The investigation of Minnesota Nice in terms of trust, communication style and personality

Yezhenzi Kuang

Submitted under the supervision of Professor Kathleen Briggs at the University of Minnesota-Twin Cities in Psychology.

April 1, 2016

Abstract

This study investigated the concept of Minnesota Nice, using three psychological variables: trust, communication style and personality. We obtained scores on measures of personality, conversational style, and trust from University of Minnesota students and a sample of other Americans through mTurk. We divided the sample into MN and non-MN groups based on their self-identified primary residency and compared the differences between them. We hypothesized that Minnesota Nice would correlate with the personality factors of Extraversion and Agreeableness. Our results found significant differences on the enthusiasm facet of Extraversion but not Assertiveness. We found a significant difference on the compassion facet of Agreeableness but no significant difference on the politeness facet. We also found that Minnesotans scored significantly lower on Openness to Experience. We then hypothesized that Minnesotans would score significantly higher on conversational styles involving Impression, Manipulation, and Expressiveness, and lower on Verbal Aggressiveness. Our results showed that they scored significantly higher on the talkativeness facet from Expressiveness and significantly lower on the non-supportiveness facet from Verbal Aggressiveness. We also hypothesized that Minnesotans would score significantly higher on Trust, and our results supported that.

The investigation of Minnesota Nice in terms of trust, communication style and personality

America covers over 9 million square kilometers, includes various climates and landscapes and forms all sorts of cultures. There is the fast-paced Northeast, the traditional Midwest, the worldly-minded Southwest and more. Among all these places, a cultural phenomenon arose – "Minnesota Nice". Some people observe that Minnesotans like to help complete strangers on the street and hold the door for others. Some complain that Minnesotans say "interesting" to every question, but talk behind people's backs. Some think that Minnesotans like to welcome people to their family and greet others on the street. What is Minnesota Nice then? The author for "Creating Minnesota: A History from the Inside Out", Annette Atkins (2008), described Minnesotans as generally friendly, polite, and modest with an aversion to confrontation and a tendency to reprimand themselves. Veldof and Bonnema (2014) defined Minnesota Nice as polite friendliness, a disinclination to intrude, a tendency to understatement, a reluctance to make a fuss, and most importantly, passive aggressiveness. Minnesota Nice can be viewed as both positive and negative, and the concept can be treated in a variety of ways: social norm, cultural behavior, belief, type of communication style, or more. However, few researchers have attempted to define Minnesota Nice, using psychological concepts and a scientific perspective. In this study, researchers living in Minnesota decided to investigate Minnesota Nice and compare Minnesotans with residents in other regions in America, using the psychological constructs of personality, communication style, and trust.

Regional differences

Many studies have addressed the differences among regions within the U.S. Elazar (1966) mentioned that U.S. regions varied on the dimension of individualism vs. collectivism. Gastil

(1975) stated that different regions in U.S. have different levels in power and aggressiveness. According to Bellah, Madsen, Sullivan, Swidler & Tipton (1985), America's West North Central region, including Minnesota, is often described as hardworking, responsible, helpful, and egalitarian. This gave us some insights to study Minnesota's culture. It is important to better understand regional variations, because, with the knowledge, we can potentially extend our intercultural communications with people from various backgrounds (Andersen, Lustig & Anderson, 1987). With more and more people traveling across states and nations, a careful study of regional differences can also help travelers, vacationers, business people, and others adjust to cultural shock or avoid unnecessary misunderstandings and conflicts (Dheer, Lenartowicz, & Peterson, 2014).

Psychologists have long been passionate about differentiating members of different groups through the study of behavior (Inkeles, Hanfmann, & Beier, 1958). Each region of America has its own pattern of cultural or social values, attitudes, scripts, and more. Those cultural patterns mold people's behaviors into distinctive communication styles, personalities, values, attitudes, and scripts at the individual level. Therefore, we targeted communication style, personality, and trust to study Minnesota Nice.

