

# Portrayals of Asian Americans in Magazine Advertisements, 1955-1975: The Impact of the 1965 Immigration Act in the USA

**Daechun An, PhD.**

Associate Professor of Marketing  
College of Business Administration  
Inha University, Incheon, Korea

## Abstract

*From the cultural history perspective, this study examined the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act on the portrayals of Asian Americans in American magazine advertisements during the 1970s. A content analysis of 734 mainstream magazine ads revealed that the first reform of the U.S. immigration policy, which was initiated by the 1965 Immigration Act, appears to have influenced the portrayals of Asian Americans in the advertisements. First, Asian Americans appeared more frequently in the advertisements. Second, they were more frequently presented as playing a major role in the advertisements. Third, they were depicted more in business settings and as having business relationships with other characters within the advertisements than ever before. Fourth, positive stereotyping in the advertisements was apparent for Asian Americans. All these were attributable to the increase in the number of the Asian population and their elevated socioeconomic status after the Act.*

**Key Words:** magazine advertising, content analysis, Asian Americans, minority portrayal

## 1. Introduction

Asian Americans were the group most significantly affected by the 1965 Immigration Act in terms of the changes in the size of population and socioeconomic status (Herschman & Wong, 1981). Among several revisions in American immigration policy toward Asians since the beginning of Chinese immigration in the mid-19<sup>th</sup> century, the 1965 Immigration Act was the first that abolished the nationality-origin quota and employed the occupational preference system. It led to a tremendous influx of Asian immigrants to the United States during the 1960s and 1970s, moreover, the largest portion of new Asian immigrants possessed relatively higher socioeconomic status than ever before (Herschman & Wong, 1981).

Asian Americans who moved to this country after the 1965 Act were very often described as more educated, more trained, better assimilated to existing culture, more technologically competent, and more economically affluent than the other two minority groups. This was in part due to the restrictions of the 1965 Act, which preferred skilled workers such as engineers or professionals and those who could provide their labor in the areas where shortages of domestic laborers existed (Kitano & Daniels, 1988).

The impact of the 1965 Immigration Act on the portrayals in magazine advertisements of the three largest minority groups in the United States was examined in this study, with particular emphasis given to Asian Americans. The analysis was based on the linkage between the 1965 Immigration Act and the changing characteristics of new Asian immigrants. African Americans and Hispanic Americans will often be compared with Asian Americans in an effort to assess influence of the Act on Asian Americans. Magazine advertisements with any minority models in 1955 and 1975 were content analyzed to detect changes during pre- and post-act period.

## 2. Background

### 2.1. Cultural Approach to History of Mass Communication and Advertising

According to James Carey, in his article *The Problem of Journalism History*, the major problem of journalism history has been what Herbert Butterfield recognized in his book, *The Whig interpretation of History*, the Whig interpretation of journalism history (Carey, 1974). The Whig interpretation views journalism history as the slow, steady expansion of freedom and knowledge from the political press to the commercial press, the setbacks into sensationalism and yellow journalism, and the forward thrust into muckraking and social responsibility.

History of journalism just reflected the expansion of individual rights and growth of public right to know. It failed to see the thoughts within historical events, which he called consciousness in the past. Carey argues the recovery of past forms of imagination of historical consciousness and the entire structure of feeling should be recognized to better understand our history. This approach was called the cultural history approach because culture means the organization of social experience in the consciousness of men manifested in symbolic action (Carey, 1974). Journalism is a particular symbolic form, a highly particular type of consciousness, and a particular organization of social experience. Thus, this form of consciousness can be grasped by history and by comparing it to older forms of consciousness such as myths and religions.

This perspective accounted for a major change in historical outlook. It was not until the 1950s when historians largely downplayed the idea of direct persuasive media influence on society and substituted for it the concept that the media themselves were a product of social influences (Sloan, 1991). Rarely did cultural historians frame their work around the role that an individual had played in affecting the media. More and more studies placed an emphasis on the environmental conditions in which the media operated and their effect on the media. The most productive historian from the cultural school was Sidney Kobre, who in a number of works tried to explain the media as a product of environment (Sloan, 1991). He argued that the development of American journalism could be explained best in terms of how the media had been influenced by economic, political, technological, sociological, geographic, and cultural forces working on them from outside (Kobre, 1945). Kobre (1945) concluded that changes in the media were natural results of the social and economic environment.

While much of the early history written about advertising has supported one side or another in the dispute over the direct effects of advertising on consumers, cultural history has tended to say more about American culture than advertising *per se* (Avery, 1991). In this approach, advertising is viewed as mirrors of society, being influenced and shaped by the culture and society (Avery, 1991). Technological developments, social, economic, and political conditions influence the society and, as a consequence, impact what is contained in advertising (Avery, 1991). For example, population movements have been regarded as important historic forces that have influenced society, industry, the educational system, politics and religion.

America has symbolized “economic abundance” during the last three centuries, and that force has helped shape the American society through an institution of modern advertising (Potter, 1954). According to David M. Potter, in his landmark work on cultural history of advertising, *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character*:

Advertising should be recognized as an important social influence and should be identified with one of the most pervasive forces in American life, the force of economic abundance. The most critical point on the functioning of society shifts from production to consumption. So, the culture must be reoriented to convert the producer’s culture into consumer’s culture. Advertising appeals primarily to consumer’s desires. (Potter, 1991, P. 188)

This is what he called “the social effect of advertising,” which is, in parallel but broader sense, “to make the individual like what he gets – to enforce already existing attitudes, to diminish the range and variety of choices, and, in terms of abundance, to exalt the materialistic virtues of consumption” (Potter, 1991). He argues that advertising should be directed to the stimulation or even the exploitation of materialistic drives and then to the standardization of these drives as accepted criteria of social value. In other words, advertising is part of the social, cultural and business milieu, and its achievement depends on the ability of the advertiser to predict and react to a changing society.

Advertisements contained in the media respond in similar ways to external circumstances, such as population growth and movements, and the content of advertising reflects how advertisers delivered their audiences to the world (Fox, 1975). As such, advertising can be an important window through which different aspects of American society can be explained. But also, the advertising itself can be explained to determine how it might have been shaped by American society. This approach, called cultural history, recognizes advertising not only as a window to culture but also a mirror that reflects the culture, or the cultures (Bowen & Schmid, 1997).

## **2.2. Asian Immigrants and Immigration Policy**

Like the other immigrants, Asians were, in the first place, attracted to America by the opportunities for employment (Archdeacon, 1985).

Economic and political conditions in their homelands also played a role in persuading them to immigrate. In the middle of the 19th century, the Chinese came in large numbers to mine for gold in California. In a cycle of ethnic succession, Japanese, Filipinos, Asian Indians, and Koreans all arrived to work in the United States. All of them were similar to the Chinese in that they all encountered racial discrimination and exclusion in the job market as well as in the social environment. Some of the discrimination, like segregation of Blacks in the South, was required by law. The immigration statutes and the discriminatory laws brought about important consequences for the Asian immigrants. An immigration scholar, Sau-ling Cynthia Wong, remarked in her 1985 article on Asian American literature:

From a legal perspective, the peoples previously known as Orientals and now designated as Asian Americans have almost all, at one time or another, been excluded from U.S. citizenship. (Recent refugees and immigrants from Southeast Asia in the wake of Vietnam War constitute an exception.)

