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ABSTRACT

The affective components of cross-cultural attitude by Japanese and Americans toward people from similar/dissimilar cultures, and those within different generations were examined and compared by survey analysis. Americans were found to have more favorable cross-cultural attitudes compared to those of Japanese, while there was no significant difference found in cross-cultural attitudes between generations. Cultural similarity/dissimilarity was found to have no impact on cross-cultural attitude as a single factor. However, interactions between generation and nationality, nationality and cultural similarity/dissimilarity on cross-cultural attitude were found. The older Americans have the most favorable attitudes toward people from similar cultures, and cross-cultural attitude by older Japanese toward similar cultures were found to be the least favorable. Limitations of the study are discussed. Attitude was treated as a dependent variable, while nationality, generation, and cultural distance were treated as independent variables.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Statement of the problem

With dramatic globalization, we are not only accessible to information all around the world which is essential and highly valued in our life, but we are also accessible to people from different countries with various cultural backgrounds at the same time on which little emphasis is placed. However, in this interdependent day, more emphasis should be placed on effective intercultural communication by uncovering thereby reinforcing the weakness that people tend to fall into in intercultural communication in order to achieve effective communication with people of various cultural backgrounds.

Numbers of studies have been done on intercultural communication and cultural similarity/dissimilarity. Some studies revealed that the fundamental process and variable of the intercultural communication is the same as intra-cultural communication (Gudykunst & Kim, 1995). Saubaugh (1979) also discussed that there appears to be temptation among scholars and practitioners of communication to approach intercultural communication as though it were a different process than intra-cultural communication. As one begins to identify the variables that operate in the communication being studied, however, it becomes apparent that they are the same for both intra-cultural and intercultural settings. (p.5)

Even if fundamental processes and variables are the same in both intra-cultural communication and intercultural communication, however, those variables that function as operating in the communication are argued they can be similar or different across cultures (Gudykunst & Kim, 1995). Furthermore, according to Kim (1986), intercultural communication involves multidisciplinary variables. To be more specific,
multidisciplinary variables includes what Gudykunst and Mastumoto (1996) called "dimensions of cultural variability" (p.19), which include 1). historical/geographical background, 2). cultural variables (e.g., individualism/collectivism), and 3). communication styles (e.g., high-context/low-context communication). There are also many factors that have influence on communication such as communication in the initial stage, uncertainty people experience in communication, an uncertainty reduction strategy (including self-disclosure, prediction, generalization, categorization, and stereotypes), cultural similarity/dissimilarity, and uncertainty avoidance (Gudykunst, 1994).

Hence, intercultural communication calls for attention on those variables that affect interpersonal communication in intercultural settings. Moreover, there is an ample scope for the existence of the impact of cultural similarity and dissimilarity in those variables stated above in intercultural communication.

Having said that point, people's attitude, how they feel, behave, or react toward communicators will also be affected by the variables in intercultural communication. From that point of view, it is fair to suppose which is the previously discussed researchers' idea that the fundamental communication process same in both intercultural and intracultural is not applicable to intercultural communication where interactions among people with diverse cultural background takes place, in which people do not share the same culture, view, values, and so forth (Okabe, 1983).

Several studies have done on attitude toward intercultural communication defined as so "cross-cultural attitude" (Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977, p.416) are from a sojourners perspective, leaving open the question for the case of a more general non-sojourners' intercultural encounter, which conditions are different from that of sojourners.

In addition, through reviewing the literature, few studies are found on
intercultural communication that especially highlight generational perspectives such as difference in cross-cultural attitude between generation or generational impact on intercultural communication and cross-cultural attitude, which entailed some research from this angle.

Therefore, present study explored the following points to have better insight on communication between people from similar and dissimilar cultures; 1). to examine cross-cultural attitude between culturally similar/dissimilar people, 2). to examine affective components of cross-cultural attitude between nations (Japanese and Americans), 3). to examine 1). and 2). between two generations.

Ultimately, the nature of cross-cultural attitude of Japanese and American people in different generation was revealed throughout the study.

Because of the remarkable interdependence among countries as a result of internationalization, communication with people from different cultures where cultural dissimilarity takes place regardless of the degree is essential and holds the key to building and maintaining intercultural relationships. Thus, the ability to communicate openly with people from other cultures in order to develop and manage relationships in intercultural encounter is significant in leading a true globalization. This study will be very meaningful if it could give any keys or guidelines for understanding and developing intercultural communication.

**Purpose of the study**

The purpose of the study was to examine the intercultural communication between people from similar and dissimilar cultures in two different generations. These were the following purposes of this study;

1). To examine the affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Japanese toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures within intercultural interaction.
2). To examine the affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures within intercultural interaction.

3). To examine the main differences in affective components of cross-cultural attitudes between Japanese and Americans toward people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures within intercultural interaction.

4). To examine generational differences in affective components of cross-cultural attitudes between Japanese and Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures within intercultural interaction.

The present study which explored cross-cultural attitudes was undertaken by examining the affective component of cross-cultural attitude. It will be significant because this study may contribute some focus and guidelines for people to better understand, help improve their communication skills within intercultural encounters by acknowledging their traits of intercultural communication and its nature.

With fairly contrasting cultural settings, Hawaii and Tokyo gave interest to this study: one exposed to great diversity and the other much less.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The situation and need of skills for intercultural communication in Japan

Many studies related to intercultural communication of Japanese people was found in literature which covered such as topics as stereotypes, concept of public and private self, communication style, uncertainty and uncertainty reduction, interpersonal and inter-group communication, social penetration, self-disclosure, and so forth. However, slight attention is paid to intercultural communication ability based on the finding from these previous studies in the present situation in Japan. The situation and need of intercultural communication skills in Japan should be noted here.

Okabe (1983) uses a term “unusual homogeneity” (p.23) to describe the nature of Japanese society. In addition to the homogeneity, what can often be observed in Japan is the nature of exclusiveness by people to whom they do not share the same culture, sameness, cultural norms, or in other words, people who deviate from the main cultural stream just as the old saying “the nail that sticks out gets banged down” indicates. However, as the world becomes dramatically globalized, Japan which is originally a homogeneous country, has to begin face the need of effective inter-group and intercultural communication. Yet, what frequently becomes the case is a lack of awareness and competence in intercultural communication skills due to the nature of the original homogeneity of Japan that is deeply rooted. There are still many Japanese that are still unfamiliar with how to interact with people from outside their culture and little attention is paid to it. What happens as a result is people from outside Japan are labeled together as an gaijin (literally “outsider”) and treated as outsider (Okabe). This discourages the exchange of mutual information and understanding between Japanese people and people from outside Japan (Okabe).
tendency frequently observed and still remains the same. Henceforth, more close attention and study is needed in order to help Japanese develop skills necessary for more effective intercultural communication skills.

**Attitude theory**

In this section, literature on attitude (including attitude toward intercultural communication), components of attitude, and function of attitude will be reviewed.

Brislin (1981) notes within when one’s attitude, traits, and skills are developed they largely affect one’s satisfaction in intercultural interaction. To elaborate more on it, it can be stated that the quality of the intercultural interaction are greatly dependent upon the attitude one has about the people or the group the communicator belongs to. Therefore, acknowledging “cross-cultural attitude” (Gudykunst, Wiseman, and Hammer, 1977, p.416) by studying it will be vital in determining effective intercultural communication.

Studies on attitude done by several researchers, defined attitude as “People’s reaction toward a concept or, in everyday language, their feelings, beliefs, and readiness to act. The concept can be a person, group, event, object, or abstraction” (Brislin, 1981). Allport (1935) made a more thorough definition on attitude which consists of at least the following five aspects: “(1) it is a mental and neural state (2) of readiness to respond, (3) organized (4) thorough experience (5) exerting a directive and/or dynamic influence on behavior” (Allport as cited in McGuire, 1969, p. 142).

McGuire (1969) categorizes the possible functions of attitude performed as the followings:

(1) Utilitarian (adaptive) functions

This is a “cognitive” or “ego-psychological” (McGuire, p. 158) approach which gives the notion that attitude leads us to instrumental objects and means for
attaining one’s valued goals. For instance, one forms attitude by adapting it so s/he can maintain a satisfactory relationship with people who have significant influence or power such as fellows, or authority in a group. Borrowing Allport’s story (1954, 1979) as an example, a little girl of age six tries hard into her daily social contact with certain racial groups in order to receive affection and approval from mother. Brislin’s discussion (1981) can also fall into this function of the attitude: people may not behave friendly even if one may have positive feelings toward an out-group people partly because of a lack of knowledge on how to interact with people from an out-group but may also be due to the pressures from the in-group members to maintain social distance. Adorno, Else, Levinson, and Stanford (1950, 1969) and Allport (1954, 1979) also explain people acquire or adapt hostile attitude toward a specific person or group of people because it promotes their acceptance by the social environment even though they do not have anything personal against them.

The extreme case of this attitude in social level would be such historical prejudice as apartheid or Jewish Holocaust.

(2) Economy (knowledge) function

This function of attitude works as information processing which simplifies the information, giving a guideline of appropriate behavior toward the attitude objects and feeling of capability to manage present and future experience. We tend to simplify information by categorizing the information about objects and generalizing them, which is stereotypical and assumpitious. This is ideally an empirical wisdom based on what is directly observed by the person and has been communicated to him/her by other people as it makes up our attitudinal world.

(3) Expressive (self-realizing) function

This function of attitude involves an emotional fulfillment that is worthwhile in allowing opportunity for expressing inner tensions, hence, relieving tensions with
little efforts and risks. An expressive function of attitude involves self-realization as well: a person self-realizes by self-asserting. Therefore, attitude function as a means of self-realization. Festinger (1964) discussed that attitude is formed to justify one’s behavior. McGuire also notes people support their behavior and choice they have chosen as a means of avoiding regrets/self-reproaching their decisions they have made. Accordingly, people bolster when confronting psychological struggle as a technique. A person who made a decision that is not to one’s satisfaction or one that is hard to accept is likely to have bolstering attitude on his/her choice.

This attitude can be changed when one is enforced to change and adapt new norms of attitudes and modified by new one.

(4) The ego-defensive function

McGuire concludes in most cases, we possess attitude to deal with internal conflict that one has more than toward the object to which the attitude is directed. He goes on to elaborate this point using the “reaction-formation mechanism” (McGuire, 1969, p. 160) of idealizing the authority: people hold attitude as an ego-defensive function when they have inner conflict creating complex hostility toward the authority by repressing his/her unacceptable hostility toward the authority and idealize them as a defensive mechanism, which is attended by downgrading out-groups.

This attitude can be changed by providing favorable information or experiences on the attitude object.

Finally, he concludes that these four attitude as one’s attitude may work for one function or can have multiple functions, while others serve other functions. One function can eventually be turned into another function: such as ethnic hostility developed as an ego-defensive function, which can be sustained by supportive attitude and becomes a favorable notion the present self-assert on and gives meaning to his/her world.
Cross-cultural attitude

According to researchers, attitude is analyzed from three aspects: cognitive, affective, and conative (McGuire, 1969; Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977; Brislin, 1981). Gudykunst et al. refer to this approach on attitude as “cross-cultural attitude” (p.416) when it is employed in intercultural settings.

These three components of attitude, cognitive, affective, and conative components defined by researchers are the following:

Cognitive component:

This component is also called stereotypic component that is the stereotype individuals have about the attitude object. It is how individuals perceive object (McGuire, Gudykunst et al.). Gudykunst et al. note that stereotypes will affect the kind of interaction that is used in communication with the interactant. As referring to the stereotype as one of the component of the attitude, literature on stereotype should be reviewed here.

Stereotype is the categorization that works “to reduce high complex bits of information into manageable proportions” (Gudykunst & Kim, 1984, p. 27), and help reduce discomfort and stress since it works as a means of organizing issues (Brislin, 1981). A stereotype is based on information about people that is collected based on cultural and sociocultural data. Stereotype is defined as;

certain generalizations reached by individuals. They derive in large measure from, or are in instance of, the general cognitive process of categorizing. The main function of the process is to simplify or systematize, for purposes of cognitive and behavioral adaptation, the abundance and complexity of the information received from its environment by the human organism (Tajfel; as cited in Gudykunst,
Stereotype as well as categorization helps reduce uncertainty people have because it tallies typical ways of communication with the group members (Krauss and Fussell’s study; as cited in Gudykunst, 1994), and it also relates how members of other groups are like and will behave, which are the generalizations shared with in-group members (Gudykunst, 1994).

