NOTE TO USERS

This reproduction is the best copy available.

UMI®

Attitudes toward Americans:
Exploring the Influences of Japanese Sojourners' Communication Experiences with
Americans

By

Copyright 2007
Makiko Imamura

B.A., Tsuda College, Tokyo, Japan

Submitted to the Department of Communication Studies and the Faculty of the
Graduate School of the University of Kansas in Partial Fulfillment of the
Requirements for the Degree of Master's of Arts

Chair: Dr. Yan Bing Zhang

Committee Member: Dr. Mary Lee Hummert

Committee Member: Dr. Nancy Baym

Date Defended: June 7, 2007

The Thesis Committee for Makiko Imamura Certifies
That This Is the Approved Version of the Following Thesis:

Attitudes toward Americans:
Exploring the Influences of Japanese Sojourners' Communication Experiences with
Americans

Committee:

_____
Chair: Dr. Yan Bing Zhang

_____
Dr. Mary Lee Hummert

_____
Dr. Nancy Baym

Date Approved: June 12, 2007

ii

Abstract

Guided by the intergroup contact hypothesis, this study examined the relationships among three sets of variables: Japanese sojourners' ($N = 103$) communication experiences, relational solidarity with their most frequent American contact, and attitude toward Americans in general. Regression analysis results indicated that communication accommodation and social support were positive predictors of relational solidarity, thus Hypothesis 1 was supported. Partially supporting Hypothesis 2, social support, relational solidarity, and communication accommodation were positive predictors of the affective, cognitive, and behavioral attitudes respectively. The third hypothesis predicting that typicality of the American individuals and perceived group salience would moderate the relationship between relational solidarity and the three dimensions of attitude was not supported. In addition, this study revealed that the participants' linguistic comfort was a positive predictor of the cognitive and behavioral dimensions of attitude. Results were discussed in light of the contact hypothesis and prior literature in intergroup and intercultural communication.

iii

Acknowledgements

I am genuinely grateful to the members of my thesis committee: Dr. Yan Bing Zhang, Dr. Mary Lee Hummert, and Dr. Nancy Baym. Without their support, insight, and encouragement, I could not have produced any better work toward my master's degree. I would like to thank Dr. Hummert for her valuable time and meaningful suggestions to develop this study on top of her busy schedule as vice provost. I also would like to thank Dr. Baym for her insightful feedback and new perspectives to improve my thesis.

I am mostly indebted to Dr. Yan Bing Zhang, my academic advisor, the most admirable mentor and role model. She spent numerous hours during the days and evenings with me providing her knowledge, profundities, and encouragement with great patience. I feel very fortunate to have had the opportunity to learn skills for conducting a study from her. She challenged me to expand ideas, guided me through the entire process of conducting a study, devoted tremendous time for me in every step, provided me instrumental and emotional support, and more importantly shared all the empowering and hard moments in the process of my master's program. Her positive attitude and enthusiasm in directing this study were the greatest sources of my motivation to complete my very first study in graduate school. I am very looking forward to continuing to learn from her throughout the rest of my graduate study.

I also would like to thank my friends and family for unconditional support. My special thanks go to Ben Warner, Cheongmi Shim, Racheal Ruble, and Stefan Duckor for their assistance, encouragement, and friendship.

iv

Table of Contents

List of Tables

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

Intergroup communication research has gained attention since the1990s greatly due to a growing interest in understanding how contact with specific group members is associated with attitudes and perceptions about groups in general (Harwood, Giles, & Palomares, 2005; Wilder & Simon, 1998). Guided by the intergroup contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954), scholars have identified various facilitating factors and critical situational conditions (e.g., equal status, social norms, institutional support, and quality of contact) for intercultural contact to reduce prejudice (Gudykunst, 1979; Ting-Toomey, 1986). In general, findings from previous research have demonstrated that contact frequency and quality are positively associated with intergroup relations as measured by perceptions and attitudes (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a). That said, the majority of the contact research has focused on contact outcomes for members of dominant and majority groups (e.g., European Americans) with minimal attention devoted to members of minority groups (Tropp, 2003). In addition, the majority of the intergroup research has also focused on different ethnic groups within the same culture (e.g., European Americans and African Americans as different social groups) and fewer studies have given attention to intercultural/intergroup relations (e.g., Greenland & Brown, 1999).

Examining contact outcomes for minority groups is especially critical in intercultural contact because minority group members may perceive and define intergroup relations differently from the majority due to their lower status and more

1

sensitivity to their group status (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005b). Extending research in intergroup communication, the current study considers outcomes for Japanese sojourners from their intercultural contact with Americans. Specifically, this study examines the relationships among Japanese sojourners' specific communication experiences, perceived relational solidarity with their most frequent American contact, and the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of attitude toward Americans in general.

The intergroup contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954) has been used as a major theoretical framework in intergroup and intercultural communication research (Hewstone & Brown, 1986). Allport's (1954) initial contact hypothesis focused on identifying conditions and situations for positive intergroup contact (e.g., status, frequency, and quality of contact). Brewer and Miller (1996) argue that if ignorance and unfamiliarity promote stereotypes and negative perceptions of outgroups, mutual knowledge about groups and connections with outgroup members should reduce those biased and negative perceptions of outgroups. In intergroup and intercultural contexts, the contact hypothesis concerns experiences of individuals from different social categories and influences of those experiences on perceptions and attitudes toward those groups (e.g., Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a; Pettigrew, 1998; Rose, 1981). In examining the intergroup contact hypothesis in intercultural contexts, previous studies have shown that frequency and quality of contact are significant factors which contribute to intergroup attitude change (Greenland & Brown, 1999; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a). In a similar vein, Tropp (2003) found that even a single

2

communication experience with an outgroup member has implications for intergroup relations (see also Harwood, Hewstone, Paolini, & Voci, 2005; Soliz & Harwood, 2003). Tropp's (2003) study shows that after a single negative contact with an Asian or a Latino American, European American participants became more hostile toward Asians and Latino Americans as a whole. In addition, American participants were more apprehensive about future intergroup interactions with Asian and Latino Americans. Similar to Tropp's (2003) findings, Rose (1981) illustrates that an intimate relationship disconfirms stereotypes and thus improves intergroup relations.

While the majority of intergroup contact research has examined the contact conditions (e.g., frequency and quality of contact), recent studies have also examined communication variables in intergroup contact situations. Previous studies have demonstrated that communication variables such as communication accommodation and social support are proxies or communicative manifestations of relational quality to enhance attitudes toward outgroup members (Soliz & Harwood, 2006). Specifically, Soliz and Harwood's (2003) study of intergenerational communication found that grandchildren's communication accommodation in conversations with grandparents was positively associated with attitudes toward older adults.

From an intergroup communication perspective, the current study examines intercultural communication between Japanese and Americans by considering communication dimensions (e.g., communication accommodation and social support), relational solidarity, and intergroup outcomes (i.e., the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of attitude). In line with prior contact literature, which has

3

focused on the consequences of the most frequent intergroup contact (e.g., Soliz &
Harwood, 2006), the current study considers the Japanese participants' most frequent
American contact (i.e., the American person with whom the Japanese participants
have had the most frequent communication). In general, the development of the
hypotheses is informed by the intergroup contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954), the
communication accommodation theory (Giles, Coupland, & Coupland, 1991), and
prior literature on intergroup communication and relations (Brislin, 1986; Ensari &
Miller, 2002; Pettigrew, 1998; Rothbart & John, 1985; Soliz & Harwood, 2006).

4

CHPATER TWO

LITERATURE REVIEW

Specific Intergroup Contact and Attitude toward Groups

Research on intergroup contact has focused on reducing intergroup bias and

conflict for the past fifty years (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). Intergroup biases include

stereotypical perceptions associated with different social groups (Allport, 1954;

Brislin, 1986; Brown, 1965). Stereotypes are person-perception schemas about groups,

which serve as an important knowledge basis that guides individuals' communication

behaviors (Hummert, 1999). Stereotypes are generated when information about

particular groups is accumulated and integrated (Wittenbrink, Park, & Judd, 1998).

Gudykunst and Nishida (1994) specify that integrated information about groups

become stereotypes when individuals overgeneralize relationships between group

memberships and psychological characteristics about group members. From the

intergroup communication perspective, however, stereotypical views of outgroup

members can be more problematic than pragmatic. Hewstone and Giles (1986) argue

that individuals tend to apply their stereotypical views of groups to interpersonal

interactions, even though predictions based on stereotypes are not always applicable

to individual members of the group (Berger, 1986). If not treated appropriately,

stereotypes create self-fulfilling prophecies and the activation of stereotypes can

create negative feedback cycles in interpersonal communication (Hewstone & Brown,

1986; Hewstone & Giles, 1986; Hummert, 1994; Hummert, Garstka, Ryan, &

Bonnesen, 2004). Furthermore, stereotypes can lead to inappropriate communication

5

behaviors, negative attitudes, misunderstanding, prejudice, discrimination, and conflict in personal relationships (e.g., Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994; Schaller, Rosell, & Asp, 1998; Hummert, Shaner, Garstka, & Henry, 1998; Williams & Giles, 1996). William and Giles (1996) explain that negative evaluations, misunderstandings, and conflict often occur when people treat individuals based on their group membership and global perceptions associated with the group.