Personality

Personality is defined as "a pattern of relatively permanent traits and unique characteristics that give both consistency and individuality to a person's behavior," (Feist and Feistl, 2006, p.4). Environmental factors, especially one's regional culture, help shape one's personality (Triandis & Suh, 2002). Personality helps us describe the behaviors of Minnesotans, further define Minnesota Nice, and locate its geographical region by comparing residents of

Minnesota and other states. Krug and Kulhavy (1973) administered the 16 personality factor questionnaire (16 PF; Cattell, Eber & Tatsuoka, 1970) to a total of 6444 people from 36 states. They divided the sample into six major geographical regions within the United States and found that people from Midwest region, including Minnesota, had relatively higher ratings on certain variables than other regions, such as L (trusting), M (imaginative), F (serious), Q2 (group adherent), and E (stubborn). People from Midwest region also had lower ratings on A (reserved) and E (submissive). Krug and Kulhavy described Midwest people as "hardworking, conscientious and stubbornly independent". Later, Plaut, Markus and Lachman (2002) studied regional features of well-being and self across a national representative sample. They found that, compared with other regions, people from the West North Central region showed a significantly lower rating on autonomy-focused well-being and significantly higher ratings on self-focused, well-being, and emotion-focused well-being. The results were consistent with people who were generally more calm, peaceful, self-accepting, and satisfied. According to the researchers, people in the West North Central region were a group of moderate, cheerful, and tolerant people.

Rentfrow, Gosling and Potter (2008) administered the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999) to 619,397 people to provide great insights on state differences in terms of personality. They obtained personality scores and home origin for all participants, grouped them based on states, and ranked them from 1 to 50. Minnesota was ranked in the top ten states for Extraversion (5), Agreeableness (2), in the middle of states for Conscientiousness (22), and in the bottom ten states for Neuroticism (41) and Openness to experience (40). Overall Minnesotans were generally more sociable, affable, and less anxious and open compared with other states' residents. Rentfrow et al. then grouped states into different regions of the U.S. The Midwest region, including Minnesota. The Midwest region had high ratings on Extraversion,

Agreeableness, Conscientiousness, and low ratings on Openness to experience and Neuroticism. It seems that Minnesota Nice is a distinguishable cultural norm that exists not only in Minnesota but in the broad Midwest region. However, a ranking does not significantly differentiate Minnesota from the rest of the regions.

In this study, the Big Five Aspect Scales (BFAS), a measure of five personality factors with each defined by two facets, was used to find the significant differences between Minnesota and other states. Based on the results from Rentfrow et al. (2008), we hypothesized that participants from Minnesota would score significantly higher on Extraversion (high on enthusiasm but low on assertiveness), Agreeableness (high on compassion and politeness), and Conscientiousness (high on industriousness and orderliness) compared with participants from other states. In addition, we hypothesized that Minnesotans would have significantly lower scores on Neuroticism (low on volatility but high on withdrawal) and Openness to experience (low on intellect and openness).

Communication Style

According to de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Siberg, Gameren and Vlug (2009), communication style is "the characteristic way a person sends verbal, paraverbal, and nonverbal signals in social interactions". Communication style both delivers the message and portrays the individual as he or she is or appears to be. Communication style also reflects the cultural pattern that includes values, attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors, and, as such, it serves as an important tool to study regional differences within U.S. (Andersen, Lustig, & Andersen, 1987). Gastil (1975) wrote that the Mid-Atlantic region was historically characterized as neither talkative, nor verbally dominant while New Yorkers were powerful, fast-talking and ruthless. Garreau (1981) described the

"breadbasket" region, including Minnesota, as having really open and friendly people. Sigler, Burnett and Child (2008) looked specifically at the difference between the Upper Midwest, including Minnesota, and the New York Metropolitan region to evaluate the level of assertive communication. They administered the Rathus Assertiveness Schedule (RAS; Rathus, 1973) to a total of 307 participants and found that participants from the Upper Midwest showed significantly lower ratings of assertive communication compared to New Yorkers. The lack of assertive communication in some degree describes Minnesota Nice. However, in an article written to help newcomers adjust to Minnesota Ryan (2003) stated, "[we] rarely say what we really mean. We speak in a way that avoids conflict". This suggests that the Minnesota Nice communication style is not just about a lack of assertiveness. The study conducted by Sigler, Burnett and Child (2008) failed to address alternative styles of conflict-management such as passive aggressiveness.