According to Vassilious, Triandis, Vassilious, and McGuire (1972), there are two types of stereotypes that people form; normative and non-normative stereotypes. The former is the stereotype made by in-group people about out-group people that is based on prior contact, information gained from such as education, the mass media, or historical events. The latter is formed when they have favorable impression about out-group people and yet do not have normative stereotypes about people of out-groups, which nature is projective.

However, a stereotype can be overgeneralized, oversimplified, or overexaggerated beliefs related to a category or groups of people that can be false (Samovar, Porter, & Jain, 1981). In addition to that point, Gudykunst (1994) points out “The stereotypes we hold have a direct impact on our communication with strangers. Our initial predictions about strangers’ behavior must, out of necessity, be based on the stereotypes we have about the strangers’ culture, race, or ethnic group” (p. 87). Stereotypes are turned on automatically when we encounter strangers regardless of the accuracy of the predictions and explanations we have about others’ behavior (Devine, 1989). In such situations, we may be highly confident of our predictions and explanations (Gudykunst, 1994).

Moreover, we are not able to collect accurate information about others when anxiety we have by interacting with others is either too high or too low. Therefore, we need to be able to manage anxiety so we can gain accurate prediction and explanation.
about strangers by accurate personal information as well as being able to be generous enough to get data from cultural, social, and personal perspectives.

Affective component:

This component of the attitude is referred to as “feeling component” or “emotional component” (McGuire, 1969, p. 155; Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977, p. 415) as it has to do with one’s feeling of liking or disliking about the attitude object. In addition, this component primarily deals with intensity of attitude (McGuire). According to Suchman (1950), intensity can be measured by what he calls “intensity function” (p. 215) which is based on a concept that is scalable, where individuals are placed in a varying degree from high to low in intensity of feeling with which people at different positions on the scale hold their attitudes and opinions.

As Gudykunst et al. uncover, this component is the psychological aspect of the attitude that is used to evaluate people and general intercultural interaction when it is applied to intercultural encounters. This component is also revealed to be the focal component of attitude while the other components are the peripheral ones. Because it is the central component of the attitude, it is hypothesized by Gudykunst et al. in the study of sojourners’ attitudinal satisfaction that it will affect the other two components, facilitate interactions with host nationals, and develop satisfaction living in another culture.

Conative components:

This component is called as “action component” or “behavioral component” (McGuire, p. 156; Gudykunst et al., p. 416), which is the one’s overall behavioral tendency toward the object.

Bogardus (1925) refers to conative component as “social distance” (Bogardus, 1925, p.299). Social distance is the distinction between in-group and the reference group (Allport, 1954, 1979), therefore, social distance is how close or
distant one perceives the person or people of the out-group. Thus, Bodardus considers the social distance as a measurement of understanding and feeling that exist in social situation varying in degree and grade. In fact, his social distance scale is often suggested as a measurement of the conative component of the attitude.

Therefore, Gudykunst et al. discuss in their study of sojourners’ satisfaction, and how conative components of cross-cultural attitude will affect the type and the amount of the intercultural interaction.

Those three components of the cross-cultural attitude discussed above are proven to be greatly correspondent to each other (Kahn, 1951; McGuire, 1969), meaning these three attitude components are highly likely to be consistent. For instance, if one has a negative attitude in cognitive component toward people of the certain race which is the stereotypes that s/he has, his/her affective and conative components of attitude will also fall into a negative attitude, namely s/he will tend to dislike the particular group of people of the race, and more distance s/he will perceive toward the people of the race.

*Attitude and generation*

In the present study, cross-cultural attitude in different generations will be studied. However, literature on either the impact of generation on cross-cultural attitude or attitudinal difference in the cross-cultural attitude between generations was very scarce. Therefore, the literature review on this section will be covered by limited but relevant and possible factors that have impact on cross-cultural attitude in generations.

Many studies on children’s acquisition of racial attitude that have a lot to do with cross-cultural attitude were found (Cantor, 1972; Aboud & Doyle; 1996; Katz,
1976; Allport, 1954, 1979), however, as is said the study of racial attitude is 
"complex", "multifaceted," and "multiply determined" (Katz, p. 145), it seems not 
easy to determine clear conclusion on acquisition of racial attitude on children.

Allport discusses that at age of five, children are able to comprehend one's 
membership in various groups, and identify ethnic identity. He goes on to point out 
the first six years of life are important for developing social attitude. Katz argues the 
early learned affective component which is the central component of attitude referred 
to as "emotional" or "feeling" component (McGuire, p. 155; Gudykunst et al., p. 416) 
may greatly fall within the mechanisms of reinforcement: friends’ or adults’ negative 
racial attitude or prejudice will consequently transmit to children. Allport also states 
that children who inherit attitude and stereotypes from family or their cultural 
environment also adapt to prejudice as well. However, findings of Aboud and Doyle 
and Katz show little support for this view.

Another possible approach to the generational difference in cross-cultural 
attitude is familiarity of other races. Cantor's study (1972) suggests familiarity with 
other races may have a positive effect on the attitude of children. Because people from 
other cultural and ethnic groups are likely to behave in deviant ways, and deviant 
from norms or expectation compared to people from same culture which they are 
familiar (Pysczynki & Greenberg; as cited in Simmel, 1982). Allport (1954) suggests 
terracial contact in early age decreases strangeness and negative attitude toward 
terracial interaction. As Miller and Steinberg (1975) also discuss, people make 
predictions when they interact with strangers in order to reduce uncertainty and to 
have possible alternatives especially within intercultural encounters where they do not 
have any or enough information about them. They reveal that accuracy in the 
predictions will be improved as cultural experience increases. Hence, cultural 
information can only be learned by actual experience of the other cultures in order to
achieve accurate predictions. For example, having been exposed to a culture enough, you will be able to predict appropriate greeting patterns when you meet people, what they will most likely say as a greeting, and how you can respond. Therefore, the more cultural experience one has, the less uncertainty one has.

Therefore, it can be assumed people in younger generations have less uncertainty and more positive outlook about interacting with people from other races as it has been dramatically internationalized and intercultural communication has become widespread compared to decades ago.

Finally, McGuire (1969) suggest that physiological factors such as aging and maturation has impact on one’s attitude: systematic change occurs in dominance, aggressiveness, competitiveness, conformity, independence, and other general attitude tendencies, which may affect cross-cultural attitude. However, further evidence on effect of maturation on cross-cultural attitude was not found. Therefore, this approach will be hard to apply to cross-cultural attitude and generation.

In the following section, 1). Dimensions of cultural variability, and 2). Factors affecting interpersonal communication in intercultural settings that may have great impact on cross-cultural attitude will be discussed.

*Dimensions of cultural variability*

Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996) refer to variables that can be different or similar among cultures that may applied to explain communication across cultures as "dimension of cultural variability" (p.19).

These variables include 1). historical and geographical backgrounds, and cultural variables (e.g., individualism/collectivism), and 2). communication styles (e.g., high-context/low-context communication) that explain and predict similarities
and dissimilarities in communication between Japan and America systematically (Gudykunst and Matsumoto, 1996). These variables will to be illustrated in this section by explaining characteristics and tendencies of Japanese and American cultures.

1). Historical, geographical differences and cultural variables of Japan and America

As some researchers mention, history and location of the country greatly impact the cultural evolution and communication style, its process of the country because a unique set of culture is generated attributes to those factors (Samovar, Porter, and Jain, 1981).

Because of Geographical isolation, Japan used to be an island country with had little contact from people of other races until its' opening of its land to the world in 1853. Japanese have never been a nomadic tribe, meaning that it has been very common for people to live in one their entire lives. Thus, it was quite natural for them to lead such a lifestyle as is stated by Okabe (1983) that humanity and nature are tended to be seen and treated as being in complete harmony and eternally inseparable. They subtly internalize the wisdom of contriving comfortable living conditions by adapting themselves to natural environs. As a result, their lives were closely based on their community, connection and peaceful relationship within those groups such as family, neighborhood, school, work place, and so forth. These groups are greatly valued within Japanese society, therefore, becoming entirely affected by emphasis of the group (Okabe, 1983). Thus, communication within the groups are seen as having greater significance than communication with people from outside groups because it is fundamental function of communication to establish and maintain harmony in the groups (Okabe). Accordingly, individuals are expected to fit into the group to maintain harmony instead of standing out (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1981). The
hierarchical relationship such as parent-child, teacher-student, boss-employee, and so on are emphasized. Hence, Japanese society is a vertical society (Okabe). School classes in Japan can be a good example for illustrating group-oriented vertical society: teachers are the knowledgeable source of information who play the role of sending information, while students receive the information. Students are expected to respect teachers and listen carefully to what teachers discuss in order to get the information. Therefore, information and communication is mostly on an one-way flow, not interactive. Also, it is common that students do not ask questions or speak up to express their ideas actively within class as s/he may stand out by doing so. Teachers call on students to ask or answer questions, or give their own ideas instead. And students feel more comfortable asking questions as individuals after the class if they have any.

According to Okabe (1983), the exclusiveness of the principle for homogeneity and verticality in Japanese society may be attributed to its conditions of nature, geographical isolation, and its moderate climate. He describes Japan as “The Japanese have escaped invasions from the outside as well as large-scale famines,” (p. 23) resulting in its culture to be drawing inward (Okabe).

On the other hand, America consists of people from various ethnic backgrounds, mainly a heterogeneous country. It was first settled by Pilgrims and other groups about 400 years ago in order to avoid persecution and started life afresh on New Continent in search of a free life (Samovar, Porter, & Jain, 1981). In order to survive in the environs in unsettled land, emphasis was placed on accomplishment and independence of individuals’ from the very beginning of the development of North American culture (Samovar, et al.). Individuals are expected to stand out from other members in society (Samovar, et al.). Emphasis is placed on the individual person and what others think or say is of little significance (Okabe, 1983). After the
settlement of Pilgrims, America began receiving immigrants from various countries all over the world thus coining the term “salad bowl”. Samovar, et al. discuss that based on this history of America, American culture and society has been forming its unique culture of freedom, tolerance, which is obliged to individuals’ great diversity and diversity in lifestyles, where relationships among people are based on egalitarianism and horizontal (Okabe). Again, the relationship between teacher and student reflects the nature of what they value in American society: there is less distance between teachers and students, and teachers expect students to speak out and contribute themselves actively to the class. Therefore, class takes on an interactive style, where individuals’ free representation of thoughts and ideas are widely allowed, moreover, expected.

Accordingly, Japan is a collectivistic culture which emphasizes upon the group, and therefore, is an interdependent culture, America is an individualistic culture which emphasizes on the individuals’ strength, and therefore, is a dependent culture. Tendencies for individual behaviors are attributed to cultural tendencies as Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996). They discuss that cultural individualism and collectivism have direct influence on personal behavior.

2). Nature of Japanese and American Communication Style

Individualism and collectivism have a lot to do with low-context and high-context cultures Gudykunst (1996) discusses forms of communication in individualistic and collectivistic cultures are dominated by low-context and high-context communication. Low-context communication and high-context communication are the fundamental differences of the communication process.

According to Hall (1976), high-context communication is defined as “most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person, while
very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message” (p. 79), and involves indirect, implicit, ambiguous ways of words usage and speaking by giving the least amount of information and letting the listeners infer the intentions of the speaker. The greater the cultural homogeneity is, the greater amount of meaning is contained and can be inferred in a single word (Barnlund, 1975). As is stated earlier, Japan is an “unusual homogeneous” society (Okabe, 1983). Therefore, the ability to infer the intentions of other people is much more necessary than verbal ability, and negative attitude is placed on verbal expressions. Okabe discusses that the tendency of Japanese culture that view the verbal aspects of life as only one of the means of communication. It is less important than non-verbal communication that can be explained by the immoderate dependence of the Japanese people on the non-verbal aspects of communication. This is in contrast to the Western rhetoric where verbal and speech dominant communication, which nature is fundamentally litigious, logical and positive attitude is placed on verbal especially verbal communication.