During the four decades before the 1965 Immigration Act was passed, American immigration policy favored European countries. The McCarran-Walter Act, which established the basic laws of U.S. citizenship and immigration, originally created a quota of only 2,990 Asians and 1,400 Africans compared to 149,667 Europeans (Reimers, 1985). In 1965, Congress passed an immigration law that removed the national origin quota as the basis of American legislation. The Immigration Act of 1965 introduced a new preference system, set up a labor certification program, and imposed a ceiling on western hemisphere immigration.

The law specified seven preferences for eastern hemisphere quota immigrants: (1) unmarried children over age 21 of U.S. citizens; (2) spouses and unmarried children of permanent residents; (3) professionals, scientists, and artists of exceptional ability; (4) married children over age 21 of U.S. citizens; (5) siblings of U.S. citizens; (6) workers, skilled and unskilled, in occupations for which labor was in short supply in the United States; and (7) refugees. A percentage ceiling was given to each preference. No one, however, could be admitted under the third and sixth preferences unless the U.S. secretary of labor certifies that there are not enough qualified workers in that occupation in the United States and that the entry of the immigrants would have not lowered wages and otherwise lead to a deterioration of working conditions. This provided the first real reform of immigration policy in the twentieth century (Wong, 1986). In fact, the passage of the 1965 Immigration Act accelerated an influx of Asian immigrants to the United States. It was a way of redressing past discrimination and promoting family reunification. These new arrivals changed the cultural landscape of the United States as they settled in cities and suburbs (Wong, 1986).

### ***2.3. The Growth of the Asian American Population after the 1965 Immigration Act***

Since the 1965 law went into effect, Asian immigration has increased so steadily that Asians composed more than half of the total influx through the 1990s. This was the first time in American immigration history for Asian nations to have achieved a parity, or better, with European countries (Kitano & Daniels, 1988). During the late 1960s and 1970s the growth rate of Asian population in the United States exceeded almost 600 percent while that of African Americans and Hispanic Americans remained almost the same (Ng, 1998). While Mexico was still the country of the largest number of immigrants, the next four sending the largest number were all from Asia, including Philippines, Korea, China (the People's Republic of China on the Asian mainland and the Republic of China in Taiwan each had its own quota), and Vietnam. The growth of the Asian American population by immigration before and after the 1965 Immigration Act is illustrated in Table 1. Before 1970 the majority of immigrants came from Europe; since 1970, the rise of Asian immigrants has been the largest. The percentage increase of Asians among the immigrants from 6 percent in 1950 to 36 percent in 1970-1980 and 48 percent in 1980-1984 is the steepest of any of the groups.

Wong (1986) reported that about 43 percent of the total immigration stream was constituted by Asian immigrants in the 1970s and 1980s, an increase of 500 percent in relative share and more than 700 percent in absolute numbers. The 20-year period from 1961 to 1981 was subdivided into five major periods: (1) 1961-65 (the five years preceding the passage of the Act); (2) 1966-68 (the transitional period in which the backlog of immigration under the old quota system was processed); (3) 1969-73 (the first five-year period after enactment of the Act); (4) 1974-77; and (5) 1978-81. During the third period (1969-73), the initial impact of the 1965 Act on the shift in region of origin of the immigrants was evident.

The last two periods revealed that the initial impacts of the 1965 Act represented an abnormal fluctuation in the number of immigrants from Asian countries and European countries. The trend showed a significant increase in the number of Asian immigrants and a relatively small increase in the number of European immigrants during these two periods. From 1965 to 1981, Asian immigration increased almost tenfold; there was a substantial increase from each Asian country except Japan, including China, Philippines, Korea, Vietnam, and other Southeast Asian countries.

**Table 1. Comparison of U.S. Legal Immigration by Continent, 1950-1960, 1970-1980, 1981-1984 (In Percent)**

|               | 1950-1960 | 1970-1980 | 1981-1984 |
|---------------|-----------|-----------|-----------|
| Europe        | 59        | 18        | 12        |
| Latin America | 22        | 41        | 35        |
| Asia          | 6         | 36        | 48        |

#### **2.4. Socioeconomic Characteristics of the New Asian Immigrants**

The 1965 Immigration Act led to a dramatic change in the socioeconomic status of Asian immigrants. During the period of 1961-1965, nearly 40 percent of Asian immigrants with jobs were engaged in service or sales area. Approximately 25% of the Asian immigrants who had an occupation were professionals or managers while during the post-act period from 1969 to 1977, this percentage went up to 33%. In their study on the socioeconomic status and change of Asian immigrants, Hirschman & Wong (1981) referred to the three sources of data: the 1960 Population Census; the 1970 Population Census; and the 1976 Survey of Income and Education (SIE). They examined four socioeconomic factors: educational attainment; occupational structure; industrial structure; and earnings. Asian male immigrants were a very highly educated population. The proportion of Asian male immigrants who arrived in the United States with college degrees and with postgraduate training was almost twice the U.S. proportion of those with college degrees. Particularly, immigrants from China, Japan, Korea, and Philippines had much higher proportion in the category of college graduates than the national average.

Partly as a consequence of their higher educational achievements, Asian immigrants were more advantaged occupationally than the typical Americans were (Wong, 1986). The analysis revealed that 22 percent of the Asian immigrants, compared to 13 percent of the U.S. population, were involved in professional occupations. Another indicator of occupational advantage was the proportion involved in white-collar occupations. More than 65 percent of the Asian immigrants were involved in white-collar occupations. Mean earnings provided a crude measure of the relative economic success of the Asian American minorities. Comparing earnings of Asian Americans with whites, those who arrived between 1965 and 1969 earned more than the national average or more than recent immigrants. The family income of the Asian immigrants was about \$2,000 higher than that of the general U.S. population. This might be due to multiple workers in the household as well as the immigrants' concentration in urban areas, where wages tended to be higher.

The basic patterns and trends of the occupational data were reflected in industrial composition of the employed male population of the Asian American populations. Consistent with prior observations, Asian Americans had an employment structure most similar to white men when compared to other minority groups in the nation (Reubens, 1978). All these factors revealed that there was a dramatic change in the characteristics of Asian immigrants following the 1965 Act. They can be characterized as more educated, more professional, more technically competent, and more affluent than the immigrants before the 1965 Act. The overall level of socioeconomic status of the new Asian immigrants even surpassed that of average white population.

#### **2.5. Minorities in Advertising**

Before looking at whether the influence of the change in social condition on Asian Americans had been reflected in advertising, it is imperative to look back at how Asian Americans and other minority groups in advertisements were described before the 1965 Act was enacted. History of minority portrayals in the mass media, especially in advertising, needs to be traced so that the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act can be assessed. While waves of immigrants from Asia continued to arrive in the United States, following World War II, vast numbers of African Americans moved from southern to northern states. Additional waves of people came from Latin American countries (Gutman, 1992).