In the current study, we adopted an elaborate inventory called the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI; de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings & Schouten, 2011) to study participants' communication styles. De Vries et al., found strong associations between the CSI and the HEXACO personality Inventory – revised (HEXACO-PI-R; Lee & Ashton, 2008). Based on the previous results from Rentfrow et al. (2008), we hypothesized that Minnesotans would score significantly higher on impression manipulation and expressiveness, and significantly lower on verbal aggressiveness compared to people from different regions.

Trust

As mentioned earlier, Krug and Kulhavy (1973) found that Midwest region residents had a general high rating on L (trust). The phrase "Minnesota Nice" for sure has an element showing

that Minnesotans trust strangers well enough to help them out. In this study, we specifically examined the concept of generalized trust, which is "a psychological state comprising the intention to accept vulnerability based upon positive expectations of the intentions or behavior of another," (Rousseau, Sitkin, Burt & Camerer, 1998). It is also the "the notion that most people we have no prior information about can be trusted," (Dinesen, 2012).

In our pilot study, conducted but not published in 2015, we originally hypothesized that Minnesotans may show a strong tendency of collectivist behaviors, because people from collectivist countries were generally very loyal to the group, modest, and self-criticizing. This description matches some of the Minnesota Nice behaviors, and we believed that we should investigate Trust as a psychological construct. As a part of our study, we constructed a trust scale with 3 items taken from the World Values Survey (WVS; 2014), and obtained scores from 70 students enrolled at the University of Minnesota. We divided the groups into the Minnesotan Group and Not-Minnesotan Group based on their self-reported hometown identifications. Although the sample size was small, the students from Minnesota scored higher on trust. We also compared the data through the WVS website. Specifically, we were able to obtain data for the same items from WVS for specific regions of the U.S., such as the North West Central. We compared all the regions of the U.S. (New England, South Atlantic, West North central, West South Central, etc.) and a sample of countries (Germany, Japan, China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Ecuador, Sweden). We chose these countries because they either scored very high or low on the dimension of Collectivism, which was developed by Hofstede (1991) in *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. We found that the West North Central region scored second highest on our measure of trust - second only to Sweden.

Based on the previous findings, we decided to include more items to construct a new generalized trust scale using items from both WVS and the European Social Survey (ESS; 2014). Since there is a difference between internal trust and external trust (Huff & Kelley, 2003), we added WVS items that allowed us to evaluate both internal and external trust as well. We hypothesized Minnesotans would trust people significantly more than people from other states on both external and internal trust items.

Method

Participants

In our study, we collected data from two groups. First, we recruited participants from an introductory psychology class at the University of Minnesota. Students who completed our online survey received 1 point of extra credit as compensation. We obtained 231 responses in total. The second sample was recruited using Amazon Mechanical Turk (mTurk), which is an online platform allowing individuals to get compensations by completing tasks, such as completing a survey. Participants, restricted to U.S. citizens only, completed the same online survey and received financial compensation. We obtained 531 responses in total. After deleting data with omitted answers, we had a total of 506 participants. Among them, we divided our participants into two samples – MN Group (N = 129) and non-MN Group (N = 377), based on their self-identified primary resident responses. Please see Table 1 for the demographic information.

Table 1

Age, Sex, and Race of MN Group and non-MN Group.

	MN Group (N = 129)	Non-MN Group (N = 377)

Age		
M	20.74	33.30
SD	3.96	12.25
Range	16 - 43	18-71
Sex		
Female	69.00%	60.74%
Male	30.23%	38.73%
Other	0.77%	0.53%
Race		
White/Caucasian	86.82%	78.25%
African American	6.20%	7.96%
East Asian	5.43%	8.22%
South Asian	4.65%	3.18%
Hispanic/Latino	3.10%	3.45%
Middle Eastern	0.00%	0.53%

Measure

We used three already existing scales/inventories and put them together in one survey with demographic information questions.

Trust

First, participants answered the nine-item composite trust scale which was adapted from the European Social Survey (ESS) and the World Value Survey (WVS) (see table 2). The EES

and the WVS are both extensive surveys conducted across many countries. The trust-related items are considered reliable and valid (Dinensen, 2012; Reeskens & Hooghe, 2008).