Low-context communication, in contrast to high-context communication is defined as “the mass of information that is vested in the explicit code,” (Hall, 1976, p. 79) and “Most of the information must be transmitted in message in order to make up for what is missing in the context (both internal and external)” (Hall, p. 88). He suggested that the nature of communication by American people is low-context and individual-oriented as being direct and unambiguous. Levine (1985) discussed the preference of directness of American people as the following:

The [North] American ways of life, by contrast (to that of collectivistic culture), affords little room for the cultivation of ambiguity. The dominant [North] American temper calls for clear and direct communication. It expressed itself in such common injunctions as “Say what you mean,” “Don’t beat around the bush,” and “Get to the point” (p. 28).
Therefore, high-context communication is dependent on context of the situations more than speech and low-context communication, that is dependent on speech more than context.

Japanese culture is placed toward the end of the continuum of high-context culture as many Asian cultures are, while American culture is placed toward the end of the low-context communication where several Western countries are located (Gudykunst, 1994). Japanese and American communication and culture are placed toward the end of the continuum (collectivism/individualism and high-context/low-context) from each other. Therefore, it is natural that cultural norms, rules, and expectations greatly differ, in other words, culture is vastly dissimilar between Japan and America.

Factors affecting interpersonal communication in intercultural settings

Uncertainty within intercultural interaction

Uncertainty is defined by Bacon (1982) as “how communication functions to help us attain knowledge and understanding of ourselves and others” (p. 5). According to him, uncertainty includes the uncertainty people have about both their own and other peoples’ beliefs and attitudes which is called “cognitive uncertainty” and uncertainty about predictable behavior in the given situation which is called “behavioral uncertainty” (p. 7). In order to reduce the uncertainty people experience in interacting with others, they ask and give the information about each other reciprocally. This is done in order to reduce uncertainty mutually, which dominates the first few minutes of initial interactions between strangers (Simmel, 1982).

One of the uncertainty reduction strategies is a reciprocal question asking and answering process in which people disclose about one another. This dominates the communication of the initial stage and can be seen as the primary means of
uncertainty reduction. Self-disclosure works as uncertainty reduction because it enables communicators to gain personal information and knowledge not only about the partner, but also about oneself through exchanging information, and helping develop a relationship as a result (Derlega, 1984).

Altman and Taylor (1973) support the idea of the reciprocity process for information exchange as an uncertainty reduction strategy in interaction as the Simmel's (1982) idea stated earlier. They state the reciprocal process in self-disclosure means equitable information exchanged in quality and amount between communicators. Jourard (1971) calls this reciprocity in self-disclosure "dyadic effect" (p. 19). He found a person who was willing to disclose personal information to others also received more personal information from others, whereas people who were not willing to disclose personal information reported they also received unwillingness in personal information from others. Therefore, if one discloses too much compared to the other, the person who receives too much information feels uncomfortable. Also, if one discloses too little, the other would feel unsatisfied. At the same time, if one's disclosure is too detailed or too personal on the contrary to the communicator's expectation, the communicator would feel uncomfortable because it makes s/he feel s/he is expected to disclose the same as the other does.

However, as Ting-Toomey (1986) states, "self-disclosure is a culturally grounded concept" (p. 119). Hence, there are differences in frequency and process of self-disclosure among cultures.

People in high-context culture are more careful about what to talk about with strangers than people in low-context culture. Hall (1976) argues that people in high-context culture do more cultural screening process, and thus make greater distinction between people from an in-group and out-group than do people in
low-context cultures. These statements are supported by Gudykunst's (1983) study indicating a greater tendency of people in high-context cultures than do people of low-context cultures that make assumptions about others based on cultural background.

Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996) point out that the way individuals gather information about others to reduce uncertainty differs between individualistic and collectivistic cultures. People in collectivistic culture collect information of others on group-based information to reduce uncertainty about strangers. In an individualistic culture, they collect information from others on person-based information to reduce uncertainty about strangers because people in low-context culture, such as those in America, do not require knowledge of the context when they interact. Hence, it is possible for them to gather specific information of individuals such as attitudes, values, emotions, and past behaviors. On the other hand, Japanese people put emphasis on seeking background information because it helps predict how strangers will behave, and it also plays a role in deciding which form of language to use when they talk to these strangers (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1986). However, because Japanese people are more cautious of interacting with people whose background they do not know (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1984), they avoid interaction with those people who they do not have any background information as they cannot predict their behavior and they do not feel certain about if strangers will behave appropriately and follow certain norms (Gudykunst & Nishida, 1986). This partly explains the discussion why Japanese people tend to treat strangers differently from people they know, and treat foreigners as outsiders.

In addition to the quality of information exchanged by self-disclosure, the amount of self-disclosure also differs between high-context and low-context culture. Okabe (1983) indicates that North American people depend more on verbal
instruments such as interrogation and self-disclosure: they tend to disclose in greater amounts. On the contrary, Japanese people show less use of self-disclosure and interrogation as an uncertainty reduction. Barnlund's (1975) study on public and self in Japan and the United States also shows the difference in self-disclosure between these two countries. His study shows that the amount of personal information accessible to the public is relatively small and the majority of personal information about self is kept private during a self-disclosure of Japanese people. He gives an explanation about this tendency; self-disclosure does not need to convey intimate information in Japanese culture because "the greater the cultural homogeneity, the greater the meaning conveyed in a single word, the more can be implied rather than stated" (p. 162). Contrary to that of Japanese, large amounts of personal information is accessible to public, and little information about self is kept private in the self-disclosure of American people.

Hence, culture guides our shaping experience, our behavior, and the interpretation of the communication exchanged (Ehrenhaus, 1983; Frake, 1977). In addition, because people from other cultures and ethnic groups are most likely to behave in deviant ways and deviate from norms or expectations compared to those in intra-cultural communication, communicators experience anxiety and uncertainty due to difficulty predicting others' behavior in intercultural interactions.

Uncertainty reduction, therefore, entails on ability of individuals to predict others' attitudes and behavior, which takes a cognitive process (Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996).

*Levels of uncertainty avoidance*

Uncertainty avoidance is one of the four dimensions of value and culture that varies in degree among nations (Hofstede, 1979), existing in every culture on different degrees (Gudykunst, 1994). Hofstede precisely defines value as "a broad tendency to
prefer certain states of affairs over others”, and culture as “the collective programming of the mind which distinguishes the members of one human group from another” (p. 389).

Hofstede’s (1979, 1980) studies show higher anxiety and stress, strong superegos, conservatism, and intolerance of deviant persons and ideas that is seen as dangerous exist in higher uncertainty avoidance cultures. People in higher uncertainty avoidance cultures resist change more, have higher anxiety, have higher intolerance for ambiguity, worry about future more, a lower motivation for achievement, and take fewer risks. Lower stress, weaker superegos, less conservatism, and greater tolerance of deviance exist in low uncertainty avoidance cultures. Gudykunst and Matsumoto (1996) also reveal that people in high uncertainty avoidance cultures develop rules and rituals for every possible situation in which they might find them interacting with strangers. In this culture, interaction with stranger may be very ritualistic and polite. Hofstede (1979) also discuss about this point as the following:

the lack of tolerance in a society for uncertainty and ambiguity, which expresses itself in higher levels of anxiety and energy release, greater need for formal rules and absolute truth, and less tolerance for people or groups with deviant ideas or behaviors” (p. 395).

Moreover, Gudykunst (1995) points out people in high uncertainty avoidance cultures are likely to have less positive explanations for interaction with strangers (out-group members) compared to low uncertainty avoidance cultures. (Gudykunst’s study; as cited in Gudykunst and Matsumoto, 1996). Therefore, “if people from high uncertainty avoidance cultures interact with strangers in a situation where they are not clear rules, they may ignore the strangers and treat them as though they do not exist” (Gudykunst, 1994, p. 46).

Japan is being categorized as high uncertainty avoidance culture, whereas
America is being categorized as low uncertainty avoidance culture (Gudykunst, 1996; Hofstede, 1979). Hofstede's study on uncertainty avoidance levels of forty countries show that uncertainty avoidance level of Japan is twice as much as that of the United States. (see Figure 1).

The level of uncertainty avoidance and Hofstede's study discussed above also help explaining the way Japanese people treat people from foreign countries as outsiders as is stated from the introduction. It also explains the nature of attitude for both Japanese and American people toward interaction with people from outside their own cultures.

Cultural similarity/dissimilarity and perceived similarity

Cultural similarity and dissimilarity refer to cultural distance (Church, 1982; Redmond, 2000; Allport, 1954a, 1979b). Distance is “the grade and degree of understanding and intimacy personal and social relations generally” (Park, 1925, p. 339). Allport notes social distance is the distinction between in-group and the reference group. Therefore, cultural distance is how cultures are either close or distant to each other, hence, cultural similarity and dissimilarity is one concept varying in degree on one continuum. Church argues as “different nationalities often make reference to cultural distance” (p.547).

Some studies dealing with cultural distance adapt Hofstede's four dimensions of cultural variability to define cultural distance. Hofstede's (1979) dimensions include power distance, uncertainty avoidance, individualism/collectivism, uncertainty avoidance, and masculinity/femininity. He notes these dimension imply “patterns of thinking, feeling and acting”(p.5).
### Figure 1. Country Uncertainty Avoidance Index (Hofstede, 1984, p. 122)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UAI Actual</th>
<th>Controlling for age</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>UAI Actual</th>
<th>Controlling for age</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greece</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Finland</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portugal</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>Switzerland</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belgium</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>Netherlands</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>Australia</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peru</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>Norway</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>France</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>South Africa</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chile</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>New Zealand</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spain</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Turkey</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>Philippines</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Israel</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Great Britain</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Ireland</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Venezuela</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>Hong Kong</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brazil</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>Sweden</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Italy</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>Denmark</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pakistan</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Singapore</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Austria</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>Mean of 39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taiwan</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>countries</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany (F.R.)</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>(same industry)</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>Yugoslavia</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iran</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**NOTE:** Value based on the scores on three attitude survey questions for a stratified sample of seven occupations at two points in time. Actual values and values obtained after controlling for the average age of the country sample.

There are numerous studies disclosing the positive impact of cultural and perceived similarity on interpersonal communication. Gudykunst and Nishida (1985) uncovered it has multivariate effects specifically interrogation, the display of
nonverbal expressiveness, attraction, and attributional confidence. Another study discusses that the more differences there are in dimensions, the more problems might be expected in “developing and maintaining relationships, meeting social need, communicating effectively...” (Redmond, 2000, p. 153). In other words, the more cultural distance there is between cultures, the harder it is to develop, maintain relationships, and communicate effectively. The study done by Ward and Kennedy (1992) on cross-cultural adjustment and social difficulty show the more dissimilar the host and original cultures are, the more problem sojourners experience. Rogers and Bhawmik (1971) also found that that there is a disadvantage in effective communication through interracial/intercultural communication where there are dissimilarities among communicators. They also argue about interaction where perceived dissimilarity takes place;

it is likely to cause message distortion, delay transmission, restriction of communication channels, and many cause cognitive dissonance, an uncomfortable psychological state, as the receiver is exposed to message that may be inconsistent with his existing beliefs and attitudes” (p. 529).

On the contrary, many previous studies show positive relationships between cultural similarity and attraction. Research findings show impact of perceived similarity on attraction between communicators of intercultural communication can occur on an attitudinal and cultural extent (Gudykunst, 1985), and is also revealed that demographic similarity is of a greater attraction (Newcomb, 1961). A study done by Lee and Gudykunst (2001) also found that perceived similarity in communication style plays a significant part in interethnic attraction in the study. In addition, a study of cultural and racial heterogeneous work place reveals the positive effect on racial similarity: racial similarity mediates tension and anxiety among communicators (Scontrino, Larson, & Fielden, 1977). Another study by Gudykunst and Nishida
(1985) discuss cultural similarities work on reducing uncertainties among communicators even if it is not the only effect on attraction, and therefore, similarity produces the base for a common ground, hence, the basis for discussion (Berscheid, & Walster, 1978). Newcomb (1956), Berscheid and Walster (1978), and Brislin (1981) concluded that perceived similarity enabled communicators to maintain a cognitive consistency on the internal level. Therefore, people strongly tended to select people who were like themselves when it comes to interaction where they have free-choice of interaction with anyone of a number of different receivers (Rogers & Bhawmik, 1971). Ehrenhaus’ (1983) notion about role of culture also helps explain the positive impact of cultural similarity on interaction: “Culture is the collection of expectations by which we construct, test, and modify our interpretations of the disclosure and of the other’s purposes as inferred through discourse” (p. 262), therefore, culture guides us shaping experience as memorable in particular ways (Frake, 1977).