Considering the negative consequences brought by stereotypes and the influences of stereotypes on communication behaviors, intergroup communication research has focused on identifying ways of reducing intergroup bias and ways of enhancing intergroup relations. Research has shown that interpersonal communication between people from different social or cultural groups reduces intergroup bias and improves intergroup attitudes. For example, recent research examining attitudes toward Muslims after the September 11th indicates that American high school students who had Muslim friends were more positive about Muslims as a group than those who had no contact with Muslim individuals (Christian & Lapinski, 2003). Some studies have also shown that prominent group categorization during contact has strong implications for intergroup attitudes. Greenland and Brown's study (1999) examined the effects of categorization and contact quality (i.e., friends versus acquaintances or competitive versus cooperative relations) on intergroup bias. They found that interpersonal categorization leads to better intergroup contact quality. However, their findings also support the claim that high intergroup categorization (i.e., group salience) demonstrates a stronger negative association between contact and

6

intergroup attitude. Bridging the arguments on interpersonal and intergroup categorizations during contact, Ting-Toomey (1986) claims positive interpersonal encounters improve intergroup attitudes when culture is considered as an intergroup marker.

In differentiating intergroup from interpersonal communication, Harwood et al. (2005a) emphasize the importance of group salience (i.e., group membership and its cognitive associations). They argue that intergroup communication occurs when group membership (e.g., Japanese) and its cognitive associations (e.g., Japanese are reserved) are prominent in social interactions. That is to say, group salience functions psychologically to increase the influence of one's group membership on perceptions and behaviors (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetcherell, 1987). Social categorization also explains the importance of group salience in intergroup contact and its contribution to attitude change. Brewer and Miller (1996) state that group salience is context-specific. That said, categorization may be highly meaningful in one situation and irrelevant in others. Brewer and Miller (1996) further explain that high group salience in a given situation accentuates group membership rather than personal identities and that individuals interact in accord with their social identities (see also Brewer et al., 1995).

Intergroup contact research has discussed the importance of group salience and the typicality of outgroup members as major aspects in determining the relationship between intergroup contact and its outcome (Miller, 2002; see also Ensari & Miller, 2002; Rothbart & John, 1985). Ensari and Miller (2002) state that "a

7

person is perceived as a typical group member if he or she looks, speaks, or acts in the ways that the perceiver stereotypically assumes to be characteristic of the group" (p. 314). Hewstone and Lord (1998) explain that perceived goodness-of-fit to the group membership contributes to attitude change. Pettigrew (1998) points out that positive contact with a typical member of an outgroup improves intergroup relationships and thus can change attitudes toward outgroup members as a whole. Supporting the important role of typicality in intergroup contact and bias reduction, Wolsko, Park, Judd, and Bachelor (2003) found that typicality moderates the relationship between intergroup contact and contact outcomes. Specifically, a pleasant contact with a typical member of an outgroup leads to a positive evaluation of that outgroup as a whole (Wolsko et al., 2003; see also Wilder, 1984). Furthermore, Wilder, Simon, and Faith (1996) found that a single counter-stereotypic example in intergroup contact can modify stereotypes if the behavior is perceived to be dispositional and the disconfirming member is seen as typical of that group. That said, prior intergroup contact literature on the roles of typicality and salience to intergroup encounters has focused on the majority group members' perspectives (e.g., Miller, 2002).

Intergroup contact hypothesis and the literature on typicality and salience have enhanced our understanding of how intergroup contact contributes to the formation and transformation of attitudes toward outgroups. Attitudes are "judgments of an object or event which aid individuals in structuring their complex social environments" (Zanna & Rempel, 1988, p. 315). Zanna and Rempel (1988) further identify attitudes as social knowledge based on experiences, beliefs, and emotions towards objects. Attitudes have

8

been viewed as a point on an evaluative continuum ranging from positive to negative (Ostrom, Skowronski, & Nowak, 1994). Although the theoretical assumption equally values all the derivations of attitudes (i.e., experiences, beliefs, and emotions), Zanna and Rempel (1988) argue that the direct experience is the predominant contributing factor of shaping attitudes. Their claim supports the current study that the most frequent direct experience with the attitude object (i.e. an American individual) contributes to shaping positive perceptions and attitudes toward the object group (i.e. Americans).

The word "attitude" summarizes all the complex dimensions such as prejudice, stereotype, beliefs, judgments, and emotions. Multidimensionality of attitude has been adopted by most researchers for the past seventy-five years (Crites, Fabrigar, & Petty, 1994). Structure of attitude is tripartite and can be classified into affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions (e.g., Katz & Stotland, 1959; Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a; Zanna & Rempel, 1988). The affective dimension refers to how we feel and relates to emotions and warmth, the cognitive dimension refers to what we think and includes perceptions (e.g., tolerant-intolerant and cooperative-competitive), and the behavioral dimension refers to what we are inclined to do about an attitude object and directly relates to the likelihood of behaviors (e.g., willingness to engage in interactions) (Zanna & Rempel, 1988).

In relation to intergroup contact and bias reduction, Pettigrew (1986) criticizes the applications of the original contact hypothesis (Allport, 1954), which has focused on cognitive attitude and ignored affective attitude, although there is a strong

9

association between the cognitive and affective attitudes (Hamilton, 1981). Recently, Tropp and Pettigrew (2005a) examined the contact hypothesis by focusing on both of the dimensions (i.e., the affective and cognitive) and found that the intergroup contact effects vary depending on the way attitude is assessed. Their findings indicate that quality of contact (i.e., friendship and intergroup closeness) has significant contribution to the affective dimension of attitude. Although Tropp and Pettigrew's (2005a) study found that the contact effects on cognitive and affective attitudes vary according to the intergroup relations, both affective and cognitive attitudes are indispensable when investigating intergroup contact and contact outcomes. In fact, the literature on intergroup contact focusing on perceptions and communication indicates a strong association between the cognitive dimension of attitude and communication accommodation (e.g., Soliz & Harwood, 2003).

While previous research has already found a strong link between intergroup contact and attitude change, Brewer and Miller (1996) argue that contact cannot, by itself, change attitude. Recent research examining the intergroup contact hypothesis has introduced various factors influencing the relationship between contact and attitude change. Informed by the major findings in intergroup contact research examining the roles of relational solidarity (e.g., Chen & King, 2002; Hecht, Larkey, & Johnson, 1992; Soliz & Harwood, 2003) and communication aspects (e.g., Hornsey & Gallois, 1998; Ye, 2006), the current study considers communication aspects as well as relational solidarity.

10

Relational Solidarity

The nature of solidarity implies various relations connecting one person with another person (Brown, 1965). The solidarity of a relationship depends primarily on the degree of psychological, social, and physical closeness (Wheelee, 1978). Prior research in intergroup communication has used several major items to gauge the concept of relational solidarity, such as relational satisfaction and closeness, liking, commonality, and trust (Harwood, 2000; Wheelee, 1978). Intergroup contact provides an opportunity to establish a closer relationship (e.g., Pettigrew, 1997). In intergroup situations, relational intimacy can break down barriers between ingroup and outgroup members (Brislin, 1986). Therefore, intimate relationships with outgroup members have high potentials to disconfirm the stereotypes about that outgroup and to change attitudes toward that group (Rose, 1981). Rose (1981) explains that cooperative interdependent relationships can promote favorability of outgroup members and can lessen bias. Furthermore, relational satisfaction is a significant communication outcome which influences future communication behaviors (Hecht, 1978). Previous intergenerational communication research has examined the relationship among stereotypes, communication, and relational satisfaction (e.g., Chen & King, 2002; Harwood, 2000, Hummert, 1994). For example, Chen and King (2002) examined the association between positive age stereotypes and intergenerational communication satisfaction and found a significant association between the stereotypes and satisfaction. Specifically, they found that higher levels of satisfaction were associated with more positive intergroup perceptions and attitudes. In a similar example, Soliz

11

and Harwood (2003) found that communication satisfaction was positively associated with intergroup attitudes.

Expanding the literature on relational solidarity and intergroup attitude, the current study examines the three dimensions of attitudes as contact outcomes. In addition, this study incorporates communication aspects as well as relational solidarity in relation to the three dimensions of attitude. Informed by previous research (e.g., Hornsey & Gallois 1998; Ye, 2006), the current study examines the influences of two communication variables (i.e., social support and communication accommodation) on relational solidarity and intergroup attitude.

Social Support

Social support includes tangible assistance, informational support, and emotional support (Salem, Boglat, & Reid, 1997). Cohen and Wills (1985) explain that social support can operate through providing resources to cope with stressors or to reduce stress. Providing available resources or even simply showing concern for recipients' conditions has a great impact on interpersonal relationships. Specifically, supportive communication plays a significant role in interpersonal relationship development and maintenance (e.g., Burleson, 1990). Perceived supportive behaviors result in a greater sense of security and less interpersonal conflict (Pierce, Sarason, & Sarason, 1991). Thus, social support promotes solid personal relationships by increasing intimacy and satisfaction (see also Soliz & Harwood, 2006). The current study emphasizes the role of social support (provided by American individuals to the Japanese sojourners) in intergroup relations.

12

In general, Japanese sojourners experience the course of acculturation (see also Rogler, Cortes, & Malgadi, 1991) when adjusting and adapting to the American culture. While undergoing acculturation, Japanese sojourners are in need of various kinds of social support ranging from language assistance to emotional and instrumental support. Social support provided by the host nationals becomes the key for most of the Japanese sojourners in adapting to the new country. Furthermore, in intergroup contact situations, supportive messages are interpreted as acceptance, whereas unsupportive messages are interpreted as rejection (Goldsmith, 1994). Ye (2006) investigated interpersonal support between Chinese and American individuals and found that there was a negative association between the perceived interpersonal support and discrimination. Lack of supportive messages results in maintaining or increasing discrimination against outgroup members. In addition to supportive personal communication, the current study also considers the influences of intergroup communication (i.e., communication accommodation) to intergroup relations.