Table 2

Items, Rating Method and Source of the Trust Scale

Item	Rating	Source
Generally speaking, would you say that most people can be trusted or that you need to be very careful in dealing with people	On a sale of 0 to 10 0 means "need to be very careful". 10 means "can be trusted".	ESS
Do you think most people would try to take advantage of you if they got a chance, or would they try to be fair	On a sale of 0 to 10 0 means "take advantage of you". 10 means "try to be fair".	ESS
Would you say that most of the time people try to be helpful or that they are mostly looking out for themselves	On a sale of 0 to 10 0 means "look out for themselves". 10 means "try to be helpful".	ESS

How much do you trust people from various groups?	choose one answer from the following options	WVS
Your family	Completely (1)	
Your neighborhood	Somewhat (2)	
People you know personally	Not very much (3)	
People you meet for the first time	Not at all (4)	
People of another religion		
People of another nationality		

Communication Style

The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI; de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings & Schouten, 2011) consists of 96 items that measure six variables. Each variable has four facets (see table 3). In the study, the CSI scales showed high validity with lexical communication marker scales and behavior-oriented communication scales, and showed high reliability as well. Specifically, the Cronbach reliabilities of the CSI variable-level scales were above 0.80, and the Cronbach reliabilities of the CSI facet-level scales were above 0.70. According to the researchers, Expressiveness evaluates people who are either extroverted and eloquent or frequently silent. Preciseness presents a professional and concise speaking style that differs from waffling. Verbal Aggressiveness includes niceness, supportiveness and threateningness. Questioningness means people either dissect someone, or just appear indifferent and not inquisitive. Emotionality

identifies people who can be stressed, sad, or mad. Impression manipulativeness relates with honesty and humility.

Table 3

Items of the Communication Styles Inventory (CSI)

Expressiveness	Preciseness	Verbal aggressiveness	Questioningness	Emotionality	Impression manipulativeness
Talkativeness	Structuredness	Angriness	Unconventionality	Sentimentality	Ingratiation
Conversational dominance	Thoughtfulness	Authoritarianism	Philosophicalness	Worrisomeness	Charm
Humor	Substantiveness	Derogatoriness	Inquisitiveness	Tension	Instructableness
Informality	Conciseness	Nonsupportiveness	Argumentativeness	Defensiveness	Concealingness

Personality

Instead of the Big Five Inventory (BFI; John & Srivastava, 1999), used by Rentfrow, Gosling, and Potter (2008), participants took the Big Five Aspect Scales (BFAS), which consists of 100 items. There are two facets under each variable, and a total of five variables (see table 4). We chose the BFAS because each facet is a distinctive and valid concept, which offers additional information. The scale was described in the study of DeYoung and Quilty (2007), with the internal reliabilities for each facet all above 0.75.

Table 4

Items of BFAS

Factor	Facets
Openness to Experience	openness/creativity
	intellect
Conscientiousness	orderliness
	industriousness
Extraversion	enthusiasm
	assertiveness
Agreeableness	politeness
	compassion
Neuroticism	withdrawal
	volatility

Demographic Information

We created our own demographic information section asking participles' age, gender, race/ethnicity, and asked which of the 50 states they considered as their primary residence.

Procedure

The questions were put into qualtrics @ UofM software and then distributed as an online survey to both the psychology department website and mTurk website. For the first sample from the University, we asked permission from the head director of the psychology department Research Experience Program (REP) to upload our survey online. Then, students could find our survey and take it in exchange for 1 point. We informed the participants that the survey would not take longer than 30 minutes, had no aggressive items, and that privacy and confidentiality would be protected. For the second sample from mTurk, we uploaded the same survey onto the website with the study's description, compensation information, and the consent form. We also had participants fill out a consent form at the beginning of the survey.

Analysis

We removed all participants who had failed to complete all items, which left us with 506 participants. Also, our two samples (MN group and non-MN Group) had a large difference in terms of age. Soto, John, Gosling and Potter (2011) studied the relationship between age and BFAS and found that age did play an important role in personality, and that middle-aged adults were generally more agreeable and stable than younger adults. Therefore, we controlled the age variable, and only selected participants who were under the age of 30 (including 30) in the two samples. The final sample was 325 participants in total with MN Group ($N = 123$) and non-MN Group ($N = 202$).