Rokeach (1960) found people who perceive out-groups as similar to their own (in-group) are likely to show positive attitude and willingness to interact with its members. He also found that if there was less perceived differences, the less rejection; and the more the perceived differences, the greater the rejection people would display. Also, Byrne (1971), Newcomb (1961), and Berscheid and Walster (1978) reveal people are likely to show affection to others who share beliefs and values: people who share the similarity because similarity is rewarding. Therefore, there are correlations among similarity, familiarity, and liking which interrelated closely to each other (Newcomb, 1956, 1961; McGuire, 1969; Berger & Calabrese, 1975; and Gudykunst & Nishida, 1985). There are many studies justifying this view; Berger and Calabrese (1974) reveal that “similarities between persons reduce uncertainty, while dissimilarities produce uncertainty,” and “decrease in uncertainty levels and produce increase in liking” (pp. 106-107).
Numerous studies on attitudinal similarity determining the positive relationships between attitudinal similarity and attraction (Byne, 1971; Newcomb, 1961; Duck, 1977; Berscheid & Walster, 1978; Brislin, 1981; Gudykunst & Nishida, 1985; and Ting-Toomey, 1986) as discussed earlier, while some studies showed little correlation between cultural similarity and attraction (Gudykunst, 1985; Kim, 1991). For instance, there are some studies revealing that racial differences can be one of the factors for attraction in an intercultural interaction (Romanzo, 1969). Communicators perceive attractiveness to each other when they find attitudinal similarity between them regardless of perceived cultural similarity (Kim, 1991). Ting-Toomey (1986) also points out perceived attitudinal similarity still affect inter-group stranger attraction (i.e., cross-cultural stranger attraction), which is the same as intra-cultural communication. Another Gudykunst and Nishida’s study (1985) between Japanese and American people is consistent with this finding that perceived attitude similarity alone works as an independent effect of interaction between Japanese and American people in the initial attraction stage. Interaction affect was found between cultural similarity and perceived attitude similarity on the two countries in the initial attraction processes.

Numerous volumes of literature on impact of cultural similarity/dissimilarity were reviewed above. However, perceived similarity/dissimilarity involves the multi-dimensions in intercultural settings, reach to cultural value similarity, cultural status similarity, cultural linguistic similarity, and perceived attitude similarity (Ting-Toomey, 1986). The cultural distance impact on intercultural interaction varies among studies. Accordingly, intercultural communication seemed to be more complex.

As a numbers of previous studies show, there are many cultural variables and
dimensions which differ among cultures, and many factors that affect human communication especially communication which takes place within intercultural settings.

It had become apparent that perceived similarity and dissimilarity is an influential factor in intercultural communication. As cultural variables fundamentally differ among cultures, they are likely to converge among similar cultures, and impact one's attitude on intercultural interaction. Yet it has not been confirmed at all by past studies.

It was meaningful to examine cross-cultural attitude of Japanese and American people and also those of different generations that may greatly differ culturally and generationally in order to better understand the nature of intercultural communication of both nations and generations. Moreover, it will be profound if the finding of the study could contribute to improving the intercultural communication skills of people by analyzing and utilizing the present study.
CHAPTER 3
RESEARCH QUESTIONS AND KEY CONCEPTS

Research questions

The present study addresses the following three research questions:

RQ 1: What are the affective components of cross-cultural attitudes for Japanese toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures?

RQ 2: What are the affective components of cross-cultural attitudes for Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures?

RQ3: What are the main differences in affective components for cross-cultural attitudes between Japanese and Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures?

RQ4: Are there any generational differences in respect to RQ3?

Key concepts

Nationality

Nationality is defined as one’s status of belonging to a particular nationality by origin, birth, or naturalization (Webster’s illustrated encyclopedic dictionary, 1987). Nationality in this study is defined as 1). those people who were born and raised in Japan, and who’s nationality, citizenship, and ethnic identity was Japanese, and 2). those people who were born and raised in the United States of America, and who’s nationality, citizenship are also Americans. This concept was asked by asking the following items:

Whether respondents were raised either in 1). Japan or 2). the United Stated of America
Whether respondents' citizenship were either 1). Japanese or 2). American

Whether ethnicity of the respondents were Japanese or not (only applicable to Japanese respondents)

Similar/dissimilar cultures

Cultural similarity and dissimilarity is referred to as cultural distance (Allport, 1954, 1979; Church, 1982; Redmond, 200), which is one continuum concept varying in grade or degree. According to Park (1925), distance is the levels of insight and familiarity/closeness that identify one's personal and social relationship. Moreover, it also illustrates distinction between in-group and reference group.

Similar cultures in this study is defined as cultures which suggest perceived similarity such as demographic similarity, racial similarity, cultural value similarity, linguistic similarity that has multivariate effect on intercultural interaction, and often give sense of familiarity. Therefore, they help to mediate tension, anxiety, and uncertainty among communicators.

As a result, China, Hong Kong, South Korea, and Taiwan were selected as similar cultures for Japanese culture, while Australia, Canada, Great Britain, New Zealand were selected as similar cultures for American culture regarding the possible perceived similarities among communicators if for intercultural interaction as discussed above.

Dissimilar cultures is defined as cultures that suggest perceived dissimilarity such as demographic dissimilarity, racial dissimilarity, cultural value dissimilarity, and linguistic dissimilarity that could give uncomfortable psychological state such as sense of unfamiliarity, anxiety, and uncertainty among communicators.

America, South Africa, Brazil, and India were selected as dissimilar cultures for Japanese culture, and China, Egypt, India, and Japan were selected as dissimilar
cultures for American cultures regarding the possible perceived dissimilarities discussed earlier.

Cross-cultural attitude

Cross-cultural attitude is defined as “people’s reactions toward a concept or, in everyday language, their feelings, beliefs, and readiness to act” (Brislin, 1981, p. 41) in intercultural settings, which concept in the present study is defined as people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures. Another definition for cross-cultural attitude is “(1) it is a mental and neural state (2) of readiness to respond, (3) organized (4) through experience (5) exerting a directive and/or dynamic influence on behavior” (Allport: as cited in McGuire, 1969, p. 142) employed in intercultural communication. This concept consists of cognitive, affective, and conative components (Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977).

Affective component of cross-cultural attitude

Affective component of cross-cultural attitude is defined as one's feeling of liking and disliking toward the object of attitude, which is the psychological aspect of attitude, and is also known as “emotional component” or “feeling component” (McGuire, 1969, p. 155; Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977, p. 416). This component fundamentally has to do with intensity of attitude (MacGuire, 1969), consequently it deals with the intensity of feeling of liking or disliking. Affective component is considered to be the central component of the attitude that is used to evaluate people and general intercultural encounters (McGuire; Gudykunst et al.), thusly, affect the other components of cross-cultural attitude, facilitate and satisfaction for intercultural interactions.

According to Suchman (1950), intensity of feeling can be scaled from
positive to negative on an intensity continuum. He discusses "intensity of feeling decreases until a point is reached at which intensity of feeling begins to increase again. This point represents the content position of persons with lowest intensity" (p. 216). The lowest intensity is called "zero point" (p. 216), which suggests it can be classifying a scale that ranks feeling from favorable to unfavorable into two groups that is identified as positive and negative.

Therefore, this concept was measured by asking questions referring to Bogardus' (1925) social distance scale that was modified by Suchman's (1950) "intensity function" (p. 215). This was done in an attempt to measure the intensity of feelings toward intercultural encounters with people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures and feeling toward these people (Bogardus' original version of questionnaire is presented in Appendix A). Items used in measuring this concept were the followings:

1. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures as visitors to your country.
2. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures only as citizens in your country.
3. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures in your work place.
4. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures in your community.
5. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures to live in your neighborhood.
6. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures next door to you.
7. Having people from similar cultures/dissimilar cultures as your pals to go to club with.
8. Having a person from similar/dissimilar culture in your family by marriage.

Respondents were asked to indicate their answers that most appropriately describe
their feeling toward people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures respectively on a 6-point scale, 1-6 point. 6-point scale was employed in this questionnaire because feeling can be scaled toward either the lower or higher degree on an intensity continuum, which could also be labeled as feeling of favorableness to unfavorableness (Suchman, 1950). (1=Very unfavorable, 2=Unfavorable, 3= Slightly unfavorable, 4=Slightly favorable, 5=Favorable, and 6=Very favorable.)

There were two main reasons for employing the term favorable-unfavorable for the scaling. First of all, the scaling favorable-unfavorable was chosen because it was the closest possible term that reflects the feeling of liking-disliking respondents have toward question items each depict intercultural interactions. The term favorable-unfavorable and comfortable-uncomfortable came up for scaling affective component of cross-cultural attitude, and were both pre-tested by several respondents respectively. It was revealed that the feelings brought out by using comfortable-uncomfortable were consistently very mild, whereas it was revealed the feeling sought by using favorable-unfavorable displayed feeling of respondents much more precisely. The second reason for employing the term favorable-unfavorable was due to the matter of translation. The term favorable-unfavorable accurately matched the closest possible term that could be used for measuring feeling in Japanese. The second possible term comfortable-uncomfortable sounds odd in Japanese, and could hardly be translated into natural Japanese.

Generations

Generations is defined as two different age groups in which variables such as cultural values, norms, frequency of intercultural interaction, attitude toward intercultural communication and people from outside one’s culture, degree of uncertainty experienced in intercultural communication, and major difficulties in
intercultural communication may greatly differ. Age group 1), age 15 to 35 and 2), age 45 and up were employed in the present study. This grouping of age with an interval of 10 years between the generations was employed to limit age groups in order to control variables stated above.

Respondents were asked their age at the very end of the questionnaire in order to sort out respondents into generations defined in this present study.
CHAPTER 4
METHODS

The data for the present study was collected through a survey using a self-administrated questionnaire which referred to Borgadus' (1925) measurement for social distance that was modified by researcher by using Suchman's (1950) “intensity function” (p. 215) in attempt to measure the intensity of feeling people have toward intercultural encounters with people from similar and dissimilar cultures. (Questionnaire used for the present study is presented in Appendix D, E, and F.) In this study, both the unit of observation and the unit of analysis were Japanese people in Tokyo who were born and raised in Japan, and American people in Honolulu who were born and raised in the United States of America. Research design, sampling procedures, questionnaire construction, data analysis will be discussed below.

Research Design

Quantitative research was conducted in this study.

In the present study, the attitude toward people from foreign countries (people from similar/dissimilar cultures) is called cross-cultural attitude is treated as a dependent variables, while nationality (Japanese and Americans in this study), cultural similarity/dissimilarity, and generations were treated as independent variables.

Sample

By employing purposive sampling, a total of 188 subjects were collected in this study. However, total of 9 questionnaires returned were excluded from the analysis due to either inappropriate scoring or unsuitable age of respondents into either of categorized generations. Gender was not treated as independent variables,
however, the balance of subjects' gender was concerned for internal validity purpose. Stating, the sample of this study consisted of the following:

1). 50 Japanese people in Tokyo age 15 to 35 (25 males = 50% and 25 females = 50%) whose nationality, ethnicity, and citizenship were Japanese, and were born and raised in Japan,

2). 49 American people in Honolulu (Oahu) age 15 to 35 (24 males = 49% and 25 females = 51%) whose nationality and citizenship were of the United States of American, and were born and raised in America,

3). 36 Japanese people age 45 and older (15 males = 42% and 21 females = 58%) whose nationality, ethnicity, and citizenship were Japanese, were born and raised in Japan. However, due to difficulty obtaining samples for this group, 19 people (8 males = 42 % and 11 females = 58%) out of 36 that were collected in Tokyo and 17 people (7 males = 41 % and 10 males = 59 %) out of 36 that were only collected in Honolulu were tourists visiting Honolulu,

4). 44 American people in Honolulu (Oahu) age 45 and older males =25% and 22 females = 25%) whose nationality and citizenship were of the United States of American, were born and raised in America.

Tokyo was selected as a location for collecting the Japanese samples in order to effectively collect samples as it is a place where the majority of citydwellers are originally from any parts of Japan due to various reasons such as attending college, finding jobs after college, due to business, leisure (sight seeing), and so forth, therefore, giving it the advantage of collecting the people (samples) who could be the potential representation of many parts of Japan. Honolulu (Oahu) was selected as a location for collecting American sample due to accessibility, and also due to its cultural condition where people are exposed not only to intercultural communication but also to inter-group communication among various ethnic groups, which allowed the
researcher to effectively collect data.