Despite or because of these movements, stereotyping of ethnic groups died hard in the media and advertising (Sivulka, 1998). From the early 1960s to the mid-1970s advertisers continued to focus on Middle America, populated by white people and guided by what they called traditional values. Advertisers typically avoided controversial and political issues and feared breaking the color line. Asians and Hispanics rarely appeared in the advertising, and African Americans disappeared from print ads and TV commercials in the 1950s and 1960s. Sivulka (1998) argue that advertisers in the United States just reflected the place of non-Whites in the social fabric of the nation either by ignoring them, or when they were included in advertisements for the mass audience, processing and presenting them in a way that would make them palatable salespersons for the products being advertised.

Cohen (1992) defined stereotyping as a fixed and simplified characterization that is constantly repeated to gain acceptance by mainstream audiences. Particularly, Branthwaite & Pierce (1990) have defined a social stereotype as a prevailing and frequently used image of one group as uniform used to categorize all members of the group on a limited number dimensions. Stereotyping can be a useful device to describe minority groups if used without prejudice. Negative stereotyping of non-White cultural groups in the United States, however, has been apparent in a White-dominant environment. Compared to the other minority groups that had rarely been the main focus of the studies that examined portrayals of minority groups in the mainstream media advertising, African Americans had been investigated in the advertisements from 1940s through 1990s (Kern-Foxworth, 1994). For those Black models pictured in mainstream advertising, the roles were often limited or demeaning (Taylor et al., 1995). They conformed, for the most part, to the White “stereotype” of Black life which breaks along two major lines – those who entertain and those who serve. Advertising has historically perpetuated social stereotypes of African Americans as uneducated and low-status (Pettigrew, 1965). In those integrated ads where both minorities and Whites were featured, the setting and interactions were not social or intimate, but formal and professional.

Controversy, however, surrounded the nature of portrayals of African Americans. Negative stereotyping was found for the first half of the century, but changes in a more positive direction have occurred since the 1960s (Taylor et al., 1995). Three studies (i.e., Pettigrew, 1965; Kassarjian, 1969; Cox, 1970) were compared to see the trend of portrayals of African Americans in mainstream advertising. As far back as the 1930s, African Americans were relegated to three roles: entertainers, athletes, and servants. In a content analysis of a large sample of magazine ads in 1965, it was found that African Americans were depicted in low-status positions and rarely shown as equals to Whites. However, this finding was rebutted in Cox’s 1970 study that found African Americans portrayed in more prominent roles. More recent studies tracking trend showed that African Americans’ roles in advertisements changed from minor roles to major roles, reflecting the change in their socioeconomic status (Zinkhan, 1990). Overall, however, the extent to which advertisers cultivated African Americans remained relatively small in relation to efforts to influence the White audience.

Advertising has tended to reinforce stereotypes of Hispanic Americans as uneducated blue-collar workers who are not well assimilated into mainstream American culture and who have large, close-knit families (Faber & O’Guinne, 1990). Hispanics had been portrayed only as part of large groups and only rarely as individuals in the advertisements during this period (Gutierrez, 1990). They were included only in background roles and received little individual importance to either the commercial or the product. Of the total number of ads in which Hispanics were clearly identified, they were found more often in ads for food products, entertainment (movies or shows), alcohol, and furniture. Hispanic characters were typically shown in minor unimportant roles.

In recent years, increased attention has been devoted to the acculturation and assimilation of the Hispanic population in the United States (Auirre, 1981). During the late 1970s and the early 1980s there was a significant change in the portrayals of Hispanics in the mainstream advertising (Czepiec & Kelly, 1983). Hispanics were given some central roles, and were moved from group scenes to scenes of everyday life and social affairs. In the past few decades, American businesses have begun actively taking the lead in insuring that Hispanics are portrayed positively within advertising and other forms of the media. Stereotypes are not as rampant as they were in the past years, and there is increasing attention to the marketing needs of the Hispanic market (Gutierrez, 1990). Overall, however, like African Americans, Hispanic Americans were quite underrepresented from 1960s through 1970s.

As far as the portrayal of Asian Americans in advertising, there are very few scholarly studies on this population (Taylor et al., 1995). The portrayal of Asian Americans in advertising was one of the least successful aspects of the Asian American experience (Kitano, 1988). Although there is little information about advertising portrayals of Asian Americans, they were socially stereotyped as technically competent, hardworking, serious, and well assimilated (Lott, 1997). The lack of a sizable Asian community, or market, in the United States made it easier to create positive stereotypes of them because they were not a numerical threat to whites. Asian Americans also were quite underrepresented until late 1970s. In sum, the three biggest minority groups in the United States had been largely underrepresented in advertising until late 1970s when their collective purchasing power began to be identified and recognized by the big national marketers (Blackwell et al., 2001). Particularly, Asian Americans were extensively excluded from the mainstream advertising in the earlier periods.

### 3. Research Agenda

Based on the framework discussed above, the present study will investigate how advertising reflected the societal change that the reform of the American immigration policy brought about during the 1970s. To do so the study examines the frequency and roles of these minority groups in mainstream magazine. That will be followed by the analysis of the meanings that advertising attached to minority status by including contextual and societal variables. Counting not only provides a barometer of the numerical representation of a minority group in proportion to its representation in the population, but also allows comparisons to be made between pre- and post-act periods. The variables include latent messages such as their roles, stereotypes, settings, and personal relationships. Asian Americans will be compared to the other minority groups, if necessary. The research questions are:

- (1) In terms of frequency of representation in the advertisements, were Asian Americans more frequently represented during the post-act period than the pre-act period? And, was there any difference in the frequency of representation among the three minority groups?
- (2) Did minority models appear most frequently in major roles, minor roles, or background roles?
- (3) Based on the (a) product types and (b) settings and relationships, was there any change in the stereotyping of minority groups between the two periods?

The first research question addresses the frequency of representation in the advertisements. As shown in Table 1, the largest number of immigrants was from European countries before 1970. After 1970, the rise of Asian and Hispanic immigrants was dominant over the European immigrants. A difference was identified in the share of each minority group in the total U.S. population between the two periods. The proportionality criterion (Faber & O'Guinne, 1987) states that minority representation should approximately equal its proportion in the total population. A comparison between pre- and post-act will provide a reliable barometer of the trend. The year 1955 will represent "pre-act" period and the year 1975 will represent "post-act" period.

The second question will examine whether minority models appear most frequently in major roles, minor roles, or background roles. As Asian Americans tended to possess improved socioeconomic status during post-act period, their buying power would have increased. As a result, advertising would be expected to respond by altering its message to reach new audience (Sivulka, 1998). As reviewed above, several immigration studies revealed that the general level of socioeconomic status among the new Asian immigrants even surpassed that of average American population while those for African Americans and Hispanic Americans remained the same or diminished (Chai, 1978).

Consequently, it is assumed that, if Asian Americans appeared in the ads, the role they had been playing would have been significantly different between pre- and post-act periods, and a difference in the role description would also exist among the three minority groups. The third research question addresses the changes in the stereotyping of minority groups between the two periods and among the three minority groups. Particularly, this question has implications for the product categories and magazine types in which minority models were likely to appear. For example, if African Americans or Hispanic Americans are stereotypically portrayed as uneducated, they are not likely to be depicted frequently in publications with highly educated readers, such as *Scientific Americans* or *Business Week*. On the other hand, if Asian Americans are stereotypically portrayed as technically oriented, they are more likely to be represented in these publications.

