TV AND ROCK 'N'ROLL. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 36(1), 79-93.

- SHOSTECK, H. (1969). SOME INFLUENCES OF TELEVISION ON CIVIL UNREST. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING, 13, 371-385.
- SIGNORIELLI, N. (1989). TELEVISION AND CONCEPTIONS ABOUT SEX ROLES: MAINTAINING CONVENTIONALITY AND THE STATUS QUO. SEX ROLES, 21(5-6), 341-360.
- SIGNORIELLI, N. (2009). MINORITIES REPRESENTATION IN PRIME TIME: 2000 TO 2008. COMMUNICATION RESEARCH REPORTS, 26(4), 323-336.
- SIGNORIELLI, N., & BACUE, A. (1999). RECOGNITION AND RESPECT: A CONTENT ANALYSIS OF PRIMETIME TELEVISION CHARACTERS ACROSS THREE DECADES. SEX ROLE, 40, 527 - 544.
- SIGNORIELLI, N., & KAHLENBERG, S. (2001). TELEVISION'S WORLD OF WORK IN THE NINETIES. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 45(1), 4-22.
- SMITH, S. L. (2005). FROM DR. DRE TO DISMISSED: ASSESSING VIOLENCE, SEX, AND SUBSTANCE USE ON MTV. CRITICAL STUDIES IN MEDIA COMMUNICATION, 22(1), 89-98.
- SNARE, A., BENDNALL, D., & SULLIVAN, L. (1972). RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN LIKING AND WATCHING TV PROGRAMS. JOURNALISM QUARTERLY, 49, 750-753.

- SOMMERS-FLANAGAN, R., SOMMERS-FLANAGAN, J., & DAVIS, B. (1993).
WHAT'S HAPPENING ON MUSIC TELEVISION? A GENDER ROLE
CONTENT ANALYSIS. *SEX ROLES*, 28(11-12), 745-753.
- STAPLES, R., & JONES, T. (1985). CULTURE, IDEOLOGY AND BLACK
TELEVISION IMAGES. *THE BLACK SCHOLAR*, 16(3), 10-20.
- STORM, J. (2000, APRIL 20). BLACK & WHITE TV, THE PHILADELPHIA
INQUIRER, PP. 11-16.
- STROMAN, C. A. (1984). MASS MEDIA EFFECTS AND BLACK AMERICANS.
URBAN RESEARCH REVIEW, 9, 1-8.
- STROMAN, C. A., & BECKER, L. B. (1978). RACIAL DIFFERENCES IN
GRATIFICATIONS. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 55, 767-771.
- STROMAN, C. A., MERRITT, B. D., & MATABANE, P. W. (1989). TWENTY
YEARS AFTER KERNER: THE PORTRAYAL OF AFRICAN AMERICANS
ON PRIME-TIME TELEVISION. *HOWARD JOURNAL OF
COMMUNICATIONS*, 2(1), 44-56.
- TAN, A. (1978). EVALUATION OF NEWSPAPERS AND TELEVISION BY
BLACKS AND MEXICAN-AMERICANS. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 55,
673-681.
- TAN, A., & VAUGHN, P. (1976). MASS MEDIA EXPOSURE, PUBLIC AFFAIRS
KNOWLEDGE, AND BLACK MILITANCY. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*,
53, 271-279.

- TAN, A. S., & TAN, G. (1979). TELEVISION USE AND SELF-ESTEEM OF BLACKS. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 29, 129-135.
- TAPPER, J., THORSON, E., & BLACK, D. (1994). VARIATIONS IN MUSIC VIDEOS AS A FUNCTION OF THEIR MUSICAL GENRE. JOURNAL OF BROADCASTING & ELECTRONIC MEDIA, 38, 103-113.
- TEDESCO, N. S. (1974). PATTERNS IN PRIME TIME. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 24, 119 - 124.
- A TELEVISION TREND: AUDIENCES IN BLACK AND WHITE. (1994, NOVEMBER 29). WASHINGTON POST, PP. A1, A20.
- . TOTAL COOMPOSITE. (2009): NIELSEN MEDIA RESEARCH.
- TURNER, J. (2008). HEGEMONY, HEDONISM, AND HIP-HOP: AN EXAMINATION OF THE PORTRAYAL OF RACE AND SEXUALITY IN MUSIC VIDEOS. PAPER PRESENTED AT THE CONFERENCE PAPERS--INTERNATIONAL COMMUNICATION ASSOCIATION.
- VINCENT, R. C., DAVIS, D. K., & BORUSZKOWSKI, L. A. (1987). SEXISM ON MTV: THE PORTRAYAL OF WOMEN IN ROCK VIDEOS. JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 64(4), 750-941.
- WEBSTER, J. G. (1986). AUDIENCE BEHAVIOR IN THE NEW MEDIA ENVIRONMENT. JOURNAL OF COMMUNICATION, 36, 77-91.
- WEST, R., & TURNER, L. H. (2004). INTRODUCING COMMUNICATION THEORY: ANALYSIS AND APPLICATION (SECOND ED.). NEW YORK: MCGRAW-HILL.