Those people who have once lived outside their country (outside of either Japan for Japanese respondents or the United States of America for American respondents) and returnees, to be more specific, people who had either lived outside their countries or stayed outside their countries even as travelers for more than a continuous duration of 1 month were excluded in this study. Those who have lived in another culture for a certain period of time would greatly be affected by the culture: therefore, the condition is different from those people who have not stayed or lived in other countries.

Subjects were collected randomly and independently.

In this study, purposive sampling, frequency distribution, repeated measure analysis of variance, and t-test were employed as data analysis plan.

20-year intervals were employed to specify and categorize two different generations that limit age groups in order to control variables to be measured as one of the analysis plans for RQ 4.

Questionnaire

There were two versions of the questionnaire, one for Japanese and the other for American respondents. Both versions consisted of the same question items that were to be measured.

Before initiating the survey, each respondent was asked to go through and certify by a consent form in order to grasp the objectives of the present study and if s/he agrees to participate. (Consent form is presented in Appendix B and C). After signing the consent form, respondents moved on to the main part of the survey, which was conducted using the questionnaire that consisted of three parts.

The first part of the questionnaire aimed at purposive sampling. This first
part asked participants several items in order to obtain targeted samples for the present study. Items used as criteria for the study were: Birthplace, place where the respondents were raised, ethnicity, citizenship, nationality, and prior experience of staying outside one's own culture (country). Only those participants who met the criteria were included in the present research and asked to go on to the second part of the questionnaire.

The second part of the questionnaire asked respondents' affective component of cross-cultural attitude toward people from similar/dissimilar cultures using items referred to Borgadus' (1925) social distance measurement, which is modified based on Suchman's (1950) "intensity function" (p. 215) in an attempt to measure the intensity of feeling toward intercultural encounters with people from similar/dissimilar cultures respectively.

Finally, demographic information was sought in the last section of the questionnaire. Sex, age and the place of the origin of the respondents were asked. Sex was asked for internal validity concerns and age was asked in an attempt to control age groups (generations).

A small pack of cookies or chocolates was given to each respondent who agreed to volunteered and participate in the survey.

The original version of the questionnaire constructed in English was translated into Japanese subsequently by the researcher. The original English version of questionnaire was translated by bilingual students who were proficient in both Japanese and English as a back translation procedure to confirm the accuracy of the translation.

The revised and completed questionnaire was pre-tested by some of the respondents from each study population group to make sure the intention of the questionnaire was clear enough to be easily understood and answered.
Data collection procedure

Below is the data collection procedure taken for each sample group:

1). 50 Japanese samples in Tokyo who were age 15 to 35 were collected from universities, restaurants, cafés, and at the airport in Tokyo. 2). 49 American samples in Honolulu (Oahu) who were age 15 to 35 were collected from the University of Hawaii at Manoa both on and off campus, in surrounding shopping centers, cafés. 3). 36 Japanese samples who were age 45 and up were collected in Tokyo and Honolulu at possible places such as shopping centers, stores, cafés, restaurants. And 4). 44 American samples who were age 45 and up were collected from the University of Hawaii at Manoa both on and off campus, in surrounding shopping centers, cafés, and so on.

Japanese samples were collected in Tokyo, a cosmopolitan city, where it allowed researcher to obtain samples originally from all around Japan, which made it possible to obtain suitable samples for this present study. American samples were collected in Honolulu where diverse ethnic groups meet and facilitate unique and peaceful intercultural (inter-group) communication.

The first section of the questionnaire was reviewed by all the samples in order to pursue samples who met the criteria for the present study.

Secondly, people who met the criteria offered in the study continued to work on the second and third part of the questionnaire dealing with the main research of the present study, affective components of cross-cultural attitude.

And finally sex, age, and place of origin of the respondents were asked for as demographic information.
Confidentiality

The survey questionnaire was conducted on condition of anonymity in order to protect participants' privacy. All data collected through this research survey was studied or discussed exclusively within this study.

Data analysis plan

For the present study, frequency distribution, t-test, and mixed design analysis of variance (ANOVA) using Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) were employed.
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Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese People

RQ1: What is the affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Japanese toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures?

In order to grasp the affective components of cross-cultural attitudes of Japanese toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures respectively, a frequency distribution was performed on each selected similar and dissimilar cultures for Japanese cultures (Similar cultures: China, South Korea, Hong Kong, and Taiwan, dissimilar cultures: South Africa, Brazil, America, and India.)

T-test on the cross-cultural attitude of Japanese toward similar/dissimilar cultures found that their attitude differed significantly between toward people from similar cultures and toward people from dissimilar cultures ($t_{85} = -2.47, p < .05$). It was found that overall affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Japanese ($n = 86$) toward people from similar ($X = 4.34$) and dissimilar cultures ($X = 4.45$) were both slightly favorable from the scale given and almost identical (see Table 1, Figure 2 and 3).

Table 1. Result of Paired T-test on Cultural Similarity/Dissimilarity Effect for Japanese

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Differences</th>
<th>Mean Paired Differences</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 SimAve - DisA</td>
<td>-1.1773</td>
<td>.44287</td>
<td>.04776</td>
<td>-2.1288 - .02278</td>
<td>-2.465</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RECEIVED
AS
FOLLOWS
**Figure 2.** Overall Cross-Cultural Attitude Toward People from Similar Cultures of Japanese

![Histogram for SIMAVE](image)

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable

**Figure 3.** Overall Cross-Cultural Attitude Toward People from Dissimilar Cultures of Japanese
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1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
From the scores obtained from each country, attitude toward people from each country given in the research was labeled using the scales employed as the measurement of the attitude (1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable) as the following.

Cross-cultural attitudes of Japanese were: slightly favorable toward people from China (X = 4.2) (see Table 2 and Figure 4), slightly favorable toward South Korea (X = 4.4) (see Table 3 and Figure 5), slightly favorable toward people from South Africa (X = 4.4) (see Table 4 and Figure 6), slightly favorable toward people from Taiwan (X = 4.2) (see Table 5 and Figure 7), slightly favorable toward people from South Africa (X = 4.4) (see Table 6 and Figure 8), slightly favorable toward people from Brazil (X = 4.4) (see Table 7 and Figure 9), slightly favorable to favorable toward people from America (X = 4.9) (see Table 8 and Figure 10), and slightly favorable toward people from India (X = 4.1) (see Table 9 and Figure 11). It was revealed attitude looked relatively similar regardless of the cultural similarity and dissimilarity except for that toward American (X = 4.9). Attitude of Japanese toward Americans was much higher than those toward the other nationals and the highest of all.
Table 2. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CH</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>26.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>55.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>83.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>16.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 4. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from China

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 3. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from South Korea

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SK</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>196</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>28.5</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 5. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from South Korea

1 = Very Unfavorable   2 = Unfavorable   3 = Slightly Unfavorable   4 = Slightly Favorable   5 = Favorable   6 = Very Favorable
Table 4. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Hong Kong

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>51.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>199</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>28.9</td>
<td>80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>132</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 6. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from Hong Kong

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
**Table 5. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Taiwan**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TW</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>19.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>251</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>55.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>81.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 7. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from Taiwan**

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 6. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from South Africa

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>195</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>51.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 8. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from South Africa

Std. Dev = 1.21  Mean = 4.4  N = 688.00

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 7. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Brazil

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>51.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>136</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 9. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from Brazil

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 8. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from the United States of America

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AM</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.6</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>30.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>254</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>67.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 10. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from the United States of America

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 9. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>9.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>29.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>216</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>61.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>81.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>688</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 11. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Japanese toward people from India

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
As sample for the samples grouped as Japanese older generation were collected from two different locations, a t-test was used for attitude toward people from similar cultures/dissimilar and overall cross-cultural attitude respectively on Japanese collected in Tokyo (n = 19) and Honolulu (n = 17) to examine if there were any significant differences between these two groups. Participants collected in Tokyo reported their feeling toward people from similar cultures was slightly favorable (X = 3.95) (1 = Very Unfavorable 2 = Unfavorable 3 = Slightly Unfavorable 4 = Slightly Favorable 5 = Favorable 6 = Very Favorable) and also toward people from dissimilar cultures as slightly favorable (X = 4.14). Participants collected in Honolulu (Japanese tourists) appeared to have a slightly favorable attitude toward people from similar cultures (X = 4.58) and also a slightly favorable attitude toward people from dissimilar cultures (X = 4.72) (see Table 10). Although cross-cultural attitude of Japanese people collected in Honolulu is slightly more favorable compared to that of Japanese in Tokyo, the t-test has shown that there are no significant differences in attitude toward people from similar cultures between these two groups. However, it was shown attitude toward people from dissimilar cultures were significantly different between two groups (t[34] = -2.32, P < .05) (see Table 11).

**Table 10. Means Table for Cross-Cultural Attitude of Older Japanese People in Tokyo and Honolulu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LOCATION</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SIMAVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>3.9523</td>
<td>.95614</td>
<td>.21935</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.5846</td>
<td>.96165</td>
<td>.23324</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAVE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tokyo</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.1480</td>
<td>.77615</td>
<td>.17806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honolulu</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.7224</td>
<td>.69850</td>
<td>.16941</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Very Unfavorable 2 = Unfavorable 3 = Slightly Unfavorable 4 = Slightly Favorable 5 = Favorable 6 = Very Favorable
**Table 11. Result of T-test for Cross-Cultural Attitude between Japanese Older People in Tokyo and Honolulu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SIMAV</td>
<td>.017</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>-1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-1.975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DISAVI</td>
<td>.075</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td>-2.323</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variance not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.337</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Result of t-test on overall cross-cultural attitude between Japanese people collected in Tokyo (n = 19) and Honolulu (n = 17) shows the result of the t-test revealed the overall cross-cultural attitude of Japanese samples collected in Tokyo (X = 4.05) and those collected from Honolulu (X = 4.65) was significantly different (t[34] = -2.21, p < .05) (see Table 12). Overall the cross-cultural attitude of samples collected in Honolulu revealed to have a slightly more favorable attitude compared to that of samples collected in Tokyo.

**Table 12. Result of T-test for Overall Cross-Cultural Attitude between Japanese Older People in Tokyo and Honolulu**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Levene's Test for Equality of Variance</th>
<th>t-test for Equality of Means</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Mean Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Sig</td>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.988</td>
<td>-2.210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Equal variances not assumed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-2.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Cross-Cultural Attitude of American People

RQ2: What is the affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures?

As well as RQ1, in order to grasp the affective component of cross-cultural attitudes of Americans toward people from similar and dissimilar cultures respectively, a frequency distribution was done on each selected similar and dissimilar cultures for American cultures (Similar cultures: Australia, Canada, Great Britain, and New Zealand. Dissimilar cultures: China, Japan, India, Egypt.)

Overall affective component of cross-cultural attitude of Americans (n = 96) were found to be favorable from the scale used as cross-cultural attitude measurement, both toward people from similar cultures (X = 5.16) and dissimilar cultures (X = 5.02). However, the result of T-test has shown the overall affective component of cross-cultural attitude of American people toward people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures were significantly different (t[92] = 2.94, p < .05) (see Table 13, Figure 12 and 13). They had a more favorable attitude toward people from similar cultures than people from dissimilar cultures.