Additionally, if fully and fairly represented, the stereotyping of Asian Americans would be different between the two periods in the same publications. In reference to product types, African Americans and Hispanic Americans who used to be depicted as uneducated are not likely to be shown frequently portrayed as users or purchasers of technologically sophisticated products. In contrast, Asian Americans are more likely to be portrayed in the advertisements of such products as electronic shaving machine or newly invented products.

In relation to stereotyping questions, the settings and personal relationships will be compared among minority groups and between the two periods. For example, stereotypes of Asian Americans depicting their high education and work ethic suggest that they are more likely to be shown in business settings and work relationships more frequently than either African or Hispanic Americans during post-act period. On the other hand, Hispanic Americans stereotyped as having close-knit families are more likely to be shown in home settings with family relationships prominent.

#### **4. Methodology**

A specialist in use of content analysis, Holsti(1969) suggests that content analysis can reveal what motives, values, beliefs and attitudes are contained in communication messages. To study the most interesting and challenging research problems, which are those about the causes and effects of communication, content analysis, a research tool for making inferences about the meaning of communication messages, is a powerful device to assess “average” of a culture or a social system in general (Shaw, 1984). Berg (2001) also suggests that content analysis may focus on either quantitative or qualitative aspects of communication messages. Especially for the study of advertising, a quantitative content analysis can move beyond counting to deal with the meanings that advertising attaches to prevalent culture by including latent variables such as contextual and societal variables that are not physically present and countable. In this regard, quantitative content analysis may be one of the appropriate approaches to assess the cultural impact of the societal changes on advertising.

This study applied content analysis to chart portrayals of minority groups in magazine advertisements of the 1955-1975 periods. These years were chosen so that research could identify periodical difference between pre- and post-act periods. The selection of magazines for this study was based on the categories representing a cross-section of mainstream magazines that contain the types of advertisements to which Americans are typically exposed. The categories in the present study are the business press, women’s magazines, general interest magazines, and technical publications. The goal of developing sampling frames for each of the four categories was to select magazines that would represent a wide range of readership and demographic categories. Care was taken to ensure that the selected magazines would reflect what might be called “mainstream” America. The selected magazines were *Business Week* and *Fortune* for business press, *Scientific America* and *Popular Science* for technical publication, *Good Housekeeping* and *Vogue* for women’s magazines, and *Time* and *Newsweek* for general interest magazines. Table 3 shows the publications chosen to represent each category and the number of advertisements analyzed in each publication for 1955 and 1975.

The category scheme and operational definitions of the variables used in this study were mainly modified from the study conducted by Bowen & Schmid (1997) and Taylor, et al (1995). The presence of minority models was recorded as a simple number. Minor roles and background roles were separated because the degree of the importance of the character or characters to the advertisements should be recognized as precisely as possible. For example, there are many advertisements where models are shown in the background, but they are important to the advertising theme. In this case, the models are coded as minor role. However, when the character is shown in the background and he or she is not important to the theme, the model is coded as background role.

This is a big difference because preliminary research showed that minority models are usually shown in the background role in many of the advertisements where they appeared mainly with white models, but were important to the theme. As the settings and relationships are very closely related to the stereotyping issue, the categories were divided as much as possible to precisely distinguish the advertisements from one another. To analyze approximately the same number of advertisements from each publication category, a quota sampling procedure was employed. Three issues of each magazine for each year were selected for a total of forty-eight issues. Issues from 1955 and 1975 were randomly selected, and advertisements with human models of one or more full pages in these issues were included in the sample. That yielded 734 advertisements.

When the sample advertisements contained models, those with minority models were identified, and only those were content analyzed. The number of advertisements with only white models, however, was counted so that data on the percentage of appearance of each minority group relative to the appearance of any human subjects in the advertisements could be compared.

The author performed initial coding of 35 advertisements from the sample and recoded the same 35 advertisements to check coding reliability. Disagreements were checked and resolved in review with the operational definitions of all variables. The coding reliability of each coding category ranged from 88% to 97% (i.e., 97% for the presence of minority groups, 95% for settings, 88% for relationships). Operational definitions are provided in Table 2.

**Table 2. Operational Definitions Pertaining to Perceived Importance of Characters, Setting, and Relationships**

- 
1. Perceived Importance of Minority Characters
    - *Major role*: Very important to the advertising theme or layout, shown in the foreground or shown holding the product.
    - *Minor role*: Of average importance to the advertising theme or layout, although not holding the product and not spotlighted in the advertisement.
    - *Background role*: Difficult to find in an advertisement and not important to its theme and layout.
  2. Setting
    - *Business setting*: factories, sales or office rooms, and retail settings in which consumers are depicted inside.
    - *Home, indoor or outdoor*: residence, room, garage, yard, home, or apartment, or driveway or parking space
    - *Natural scenery*: forests, rivers, ocean, fields, or sky as well as streets, public roads, sidewalks, or pathways.
    - *Social setting*: public places, auditoriums, restaurants, movie theaters, places where people meet for social purposes.
    - *Other*: artificial setting and any other settings not listed above
  3. Relationships to others
    - *Family context*: any relationship between families and relatives, including children and extended family such as uncles, aunts, grandparents, grandchildren and etc.
    - *Social context*: friends or any other two people depicted in a social setting except family members depicted in a social context.
    - *Business context*: members or workers in a company, colleagues in the same profession or occupation, and any relationship between employers and employees
    - *Impersonal context*: no apparent relationships between more than one character.
    - *Other relationship*: any other than those listed above.
- 

Items measured were the frequency of appearance of minority models, their perceived importance in the advertisements, the setting, and the relationship between models. Also, the product category was coded according to a 12-item product category code used by the Advertising Age, including auto or auto-related, financial services, home electronics, food, beverages, cigarette, clothing, household goods, and others. The product category was later collapsed into two groups: (1) “technology-based” products, such as automobiles, electronics, financial services and telecommunications and transportation services, and (2) “nontechnology-based” products, all other such as food, cosmetics and furniture.

## 5. Results

### 5.1. Research Question 1: Frequency of Representation

Table 3 summarizes the frequency of incidence of minority portrayals. Of a total of 734 advertisements with human models, 101 (13.8%) contained at least one minority model. For the year 1955, only 9.8% of sampled advertisements had minority models; this percentage nearly doubled in the year 1975 to 17.2%. The difference in relative frequency of minority portrayals between 1955 and 1975 was statistically significant (chi-square = 13.5292;  $p = 0.0002$ ), which means that there were more minority models in 1975.