Communication Accommodation

Communication accommodation is another communication element that influences not only relational solidarity but also attitudes towards outgroup members. Communication accommodation theory (CAT; Giles et al., 1991) explains how people modify their speech patterns according to cognitive, situational, and interactional variables. That is to say, interactants shift their speech patterns based on what they perceive to be the cognitive, emotional and conversational needs of their conversation partners and situational cues such as intergroup settings (e.g.,

13

stereotypical views of their partners' group). However, communication accommodation could be inappropriate and dissatisfying if it is in excess of what is needed or fails to adapt to the situation (Giles et al., 1991). Inappropriate accommodation could lead to negative evaluations because it is frequently motivated by general group stereotypes without considering the specific needs of the conversation partners (Hummert, 1994).

Communication accommodation becomes more critical in intergroup contact situations than in interpersonal communication (see also Hornsey & Gallois, 1998). Harwood and Giles (2005) suggest that CAT provides another theoretical framework for intergroup and intercultural communication. In intergroup and intercultural situations, CAT views stereotypes as factors that influence speech modifications (Beebe & Giles, 1984). Interactants are likely to apply their stereotypical views of the other party to interpersonal communication hoping to facilitate conversations and to enhance understanding. For example, in the context of intergenerational communication, Hummert et al. (1998) found that both positive and negative age stereotypes are capable of inducing patronizing talk to older adults depending on the physical context where interaction takes place (see also ASI; Hummert., 1994). Thus, both positive and negative stereotypes of outgroup members could activate unfavorable speech patterns and result in inappropriate communication.

Inappropriate accommodation is frequently induced by stereotypes, misreading of the communication situation or insensitivity of the conversation partner's needs, and thus results in stronger intergroup boundaries (Soliz & Harwood,

14

2006). The more non-accommodative the interactants are to each other, the more salient the intergroup aspect becomes in conversations. Specifically, Hornsey and Gallois (1998) conducted a study on intergroup communication accommodation of Australian students toward Chinese students and found that Australians tend to modify their speech patterns in interactions when they identify a stronger intergroup marker than an interpersonal aspect. That said, intergroup communication situations motivate the interactants to try to accommodate their speech patterns depending on the target.

Current Study and Hypotheses

The rapid acceleration of globalization in recent years has increased the opportunities for intergroup and intercultural encounters. Abrams and Hogg (2004) note that communication is no longer restricted to the cultural, ethnic, and geographic ingroup social networks due to communication technology and transportation advancement. In fact, an increasing number of sojouners (e.g., students and temporary workers) and immigrants are coming to the United States every year. For example, institutions in the United States accepted over 60,000 students from China, 50,000 from Korea, and 40,000 from Japan in the accademic year of 2005/06 (Institute of International Education, 2006). As the minority population in the United States grows, broader application of the contact hypothesis to multiethnic/multicultural contexts becomes more significant (Levin, Laar, & Sidanius, 2003). Studying communication between Japanese and Americans is especially meaningful not only because of the large number of people coming to the United States from Japan but also because of

15

dissimilarity in value orientations of the two cultures (e.g., Individualistic versus Collectivistic value orientations).

Cultural differences and value orientaions are frequently assessed by the Individualism-Collectivism (I-C) cultural framework. I-C orientation has been regarded as the most important dimension guiding social behaviors (Kim, 2002; Triandis, 1988) and provides information about cultural beliefs, values, thoughts and feelings, acts, and communication styles (Adams & Blieszner, 1994). Specifically, the I-C cultural framework embraces culturally specific relational structures (e.g., harmony versus independence) and communication modes (e.g., high-low context) (e.g., Gudykunst & Kim, 2003). Collectivistic cultures, such as the Japanese culture, emphasize stable and harmonious interdependent relationships more than individualistic cultures, such the American culture, where independence and individuality are more valued (e.g., Kim, 2002).

Hecht et al. (1992) say that "communication is problematic because there are few 'taken-for-granteds'" (p. 210). The conspicuous differences in relational structure and communication modes between the Japanese and American cultures might influence the Japanese participants' perceptions of social support and communication accommodation in intergroup contact with Americans. Specifically, relational harmony and security can be achieved through the use of indirect communication, reciprocal care or social support (see also Kim, 2002). How much support the Japanese sojourners have received or can expect to receive from host nationals should determine their perceptions of the quality of the relationships with Americans. In

16

addition, Japanese individuals rarely express their needs explicitly and thus American individuals' sensitivity to the Japanese sojourners' needs may also play a vital role in developing relational solidarity and establishing attitudes toward Americans. Coming from a culture where taciturnity, high context, and implicit messages are widely accepted, there is a high potential of the Japanese sojourners to feel that some of the communication practices of Americans are inappropriate (non-accommodative). When Japanese perceive Americans using excessively direct messages or exaggerated tones in conversations with an attempt to enhance understanding, they may perceive that these communicative cues are non-accommodative.

Considering the previous findings on the intergroup contact hypothesis that the frequency of contact is a significant factor in determining intergroup relations (Tropp & Pettigrew, 2005a), and that a single negative communication experience with the attitude object can affect intergroup attitude change (e.g., Tropp, 2003), the current study focuses on the Japanese sojourners' most frequent American contact. Based on the basic tenets of the intergroup contact hypothesis (Pettigrew, 1986), the literature on intergroup attitude, communication accommodation theory (Giles, et al. 1991), the following research hypotheses are investigated:

H1. Japanese participants' perceived social support and communication accommodation from their most frequent American contact will be positively associated with their perceptions of relational solidarity with that individual.

H2. Their relational solidarity with their most frequent American contact will be positively associated with their cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitude

17

toward Americans in general when social support and communication accommodation are controlled.

H3. The perceived typicality of their most frequent American contact and group salience will moderate the relationship between relational solidarity and the contact outcomes (i.e., the three dimensions of attitude).

18

CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

One hundred and three Japanese participants (M age = 27.08, SD = 6.76, range = 17 - 46) were recruited from a medium-sized mid-Western university in the United States. Three subjects were removed from the original sample due to a large number of missing responses. Among the participants included in this study (N = 103), 60.2% were female. One participant did not specify his/her gender. Respondents had lived in the United States for 3.92 years on average (SD = 3.74, range = 3 months – 21 years). They reported their linguistic comfort by answering how comfortable they were in using the four language skills (i.e., speaking, listening comprehension, reading, and writing) on 7-point scales (1 = not comfortable at all and 7 = extremely comfortable). The average comfort level with using English of the Japanese participants was 4.5 (SD = 1.34, α = .91), which was significantly above the mid-point of the scale (i.e., 4), t (102) = 3.34, p < .001, indicating that the Japanese participants were moderately comfortable with using English, but were not extremely comfortable.

Procedure

The questionnaire had three parts (see Appendix A). In the first part, participants were asked to answer questions regarding their demographics, overseas experience, and linguistic comfort. After completing their demographic information and individual characteristics, participants were asked to answer questions regarding their specific intergroup communication experiences with their most frequent

19

American contact. The participants reported basic traits of their most frequent American contact (e.g., sex, nature of their relationship, length of the relationship, frequency of contact), social support they have received from, communication accommodation of, relational solidarity with the American individual. Typicality of the American individual and perceived group salience were also assessed. After completing the first part of questionnaire, participants answered unrelated questions on peer conflict in order to avoid any association of the single frequent communication with intergroup outcome variables. In the third part of questionnaire, participants answered questions regarding their cognitive, affective, and behavioral attitudes toward Americans in general.

Materials

Contact. Participants identified their most frequent American contact and provided information on this American individual (e.g., ethnicity, native language, other acquired East Asian languages, percentage of English used in their conversations, nature of their relationship to this individual, and length of the relationship). The types of their relationships with the American individuals included friend (61.4%), classmate (4%), spouse (5%), romantic partner (9.9%), teacher (3%), student (1%), host family member (1%), and other (14.9%). After answering those questions, four items were used ($\alpha = .83$; $M = 4.91$, $SD = 1.33$) to measure the frequency of contact with this individual (e.g., I interact with this person much more than with most people I know; I spend leisure time with this person daily.) on 7-point

20

scales (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). The items were adopted from Wheeless (1978) and Harwood et al. (2005b).

Social Support. Ten items were used to measure social support ($\alpha = .94$; $M = 5.2$, $SD = 1.19$). Participants indicated how much support they received from the American individual when they faced problems (e.g., this person showed me that he/she accepts me; this person expressed concern about my situation.) on 7-point scales (1 = almost never true and 7 = almost always true). The items were based on Pierce et al., (1991).

Communication Accommodation. Fifteen items were used to measure the participants' perceptions of communication accommodation of the American individual ($\alpha = .88$; $M = 5.46$, $SD = .94$). These items were developed from a focus group interview with eight East Asian international students. The focus group interview focused on Americans' accommodative and non-accommodative communication behaviors experienced by East Asian students (e.g., this person is overly direct; this person is condescending in conversations with me; this person is a good listener). In the current study, participants reported how strongly they agree or disagree with each of the 15 statements on 7-point scales. The negatively phrased items were recoded so that high means indicate more appropriate communication.