Table 13. Result of Paired T-test on Cultural Similarity/Dissimilarity Effect for Americans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Paired Samples Test</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paired Differences</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
<td>Upper</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pair 1 SimAve - DisAve</td>
<td>1.3542</td>
<td>.44394</td>
<td>.04603</td>
<td>.04399</td>
<td>.22684</td>
<td>2.942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>df</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 12. Overall Cross-Cultural Attitude Toward People from Similar Cultures of Americans

![Histogram for SIMAVE]

**SIMAVE**

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable

Mean = 5.15  Std. Dev = 0.80  N = 93.00

Figure 13. Overall Cross-Cultural Attitude Toward People from Dissimilar Cultures of Americans

![Histogram for DISAVE]

**DISAVE**

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable

Mean = 5.02  Std. Dev = 0.88  N = 93.00
Labeling the attitude using the scales employed as the measurement of the attitude (1 = Very Unfavorable 2 = Unfavorable 3 = Slightly Unfavorable 4 = Slightly Favorable 5 = Favorable 6 = Very Favorable), the following is the overall attitude of American samples toward people from each country given: favorable toward people from Australia (X = 5.1) (see Table 14 and Figure 14), favorable toward people from Canada (X= 5.2) (see Table 15 and Figure 15), favorable toward people from Great Britain (X = 5.1) (see Table 16 and Figure 16), favorable toward people from New Zealand (X = 5.2) (see Table 17 and Figure 17), favorable toward people from China (X = 5.1) (see Table 18 and Figure 18), favorable toward people from Japan (X = 5.4) (see Table 19 and Figure 19), slightly favorable to toward people from India (X= 4.8) (see Table 20 and Figure 20), and slightly favorable toward people from Egypt (X = 4.7) (see Table 21 and Figure 21). It was revealed that the scores looked relatively similar regardless of the cultural similarity and dissimilarity except for that of American.
Table 14. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Americans Toward People from Australia

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AU</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>13.4</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>38.8</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 14. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the Australia

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 15. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Canada

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CN</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.4</td>
<td>.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>15.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>40.5</td>
<td>56.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>326</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 15. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the Canada

I = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
**Table 16. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Great Britain**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>20.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>56.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>325</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>43.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Figure 16. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the Great Britain**

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 17. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Americans Toward People from New Zealand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>NZ</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
<td>.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>.8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>33.5</td>
<td>54.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>342</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>46.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 17. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the New Zealand

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable 3 = Slightly Unfavorable 4 = Slightly Favorable 5 = Favorable 6 = Very Favorable
Table 18. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Americans Toward People from China

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CH</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>23.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>58.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>306</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 18. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the China

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
Table 19. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Americans Toward People from Japan

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>JP</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>.9</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>293</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>46.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>396</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>53.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 19. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the Japan

1 = Very Unfavorable  2 = Unfavorable  3 = Slightly Unfavorable  4 = Slightly Favorable  5 = Favorable  6 = Very Favorable
### Table 20. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Americans Toward People from India

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>15.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>28.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>233</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>60.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 20. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the India

1 = Very Unfavorable  
2 = Unfavorable  
3 = Slightly Unfavorable  
4 = Slightly Favorable  
5 = Favorable  
6 = Very Favorable

Std. Dev = 1.36  
Mean = 4.8  
N = 744.00
Table 21. Frequency Distribution of the Cross-Cultural Attitudes of Japanese Toward People from Egypt

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EP</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
<td>.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>8.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>16.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>32.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>234</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>64.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>744</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 21. Cross-Cultural Attitude of Americans toward people from the Egypt

1 = Very Unfavorable   2 = Unfavorable   3 = Slightly Unfavorable   4 = Slightly Favorable   5 = Favorable   6 = Very Favorable
RQ 3 & RQ 4

RQ3: What are the main differences in affective component of cross-cultural attitudes between Japanese and Americans toward people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures?

RQ4: Are there any generational differences in respect for RQ3?

For both RQ3 and RQ4, a mixed design ANOVA was performed with age (younger/older), nationality (Japanese/American) within subject and culture (similar cultures/dissimilar cultures) within subjects. The dependent variable was attitude.

The result indicated a main effect for nationality (F[2/174] = 18.77, p < .001) (see Table 22). It was indicated by follow-up polynomial contrast that Americans had a more favorable cross-cultural attitude (X = 5.10) compared to those of Japanese people (X= 4.38). There was no significant effect for age or cultures.

Table 22. Result of Tests of Between-Subject Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AgeC</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.781</td>
<td>1.266</td>
<td>.262</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nationality</td>
<td>23.179</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.589</td>
<td>18.773</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AgeC * Nationality</td>
<td>3.730</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.730</td>
<td>6.041</td>
<td>.015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error</td>
<td>107.420</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 23. Result of Tests of Within-Subjects Effects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Type III Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>cultures</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.832</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures * AgeC</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.397</td>
<td>1.770</td>
<td>.185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures * Nationality</td>
<td>2.525</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.262</td>
<td>5.623</td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cultures * AgeC * Nationality</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.068</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Error(cultures)</td>
<td>39.070</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>.225</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There was a significant generation by nationality interaction \((F[1] = 6.04, p < .05)\) (see Table 22). Older Americans have the highest attitude \((X = 5.31)\), and younger Americans had second highest score \((X = 4.89)\). The attitude of older Japanese and younger Japanese were about the same (see Table 24).

**Table 24. Mean Table of Generation and Nationality Interaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AgeC * Nationality</th>
<th>Measure: attitude</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Younger American</td>
<td>4.460</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Younger Japanese</td>
<td>4.887</td>
<td>.112</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older American</td>
<td>5.313</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Older Japanese</td>
<td>5.614</td>
<td>.786</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This level combination of factors is not observed, thus the corresponding population marginal mean is not estimable.*

There was a significant culture by nationality interaction \((F[2/174] = 5.62, p < .05)\) (see Table 23). Americans had attitude favorable attitude from the scale provided toward people from both similar cultures \((X = 5.16)\) and dissimilar cultures \((X = 5.03)\), while Japanese people had less favorable cross-cultural attitude compared to Americans that is interpreted as slightly favorable toward people from both similar cultures \((X = 4.32)\) and dissimilar cultures \((X = 4.43)\) (see Table 25). Again, both nationals' attitude was found to be around the same score regardless of similar cultures and dissimilar cultures.
### Table 25. Mean Table for Nationality by Cultures Interaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Cultures</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4.327</td>
<td>.091</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.434</td>
<td>.090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.167</td>
<td>.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.033</td>
<td>.084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.630</td>
<td>.828</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.598</td>
<td>.814</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Based on modified population marginal mean.

No significance was found in culture (F[1/174] = 0.5, ns), culture by generation interaction (F[1/174] = 1.77, ns), and culture by age by nationality interaction (F[1/174] = 0.30, ns) (see Table 23).
CHAPTER 6
DISCUSSION

The results have supported the literature and previous studies on difference of cross-cultural attitude between Japanese and Americans, and impact of generations and cultural distance on cross-cultural attitude partially, while no significant impact of generation and cultural distance on attitude was found as single factors. It was found American people were more open to intercultural interaction, thus they showed more favorable attitude compared to that of Japanese people. Comments on intercultural interaction from both Japanese and American participants and how they feel about interacting with people from different countries were obtained through informal interviews with participants during the data collection process, which also greatly reflect the result of analysis: It was often heard from American respondents all attitudes should be the same toward people from every country, and those people who commented in such a way had the most favorable attitude toward all the countries regardless of the countries and categories, or similar and dissimilar cultures. For Japanese respondents, it was also heard that they welcomed chances to interact with people from foreign countries. Overall, Japanese people still tended to score lower in favorableness, not maintaining the high scores even though they declared that they were favorable of interacting interculturally. The fact was that only a small number of people commented that they favor interacting with people from other countries and actually scored high scores in the scale.

Descriptive statistics for RQ 1. and RQ 2. also representing the differences in cross-cultural attitude between Japanese people and American people were interesting. Looking at graphs for distribution, much of the wide distribution converted in the middle of the scale was seen in all of the graphs for descriptive statistics of Japanese
people regardless of the countries. On the other hand, the distribution of scores for American people were placed toward the very high scores for all the countries given.

Little research or literature was found on generation and cross-cultural attitude. Hence, it was of great interest to the present study with curiosity and hope. However, there was no difference in cross-cultural attitude between younger and older generations. The result of the analysis revealed that the generations (categorized age groups by researcher) did not have an effect on attitude when it was treated as a single factor. However, studying interaction between generation and nationality, significant differences in attitude among groups were noticed (see Table 22). American people in an older generation had much more favorable attitude than any of the other groups. The result may possibly support Miller and Steinberg's discussion (1975) that cultural information is learned by actual intercultural experience and accuracy in prediction improves as cultural experience increases. As older American people have been exposed to heterogeneous cultures for longer period of time compared to other groups, they may have less strangeness or negative attitude toward intercultural contact and have improved cross-cultural attitude consequently. On the contrary, Japanese people had the least favorable attitude of all the groups. Particularly for Japanese people, it was noticed that younger people have slightly more favorable attitude than of older generation.

It was frequently noticed through the research and informal interviews to seemingly to be true among Japanese and American people that the more intercultural interactions respondents have had before, the more favorable their attitude toward it just as many of the previous studies have discussed in literature: those people who have more cultural experience have less uncertainty and anxiety interacting with people interculturally as they are more familiar with it and therefore, able to predict others' behaviors, attitude, beliefs, customs, and so forth, which helps them feel more

Finally, what revealed to be common throughout each analysis was attitude toward people from similar cultures and dissimilar cultures were the same except for Japanese people toward American people. In other words, cultural similarity/dissimilarity was found to have little impact on the cultural attitude people have. Through the informal interviews with respondents, there were some people who disclosed they feel more comfortable with, and therefore, have favorable attitude toward people from different countries whose appearance (i.e., color of skin, hair, and so forth) and race are similar to those of his/hers. However, cultural similarity/dissimilarity was proven to have little impact on cross-cultural attitude, as a single factor. Therefore, neither theories of cultural similarity-attraction nor cultural dissimilarity-unattraction were supported by the result of the study. As will be mentioned in the limitations later, there is a possibility that specified similar cultures and dissimilar cultures for present study may have affected the lack of the significance in the result: Economical and political similarities/dissimilarities were not taken into consideration as one of the factors that may have a lot to do with one's attitude, as well as respondents that may have had different notions, experiences, and attitude toward cultures that were categorized by the researcher. Therefore, specifying similar and dissimilar cultures itself will have to be done carefully with insightful study covering multifaceted perspectives in the future study.

Another concern is that qualitative research method as well as quantitative method and informal interviews may help obtaining a much broader view of cross-cultural attitude of people. Therefore, it is highly recommended that both qualitative and quantitative research methods will be employed in the research in the future study.
The research was launched based on researcher’s observation and curiosity about how Japanese people react when they encounter interaction with people from other countries: A lack of awareness and competence in intercultural communication skills due to the nature of the original homogeneity of Japan that is deeply rooted, hence, there are still many Japanese who are unfamiliar with how to interact with people from outside their culture and little attention is paid to it. As a result, people from outside Japan are labeled together as *gaijin* (literally “outsider”) and treated as outsider just as Okabe (1983) discussed. And therefore, original intention of the study which was to acknowledge cross-cultural attitude of Japanese people, the difference of cross-cultural attitude from that of American people who are exposed to inter-group interaction more frequently than Japanese people, and cross-cultural attitude between two different generations was achieved through the research. Therefore, giving some guideline for understanding and developing intercultural communication skills of people consequently. Some findings were very interesting, while some were unsatisfactory.

The study has shown that American people who are exposed to constant interracial communication have a more favorable attitude compared to that of Japanese people. As is found in the previous studies, there must be many factors affecting this tendency. A fundamental difference of a countries’ population composition can be one of the factors that give the difference of cross-cultural attitude. In addition, levels of uncertainty that is the trait of people reviewed may also have to do with why attitude differs between Japanese people and American people. People in high uncertainty avoidance cultures are likely to have less positive explanation for interaction with people or groups whose values and behaviors deviate from these of their own. Therefore, Japanese people experience more uncomfortableness, whereas people in
low uncertainty avoidance cultures possess greater tolerance of deviance, ease, lower stress, and less anxiety in inter-group interaction (Gudykunst, 1994, 1995; Gudykunst & Matsumoto, 1996; Hofstede, 1979, 1980).

In regards to the cross-cultural attitude of the Japanese people that was to the great interest of researcher was found to be relatively less sensible to the researcher’s expectation than it was hoped to be. Besides the result of the analysis, distribution of the score tells the fact Japanese people possess barriers toward people of other races or nationals that may greatly have direct impact on intercultural communication, and can hinder effective communication of desirable relationships. In answering questionnaire, it was common for Japanese people to score rather favorable attitudes on the question items up to 7, but hardly on item 8 which is to have people from non-Japanese people in the family by marriage. It was of a conspicuous tendency observed in the data collected leaving a strong impression of exclusiveness that deeply resides within them.

However, even though it was not a significant difference found between younger Japanese and older Japanese, younger Japanese people were found to have slightly more favorable attitude compared to that Japanese people of an older generation. It showed a slightly improved cross-cultural attitude and even slightly desirable change.