As discussed earlier, the proportionality criterion states that minority representation should approximately equal its proportion in the American population. Table 4 depicts the changes in the proportion of the three minority groups included in the study on the basis of appearance in the advertisements and total U.S. population. For example, in 1955 Asians accounted for 0.43 % of the total U.S. population but 2.1 % of the sample contained the Asian models. Both in 1955 and 1975, Asian Americans were overrepresented compared to African Americans. The 1955 ratio, however, might be higher than the actual rate due to multiple appearances of the same advertisements from Japanese Air Line and Northwest Airline, which seemed to exclusively target toward Asian Americans. Both ads featured a typical Japanese woman in Kimono and a combination of Asian faces from different countries such as Philippines, Korea, India and the other Southeast Asian countries. Asian Americans in 1975 were almost three times more likely to appear in the advertisements than in the general population. This trend slowed down in the 1980s to the ratio of 0.7%.

**Table 3. Number of Analyzed Advertisements for 1955 and 1975**

| Publication               | Total Number of Ads Analyzed |            | Total Ads with Minority Models |           | Percentage of Ads with Minorities (%) |             |
|---------------------------|------------------------------|------------|--------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------------------|-------------|
|                           | 1955                         | 1975       | 1955                           | 1975      | 1955                                  | 1975        |
| <b>Popular business</b>   |                              |            |                                |           |                                       |             |
| <i>Business Week</i>      | 43                           | 52         | 5                              | 11        | 11.6                                  | 21.2        |
| <i>Fortune</i>            | 35                           | 45         | 5                              | 14        | 14.3                                  | 31.1        |
| <b>Technical</b>          |                              |            |                                |           |                                       |             |
| <i>Scientific America</i> | 42                           | 48         | 6                              | 13        | 14.3                                  | 27.1        |
| <i>Popular Science</i>    | 37                           | 49         | 4                              | 5         | 10.8                                  | 10.2        |
| <b>Women's</b>            |                              |            |                                |           |                                       |             |
| <i>Good Housekeeping</i>  | 42                           | 48         | 0                              | 6         | 0                                     | 12.5        |
| <i>Vogue</i>              | 45                           | 51         | 3                              | 4         | 6.7                                   | 7.8         |
| <b>General Interest</b>   |                              |            |                                |           |                                       |             |
| <i>Time</i>               | 49                           | 50         | 5                              | 8         | 10.2                                  | 16.0        |
| <i>Newsweek</i>           | 45                           | 53         | 5                              | 7         | 11.1                                  | 13.2        |
| <b>Total</b>              | <b>338</b>                   | <b>396</b> | <b>33</b>                      | <b>68</b> | <b>9.8</b>                            | <b>17.2</b> |

**Table 4. Minority Models between 1955 & 1975 in Sampled Magazines as Compared With U.S. Population**

|                              | Asian Americans |       | African Americans |        | Hispanic Americans |      |
|------------------------------|-----------------|-------|-------------------|--------|--------------------|------|
|                              | 1955            | 1975  | 1955              | 1975   | 1955               | 1975 |
| <b>U.S. Population</b>       |                 |       |                   |        |                    |      |
| In Thousands                 | 713             | 2,114 | 17,097            | 24,456 | N/A                | N/A  |
| Percentage of Population     | 0.43            | 0.99  | 10.3              | 11.5   | N/A                | N/A  |
| <b>Representation in Ads</b> |                 |       |                   |        |                    |      |
| Actual Number of Ads         | 7               | 19    | 18                | 32     | 8                  | 17   |
| Percentage of Sample         | 2.1             | 4.8   | 4.7               | 8.1    | 2.4                | 4.3  |
| Difference                   | 1.7             | 3.8   | -5.6              | -3.4   | N/A                | N/A  |

On the other hand, even though the trend had slightly slowed down in 1975, African Americans were largely underrepresented in both 1955 and 1975: representation difference for African Americans was -5.6% in 1955 and -3.4% in 1975 (Table 4). More recently a few studies showed that representation of African Americans in television and magazine advertisements is almost identical to their population proportion (Zinkha, 1990; Brnathwaite & Pierce, 1990).

## 5.2. Research Question 2: Changes in the Role Description in the Advertisements

The second research question examined whether minority models appeared most frequently in major roles, minor roles, or background roles. Table 5 indicates that Asian American models were depicted in major roles in more than half (57.6%) of the advertisements in which they appeared in 1955 and 1975. African American models were in major roles in less than a third (29.2%) of the advertisements in which they appeared, and Hispanic Americans in less than one fifth (16.0%). Importantly, for Asian Americans, their percentage in major roles increased from 25.0% in 1955 to 68.0% in 1975. This might be in response to the larger Asian American population as a target market, and to stereotyping of the groups as technologically competent, hardworking, serious, and well assimilated. The stereotyping as such was reinforced during this period.

**Table 5. Importance of Minorities in the Advertisements (%)**

| Characteristics | Asian Americans |      |      | African Americans |      |      | Hispanic Americans |      |      |
|-----------------|-----------------|------|------|-------------------|------|------|--------------------|------|------|
|                 | 1955            | 1975 | Avg. | 1955              | 1975 | Avg. | 1955               | 1975 | Avg. |
|                 | Major Role      | 25.0 | 68.0 | 57.6              | 12.4 | 37.5 | 29.2               | 12.5 | 17.6 |
| Minor Role      | 62.5            | 8.0  | 21.2 | 68.8              | 53.1 | 58.3 | 62.5               | 64.8 | 64.0 |
| Background      | 12.5            | 24.0 | 21.2 | 18.8              | 9.4  | 12.5 | 25.0               | 17.6 | 20.0 |

The role in which Asian Americans were described in the advertisements was significantly different between pre- and post-act periods (chi-square = 9.2141;  $p = 0.003$ ); also a difference was significant among the three minority groups (chi-square = 15.3423;  $p = 0.0001$ ). This implies that the role-playing of the Asian groups became more important to advertising themes and they were the only group that was positively stereotyped among the minority groups during this period.

### 5.3. Research Question 3-A: Changes in Magazine and Product Types

The third research question assessed the changes in the product types, settings, and relationships with which minority models appeared in the advertisements. Table 6 illustrates the changes in magazine types between the two periods. Asian Americans were highly skewed toward the business press and technical publications as opposed to women's and general interest magazines. In 1955, Asian American models appeared across all four categories of magazines at least once. Approximately two-thirds of advertisements in which Asian Americans appeared, however, were from business and technical publications in 1975. The difference between the two periods was statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test Probability = 0.0002).