Relational Solidarity. Six items were used to measure relational solidarity ($\alpha = .73$; $M = 5.53$, $SD = .83$). Participants reported their perceptions of commonality, closeness, liking, trust, and satisfaction with the American individual (e.g., we feel very different about most things; in general, I am very satisfied with my relationship

21

with this person) on 7-point scales (1 = strongly disagree and 7 = strongly agree). The items were adopted from Wheeless' (1978) measurement of interpersonal solidarity and Hendrick's (1988) measurement of relationship satisfaction. Items that described negative perceptions of relational solidarity were recoded.

Typicality. Four items were used to measure typicality of the American individual (α = .91; M = 4.1, SD = 1.37). Participants reported their perceptions of how representative the American individual was (e.g., to what extent is this person typical of other American individuals?; is this person representative of American individuals?) on 7-point scales (1 = not at all and 7 = a great deal). Items were developed based on Harwood et al. (2005b).

Salience. Two items were used to measure the participants' perceptions of group salience (α = .70; M = 4.36, SD = 1.26). Participants reported their awareness of cultural differences with the American individual (e.g., in general, how aware are you of the racial/ethnic difference between yourself and this person.) on 7-point scales (1 = not at all and 7 = a great deal). Items were modified based on Harwood et al. (2005b) measurement of age group salience in an investigation of attitudes towards older adults.

The Cognitive Dimension of Attitude. Nine items were used to measure the cognitive dimension of attitude (α = .76; M = 4.71, SD = .77). Each item had a pair of adjectives to describe general perceptions about Americans (e.g., intelligent-stupid, sincere-insincere) on 7-point scales. Items were adopted from Tropp and Pettigrew's (2005a) investigation of intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of

prejudice. Each item was recoded and thus high means indicate more positive perceptions.

The Affective Dimension of Attitude. To assess the general feelings toward Americans, participants indicated how warm they felt toward Americans in general on a thermostat scale ranging from 0° (cold or unfavorable) to 99° (warm or favorable) ($M = 66.7$, $SD = 18.85$). The thermometer scale was adopted from Hummert, O'Brian, Mellott, and Greenwald (2002).

The Behavioral Dimension of Attitude. Eight items were used to measure the participants' behavioral attitude toward Americans ($\alpha = .87$; $M = 5.36$, $SD = 1.06$). Participants reported how much they were willing to engage in behaviors and activities if given situations (e.g., develop more than just speaking acquaintances with Americans; choose to marry an American.) on 7-point scales (1 = not at all willing and 7 = extremely willing). Items were adopted from Cooke's (1978) attitudes scale and Tropp's (2003) investigation on the psychological impact of prejudice.

23

CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Regression analysis was conducted to examine the three hypotheses in this study. Analysis was performed for relational solidarity, the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of attitude respectively. Correlations among the communication variables (i.e., social support and communication accommodation) and linguistic comfort (i.e., English) were significant, either small or moderate. Relational solidarity had moderate correlations with the communication variables. The correlations among the three dimensions of attitude were moderate. Typicality had small, positive but significant correlations with the cognitive and affective dimensions of attitude. Group salience was significantly negatively correlated with relational solidarity (see Table 1).

24

Table 1

Correlations among variables

Variable	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
1. English	4.50	1.34								
2. Social Support	5.20	1.19	.26**							
3. CAT	5.40	.94	.26**	.38**						
4. Solidarity	5.35	.83	.30**	.50**	.51**					
5. Behavioral	5.36	1.06	.28**	.26**	.31**	.29**				
6. Cognitive	4.71	.77	.31**	.16	.16	.35**	.48**			
7. Affective	66.7	18.85	.15	.28**	.15	.21*	.42**	.60**		
8. Typicality	4.10	1.37	.03	-.10	-.06	.01	.07	.29**	.25**	
9. Salience	4.36	1.26	-.05	-.13	-.13	-.23*	.01	-.16	-.04	.09

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Hypothesis 1: Communication and relational solidarity

Hypothesis 1 predicted that communication accommodation and social support would be positive predictors of relational solidarity. To examine this hypothesis, hierarchical multiple regression analysis was conducted on relational solidarity. Demographic variables (i.e., age, sex, length of stay in the U.S.) and perceived linguistic comfort were entered in the first model, followed by the communication variables (i.e., social support and communication accommodation) in the second model. Results indicated that the group of demographic variables significantly predicted relational solidarity, F (4, 89) = 3.78, adjusted R^2 = .11, p < .01. Perceived linguistic comfort (β = .17, t = 2.65, pr^2 = .07, p < .01) and age (β = .03, t = 2.51, pr^2 = .06, p < .05) were significant individual predictors of relational solidarity. When the demographic variables and perceived linguistic comfort were controlled, the communication variables significantly predicted relational solidarity, F (2, 87) = 20.01, adjusted R^2 = .37, R^2 Change = .27, p < .001. Communication accommodation (β = .29, t = 3.46, pr^2 = .11, p < .001) and social support (β = .26, t = 4.13, pr^2 = .08, p < .001) were significant individual predictors of relational solidarity. The results are reported in Table 2.

26

Table 2

Regression for relational solidarity

	Relational Solidarity		
	R^2 change	β	pr^2
1. Demographics and English	.15**		
Age		.03*	.06
Sex		-.23	.02
Length of Stay		-.00	.00
English Proficiency		.17**	.07
2. Communication Elements	.27***		
CAT		.29***	.11
Social Support		.26***	.08

Overall $R^2 = .41$, $F(6, 87) = 10.27$, $p < .001$

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

Hypothesis 2: Communication, relational solidarity, and attitude dimensions

Hypothesis 2 predicted that relational solidarity would be a positive predictor

of the three dimensions of attitude when the communication variables were controlled.

To examine the hypothesis, hierarchical multiple regression analyses were conducted

on the cognitive, affective, and behavioral dimensions of attitude. Demographic

variables and perceived linguistic comfort were entered in the first model and social

support and communication accommodation were entered in the second model,

27

followed by relational solidarity in the third model. All the results are reported in Table 3.

The Affective Dimension of Attitude. Results indicated that the group of demographic variables and perceived linguistic comfort did not significantly predict the affective dimension, $F(4, 89) = 2.28$, adjusted $R^2 = .05$, $p = .07$. However, perceived linguistic comfort was a significant individual predictor, $\beta = 3.7$, $t = 2.42$, $pr^2 = .06$, $p < .05$. When the demographics and perceived linguistic comfort were controlled, the communication variables significantly predicted the affective dimension of attitude, $F(2, 87) = 3.77$, adjusted $R^2 = .11$, R^2 change $= .07$, $p < .05$. Social support was a significant individual predictor, $\beta = 4.21$, $t = 2.52$, $pr^2 = .06$, $p < .05$. When the demographics, perceived linguistic comfort, and the communication variables were controlled, relational solidarity did not predict a significant variance in the affective dimension of attitude ($F(1, 86) = .26$, adjusted $R^2 = .1$, R^2 change $= .00$, $p = .61$), but social support remained to be a significant individual predictor, $\beta = 3.83$, $t = 2.09$, $pr^2 = .04$, $p < .05$.

The Cognitive Dimension of Attitude. Results indicated that the group of demographic variables and perceived linguistic comfort significantly predicted the cognitive dimension of attitude ($F(4, 89) = 2.99$, adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p < .05$) and perceived linguistic comfort was a significant individual predictor, $\beta = .19$, $t = 3.1$, $pr^2 = .09$, $p < .01$. When the demographics and perceived linguistic comfort were controlled, the communication variables did not significantly predict the cognitive dimension of attitude, $F(2, 87) = .02$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$, R^2 change $= .00$, $p = .98$.

28

However, perceived linguistic comfort remained to be a significant individual predictor, $\beta = .19$, $t = 2.9$, $pr^2 = .09$, $p < .01$. When the demographics, perceived linguistic comfort, and the communication variables were controlled, relational solidarity significantly predicted the cognitive dimension of attitude, $F(1, 86) = 5.09$, adjusted $R^2 = .1$, R^2 change $= .05$, $p < .05$. Perceived linguistic comfort remained as a significant individual predictor ($\beta = .17$, $t = 2.6$, $pr^2 = .07$, $p < .05$) and relational solidarity was also a significant individual predictor of the cognitive dimension of attitude ($\beta = .27$, $t = 2.26$, $pr^2 = .05$, $p < .05$).

The Behavioral Dimension of Attitude. Results indicated that the group of demographic variables and perceived linguistic comfort significantly predicted the behavioral dimension of attitude, $F(4, 89) = 3.0$, adjusted $R^2 = .08$, $p < .05$. Perceived linguistic comfort was a significant individual predictor, $\beta = .25$, $t = 2.9$, $pr^2 = .08$, $p < .01$. When the demographics and perceived linguistic comfort were controlled, the communication variables significantly predicted the behavioral dimension of attitude, $F(2, 87) = 3.8$, adjusted $R^2 = .13$, R^2 change $= .03$, $p < .05$. Perceived linguistic comfort remained to be a significant individual predictor ($\beta = .18$, $t = 2.14$, $pr^2 = .04$, $p < .05$) and communication accommodation was also a significant individual predictor of the behavioral dimension of attitude ($\beta = .28$, $t = 2.24$, $pr^2 = .05$, $p < .05$). When the demographics, perceived linguistic comfort, and the communication variables were controlled, relational solidarity did not predict a significant variance in the behavioral dimension of attitude ($F(1, 86) = .94$, adjusted $R^2 = .13$, R^2 change $= .01$, $p = .34$).