In order to help Japanese people enhance the awareness and readiness to communicate or living with people from other parts of the world, the hope is not only will there be more opportunity to interact with people from other countries, but also provide them with appropriate information and knowledge by giving education on intercultural communication, which is still a relatively new subject in Japan. As mentioned earlier, more intercultural experience will help people become familiar with interacting with people whose cultures are different from theirs, and hopefully bring better intercultural awareness and cross-cultural attitude to them consequently.
In regard to that, another concern that was outstanding in the cross-cultural attitudes of the Japanese people should be noted. The descriptive statistics for cross-cultural attitude of the Japanese people toward American people were highly different from those toward other cultures: it was much higher compared to those toward others. In fact, it was the highest of all even though America was categorized as dissimilar culture to Japan. This may have affected the overall score for dissimilar culture, and also the result of the impact for cultural similarity/dissimilarity on attitude. Again, even though American cultural variables are dissimilar to those of Japanese linguistically, racially, geographically, historically, and so forth as was defined in the present study, other variables such as economical and political reasons may have added another factor making the attitude favorable. It was also true that the U.S. is the primary destination for many Japanese people to study abroad in order to acquire education as well as learn English, meaning that America is seen as a desirable place for Japanese people. However, when it comes to provide training or education on intercultural communication in the future, it should be provided from various different cultural perspectives without prejudice including both non-Western perspectives and Western perspectives in order to truly enhance the fostering of intercultural awareness for Japanese people to interact with people interculturally.

As another implication of the study, it is highly recommended, and therefore, is very important and necessary for the future intercultural training or education to be provided properly as a subject: It is important to acknowledge the cultural differences in macro cultural level which is often the case of present intercultural education in Japan. However, it is strongly suggested that practical as well as profound education and skills on what or how they could do to cope with the cultural differences with people whose cultures and values are different from their own will be provided to people in order to communicate successfully in intercultural interaction.
Limitations

In this study, there are several limitations that should be mentioned.

First, the similar cultures applied for the Japanese culture were specified as China, Hong Kong, South Korea, and Taiwan, and Australia, Canada, and Great Britain, and New Zealand for American cultures. Dissimilar cultures for the Japanese were specified as America, Brazil, India, and South Africa, China, Egypt, India, and Japan for American culture in this study. It is generally true in many cases such as demographic, racial, linguistic, cultural values, norms, communication processes, and so forth are highly likely to be similar within these similar cultures and tend to be different among those dissimilar cultures. However, it was not always applicable or true in every aspect. In other words, cultures may be very similar in one factor, such as cultural values, while it can be very different on others such as communication style (Furnham, & Bochner, 1982). Therefore, even if cultures that were given together as a classification of similar and dissimilar cultures, it could be an overgeneralization or overcategorization. Respondents had different images or attitudes toward each culture that were classified in one category as either similar cultures or dissimilar cultures. In addition, economical and political similarity and dissimilarity was not taken into account, and therefore was not included as one of the factors of the cultural similarity and dissimilarity, which turned out to be one of the biggest factor influencing one’s attitude toward people from other countries. A careful and profound study is highly suggested identifying and defining one’s similar cultures and dissimilar cultures in the future study.

Secondly, it was found ethnic background of American respondents’ made the definition and perception of similar and dissimilar cultures different depending on one’s ethnic background. Therefore, cross-cultural attitude toward each given similar and dissimilar cultures tended to be favorable if it was similar to his/her ethnic
background even though it was categorized as a dissimilar culture by the researcher, and vice-versa. As a result, the defined cultural similarity and dissimilarity by researchers was too limited from their perspectives.

Third, in this study, only one of the cross-cultural attitude, the affective component, was focused on partly because it was verified that cognitive, affective, and conative components are greatly intercorrelated to each other and highly likely to be consistent (Kahn, 1951; McGuire, 1969), and mainly due to the time limitation. Proven study also that this component is the central component of the cross-cultural attitude while cognitive and conative components are considered as the peripheral ones (Gudykunst, Wiseman, & Hammer, 1977) partly explains the reason why the affective components of the attitude were chosen to be focused on in the present study. Due to the discussed reasons, the affective components was selected to be focused for the present study. However, it would have been ideal to study each component of the cross-cultural attitude to further investigate it if time allowed. Hence, this limitation will call for further research on the study of cross-cultural attitude in the future in order to have an even clearer picture of it and help promote awareness and effective intercultural communication among people.

Fourth, in the present study, two age groups which was limited to approximately 20 year intervals were employed as two different generations that may have differed in the frequency of intercultural communication, cross-cultural attitude, and the degree of uncertainty experienced within intercultural communication. Generations which were limited to certain age groups were applied to the present study, however, borders among generations were vague in actuality and hardly be categorized within certain classifications. The condition will be greatly vary in other generations than the two certain age groups focused in this proposed study as well as another way of groupings of generation than the one employed in the present study.
Fifth, the sample number for the Japanese older generation and the location of the data collection for this group should be mentioned as a limitation. The same amount of effort was equally made to collect data for every group, with the total number of the sample (36 samples in total) being smaller compared to the other three groups due to difficulty obtaining a sample for this group. In addition, also giving difficulty to getting enough sample for this group, 19 people (8 males = 42% and 11 females = 58%) out of 36 were collected in Tokyo and 17 people (7 males = 41% and 10 males = 59%) out of the 36 collected in Honolulu were tourists visiting Honolulu. However, those 17 respondents collected in Honolulu all met the criteria set for Japanese respondents for purposive sample.

Finally, limitation concerned with the location selected for this study to conduct survey should be noted. Tokyo was selected as a place to conduct the survey for the Japanese sample, and Honolulu (Oahu) for the American sample. Tokyo was selected as a location to collect the Japanese sample in order to effectively collect samples as it is a place where the majority of people in the city are originally from the many other parts of Japan due to various reasons. Therefore, it gives advantage to collect samples from those who can be the potential representation of the many parts of Japan. However, Tokyo is the most cosmopolitan city in Japan where it is a commonplace to see people from various countries who are either working or visiting in Japan, and where the circumstance is very much different from the other parts of Japan. Honolulu (Oahu) is one of the states in the United States of America, which is “one of the most racially diverse places in the world as there is no majority- everyone is in a minority:..., more than 20% claimed multi-ethnic backgrounds, far more than any other U.S States” (Hawaii School Reports, 2000 Introduction Section), where people of various cultures and ethnicity form a very unique local culture. Therefore, it is very different from other parts of the United States. Hence, the selected location for
this study is limited to this study and can hardly be considered as a representation of
the two countries.
Appendix A: Bogardus' (1925) Measurement for Social Distance

Social Distance

According to my first feeling reactions I would willingly admit members of each race (as a class, and not the best I have known, nor the worst members) to one or more of the classifications under which I have placed a cross (X).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>7</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Close kinship by marriage</td>
<td>To my club as personal friends</td>
<td>To my street</td>
<td>To my neighbors</td>
<td>To employment in my city</td>
<td>To occupation in my country</td>
<td>To citizenship in my country</td>
<td>As visitors only to my city</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Americans
Bulgarians
Canadians
Chinese
Czecho-Slovaks
Danes
English
French
French-Canadians
Finns
Germans
Greeks
Hindus
Hungarians
Indians (Amer.)
Irish
Italians
Japanese
Jew-German
Jew-Russian
Koreans
Mexicans
Mulattos
Negroes
Norwegians
Portuguese
Filipinos
Poles
Rumanians
Russians
Appendix B: Consent Form
Agreement of Participation for Japanese Participants

リサーチ調査協力承諾書

異文化間接触における異文化間コミュニケーション態度
に及ぼす類似/非類似文化、及び世代の影響に関する
リサーチ：日本人、アメリカ人間の研究調査

松林真紀
387-0021長野県更埴市稲荷山1095-4
電話番号: (026) 273-1907
E-mail: makiandms@aol.com

研究内容の説明
現研究調査の目的は、異文化間コミュニケーションにおける類似/非類似文化出身の人々に対する日本人、アメリカ人、そしてそれぞれ異なる2世代間の態度について研究することです。調査は日本、及びアメリカで行われます。調査のためのアンケートは一般的な質問と、異文化間態度に関する質問の2部から成っています。アンケート記入にはおおよそ15分要すると考えられます。リサーチに参加頂く方々のプライバシー保護のためアンケートは匿名で行われ、個人を識別で出来るような情報は一切含まれません。又、本研究目的でお答え頂いた情報は本研究内のみで扱われることをお約束します。調査への参加は全くの任意的なものであり希望時にいつでも参加を辞めていただくことが可能です。リサーチの結果はリサーチに御協力頂いた方で、ご希望の方に後にご紹介することが出来ます。

承諾
私は上記の内容を読み、理解し、又、調査の手順及び他の事情に関して十分情報を与えられ、納得をしました。そして、参加承諾とリサーチ参加を希望時にいつでも偏見無く取り辞めることが出来ることを通知されたことをここに理解しました。

参加者署名

日付
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人権等に関する情報、及び質問については以下 Committee on Human Studies にご連絡下さい:

UH Committee on Human Studies
2540 Maile Way, Rm. 253
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

Phone: (808) 956-5007
Appendix C: Consent Form

Agreement of Participation for American Participants

Survey Research of the Influence of Cultural Similarity/Dissimilarity and Generation on Cross-cultural Attitude:
A study of Japanese and Americans

Maki Matsubayashi
1095-4 Inariyama, Koshoku-shi, Nagano-ken 387-0021 Japan
Phone number: (026) 273-1907
E-mail: makiandms@aol.com

Description of the project
The purpose of the present study is to acquire knowledge on cross-cultural attitude of Japanese and American people toward culturally similar and dissimilar people in two different generations. The project will be conducted in Japan and America. The survey questionnaire consists of two parts; general information and cross-cultural attitude, and it will take about 15 minutes to complete questionnaire. In order to protect privacy of respondents, questionnaire will be done anonymously and no personal identifiable information will be collected. The data collected through this project will only be studied or discussed within the study. The participation is completely voluntarily, and participants are able to withdraw from the survey questionnaire at any time they wish to. The result of the research will be presented to any participants interested in.

Certification
I certify that I have read and that I understand the foregoing that I have been given satisfactory answers to my inquiries concerning project procedures and other matters and that I have been advised that I am free to withdraw my consent and to discontinue participation in the project on activity at any time without prejudice.

__________________________
Signiture of individual participant

__________________________
Date
For questions and further information about human subject/human right, please contact Committee on Human Studies at the contact information below:

UH Committee on Human Studies
2540 Maile Way, Rm. 253
University of Hawaii
Honolulu, HI 96822

Phone: (808) 956-5007
Appendix D: Cross-Cultural Attitude Questionnaire for Japanese Respondents
(Japanese version)

アンケート記入のお願い

私は、現在ハワイ大学コミュニケーション学部で修士論文目的のため
異文化間態度、つまり異文化間コミュニケーションにおいての態度についての
リサーチを行っております。大変お忙しい中恐縮ですが、リサーチのためのアンケート記入にご協力頂ければ幸いです。アンケート記入にはおおよそ15分
程度要すると思われますが、宜しくお願い致します。アンケートで集められる
情報は、無記名の下に厳しくリサーチ内のみで扱われ、他の目的で利用される
ことや他に漏れることは一切ありません。

松林真紀

アンケート

このアンケートは本研究のために日本人・アメリカ人の間で行われます。本
リサーチに適するアンケート回答者を得るために、アンケートを回答頂く前
にいくつかお聞きしたい項目が設けられています。以下の全項目にあなた
が当てはまるかどうかどうぞ目を通して下さい。

☐ 日本育ち
☐ 日本国籍を有する
☐ 日本の市民権を有する
☐ 人種が日本人である
☐ 日本国外に継続して1ヶ月以上滞在、又は、住んでいた経験が無
い。(例えば、ホームステイ、仕事の都合で、一ヶ月以上旅行者と
して、帰国子女、日本国外で生まれ育った、などという理由から。)

もし、あなたが上に示された項目全てに当てはまる場合、続いてアン
ケート記入を行って下さい。

もし、あなたが上に示された項目1つでも当てはまらない項目がある
場合、今回のリサーチのご協力はここまでとなります。お時間とご協力大変有
難うございました。
Part 1.