**Table 6. Number of Advertisements Containing Minorities**

| Publications                      | Asian Americans               |      | African Americans |      | Hispanic Americans |      | Total |       |
|-----------------------------------|-------------------------------|------|-------------------|------|--------------------|------|-------|-------|
|                                   | '55                           | '75  | '55               | '75  | '55                | '75  | '55   | '75   |
|                                   | <b>Popular Business Press</b> |      |                   |      |                    |      |       |       |
| <i>Business Week</i>              | 1                             | 3    | 3                 | 4    | 1                  | 4    | 5     | 11    |
| (%)                               | 14.3                          | 15.8 | 16.7              | 12.5 | 12.5               | 23.5 | 15.6  | 16.2  |
| <i>Fortune</i>                    | 0                             | 6    | 3                 | 5    | 2                  | 3    | 5     | 14    |
| (%)                               | 0.0                           | 31.6 | 16.7              | 15.6 | 25.0               | 17.6 | 15.6  | 20.6  |
| <b>Technical Publications</b>     |                               |      |                   |      |                    |      |       |       |
| <i>Scientific Americans</i>       | 1                             | 4    | 4                 | 6    | 1                  | 3    | 6     | 13    |
| (%)                               | 14.3                          | 21.1 | 22.2              | 18.8 | 12.5               | 17.6 | 18.8  | 19.1  |
| <i>Popular Science</i>            | 1                             | 0    | 2                 | 3    | 1                  | 2    | 4     | 5     |
| (%)                               | 14.3                          | 0.0  | 11.1              | 9.4  | 12.5               | 11.8 | 12.5  | 7.4   |
| <b>Women's Magazines</b>          |                               |      |                   |      |                    |      |       |       |
| <i>Good Housekeeping</i>          | 1                             | 2    | 0                 | 4    | 0                  | 0    | 1     | 6     |
| (%)                               | 14.3                          | 10.5 | 0.0               | 12.5 | 0.0                | 0.0  | 3.3   | 8.8   |
| <i>Vogue</i>                      | 0                             | 2    | 1                 | 1    | 0                  | 1    | 1     | 4     |
| (%)                               | 0.0                           | 10.5 | 5.6               | 3.1  | 0.0                | 5.9  | 3.3   | 5.9   |
| <b>General Interest Magazines</b> |                               |      |                   |      |                    |      |       |       |
| <i>Time</i>                       | 2                             | 2    | 2                 | 4    | 2                  | 2    | 6     | 8     |
| (%)                               | 28.7                          | 10.5 | 11.1              | 12.5 | 25.0               | 11.8 | 18.8  | 11.8  |
| <i>Newsweek</i>                   | 1                             | 0    | 3                 | 5    | 1                  | 2    | 5     | 7     |
| (%)                               | 14.3                          | 0.0  | 16.7              | 15.6 | 12.5               | 11.8 | 15.6  | 10.3  |
| <b>Total</b>                      | 7                             | 19   | 18                | 32   | 8                  | 17   | 33    | 68    |
| (%)                               | 100.                          | 100. | 100.              | 100. | 100.               | 100. | 100.  | 100.0 |
|                                   | 0                             | 0    | 0                 | 0    | 0                  | 0    | 0     | 0     |

The findings for both African Americans and Hispanic Americans showed a more even split. No big difference in the magazine types was found between 1955 and 1975 for the appearance of African Americans and Hispanic Americans. These two minority groups were almost evenly depicted across all four types of magazines in both 1955 and 1975. The difference in the representation of the three groups in the magazine type was statistically significant (Fisher's Exact Test Probability = 0.0051). As discussed, the magazine type issue is directly related with types of product: technological vs. nontechnological. Also, the changes in role description, settings and relationships are related with both issues because the type of magazine and product is highly correlated with how they are depicted. The difference in the product category across all minority models and between the two periods is shown in Table 7. The percentages in Table 7 represent the proportion of advertisements in which minority models appeared for either technical or nontechnical products to the total number of advertisements in which they appeared. Asian models were highly overrepresented in advertisements for technology-based products, on average, appearing in 65.3% of the advertisements that featured Asian Americans. In contrast, African and Hispanic models were underrepresented in the advertisements for technical products; both groups appeared in only 20% of the advertisements in total. Differences in minority group representation were statistically significant (chi-square = 54.3254;  $p < 0.0001$ ).

The role in which Asian Americans were described in the advertisements was significantly different between pre- and post-act periods (chi-square = 9.2141;  $p = 0.003$ ); also a difference was significant among the three minority groups (chi-square = 15.3423;  $p = 0.0001$ ). This implies that the role-playing of the Asian groups became more important to advertising themes and they were the only group that was positively stereotyped among the minority groups during this period. Asian Americans appeared in only 28.6% of the advertisements for technology-based products in 1955. This percentage was more than doubled in 1975, at 68.4%. On the contrary, the other two minority groups experienced only a slight increase or decrease in frequency in the advertisements for technology-based products; African Americans, from 16.7% in 1955 to 21.9% in 1975, and Hispanic Americans, from 25.0% in 1955 down to 17.6% in 1975. The difference in the appearance of Asian Americans in technology-based product advertisements between the two periods was found statistically significant (chi-square = 15.5462;  $p < 0.001$ ). This shows that Asian Americans were positively stereotyped, being most frequently featured in technical products, compared to the other two minority groups, and their stereotyping became more visible in 1975.

**Table 7. Percentages of Minority Groups in Technical Versus Nontechnical Categories**

| Product Category | Asian Americans |             | African Americans |             | Hispanic Americans |             | Total       |             |
|------------------|-----------------|-------------|-------------------|-------------|--------------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|
|                  | '55             | '75         | '55               | '75         | '55                | '75         | '55         | '75         |
|                  | Technical       | 2<br>28.6   | 13<br>68.4        | 3<br>16.7   | 7<br>21.9          | 2<br>25.0   | 3<br>17.6   | 7<br>21.2   |
| Nontechnical     | 5<br>71.4       | 6<br>31.6   | 15<br>83.3        | 25<br>78.1  | 6<br>75.0          | 14<br>82.4  | 26<br>78.8  | 45<br>66.2  |
| Total            | 7<br>100.0      | 19<br>100.0 | 18<br>100.0       | 32<br>100.0 | 8<br>100.0         | 17<br>100.0 | 33<br>100.0 | 68<br>100.0 |

#### **5.4. Research Question 3-b: Asian Americans in Different Settings and Relationships**

Table 8 illustrates the settings in which minority groups were shown. A change in the settings in which Asian Americans were depicted in the advertisements was dramatic between 1955 and 1975; Asian Americans were shown most frequently in social settings in 1955 (53.2%), but in 1975 they appeared most frequently in business setting in 1975 (52.5%). Overall, they were most frequently shown in business settings (46.1%), social settings (23.1%), and home settings (19.2%). Compared to the other two groups, Asian Americans were the highest in representation in business settings, which indicates that they were overrepresented in business settings.

On the other hand, African Americans were slightly overrepresented in home, outdoor and indoor settings and social settings and underrepresented in business settings. Hispanic Americans were most frequently depicted in business and home settings, but compared to the other two groups they were shown less frequently as professionals in business settings.

For Asian Americans, differences in the settings by year were statistically significant (chi-square = 23.82;  $p < 0.01$ ). And, in all cases, differences in the settings by minority groups were also statistically significant (chi-square = 12.35;  $p < 0.035$ ).

Table 9 shows the percentages of the relationships in which each minority group appeared. Advertisements with only one model or with models in an impersonal context were excluded. Overall, Asian Americans were most frequently depicted in business relationships (53.8%) while the other two groups appeared to have more social or family relationships: for African Americans, 51.5% of models were in social relationships, and for Hispanic Americans, 50.0% of models were in family relationships. This difference was statistically significant (Fisher's exact test probability = 0.0002). A significant difference was found for Asian Americans in the category of business relationship between 1955 and 1975: 42.9% in 1955 and 58.0% in 1975 (chi-square = 22.5461;  $p < 0.0035$ ). They were overrepresented in business relationships compared to the other groups both in the year 1955 and 1975. Settings and relationships in which minority groups were depicted are closely related to each other, and they can be explained from the framework of stereotyping questions along with role-playing.