29

Table 3

Regressions for the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of attitude

	Affective Dimension[a]			Cognitive Dimension[b]			Behavioral Dimension[c]		
	R^2 change	β	pr^2	R^2 change	β	pr^2	R^2 change	β	pr^2
1. Demographics/English	.09			.12*			.02*		
Age		.03	.00		.01	.01		-.01	.01
Sex		-6.04	.02		-.16	.01		-.30	.02
Length of Stay		-.08	.03		-.00	.00		-.00	.01
English Proficiency		3.70*	.06		.19**	.09		25**	.08
2. Communication	.07*			.00			.03*		
CAT		.79	.00		.02	.00		.28*	.05
Social Support		4.21*	.06		.00	.00		.09	.00
3. Relational Solidarity	.00			.05*			.01		
Relational Solidarity		1.50	.00		.27*	.05		.16	.01

[a]Overall $R^2 = .17$, $F (7, 86) = 2.48$, $p < .05$ [b]Overall $R^2 = .17$, $F (7, 86) = 2.48$, $p < .05$

[c]Overall $R^2 = .20$, $F (7, 86) = 3.04$, $p < .05$ *$p < .05$, **$p < .01$

Hypothesis 3: Typicality and Salience

      Hypothesis 3 predicted that typicality and salience would moderate the relationship between relational solidarity and the three dimensions of attitude. Results for Hypothesis 2 indicated that relational solidarity was not a significant predictor of the affective or the behavioral dimensions of attitude, thus multiple hierarchical regression analysis was conducted only on the cognitive dimension of attitude. Interaction scores (i.e., relational solidarity × typicality and relational solidarity × salience) were created using centered means of each variable. Means of relational solidarity and typicality (uncentered) were entered in the first model, followed by the interaction between centered solidarity and centered typicality in the second model.

      Results indicated that typicality did not moderate the relationship between relational solidarity and the cognitive dimension of attitude (see Table 4). The set of predictor variables (i.e., relational solidarity and typicality) significantly predicted the cognitive dimension of attitude, $F(2, 100) = 13.03$, adjusted $R^2 = .19$, $p < .001$. Relational solidarity ($\beta = .33$, $t = 3.89$, $pr^2 = .12$, $p < .001$) and typicality ($\beta = .17$, $t = 3.27$, $pr^2 = .09$ $p < .001$) were both significant individual predictors. Although the interaction between relational solidarity and typicality did not significantly predict the cognitive dimension of attitude ($F(1, 99) = .00$, adjusted $R^2 = .18$, R^2 change $= .00$, $p = .95$), relational solidarity ($\beta = .33$, $t = 3.85$, $pr^2 = .12$, $p < .001$) and typicality ($\beta = .17$, $t = 3.25$, $pr^2 = .08$, $p < .01$) remained as significant individual predictors.

31

Table 4

Moderation of typicality

	Cognitive Dimension		
	R^2 change	β	pr^2
1. Solidarity and Typicality	.21***		
Relational Solidarity		.33***	.12
Typicality		.17***	.09
2. Interaction	.00		
Solidarity×Typicality		.00	.00

Overall R^2 = .21, F (3, 99) = 8.60, p < .001

*p < .05, **p < .01, ***p < .001

Results for salience are reported in Table 5. The set of predictor variables (i.e., relational solidarity and salience) significantly predicted the cognitive dimension of attitude, F (2, 100) = 7.34, adjusted R^2 = .11, p < .001. Relational solidarity was a significant individual predictor, β = .32, t = 3.44, pr^2 = .10, p < .001. When relational solidarity and salience were controlled, interaction between relational solidarity and salience did not significant predict the cognitive dimension of attitude, F (1, 99) = .51, adjusted R^2 = .11, R^2 change = .01, p = .48. However, relational solidarity remained as a significant individual predictor, β = .30, t = 3.17, pr^2 = .09, p < .01.

Table 5

Moderation of salience

	Cognitive Dimension		
	R^2 change	β	pr^2
1. Solidarity and Salience	.13***		
Relational Solidarity		.32***	.10
Salience		.05	.01
2. Interaction	.01		
Solidarity×Salience		.05	.00

Overall $R^2 = .13$, $F(3, 99) = 5.04$, $p < .01$

*$p < .05$, **$p < .01$, ***$p < .001$

CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION

Summary of Findings

The current study investigated the relationships among Japanese sojourners' communication experiences, relational solidarity with their most frequent American contact, and their attitude toward American in general. In addition, this study also examined whether the typicality of the American individual and the perceived group salience moderated the relationship between relational solidarity and intergroup attitude. Results of this study supported the prior literature on CAT, social support, and relational solidarity (e.g., Soliz & Harwood, 2006) in that communication accommodation and social support were positively associated with relational solidarity. The findings have reconfirmed the strong links from communication accommodation and social support to relational solidarity in intercultural communication settings despite the prominent differences in communication practices in the Japanese and American cultures (e.g., Kim, 2002).

In investigating the contributions of intercultural communication and perceived relational solidarity to intergroup attitude, this study has three major findings. First, the Japanese participants' perceived social support provided by the American individuals was found to have a significant positive contribution to the affective dimension of attitude. Second, consistent with the literature on the intergroup contact hypothesis, relational solidarity was positively associated with the cognitive dimension of attitude. Third, the communication accommodation of the

34

American individuals was a significant predictor of the behavioral dimension of attitude. In addition to the major findings, results also showed that the perceived linguistic comfort of the Japanese participants (i.e., comfort with using English) was a positive significant predictor of the cognitive and behavioral dimensions of attitude. Contrary to the hypothesis, typicality and group salience (one of the most frequently argued concepts in the intergroup contact hypothesis) did not moderate the relationship between relational solidarity and intergroup attitude.

Implications

The major findings of this study have revealed several themes that contribute to the growing body of the literature on the intergroup contact hypothesis. First, supportive communication, communication accommodation, and relational solidarity enhance the Japanese-American intergroup relations. Second, different communication variables affect different dimensions of intergroup attitude. Third, group salience and typicality may function differently in intergroup/intercultural communication for minority groups. Finally, this study has demonstrated that communication competence which directly relates to perceived linguistic comfort of the Japanese participants is important in studying intergroup/intercultural relations.

Supportive communication has the potential to lower intergroup boundaries and to shape favorable-unfavorable feelings toward outgroup members by mitigating intergroup communication apprehension. Consistent with Goldsmith's (1994) argument and Ye's (2006) findings, social support provided by American individuals may have lowered the boundaries of ingroup and outgroup memberships by

35

decreasing the Japanese sojourners' intercultural/intergroup communication anxieties. Generally, it is a natural human behavior to identify ourselves in terms of group memberships and those categorizations often depend on cultural classification in intercultural encounters (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984). Especially for Japanese sojourners, ingroup-outgroup boundaries are even more distinct than those who are in individualistic cultures (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994).

Members of collectivistic cultures draw a sharper distinction between ingroup and outgroup memberships than those of individualistic cultures and the ties in ingroup membership in collectivistic cultures have a large influence on social behaviors (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994). Emphases on conformity, security, and values shared within the ingroup have influences on Japanese people's comfort and confidence in ingroup interactions (e.g., Schwartz, 1990). However, Japanese people may experience more anxieties and less comfortable feelings in intergroup interactions because of some of the unpredictable communication behaviors from the outgroup members. As social support induces harmony and security in interpersonal relationships, the Japanese participants' perceived conformity and security in interactions with the most frequent contact American may have reduced intergroup communication apprehension and influenced their feelings toward Americans as a social group from which they can always expect supportive interactions.

Whereas social support emphasizes the personal dimension in interactions, communication accommodation stresses intergroup perception. Appropriate communication accommodation of American individuals was a positive predictor of

36

the behavioral dimension of attitude which includes the participants' inclinations of future interactions with Americans. It is reasonable to assume that appropriate communication accommodation allayed concerns of the Japanese sojourners over intercultural/intergroup communication and resulted in motivating them to engage in future interactions more actively. Lukens (1978) gives a clear explanation of this strong link between appropriate/inappropriate communication and intentions of future interaction with outgroup members. Non-accommodative communication creates communicative distance which include the distance of indifference (i.e., insensitivity to cultural differences), the distance of avoidance (i.e., purposeful avoidance of the amount of interaction with outgroups), and the distance of disparagement (i.e., feelings of hostility towards outgroup members) (Lukens, 1978). Especially pointing out the distance of avoidance, Gudykunst and Kim (1984) explain that the distance of avoidance results in minimizing future intergroup contact. On the contrary, communication accommodation should increase a sense of cultural sensitivity and a potential for future interactions.

Hofstede (1980) claims that people in collectivistic cultures, especially the Japanese culture, have high uncertainty avoidance. People from cultures of high uncertainty avoidance have strict rules and norms to protect themselves from encountering unpredictable situations (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1994). Violations of norms and expectations of the message recipients resulting from inappropriate communication (non-accommodation) (see also Ball, Giles, Byrne, & Berechree, 1984) may disturb the anticipated harmonious relationships. In contrast, however,

37

cultural sensitivity of American individuals and their abilities to realize the needs of the Japanese participants' in conversations should maintain harmony and establish a positive impact. In fact, the Japanese participants in the current study experienced appropriate communication accommodation from their most frequent American contact ($M = 5.46$), indicating that their intergroup communication experiences are positive and personal. When conversations flowed within expectations, Japanese people would develop satisfying communication experiences which may have induced more future interactions.