- WESTLEY, B., & SEVERIN, W. (1964). SOME CORRELATES OF MEDIA CREDIBILITY. *JOURNALISM QUARTERLY*, 41, 325-335.
- WHITT, J. (2005). FRANK'S PLACE: COMING HOME TO A PLACE WE'D NEVER BEEN BEFORE. *JOURNAL OF POPULAR FILM AND TELEVISION*, 33(2), 80-87.
- WIEGEL, R. H., LOOMIS, J. W., & SOJA, M. J. (1980). RACE RELATIONS ON PRIME TIME TELEVISION. *JOURNAL OF PERSONALITY AND SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 39(5), 884.
- WILKES, R. E., & VALENCIA, H. (1989). HISPANICS AND BLACKS IN TELEVISION COMMERCIALS. *JOURNAL OF ADVERTISING*, 18(1), 19-25.
- WILSON, C., GUTIERREZ, F., & CHAO, L. M. (2003). RACISM, SEXISM, AND THE MEDIA: THE RISE OF CLASS COMMUNICATION IN MULTICULTURAL AMERICA COMMUNICATION: SAGE PUBLICATIONS.
- ZILLMANN, D., AUST, C. F., HOFFMAN, K. D., LOVE, C. C., ORDMAN, V. L., POPE, J. T., . . . GIBSON, R. J. (1995). RADICAL RAP: DOES IT FURTHER ETHNIC DIVISION? *BASIC AND APPLIED SOCIAL PSYCHOLOGY*, 16(1-2), 1-25.
- ZINKHAN, G. M., QUAILS, W. J., & BISWAS, A. (1990). THE USE OF BLACKS IN MAGAZINE AND TELEVISION ADVERTISING: 1946 TO 1986.

JOURNALISM & MASS COMMUNICATION QUARTERLY, 67(3), 547-553.

ABSTRACT**COMPARATIVE CONTENT ANALYSIS OF AFRICAN AMERICAN AND
CAUCASIAN ROLE PORTRAYALS IN BROADCAST TELEVISION
ENTERTAINMENT PROGRAMMING****by****SCOTT E. BURKE****August 2015****Advisor:** Dr. Hayg Oshagan**Major:** Communication**Degree:** Doctor of Philosophy

This study examines the nature and number of character portrayals in broadcast entertainment programming. More specifically, the portrayals of African American characters are examined and compared to Caucasian portrayals. The goal of this study is to determine what, if any, stereotypes may still be prevalent on broadcast television and if there are any discrepancies between portrayals of African American and Caucasian characters.

A content analysis methodology was utilized to code 577 character occurrences from broadcast television entertainment programs popular with African Americans and Caucasian audiences. Each character occurrence was evaluated using thirty-two schematic differential items with regard to portrayal attributes, physical characteristics, behavioral characteristics, appearance characteristics, and the five factor model of personality elements. T-test and z-score analysis were used to determine significant differences between items.

Results determined that African American characters were not portrayed in a negative manner when compared to Caucasian characters. African American characters were overrepresented on television but were underrepresented in programs popular with Caucasian audiences. In programming watched by African Americans, they were overrepresented. The most common significantly different characteristics found between African American and Caucasian characters on broadcast entertainment programming were hair color, skin color, amount of makeup and amount of accessories.

KEY WORDS:

RACE

CONTENT ANALYSIS

BROADCAST TELEVISION

PORTRAYALS

AUTOBIOGRAPHICAL STATEMENT

Scott Evan Burke

Scott Burke was born in Detroit, Michigan. He left Michigan with his family at the age of five to spend seven years in New Jersey before moving to St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands at the age of 12. He lived on St. Thomas through his graduation from Antilles School.

Scott earned his B.A. in Telecommunication from Michigan State University in 1992. At MSU, Scott joined Alpha Phi Omega, a national coed service fraternity. He served as Pledgemaster and Sargent-At-Arms before becoming a Lifetime Member upon graduation.

Scott then began his career in video production working for a number of PEG Access stations in the Detroit Metropolitan area before being hired as the Director of Video Services at Oakland University in 1999. While working at Oakland University as full-time staff, Scott began teaching existing video production classes as well as developing and teaching new production courses for the Communication Department. He also earned his MBA in Entrepreneurship from Oakland University in 2004.

During his time at Oakland University, Scott started his family. He married Jennifer, who he met at MSU, two years after graduation. In the early 2000's they had a son, Evan, and then a daughter, Miranda. Scott enjoys being very active in his children's lives including being assistant soccer coach, den leader, and even taking dancing lessons.

Scott left his full-time position at Oakland University in 2013 to concentrate on teaching and completing his Ph.D. He now teaches video production courses at both Oakland University and Wayne State University. He earned his Ph.D. in Communication from Wayne State University in 2015.

Scott intends to continue teaching while pursuing opportunities within the Michigan production community.