We conducted a two-tailed independent-samples t-test between the two samples (MN Group and non-MN Group) for the five BFAS factors and ten facets (see Table 5). Our

hypothesis was partially supported by the result. For personality, the MN-Group scored significantly lower on Openness to Experience compared to the non-MN Group. Specifically looking at the facets, Minnesotans scored significantly higher on the enthusiasm facet and the compassion facet. We did not find any significant differences on other variables or facets.

We then conducted a two-tailed independent-samples t-test between the two samples (MN Group and non-MN Group) across the six variables and 24 facets of the CSI (see Table 6). We found significantly higher results on talkativeness and lower results on nonsupportiveness, which indicated that people from MN-Group were more likely to talk to and support other people.

For the trust scale, we conducted a two-tailed independent-samples t-test (see Table 7), and found significant results in all items. We then divided the last six items into two groups –In Group and Out Group. The In Group included all the values from the items "Family", "Neighborhood", and "People you know personally", while the Out Group included "People you meet for the first time", "People of another religion", and "People of another nationality". We, then, conducted another two-tailed independent-samples t-test specifically comparing the In Group and Out Group (see Table 8) between our two samples, and we found significant results.

Table 5

Independent Group T-Test between MN Group and non-MN Group in terms of BFAS variables and facets

Variables	MN Group	Non- MN Group		
	M	*M*	t	Sig. (2-tail)
Neuroticism	2.87	2.90	-.426	.670
N-withdrawal	3.02	3.02	-.007	.995
N-volatility	2.72	2.79	-.0746	-.456

Agreeableness	3.84	3.73	1.690	.092
A-compassion	3.94	3.76	2.425	.016*
A-polite	3.74	3.71	.478	.633
Conscientious	3.30	3.37	-1.094	.275
C-industrious	3.18	3.26	-.981	.327
C-orderliness	3.42	3.48	-.896	.371
Extraversion	3.46	3.30	2.396	.017
E-enthusiasm	3.57	3.36	2.671	.008*
E-assertiveness	3.36	3.23	1.519	.130
Openness to experiences	3.59	3.73	-2.177	.030*
O-intellect	3.58	3.72	-1.921	.056
O-openness	3.60	3.73	-.1796	.073

Note. df = 323. Significant results are marked with *. $p < .05$.

Table 6

Independent Group T-Test between MN Group and non-MN Group in terms of CSI variables and facets

Variables	MN Group	Non-MN Group		
	M	*M*	*t*	*Sig. (2-tail)*
Expressiveness	3.20	3.07	1.996	.047
E-talkativeness	3.32	3.06	2.787	.006*
E-conversational dominance	3.12	2.97	1.752	.081
E-humor	3.29	3.29	.030	.976
E-informality	3.08	2.98	1.567	.118
Preciseness	3.14	3.20	-1.009	.314
P-structuredness	3.20	3.23	-.395	.693
P-thoughtfulness	3.47	3.50	-.443	.658
P-substantiveness	2.77	2.87	-1.401	.162
P-consciseness	3.13	3.19	-.677	.499
Verbal aggressiveness	2.51	2.53	-.354	.723
V-angriness	2.77	2.76	.199	.842
V-authoritarianism	2.75	2.68	.803	423
V-derogatoriness	2.58	2.58	-.008	.994
V-	1.92	2.09	-2.338	.020*

nonsupportiveness				
Questioningness	3.22	3.20	.290	.772
Q-unconventionality	3.04	3.01	.298	.766
Q-philosophicalness	3.53	3.48	.567	.571
Q-inquisitiveness	3.40	3.47	-.937	.349
Q-argumentativeness	2.90	2.84	.647	.518
Emotionality	3.16	3.15	.102	.919
E-sentimentality	3.13	3.05	.812	.417
E-worrisomeness	3.15	3.19	-.453	.651
-E-tension	3.09	3.12	-.385	.701
E-defensiveness	3.27	3.24	.260	.795
Impression manipulativeness	2.97	2.89	1.329	.185
I-ingratiation	2.79	2.69	1.085	.279
I-charm	2.88	2.71	1.739	.083
I-instructableness	3.28	3.26	.300	.765
I-concealingness	2.93	2.91	.204	.839

Note. df = 323. Significant results are marked with *. $p < .05$.