The current study indicated that intercultural communication has an impact on intergroup relations. In addition, the cognitive dimension of attitude was predicted significantly by relational solidarity. This finding revealed that perceived closeness, satisfaction, liking, trust, and commonality of the Japanese participants with particular American individuals contributed to general positive perceptions of Americans. For example, the Japanese participants who had close and satisfying relationships with Americans identified Americans as being more confident, good-natured, competent, intelligent, or tolerant. Considering the fact that establishing solid relationships with sojourners generally requires the host nationals to have patience due to language barriers and cultural differences (e.g., Gareis, 1995; Kudo & Simkin, 2003), it is very likely that American individuals who offered opportunities for the Japanese participants to develop intimate, satisfying, and trustworthy relationships were tolerant and good-natured. Thus, it might be inferred that the Japanese participants generalized traits of their most frequent American contact to Americans as a whole.

38

As discussed earlier, the two communication variables and perceived relational solidarity made distinctive contributions to the three dimensions of attitude. The majority of prior research has been devoted to exploring attitudes generally by combining all the dimensions of attitude or focusing only on the affective and cognitive dimensions. In particular, Tropp and Pettigrew's (2005a) study showed the importance of the inclusion of the affective and cognitive dimensions of attitude in intergroup contact. This study measured the three dimensions of intergroup attitude and has revealed that all the three dimensions of attitude are equally important as each one of them is related to a particular aspect of communication. For instance, social support, communication accommodation, and relational solidarity significantly predicted the affective, behavioral, and cognitive dimensions of attitude respectively, indicating the importance of including all three dimensions of attitude in intergroup contact research.

Previous research has demonstrated that typicality of an outgroup member and perceived group salience moderate the relationship between intergroup contact and contact outcomes. However, the current study did not support this proposition. Results indicated that the participants had a more positive cognitive attitude when they perceived their most frequent American contact as more typical of that cultural group. Goodness-of-fit of the individuals to the general attributes of the group in terms of appearance and behaviors activated the participants' positive perceptions of Americans in general. The correlation between typicality and the affective dimension of attitude also showed significant positive association (see Table 1). The correlation

39

analysis also indicated that the more typical the participants perceived their most frequent American contact was, the more positive feelings about Americans they had. However, the mean of typicality (M = 4.10) was not significantly higher than the mid point on the scale (i.e., 4), t = 1.3, p = .2, indicating that the Japanese participants in this study did not perceive their most frequent contact Americans as highly typical of that cultural group. Gudykunst, Gao, Sudweeks, Ting-Toomey, and Nishida (1991) found that perceptions of the typicality of an outgroup member depend on interpersonal relationships. They found that Japanese participants perceived acquaintances as typical Americans while they perceived friends and romantic partners as atypical Americans. Essentially, their findings explain the findings of the current study that the participants' relationship with their most frequent American contact was based primarily on friendship (61.4%) and thus they did not perceive the American individuals as typical members of that cultural group. When the participants' relationships with the Americans are interpersonal (e.g., friends), it is reasonable to assume that their interpersonal relationships induced more positive cognitive and affective attitudes toward Americans in general.

The nature of the participants' relationships (e.g., 61.4% friends) with their most frequent American contact also explains the results of group salience. Brewer and Miller (1988) explains that the frequent exposure to an outgroup member reduces the group boundaries when the relationships are interpersonal. In fact, means of relational solidarity (M = 5.53, SD = .83), communication accommodation (M = 5.46, SD = .94), and social support (M = 5.2, SD = 1.19) illustrate a stronger interpersonal

40

schema than intergroup perception of the Japanese participants. High average scores in relational solidarity, communication accommodation, and social support demonstrate that the Japanese participants categorized their relationships with the American individuals as interpersonal. Furthermore, a negative correlation between salience and relational solidarity (see Table 1) confirms that the more solid a relationship the Japanese participants had with their most frequent American contact, the less group salience they perceived.

Unlike other intergroup contact situations (e.g., European Americans versus African Americans) when both groups share the same language, the Japanese participants' comfort with using English became a significant factor that influenced intergroup relations. Specifically, perceived linguistic comfort was found to have significant associations with the cognitive and behavioral dimensions of attitude. The results indicated that the higher levels of comfort with English led to more positive perceptions of Americans in general and motivated Japanese people to engage in more activities and establish more in-depth relationships with Americans.

It is probably a natural phenomenon that Japanese participants with higher linguistic competence and comfort experience more pleasant interactions with Americans and are capable of carrying intellectual conversations. Kim (1991) argued that linguistic competence and comfort enable the non-native to engage in more varied and in-depth conversations with native speakers. On the same note, Kudo and Simkin's (2003) study of intercultural friendship formation found that competence and comfort with the English of Japanese students influence the quality of message

41

exchange with the host nationals. As a result, the Japanese participants' in-depth and varied conversations with the American individuals enabled them to establish solid interpersonal relationships, which may well have led to more positive cognitive evaluations of Americans in general. In fact, Kim (2002) identifies talking as a vital component in interpersonal communication and interpersonal relationship development across cultures. When interactants are challenged by linguistic ability to engage in communication, relationship development becomes more difficult, especially in American culture where verbal message exchange is highly valued (Kim, 2002).

Needless to say, perceived linguistic comfort of the Japanese participants may have reduced anxiety and uncertainty of future communication and thus created a higher inclination to engage in more conversations or develop relationships. Gareis' (1995) argues that communication competence, especially linguistic performance, is tied to interaction process and thus influences sociocultural adjustment. The Japanese participants' comfort with the English language appears to be a determinant for cultural adjustment and an influential factor of the future interactions with Americans.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

The major concern for this study was the sample size. The current study included 103 Japanese participants who have been attending a medium-sized mid-Western university in the United States. Although all the participants were Japanese, they were solicited from this institution because of the accessibility and because of geographical reasons. More responses could have been collected if sampled in Japan,

42

but the number of people who would be qualified in terms of direct contact with Americans would be limited. Japanese sojourners attending institutions in the United States were the best source for this study. Considering the number of variables examined in this study, however, a larger sample size would increase the statistical power.

Another constraint of this study was the potential deviation of the characteristics of the current sample from the traits of the majority of Japanese living in Japan. It is likely that those who come to study in the United States are willing to communicate with Americans and to establish relationships with Americans. By coming to a new culture, the Japanese participants chose to engage in intergroup communication and relationships. These intrinsic positive attitudes of the Japanese participants may have influenced their overall attitudes toward Americans. In order to measure the pure communication effects in intergroup contact hypothesis, it will be crucial to consider prior contact experiences and variability of contact of each participant in addition to the frequency of contact with a particular American individual. Future research should also consider longitudinal studies in which both attitude formation and attitude change can be investigated. The current study was not aiming to evaluate intergroup attitude change per se. This study rather focused on the current perceptions of the Japanese participants. It would be ideal to measure newcomers' attitudes and perceptions toward Americans and reevaluate them after a certain time interval. Supporting the possibilities of longitudinal design in intergroup contact research, Eller and Abrams (2004) claim that longitudinal research allows us

43

to examine the intergroup contact in the context of real-world and historical intergroup contexts.

Conclusion

Supporting and expanding the intergroup contact hypothesis, findings in the current study have confirmed the relationship among communication experiences, perceived relational solidarity with the most frequent intergroup contact, and positive attitude toward outgroup members. Highlighting the central function of communication as well as perceived relational solidarity in intergroup relations, the current study has revealed that the three communication elements (i.e., social support, communication accommodation, and linguistic competence) carry important roles in intergroup attitude. By focusing on the minority's perspectives, communication was found to have a considerable impact on intergroup relations. Furthermore, another major contribution of this study to the growing body of the intergroup contact literature includes focuses on the three dimensions of intergroup attitude. Each dimension of attitude was influenced by different communication variables, suggesting the importance of including the affective, cognitive, and behavioral dimensions of attitude for a broader understanding of the intergroup contact hypothesis. This study has opened up possibilities for other communicative elements to be involved in studying the relationship between intergroup contact and the three dimensions of attitude. In an age of globalization that promotes ethnic and cultural diversity there will be a growing need to understand intergroup communication and relations. As the world becomes more diverse, scholarly attention should be devoted

44

to promote appreciation of multiethnic/multicultural interactions. Gudykunst and

Nishida (1994) state that one of the reasons for humans to communicate is to change

another person's attitudes or behaviors and that inevitable activity of humans,

communication, may change our perceptions of the world.

References

Abrams, D., & Hogg, M. A. (2004). Collective identity: Group membership and self-conception. In M. B. Brewer & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Self and social identity* (pp. 147-181). Malden, MA: Blackwell.

Adams, R. G., & Blieszner, R. (1994). An integrative conceptual framework for friendship research. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 11,* 163-184.

Allport, G. W. (1954). *The nature of prejudice.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Ball, P., Giles, H., Byrne, J. L., & Berechree, P. (1984). Situational constraints in the evaluative significance of speech accommodation: Some Australian data. *International Journal of the Sociology of Language, 46,* 115-130.

Beebe, L. M., & Giles, H. (1984). Speech accommodation theories: A discussion in terms of second language acquisition. *International Journal of the Sociology and Language, 46,* 5-32.

Berger, C. R. (1986). Social cognition and intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication* (pp. 51-61). London: Edward Arnold.

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1996). *Intergroup relations.* Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole Publishing.

Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1988). Contact and cooperation; When do they work? In P. Katz and D. Taylor (Eds.), *Eliminating racism; Profiles in controversy,* pp. 315-326. New York: Academic Press.