**Table 8. Percentages of Minority Groups in Different Settings by Year**

| Settings               | Asian Americans |                 | African Americans |                 | Hispanic Americans |                 | Total           |                  |
|------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|------------------|
|                        | '55             | '75             | '55               | '75             | '55                | '75             | '55             | '75              |
| Business               | 2<br>28.6       | 10<br>52.6      | 6<br>33.3         | 8<br>25.0       | 3<br>37.5          | 7<br>41.2       | 11<br>33.3      | 25<br>36.8       |
| Home, outdoor, indoors | 1<br>14.3       | 4<br>21.1       | 9<br>50.0         | 9<br>28.1       | 4<br>50.0          | 6<br>13.7       | 14<br>42.4      | 19<br>27.9       |
| Natural Scenery        | 0<br>0.0        | 3<br>15.8       | 0<br>0.0          | 2<br>6.3        | 0<br>0.0           | 2<br>11.8       | 0<br>0.0        | 7<br>10.3        |
| Social                 | 4<br>53.2       | 2<br>10.5       | 2<br>11.1         | 11<br>34.4      | 1<br>12.5          | 1<br>5.9        | 7<br>21.2       | 14<br>20.6       |
| Others                 | 0<br>0.0        | 0<br>0.0        | 1<br>5.6          | 2<br>6.3        | 0<br>0.0           | 1<br>5.9        | 1<br>3.0        | 3<br>4.4         |
| Total                  | 7<br>100.<br>0  | 19<br>100.<br>0 | 18<br>100.<br>0   | 32<br>100.<br>0 | 8<br>100.<br>0     | 17<br>100.<br>0 | 33<br>100.<br>0 | 68<br>100.0<br>0 |

**Table 9. Percentages of Minority Groups in Different Relationships between Characters, by Year**

| Relationship | Asian Americans |                 | African Americans |                 | Hispanic Americans |                 | Total           |                 |
|--------------|-----------------|-----------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
|              | '55             | '75             | '55               | '75             | '55                | '75             | '55             | '75             |
| Family       | 1<br>14.2       | 4<br>21.0       | 0<br>0.0          | 1<br>5.3        | 2<br>33.3          | 7<br>58.3       | 3<br>11.1       | 12<br>24.0      |
| Social       | 3<br>42.9       | 4<br>21.0       | 7<br>50.0         | 10<br>52.6      | 1<br>16.7          | 2<br>16.7       | 11<br>40.7      | 16<br>32.0      |
| Business     | 3<br>42.9       | 11<br>58.0      | 7<br>50.0         | 8<br>42.1       | 3<br>50.0          | 3<br>25.0       | 13<br>48.1      | 22<br>44.0      |
| Total        | 7<br>100.<br>0  | 19<br>100.<br>0 | 14<br>100.<br>0   | 19<br>100.<br>0 | 6<br>100.<br>0     | 12<br>100.<br>0 | 27<br>100.<br>0 | 50<br>100.<br>0 |

## 6. Discussion and Conclusion

This study suggests that as far as Asian Americans are concerned, the impact of the 1965 Act on the portrayals of Asian Americans in the mainstream magazine advertisements seemed visible based on the following five results. First, the change in the frequency of representation is indicative of the impact of the Act on the representation of Asian Americans in the advertisements. This is not simply a measurement issue but one that carries implications for the societal valuation of minorities, for when a segment of the population is found to be underrepresented in advertising, the covert message may be that the societal majority is indifferent or hostile to the minority. Asian Americans were overrepresented in both pre- and post-act period, but the rate of overrepresentation was much larger in 1975. Even when the frequency of representation issue is isolated from the stereotyping and other contextual variables, Asian Americans were the only group whose representation in the advertising was most visibly affected by the 1965 Act. The impact on Hispanic Americans was barely visible. Hispanic Americans were not completely compared because population data were not available before the 1970s although some partial data were accessible. The representation of Hispanic Americans in the advertising also increased from 1955 to 1975. But, this increase reflects no more than the increase in the raw number of Hispanic population. Overall, the Act appeared to have influenced the frequency of representation for Asian Americans, but not necessarily that of African Americans and Hispanic Americans.

Second, the impact of the Act was apparent in the changes in the role description of Asian Americans between pre- and post-act period. Defined as a character that is very important to the advertising theme or layout, shown in the foreground or shown holding the product, “major roles” were very often assigned to the majority of Asian Americans who appeared in the advertisements in 1975. In the advertisements in which Asian Americans were described in major roles, a consistent stereotypical portrayal of Asian Americans as an “all work, no play” group was prominent. Due to the 1965 Act, the post-act socioeconomic status of Asian Americans exceeded even that of average white Americans. Particularly in the advertisements that were targeting the Asian market, most Asian models were characterized in a major role. Thus, one of the key strategies of advertising -- to persuade consumers by making them behave like a model -- was evident in the advertisements (Czerniawski & Maloney, 1999) and the new behaviors advocated by the Asian models reflected the advertisers’ reactions to the changing society. On the other hand, the role description of African Americans and Hispanic Americans did not change significantly during these periods: they continued to be depicted in a minor or background role.

Third, the changes in stereotyping of Asian Americans were conspicuous during this period. The 1965 Act apparently influenced how and where Asian Americans were described. Stereotyping of Asian Americans was very straightforward: they were socially stereotyped as technically competent, hardworking, and business-oriented in the advertisements (Lott, 1997). Often appeared in the advertisements of technology products, Asian Americans appeared most frequently in the technological and professional magazines such as *Scientific Americans* and *Fortune*, especially more frequently in 1975. Fourth, most of the Asian models appeared in business settings and work relationships. This would suggest that the Act might have contributed to this portrayal. Compared to the relationships with the other models in the advertisements, Asian Americans were more frequently depicted in business contexts during the post-act period, and were represented as members or workers in a company, colleagues in the same profession or occupation, and in relationships between employers and employees. On the other hand, African Americans and Hispanic Americans more frequently appeared in social or family relationships during both pre- and post-act periods. This would suggest that there was a change in the way Asian models, in accordance with stereotyping and settings variable, were depicted in the advertisements in terms of their relationship with the other characters.

In regard to African Americans or Hispanic Americans, no significant change was detected in portrayals of these two minority groups before and after the act in terms of settings and relationships to others. The impact of the Act was not much visible with these two minority groups. In summary, there were significant differences in the presentation of Asian Americans before and after the Act in frequency of representation, role description, and stereotype-related factors that appear related to the reform of the immigration policy in 1965. The Act resulted in a tremendous influx of Asian Americans to the United States and an improvement of their socioeconomic status, and as a result, the way Asian Americans were described in magazine advertising changed considerably during pre- and post-act period.