Table 7

Independent Group T-Test between MN Group and non-MN Group in terms of Trust Scale

Variables	MN Group	Non-MN Group		
	M	*M*	*t*	*Sig. (2-tail)*
People can be trusted	6.06	5.05	3.921	.000*
Try to be fair	5.94	5.07	3.435	.001*
Try to be helpful	5.37	4.82	2.125	.034*
Family	1.17	1.43	-3.778	.000*
Neighborhood	2.10	2.46	-4.070	000*
People you know personally	1.45	1.73	-3.860	.000*
People you meet for the first time	2.66	2.92	-3.037	.003*
People of another religion	2.10	2.39	-3.754	.000*
People of another nationality	2.09	2.35	-3.493	.001*

Note. df = 323. Significant results are marked with *. $p < .05$.

Table 8

Independent Group T-Test between MN Group and non-MN Group in terms of In Group Trust and Out Group Trust

Variables	MN Group	Non-MN Group		
	M	*M*	*t*	*Sig. (2-tail)*
Out Group	6.85	7.65	-4.085	.000*
In Group	4.72	5.61	-5.236	.000*

Note. df = 323. Significant results are marked with *. $p < .05$.

Discussions

The significant results we found from the personality inventory were aligned with what we hypothesized initially. We found that MN-Group scored significantly higher on variables like enthusiasm and compassion, and lower on Openness to Experience. Although we did not find significant results on the factor of Agreeableness, we did find a significant result on the compassion facet. We can describe the participants as interactive with people, and sympathetic during the conversation, which could account for the statement that "Minnesotans being kind to everyone they meet," (Tayler, n.d.). Specifically, with a relatively more compassionate nature, Minnesotans are more likely to inquire about others' lives, take an interest in others, and like to do things for others. Also, because they are more enthusiastic, Minnesotans make friends more easily, or warm up quickly to others. At the same time, they can be less curious, less willing to try new things, or may not appreciate creativity as much as others based on the significant lower scores on Openness to Experience.

Since Minnesota Nice was widely described as passive aggressiveness (Veldof & Bonnema, 2014), we originally expected some significant results on Impression Manipulation or Verbal Aggressiveness. However, the CSI scores did not support this. Instead we found that MN-Group scored higher on talkativeness facet but lower on non-supportiveness facet. It corresponded with our finding that MN Group had a higher score on the compassion facet and on Extraversion because of the high correlation between personality and communication style (de Vries, Bakker-Pieper, Konings & Schouten, 2011). It further supported that Minnesotans like to have conversations, like to listen, and are able to show a good understanding of others.

From the Trust scale we created, we obtained strong support that our MN Group participants were more likely to trust others. They tended to believe that most people can be trusted, try to be fair, and try to be helpful. They not only trust people within the same social circle such as family, neighbors, or people they personally know, but also extend their trust to people they may barely know or do not have much information about. Maybe due to this high level of trust, Minnesotans are more likely to greet people, have conversations with others, or even help strangers on the road.

These results use psychological variables to describe the characteristics of Minnesota Nice. Minnesotans can be really friendly and trusting, and like to talk and listen to people. These behaviors are not insincere signs of polite friendliness or passive aggressiveness, which is one way people sometimes interpret Minnesotan behavior (Veldof & Bonnema, n.d.). People who came from cultures or background with lower trust or support may be suspicious when they encounter genuine friendliness and kindness. The lack of support for passive aggressiveness illustrates the importance of understanding one's culture and communication style. Misunderstanding can arise easily so we need to facilitate effective interactions.