Brislin, R. W. (1986). Prejudice and intergroup communication. In W. B. Gudykunst

    (Ed.), *Intergroup Communication* (pp. 74-85). London: Edward Arnold.

Brown, R. (1965). *Social psychology*. New York: The Free Press.

Burleson, B. R. (1990). Comforting as social support: Relational consequences of

    supportive behaviors. In S. Duck & R. C. Silver (Eds.), *Personal*

    relationships and social support (pp. 66-82). London: Sage.

Chen, Y., & King, B. E. (2002). Intra- and intergenerational communication

    satisfaction as a function of an individual's age and age stereotypes.

    International Journal of Behavioral Development, 26, 562-570.

Christian, S. E., & Lapinski, M. K. (2003). Support for the contact hypothesis: High

    school students' attitudes toward Muslims post 9-11. *Journal of*

    Intercultural Communication, 32, 247-263.

Cohen, S., & Wills, T. A. (1985). Stress, social support, and the buffering hypothesis.

    Psychological Bulletin, 98, 310-357.

Cooke, M. A. (1978). A pair of instruments for measuring student attitudes toward

    bearers of the target culture. *Foreign Language Annals, 11*, 149-163.

Crites, S. L., Fabrigar, L. R., & Petty, R. E. (1994). Measuring the affective and

    cognitive properties of attitudes: Conceptual and methodological issues.

    Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 20, 619-634.

Eller, A., & Abrams, D. (2004). Come together: Longitudinal comparisons of

    Pettigrew's reformulated intergroup contact model and the common

    intergroup identity model in Anglo-French and Mexican-American contexts.

    European Journal of Social Psychology, 34, 229-256.

Ensari, N., & Miller, N. (2002). The out-group must not be so bad after all: The

    effects of disclosure, typicality, and salience on intergroup bias. *Journal*

    of Personality and Social Psychology, 83, 313-329.

Gaertner, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (2000). *Reducing intergroup bias: The common*

    intergroup identity model. Philadelphia, PA: Psychology Press.

Gareis, E. (1995). *Intercultural friendship: A qualitative study.* Lanham; New York;

    London: University Press of America, Inc.

Giles, H., Coupland, N., & Coupland, J. (1991). Accommodation theory:

    Communication, contexts and consequence. In H. Giles, N. Coupland, & J.

    Coupland (Eds.), *Contexts of accommodation: Developments in applied*

    sociolinguistics (pp. 1-68). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Goldsmith, D. (1994). The role of facework in supportive communication. In B. R.

    Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of social*

    support: Messages, interaction, relationships, and community. London:

    Sage.

Greenland, K., & Brown, R. (1999). Categorization and intergroup anxiety in contact

    between British and Japanese nationals. *European Journal of Social*

    Psychology, 29, 503-512.

Gudykunst, W. B. (1979). Intercultural contact and attitude change: A review of literature and suggestions for future research. *International and Intercultural Communication Annual, 4,* 1-16.

Gudykunst, W. B., Gao, G., Sudweeks, S., Ting-Toomey, S., & Nishida, T. (1991). Themes in opposite sex, Japanese-North American relationships. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), *Cross-cultural interpersonal communication.* Newbury Park; London; New Delhi: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (2003). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (4th Ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1984). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication* (1st Ed.). New York: Random House.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1994). *Bridging Japanese/North American differences.* Thousand Oaks; London; New Delhi: Sage.

Hamilton, D. L. (1981). Stereotyping and intergroup behavior: Some thoughts on the cognitive approach. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior* (pp.333-353). Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Harwood, J. (2000). Communicative predictors of solidarity in the grandparent-grandchild relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 17,* 743-766..

49

Harwood, J., Giles, H., & Palomares, N. A. (2005). Intergroup theory and

    communication processes. In J. Harwood & H. Giles (Eds.), *Intergroup*

    communication: Multiple perspectives (pp. 1-17). New York: Peter Lang

    Publishing, Inc.

Harwood, J., Hewstone, M., Paolini, S., & Voci, A. (2005). Grandparent-grandchild

    contact and attitudes toward older adults: Moderator and mediator effects.

    Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 393-406.

Hecht, M. L. (1978). Measures of communication satisfaction. *Human*

    Communication Research, 4, 350-268.

Hecht, M. L., Larkey, L. K., & Johnson, J. N. (1992). African American and

    European American perceptions of problematic issues in interethnic

    communication effectiveness. *Human Communication Research, 19*, 209-

    236

Hendrick, S. S. (1988). A generic measure of relationship satisfaction. *Journal of*

    Marriage and the Family, 50, 93-98.

Hewstone, M., & Brown, R. (Eds.) (1986). *Contact and conflict in intergroup*

    encounters. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Hewstone, M., & Giles, H. (1986). Social groups and social stereotypes in intergroup

    communication: A review and model of intergroup communication

    breakdown. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication* (pp.10-

    26). London: Edward Arnold.

Hewstone, M., & Lord, C. G. (1998). Changing intergroup cognitions and intergroup cognitions and intergroup behavior: The role of typicality. . In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (pp. 367-392). Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Hornsey, M., & Gallois, C. (1998). The impact of interpersonal and intergroup communication accommodation on perceptions of Chinese students in Australia. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 17,* 323-345.

Hummert, M. L. (1999). A social cognitive perspective on age stereotypes. In T. M. Hess & F. Blanchard-Fields (Eds.), *Social cognition and aging.* San Diego: Academic Press.

Hummert, M. L. (1994). Stereotypes of the elderly and patronizing speech. In M. L. Hummert, J. M. Wiemann, & J. F. Nussbaum (Eds.), *Interpersonal communication in older adulthood.* London: Sage.

Hummert, M. L., Garstka, T. A., Ryan, E. B., & Bonnesen, J. L. (2004). The Role of Age Stereotypes in Interpersonal Communication. In J. F. Nassbaum & J. Coupland (eds.), *Handbook of communication and aging research* (2nd ed.) (pp. 91-114). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates Publishers.

Hummert, M. L., O'Brian, L. T., Greenwald, A. G.., & Mellott, D. S. (2002). Using the implicit association test to measure age differences in implicit social cognitions. *Psychology and Aging, 17,* 482-495.

51

Hummert, M. L., Shaner, J. L., Garstka, T. A., & Henry, C. (1998). Communication

   with older adults: The influence of age stereotypes, context, and

   communicator age. *Human Communication Research, 25*, 125-152.

Institute of International Education. (2006). Report on International Educational

   Exchange. Retrieved November 5, 2006, from

   http://opendoors.iienetwork.org/?p=69691

Katz, D., & Stotland, E. (1959). A preliminary statement to a theory of attitude

   structure and change. In S. Koch (Ed.), *Psychology: A study of a science.*

   New York: McGraw-Hill.

Kim, Y. Y. (1991). Intercultural communication competence: A systems-theoretic

   views. In S. Ting-Toomey & F. Korzenny (Eds.), *Cross-cultural*

   interpersonal communication. Newbury Park; London; New Delhi: Sage.

Kim, M. S. (2002). *Non-western perspectives on human communication.* Thousand

   Oaks; London; New Delhi: Sage.

Kudo, K. & Simkin, K. A. (2003). Intercultural friendship formation: The case of

   Japanese students at an Australian university. *Journal of Intercultural*

   Studies, 24, 91-114.

Levin, S., van Laar, C., & Sidanius, J. (2003). The effects of intergroup and outgroup

   friendships on ethnic attitudes in college: A longitudinal study. *Group*

   Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6, 76-92.

Lukens, J. (1978). Ethnocentric speech. *Ethnic Groups, 2*, 35-53.

Miller, N. (2002). Personalization and the promise of contact theory. *Journal of Social Issues, 58*, 387-410.

Ostrom, T. M., Skowronski, J. J., & Nowak, A. (1994). The cognitive foundation of attitudes: It's a wonderful construct. In P. G. Devine, D. L. Hamilton, & T. M. Ostrom (Eds.), *Social cognition: Impact on social psychology* (pp. 195-258). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*, 65-85.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1997). Generalized intergroup contact effects on prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 23*, 173-186.

Pettigrew, T. F. (1986). The intergroup contact hypothesis reconsidered. In M. Hewstone & R. Brown (Eds.), *Contact and conflict in intergroup encounters* (pp.169-195). Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Pierce, G. R., Sarason, I. G., & Sarason, B. R. (1991). General and relationship-based perceptions of social support: Are two constructs better than one? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 61*, 1028-1039.

Rogler, I. E., Cortes, R. S., & Malgadi, R. G. (1991). Accuturation and mental health status among Hispanics. *American Psychologist, 46*, 585-597.

Rose, T. L. (1981). Cognitive and dyadic processes in intergroup contact. In D. L. Hamilton (Ed.), *Cognitive processes in stereotyping and intergroup behavior*. Hillsdale, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Rothbart, M., & John, O. P. (1985). Social categorization and behavioral episodes: a

    cognitive analysis of the effects of intergroup contact. *Journal of Social*

    Issues, 41, 81-104.

Salem, D. A., Bogat, G. A., & Reid, C. (1997). Mutual help goes on-line. *Journal of*

    Community Psychology, 25, 189-207

Sarason, I. G., Sarason, B. R., & Pierce, G. R. (1994). Relationship-specific social

    support: Toward a model for the analysis of supportive interactions. . In B.

    R. Burleson, T. L. Albrecht, & I. G. Sarason (Eds.), *Communication of*

    social support (pp. 91-112). London: Sage.