One of the key arguments of the cultural history of advertising contends that advertising should be viewed as mirrors of society, because it is influenced and shaped by the culture and society (Avery, 1991). The society is influenced by technological developments as well as social, economic, and political conditions and, in turn, the societal change is reflected in advertising. In line with the arguments from the cultural history viewpoint, this study supports the thesis that the impact of the 1965 Immigration Act on Asian Americans was reflected in mainstream advertising. The increase of Asian Americans in the advertisements during the post-act period suggests that advertising reflected the increase in the Asian population during the 1970s that was directly attributable to the Act. And, the positive changes in the context of the portrayals of Asian Americans in the advertisements also show that advertising reflected their elevated socioeconomic status that was also attributable to the Act. The status of the other two minority groups in the study - African Americans and Hispanic Americans – did not change significantly during the periods. Neither did their presentation in the advertisements. Since social effects of advertising are upon the values of our society (Potter, 1954), which used to emphasize materialistic values, Asian Americans' achievements on their economic status were well reflected in advertising.

However, interpretation of the impact of this special reform of the U.S. immigration policy on the mainstream advertising requires a special caution. During the early 1970s, the spread of new social values began to transform the workplace, creating new demands for equal rights in hiring and promotion (Sivulka, 1998). Multiculturalism, feminism, and environmentalism all became potent forces as well. Thus, the advertising industry had to address these long-deferred issues in this period. Advertisers in general had become more culturally sensitive about minority images and began to consciously avoid stereotyped images. This might have some influence on how minority groups were described in the advertisements in the 1970s, too.

Admitting that this study could not completely attribute the changes in the portrayals of Asian Americans exclusively to the reform of the immigration policy in 1965, nevertheless it appears reasonable to conclude that at least part of the changes were attributable to the 1965 Immigration Act. The function of advertising can be explained in two ways: economic effect and social effect (Potter, 1954). As far as the latter is concerned, the changes in population and their movement in one country are worth considering as historical forces that would have affected the society and, as a result, altered what had been contained in advertising when the focus is given to a particular segment of the population.

## References

- Archdeacon, T. (1985). *Becoming American: An Ethnic History*. New York, NY: TheFree Press.
- Auirre, J.D. (1981). View From the inside: Mexico. *Advertising Age* 52 (April 6, 1981),S6-S7.
- Avery, D.R. (1991). *Perspectives on Mass Communication History*. Hillsdale, NJ:Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Berg, B.L. (2001). *Qualitative Research Methods for the Social Sciences*. Needham Heights, MA: Allyn& Bacon.
- Blackwell, R. D., Miniard, W. P., & Engel, J. F. (2001). *Consumer Behavior*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt College Publishers.
- Bowen, L.,&Schmid, J. (1997).Minority presence and portrayal in mainstreammagazine advertising: An update. *Journalism and Mass Communication Quarterly*, 74(1), 134-146.
- Branthwaite, A., & Pierce, L. (1990).The portrayal of black people in British televisionadvertisements.*Social Behavior*, 5, 327-344.
- Carey, J. (1974). The problem of journalism history.*Journalism History*, 1, 3-5,27.
- Chai, W. (1978).New responsibilities for Asian Americans.*Bridge, An Asian American Perspective*, 6(3), 41-42.
- Cohen, J. (1992). White consumer response to Asian models in advertising. *Journal of Consumer Marketing*, 9, 17-27.
- Cox, K. K. (1970).Social effects of integrated advertising.*Journal of AdvertisingResearch*, 10, 41-44.
- Czepiec, H., & Kelly, J. S. (1983).Analyzing Hispanic roles in advertising: A portraitof an emerging subculture.*Current Issues and Research in Advertising*, 219-237.
- Czerniawski, R. D., & Maloney, M. W. (1999).*Creating Brand Loyalty*.New York, NY: American Management Association.
- Daniels, R. (1974). *Racism and Immigration Restriction*. St. Charles, MO: Forum Press.

- Faber, R. J., & O'Guinne, T. C. (1987). Televised portrayals of Hispanics: A comparison of ethnic perceptions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 11, 155-169.
- Fox, F. W. (1975). *Madison Avenue Goes to War: The Strange Military Career of American Advertising 1941-1945*. Provo, Utah: BYU Press.
- Gutierrez, F. F. (1990). Advertising and the growth of minority markets and media. *Journal of Communication Inquiry*, 14(Winter), 6-16.
- Gutman, H. G. (1992). American Social History Project, *Who Built America, Vol. 2*. New York, NY: Pantheon Books.
- Herschman, C., & Wong, M. G. (1981). Trends in socioeconomic achievement among immigrants and native-born Asian-Americans, 1960-1976. *The Sociological Quarterly*, 22(Autumn), 495-513.
- Holsti, O. R. (1969). *Content Analysis for the Social Sciences and Humanities*. Reading, MS: Addison-Wesley.
- Kassarjian, Harold H., The Negro and American Advertising, 1946-1965. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 6, 1969, p. 29-39.
- Kern-Foxworth, M. (1994). *Aunt Jemima, Uncle Ben, and Rastus: Blacks in Advertising, Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow*. Westbury, CT: Praeger.
- Kitano, H., & Daniels, R. (1988). *Asian Americans: Emerging Minority*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Kobre, S. (1945). The sociological approach in research in newspaper history. *Journalism Quarterly*, 22, 12-22.
- Lott, J. (1997). *Asian Americans*. Walnut Creek, CA: Alta Mira Press.
- Ng, F. (1998). *Asians in America: The Peoples of East, Southeast, and South Asia in American Life and Culture*. New York, NY: Garland Publishing.
- Pettigrew, T. F. (1965). Complexity and change in American racial patterns: A social psychological view. *Daedalus*, 94, 974-1008.
- Potter, D. M. (1954). *People of Plenty: Economic Abundance and the American Character*. Chicago, IL: The University of Chicago Press.
- Reid, L. N., & Bergh, B. G. (1980). Vanden, blacks in introductory ads. *Journalism Quarterly*, 57(Autumn), 487.
- Reimers, D. M. (1985). *Still the Golden Door: The Third World Comes to America*. New York, NY: Columbia University Press.
- Reubens, E. P. (1978). Asian American immigration in economic and social perspective. *Bridge, An Asian American Perspective*, 6(2), 10-21.
- Russel, J. T., & Lane, R. (1990). *Kleppner's Advertising Procedure*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Shaw, D. L. (1984). News about slavery from 1820-1860 in newspapers of South, North and West. *Journalism Quarterly*, 61(Autumn), 483-493.
- Sivulka, Julian, *Soap, Sex, and Cigarette: A Cultural History of Advertising*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sloan, D. (1986). *Historical Methods in Mass Communication*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Sloan, D. (1991). *Perspectives on Mass Communication History*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Taylor, C. R., Lee, J. Y., & Stern, B. B. (1995). Portrayals of African, Hispanic, and Asian Americans in magazine advertising. *American Behavioral Scientists*, 38(4), 608-621.
- Wong, M. G. (1986). Post-1965 Asian immigrants: Where do they come from, where are they now, and where are they going? In F. Ng (Ed.), *The History and Immigration of Asian Americans* (pp. 202-205). New York: Garland Publishing.
- Wong, S. C. (1985). *Reading Asian American Literature: From Necessity to Extravagance*. Princeton, MA: Princeton University Press.
- Zinkhan, G. M. (1990). The use of blacks in analysis of blacks in magazine and television advertising, 1946 to 1986. *Journalism Quarterly*, 67, 547-553.