以下に設定された南アフリカ人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を
思い出浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられ
た6つの中から選び〇を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても好ましい</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てはまる番号に〇を付けて下さい。

1. 南アフリカ出身の人が旅行者として日本を
   訪れること。

2. 南アフリカ出身の人が住民として日本に
   住むこと。

3. 南アフリカ出身の人と同じ職場で働く
   こと。

4. 南アフリカ出身の人があなたの住む
   地域に住むこと。

5. 南アフリカ出身の人があなたの家の
   隣近所に住むこと。

6. 南アフリカ出身の人があなたの家の
   隣家に住むこと。

7. 南アフリカ出身の人をクラブ、野球、
   習い事、お酒等を共にする親しい
   友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によって南アフリカ出身の人を家族
   の一員として持つこと。
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以下に設定された中国人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び〇を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てはまる番号に〇を付けて下さい。

1. 中国出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. 中国出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. 中国出身の人と同一職場で働くこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. 中国出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. 中国出身の人があなたの家の隣り近所に住むこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. 中国出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. 中国出身の人をクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする親しい友達として持つこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. 結婚によって中国出身の人が家族の一員として持つこと。
   1 2 3 4 5 6
以下に設定されたブラジル人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び○を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても好ましい</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ブラジル出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。

2. ブラジル出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。

3. ブラジル出身の人と同じ職場で働くこと。

4. ブラジル出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。

5. ブラジル出身の人があなたの家の隣近所に住むこと。

6. ブラジル出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。

7. ブラジル出身の人のクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする親しい友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によってブラジル出身の人の家族の一員として持つこと。

一番当てはまる番号に○を付けて下さい。

1 2 3 4 5 6
以下に設定された韓国人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び○を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てはまる番号に○を付けて下さい。

3. 韓国出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. 韓国出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. 韓国出身の人と同じ職場で働くこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. 韓国出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. 韓国出身の人があなたの家の隣り近所に住むこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. 韓国出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. 韓国出身の人がクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする親しい友達として持つこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. 結婚によって韓国出身の人が家族の一員として持つこと。 1 2 3 4 5 6
以下に設定されたアメリカ人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び〇を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても好ましい</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てにはまる番号に〇を付けて下さい。

1. アメリカ出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。

2. アメリカ出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。

3. アメリカ出身の人が同じ職場で働くこと。

4. アメリカ出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。

5. アメリカ出身の人があなたの家の隣近所に住むこと。

6. アメリカ出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。

7. アメリカ出身の人がクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によってアメリカ出身の人が家族の一員として持つこと。
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以下に設定された香港出身の人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び○を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てはまる番号に○を付けて下さい。

1. 香港出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。

2. 香港出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。

3. 香港出身の人と同じ職場で働くこと。

4. 香港出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。

5. 香港出身の人があなたの家の隣り近所に住むこと。

6. 香港出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。

7. 香港出身の人在クラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によって香港出身の人を家族の一員として持つこと。
以下に設定されたインド人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び〇を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>やや好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
<td>とても</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. インド出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れることが。

2. インド出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。

3. インド出身の人と同じ職場で働くこと。

4. インド出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。

5. インド出身の人があなたの家の隣近所に住むこと。

6. インド出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。

7. インド出身の人がクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によってインド出身の人が家族の一員として持つこと。

一番当てはまる番号に〇を付けて下さい。
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以下の設定された台湾人との交流が描かれたそれぞれの状況を思い浮かべて下さい。それぞれの状況に対するあなたの気持ちを下に与えられた6つの中から選び〇を付けて下さい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>とても</td>
<td>好ましくない</td>
<td>そのように</td>
<td>好ましい</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一番当てはまる番号に〇を付けて下さい。

1. 台湾出身の人が旅行者として日本を訪れること。

2. 台湾出身の人が住民として日本に住むこと。

3. 台湾出身の人と同じ職場で働くこと。

4. 台湾出身の人があなたの住む地域に住むこと。

5. 台湾出身の人があなたの家の隣近所に住むこと。

6. 台湾出身の人があなたの家の隣家に住むこと。

7. 台湾出身の人がクラブ、球団、習い事、お酒等を共にする友達として持つこと。

8. 結婚によって台湾出身の人が家族の一員として持つこと。
Part 2.

最後に、性別と年齢をお聞きします。
当ではまる性別に印を、又、年齢、出身地をご記入下さい。

1. 性別
   □ 男
   □ 女

2. 年齢
   __________歳

3. 出身
   __________都・道・府・県

アンケート記入の御協力大変有難うございました！
Appendix E: Cross-Cultural Attitude Questionnaire for Japanese Respondents  
(English version)

Dear respondents;

I am currently conducting research about cross-cultural attitude, that is attitude toward interaction in intercultural settings, for my Master’s thesis at the Department of communication at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. I would very much appreciate your time and cooperation on completing the questionnaire. This questionnaire will take approximately 15 minutes to be completed. The information obtained through this questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation!!!

Maki Matsubayashi

Questionnaire

I am conducting research with Japanese people and American people for present study. In order to obtain targeted respondents for the study, there are several criteria. Please take a look at the items stated below and see if you meet all of the items.

- You were raised in Japan
- Your citizenship is Japanese
- Your ethnicity is Japanese
- You HAVE NOT stayed in or lived outside Japan for more than the duration of 1 continuous month. (i.e., home stay program, sojourner, as a traveler for the length of more than 1 month, returnee, born and/or raised in other countries, etc.)

If you meet all the items given above, please continue to complete the following questionnaire.

If there is any single item that does not apply to you, your participation to this research ends here. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Part 1.

Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from South Africa. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from South Africa as visitors to America.

2. Having people from South Africa as citizens in America.

3. Having people from South Africa in your work place.

4. Having people from South Africa in your community.

5. Having people from South Africa in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from South Africa next door to you.

7. Having people from South Africa as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from South African in your family by marriage.
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Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from China. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from China as visitors to Japan.

2. Having people from China as citizens in Japan.

3. Having people from China in your work place.

4. Having people from China in your community.

5. Having people from China in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from China next door to you.

7. Having people from China as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from China in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Brazil. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Brazil and as visitors to Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from Brazil and as citizens in Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from Brazil and in your workplace.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from Brazil and in your community.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from Brazil and in your neighborhood.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from Brazil and next door to you.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from Brazil and as your pals to go to club with.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from Brazil in your family by marriage.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from South Korea. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from South Korea as visitors to Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from South Korea as citizens in Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from South Korea in your work place.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from South Korea in your community.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from South Korea in your neighborhood.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from South Korea next door to you.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from South Korea as your pals to go to club with.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from South Korea in your family by marriage.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from America. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from America as visitors to Japan.
2. Having people from America as citizens in Japan.
3. Having people from America in your work place.
4. Having people from America in your community.
5. Having people from America in your neighborhood.
6. Having people from America next door to you.
7. Having people from America as your pals to go to club with.
8. Having a person from America in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Hong Kong. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Hong Kong as visitors to Japan.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from Hong Kong as citizens in Japan.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from Hong Kong in your work place.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from Hong Kong in your community.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from Hong Kong in your neighborhood.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from Hong Kong next door to you.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from Hong Kong as your pals to go to club with.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from Hong Kong in your family by marriage.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from India. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from India as visitors to Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from India as citizens in Japan.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from India in your work place.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from India in your community.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from India in your neighborhood.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from India next door to you.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from India as your pals to go to club with.
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from India in your family by marriage.
   1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Taiwan. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Taiwan as visitors to Japan.

2. Having people from Taiwan as citizens in Japan.

3. Having people from Taiwan in your work place.

4. Having people from Taiwan in your community.

5. Having people from Taiwan in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from Taiwan next door to you.

7. Having people from Taiwan as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from Taiwan in your family by marriage.
Part 2.

This part asks you your demographic information.

Please check and give the answer that most truthfully describe you.

1. Sex
   
   □ Male
   □ Female

2. Age

   _________ years old.

3. Where are you originally from?

   _________ prefecture.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
Appendix F: Cross-Cultural Attitude Questionnaire for American Respondents

Dear respondents;

I am currently conducting research about cross-cultural attitude, that is attitude toward interaction in intercultural settings, for my Master's thesis at the Department of communication at the University of Hawaii at Manoa. I would very much appreciate your time and cooperation on completing the questionnaire. This questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to be completed. The information obtained through this questionnaire will be kept strictly confidential.

Thank you very much for your cooperation!!!

Maki Matsubayashi

Questionnaire

I am conducting research with Japanese people and American people for present study. In order to obtain targeted respondents for the study, there are several criteria. Please take a look at the items stated below and see if you meet each of them.

☐ You were raised in America
☐ Your citizenship is American
☐ You HAVE NOT stayed in or lived outside America for more than the duration of 1 continuous month.
(i.e., home stay program, sojourner, as a traveler for the length of more than 1 month, returnee, born and/or raised in other countries, etc.)

If you meet all the items given above, please continue to complete the following questionnaire.

If there is any single item that does not apply to you, your participation to this research ends here. Thank you very much for your time and cooperation!
Part 1.

Please consider the situations given below that each depict interactions with people from Australia. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Australia as visitors to America. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Having people from Australia as citizens in America. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Having people from Australia in your work place. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Having people from Australia in your community. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Having people from Australia in your neighborhood. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Having people from Australia next door to you. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Having people from Australia as your pals to go to club with. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Having a person from Australia in your family by marriage. 1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from China. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from China as visitors to America.
2. Having people from China as citizens in America.
3. Having people from China in your work place.
4. Having people from China in your community.
5. Having people from China in your neighborhood.
6. Having people from China next door to you.
7. Having people from China as your pals to go to club with.
8. Having a person from China in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that interaction with people from Canada. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Canada as visitors to America.

2. Having people from Canada as citizens in America.

3. Having people from Canada in your work place.

4. Having people from Canada in your community.

5. Having people from Canada in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from Canada next door to you.

7. Having people from Canada as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from Canada in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Japan. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Japan as visitors to America.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from Japan as citizens in America.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from Japan in your work place.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from Japan in your community.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from Japan in your neighborhood.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from Japan next door to you.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from Japan as your pals to go to club with.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from Japan in your family by marriage.
   - 1 2 3 4 5 6
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Great Britain. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Great Britain as visitors to America.

2. Having people from Great Britain as citizens in America.

3. Having people from Great Britain in your work place.

4. Having people from Great Britain in your community.

5. Having people from Great Britain in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from Great Britain next door to you.

7. Having people from Great Britain as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from Great Britain in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from India. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from India as visitors to America.

2. Having people from India as citizens in America.

3. Having people from India in your workplace.

4. Having people from India in your community.

5. Having people from India in your neighborhood.

6. Having people from India next door to you.

7. Having people from India as your pals to go to club with.

8. Having a person from India in your family by marriage.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from New Zealand. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Very Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Unfavorable</td>
<td>Slightly Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very Favorable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Having people from New Zealand as visitors to America. 1 2 3 4 5 6
2. Having people from New Zealand as citizens in America. 1 2 3 4 5 6
3. Having people from New Zealand in your work place. 1 2 3 4 5 6
4. Having people from New Zealand in your community. 1 2 3 4 5 6
5. Having people from New Zealand in your neighborhood. 1 2 3 4 5 6
6. Having people from New Zealand next door to you. 1 2 3 4 5 6
7. Having people from New Zealand as your pals to go to club with. 1 2 3 4 5 6
8. Having a person from New Zealand in your family by marriage. 1 2 3 4 5 6

Please circle the best answer.
Please consider the situations given below that each depict interaction with people from Egypt. And please indicate your feeling about each situation from the scale provided.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>3</th>
<th></th>
<th>5</th>
<th></th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Slightly</td>
<td></td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Unfavorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
<td>Very</td>
<td>Favorable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle the best answer.

1. Having people from Egypt as visitors to America.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

2. Having people from Egypt as citizens in America.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

3. Having people from Egypt in your workplace.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

4. Having people from Egypt in your community.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

5. Having people from Egypt in your neighborhood.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

6. Having people from Egypt next door to you.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

7. Having people from Egypt as your pals to go to club with.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6

8. Having a person from Egypt in your family by marriage.  
   1 2 3 4 5 6
Part 2.

This part asks you your demographic information.
Please check and give the answer that most truthfully describe you.

4. Sex
   - Male
   - Female

5. Age
   __________ years old.

6. Where are you originally from?
   __________ state.

THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
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