Schaller, M., Rosell, M. C., & Asp, C. H. (1998). Parsimony and pluralism in

    psychological study of intergroup processes. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, &

    C. A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (pp. 3-26).

    Mahwah, New Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Schwartz, S. H. (1990). Individualism-collectivism: Critique and proposed

    refinements. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 21*, 139-157.

Soliz, J., & Harwood, J. (2006). Shared family identity, age salience, and intergroup

    contact: Investigation of the grandparent-grandchild relationship.

    Communication Monographs, 73, 87-107.

Soliz, J., & Harwood, J. (2003).Perceptions of communication in a family

    relationship and the reduction of intergroup prejudice. *Journal of Applied*

    Communication Research, 31, 320-345.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1986). Interpersonal ties in intergroup communication. In W. B.

    Gudykunst (Ed.), *Intergroup communication*. London: Edward Arnold.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs. Individualism: A reconceptualization of a

    basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In G. Verma & C. Bagley

    (Eds.), *Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes, and cognition* (pp.

    60-95). London: Macmillan.

Tropp, L. R. (2003). The psychological impact of prejudice: Implications for

    intergroup contact. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 6*, 131-149.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005a). Differential relationships between

    intergroup contact and affective and cognitive dimensions of prejudice.

    Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 31, 1145-1158.

Tropp, L. R., & Pettigrew, T. F. (2005b). Relationships between intergroup contact

    and prejudice among minority and majority status groups. *Psychological

    Science, 16*, 951-957.

Turner, J. C., Hogg, M. A., Oakes, P. J., Reicher, S. D., & Wetcherell, M. S. (1987).

    Rediscovering the social group: A self-categorization theory. Oxford,

    England; Blackwell.

Wheelee, L. R. (1978). A follow-up study of the relationships among trust, disclosure,

    and interpersonal solidarity. *Human Communication Research, 4*, 143-157.

Wilder, D. (1984). Intergroup contact: The typical member and the exception to the

    rule. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 20*, 177-194.

Wilder, D., & Simon, A. F. (1998). Categorical and dynamic groups: Implications for

    social perception and intergroup behavior. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C.

    A. Insko (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and intergroup behavior* (pp. 27-44),

    London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wilder, D. A., Simon, A. F., & Faith, M. (1996). Enhancing the impact of

    counterstereotypic information: Dispositional attributions for deviance.

    Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 71, 276-287.

Williams, A., & Giles, H. (1996). Intergenerational conversations: Young adults'

    retrospective accounts. *Human Communication Research, 23*, 220-250.

Wittenbrink, B., Park, B., & Judd, C. M. (1998). The role of stereotypic knowledge in

    the construal of person models. In C. Sedikides, J. Schopler, & C. A. Insko

    (Eds.), *Intergroup cognition and Intergroup behavior*. Mahwah, New

    Jersey; London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wolsko, C., Park, B., Judd, C. M., & Bachelor, J. (2003). Intergroup contact: Ethnics

    on group evaluations and perceived variability. *Group Processes and

    Intergroup Relations, 6*, 93-110.

Ye, J. (2006). An examination of acculturative stress, interpersonal social support,

    and use of online ethnic social groups among Chinese international students.

    Howard Journal of Communication, 17, 1-20.

Zanna, M. P., & Rampel, J. K. (1988). Attitudes: A new look at an old concept. In D.

    Bar-Tal & A. W. Kruglanski (Eds.), *The social psychology of knowledge*

    (pp. 315-334). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Demographics and English Proficiency of Japanese Participants

[**Instructions**: Please answer the following questions by checking applicable boxes and/or by filling in the blanks.]

Your Sex
[ ] 1. Female
[ ] 2. Male

Your Age
_____ **years old** (2 digits, e.g., 21)

How long have you been here at KU?
_____ **years**
(2 digits, e.g., 02 for 2 years)
_____ **months**

Is this your first visit to the U.S.?
[ ] 1. Yes
[ ] 2. No

If No, please explain your previous visit(s) in terms of when, length of each stay, and purpose(s) of your visit(s).

_____

_____

_____

How long have you studied English?

_____ **years**
(2 digits, e.g., 02 for 2 years)

How comfortable are you in speaking English?

Not comfortable   Extremely
at all   comfortable

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How comfortable are you in understanding spoken English?

Not comfortable   Extremely
at all   comfortable

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How comfortable are you in reading English?

Not comfortable   Extremely
at all   comfortable

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

How comfortable are you in writing English?

Not comfortable   Extremely
at all   comfortable

1	2	3	4	5	6	7

57

Basic Information about the American Individual

[**Instructions:** For the following questions, please consider **one American individual** you have had **the most frequent contact with in your daily life.**]

This American person is
[ ] 1. Female   [ ] 2. Male

What is this person's ethnic background?
[ ] 1. European American
[ ] 2. African American
[ ] 3. Asian American
[ ] 4. Latino American
[ ] 5. Other

How long have you known this person?

_____ years _____ months

Is this American a native English speaker?
[ ] 1. Yes   [ ] 2. No

Please briefly describe how you met this person.

How old is this American person?

_____

Does this American person speak Japanese?
[ ]Yes   [ ]No

Please indicated how much communication with this person in general is in English and/or in other language(s)?

1. English: _____ % (e.g., 100%)
2. Other language(s):
   Please specify _____ (e.g., Chinese)

What is your relationship to this person?
This person is my
[ ]1. Friend   [ ]2. Classmate
[ ]3. Spouse   [ ]4. Romantic Partner
[ ]5. Teacher   [ ]6. Student
[ ]7. Host Family Member
[ ]8. Other: Please specify_____

<For the next sets of questions and statements, consider **the same American individual** as you reported above.>

Frequency of Contact

[**Instructions:** Please answer the following questions by circling corresponding numbers (1 =Strongly Disagree, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = Strongly Agree).]

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
I interact with this person much more than with most people I know (including my own fellow citizens).	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I communicate with this person daily in general.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I spend leisure time with this person daily.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I do non-leisure activities with this person daily.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Relational Solidarity

[**Instructions:** Consider your relationship and communication in general with this person. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a corresponding number (1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = Strongly Agree).]

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
We are not very close at all.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I distrust this person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I dislike this person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
I have little in common with this person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
In general, I am very satisfied with the way this person behaves.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
In general, I am very satisfied with my relationship with this person.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[**Instructions:** Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each of the following statements by circling a corresponding number (1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = Strongly Agree).]

"When I have faced a problem, "

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
This person showed me that he/she accepts me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person was there when I needed him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person comforted me when I was feeling bad.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person took care of many things for me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person made me feel valued and important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person expressed concern about my situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person assured me that I can rely completely on him/her.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person helped me find something positive in my situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person encouraged me not to give up.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person took care of things I could not manage on my own.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

[**Instructions:** Consider your conversations with this person in general. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a corresponding number (1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = Strongly Agree).]

	Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
This person stereotypes me as a foreigner who cannot speak English well.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person gives me unwanted advice.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is impolite and rude.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is controlling.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is overly direct.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is self-centered in conversation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person shows prejudice against me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is a good listener.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is loud.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is overly expressive.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person frequently uses exaggerating tones.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person is condescending in conversations with me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
His/her remarks in conversations with me are appropriate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person interrupts me in conversations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
This person respects me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Typicality

[**Instructions:** Please answer each of the following questions by circling a corresponding number (1 = Not At All, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = A Great Deal).]

	Not at all					A great deal
How similar is this person to other American individuals?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To what extent is this person typical of Americans?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Is this person representative of American individuals in general?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
To what extent is this person like other Americans?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Salience

[**Instructions:** Please answer each of the following questions by circling a corresponding number (1 = Not At All, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = A Great Deal).]

	Not at all					A great deal
In general, how aware are you of cultural differences between yourself and this person?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
How much do you think about this person's culture when you communicate with him/her?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
How much does culture matter when you communicate with this person?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

*<For the next sets, please consider **Americans in general**.>*

The Behavioral Dimension of Attitude

[Instructions: If given the opportunity, which does not conflict with any ethical or legal concerns, to engage in the following behaviors, please indicate the extent to which you will engage in such behaviors. Please indicate your willingness to do so by circling a corresponding number (1 = Strongly Disagree, 4 = Moderate, and 7 = Strongly Agree).]

	Not at all willing						Extremely willing
Accept Americans as citizens of my country.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Have a number of American families move into my neighborhood.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Develop more than just speaking acquaintances with Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Accept Americans as a neighbor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Accept Americans as my close friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Choose to marry Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Work directly with Americans in the same office.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
Enjoy interacting with most Americans.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

63

The Cognitive Dimension of Attitude

[**Instructions:** Please make a mark on the scale below indicating how you feel about Americans in general.]

"In general, Americans are..."

Warm	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Cold
Tolerant	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Intolerant
Good-natured	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not good-natured
Sincere	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Insincere
Competent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Incompetent
Confident	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Not confident
Independent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Dependent
Competitive	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Non competitive
Intelligent	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	Stupid

The Affective Dimension of Attitude

[Instructions: Please mark on the scale below indicating how you feel about Americans in general. If you mark somewhere between 1°and 49°, that indicates you feel cold, or unfavorable, towards Americans, marking 50°means that you feel neutral and marking between 51°and 99°means that you feel warm, or favorable, towards Americans.]

```
99  Warm, or favorable

90

80

70

60

50  Neutral

40

30

20

10

 0  Cold, or unfavorable
```

65