However, it is necessary to address potential problems with our studies. Both samples included only people below the age of 30, which could have potentially influenced our results. Also our two samples were based primarily on participants' self-identified primary residency. This may not be the best indicator to describe people who are Minnesota Nice since people may be residents in Minnesota who are not Minnesotans, and Minnesotans may live elsewhere. The geographic location may not be a valid drawing line on its own. Instead, it may be more effective to ask whether participants self identify as Minnesota Nice, and divide the sample based on their answers. The questionnaire we used does not cover all Minnesota Nice behaviors. Other aspects to explore include conflict styles, emotional expressiveness, confidence, and more. More importantly, our operational definition of passive aggressiveness may be deficient and fail to correctly measure the relationship between passive aggressiveness and Minnesota Nice.

In the end, we speculate that Minnesota's historical roots may largely account for the specific Minnesota Nice phenomenon. According to the 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates from the U.S. Census Bureau, Minnesota has the largest Scandinavian population (Denmark, Norway and Sweden, Finland). In the U.S., nearly 30% of Scandinavians settled in Minnesota, who passed down their great trusting values and relatively collectivist ideologies to their descendants in Minnesota. This has contributed to the formation of "Minnesota Nice". Jones (2009) argued in his article that by tracing the Scandinavian culture, one can find a lot of resemblances between the Scandinavian culture and Minnesota Nice. We also gained support from our pilot study that Sweden was ranked as number one in the Trust scale, and the North West Central region, which includes Minnesota, was ranked as number two.

In the future, it will be important to study Scandinavian culture to further investigate Minnesota Nice.

Reference

Andersen, P.A., Lustig, M.W., & Andersen, J.F. (1987). Regional patterns of communication in the United States: A theoretical perspective. *Communication Monographs, 54,* 128-144. doi: 0.1080/03637758709390222

Atkins, A. (2008). *Creating Minnesota: A history from the inside out.* St. Paul: Minnesota Historical Society

Bellah, R. N., Madsen, R., Sullivan, W. M., Swidler, A., & Tipton, S. M. (1985). *Habits of the heart: Individualism and commitment in American life.* New York: Harper & Row

Cattell, R.B., Eber, H.W., & Tatsuoka, M.M. (1970). *Handbook for the sixteen personality factor questionnaire (16PF).* Champaign, IL: Institute for Personality and Ability Testing.

De Vries, R.E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Konings, F.E., & Schouten,B. (2011). The Communication Styles Inventory (CSI): A six-dimensional behavioral model of communication styles and its relation with personality. *Communication Research, 40*(4), 506-532. doi: 10.1177/0093650211413571

De Vries, R. E., Bakker-Pieper, A., Siberg, R. A., Gameren. K. V., & Vlug. M. (2009). The content and dimensionality of communication styles. *Communication Research, 36*(20), 178-206. doi: 10.1177/0093650208330250

DeYoung, C. G. & Quilty, L.C. (2007). Between facets and domains: 10 aspects of the big five.

Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 93(5), 880-896. doi: 10.1037/0022-3514.93.5.880

Dheer, R., Lenartowicz, T., & Peterson, M. F. (2014). Cultural regions of Canada and United States: Implications for international management research. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 14*(3), 343-384. Doi: 10.1177/1470595814543706

Dinesen, P.T. (2012). Does generalized (dis)trust travel? Examining the impact of cultural heritage and destination-country environment on trust of immigrants. *Political Psychology, 33*(4), 495-511. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-9221.2012.00886.x

Elazar, D.J. (1966). *American federalism: A view from the states.* New York: Thomas Crowell.

European Social Survey. (2014). *ESS Round 7 Source Questionnaire.* London: Centre for Comparative Social Surveys, City University London.

Feist, J., & Feist, G. J. (2006). *Theories of personality.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Garreau, J. (1981). *The nine nations of North America.* New York: Avon Books.

Gastil, R.D. (1975). *Cultural regions of the United States. Seattle.* WA: University of Washington Press.

Hofstede, G.H. (1991). Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind. London: McGraw-Hill.

Huff, L. & Kelley, L. (2003). Levels of organizational trust in individualist versus collectivist societies: A seven-nation study. *Organization Science, 14*(1), 81-90. Retrieved from www.jstor.org/stable/3086035

Inkeles, A., Hanfmann, E., & Beier, H. (1958). Modal personality and the adjustment to the Soviet socio-political system. *Human Relations, 11*(1), 3-22. doi: 10.1177/001872675801100101

John, O.P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The big five trait taxonomy: History, measurement and theoretical perspectives. *Handbook of personality: Theory and research* (2nded). Retrieved from http://moityca.com.br/pdfs/bigfive_John.pdf

Jones, S. (2009, December 14). Tracing the origin of "Minnesota Nice". *Minnesota Public Radio News.* Retrieved from http://www.mprnews.org/story/2009/12/14/syljones

Krug, S.E., & Kulhavy, R.W. (1973). Personality differences across regions of the United States. *The Journal of Social Psychology, 91*(1), 73-79. doi: 10.1080/00224545.1973.9922648

Lee, K., & Ashton, M. C. (2008). The HEXACO personality factors in the indigenous personality lexicons of English and 11 other languages. *Journal of Personality, 76*(5), 1001-1054. doi: 10.1111/j.1467-6494.2008.00512.x

Plaut, V.C., Markus, H.R., & Lachman, M.E. (2002). Place matters: Consensual features and

regional variation in American well-being and self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*(1). 160-184. doi: 10.1037//0022-3514.83.1.160

Rathus, S. A. (1973). A 30-item schedule for assessing assertive behavior. *Behavior Therapy, 4*, 398–406. Retrieved from http://homepages.se.edu/cvonbergen/files/2013/01/A-30_Item-Schedule-for-Assessing-Assertive-Behavior.pdf

Reeskens, T. & Hooghe, M. (2008). Cross-cultural measurement equivalence of generalized trust. Evidence from the European Social Survey (2002 and 2004). *Social Indicators Research, 85*(3), 515-532. doi:10.1007/s11205-007-9100-z

Rentfrow, P.J., Gosling, S.D., & Potter, J. (2008). A theory of the emergence, persistence, and expression of geographic variation in psychological characteristics. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(5), 339-369. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org/stable/40212258

Rousseau, D. M., Sitkin, S. B., Burt, R. S., & Camerer, C. (1998). Not so different after all: A cross-discipline view of trust. *Academy of Management Review, 23*(3), 393–404. Retrieved from http://portal.psychology.uoguelph.ca/faculty/gill/7140/WEEK_3_Jan.25/Rousseau,%20Sitkin,%20Burt,%20%26%20Camerer_AMR1998.pdf

Ryan, B. (2003). Minnesota nice ain't nice: Challenging the accepted wisdom on

communication. Retrieved from http:// www.skillshare.net/Minnesota%20Nice.htm

Soto, C.J., John, O.P., Gosling, S.D., & Potter, J. (2011). Age differences in personality traits from 10 to 65: Big Five Domains and Facets in a large cross-sectional sample. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 100*(2), 330-348. doi: 10.1037/a0021717

Triandis, H.C., & Suh, E.M. (2002). Cultural influences on personality. *Annual Review of Psychology, 53,* 133-160. Retrieved from http://isites.harvard.edu/fs/docs/icb.topic1230873.files/CulturalInfluences.pdf

U.S. Census Bureau. (2010). 2006-2010 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Retrieved from http://factfinder2.census.gov/faces/tableservices/jsf/pages/productview.xhtml?pid=ACS_10_5YR_B04003&prodType=table

Tayler, B. (n.d.). Is Minnesota Nice a Minnesotan Myth? Retrieved from https://www.css.edu/about/the-cable/the-cable-news/is-minnesota-nice-a-minnesotan-myth.html

Veldof, J & Bonnema, C. (2014, July 11). Minnesota nice? It's like ice. *StarTribune.* Retrieved from http://www.startribune.com/opinion/commentaries/266823811.html

Veldof, J.& Bonnema, C. (n.d.). What Exactly is Minnesota Nice? Retrieved from http://www.thrivemnnice.com/home/NiceTips/what-is-mn-nice

Sigler, K., Burnett, A., & Child, J.T. (2008). A regional analysis of assertiveness. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 37(*2), 89-104. doi: 10.1080/17475750802533364

World Values Survey. (2014). WVS 2010-2012 Wave, revised master, June 2012. Retrieved from http://www.worldvaluessurvey.org/WVSDocumentationWV6.jsp