

INTRA-PERSONAL PERCEPTION
AND
NATIONAL RATINGS

ROBERT D.H. SALLERY

A Thesis

Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements of
the Degree of Master of Arts in the Psychology
Department of the
American University of Beirut

Beirut, Lebanon

June, 1965

INTRA-PERSONAL PERCEPTION
AND
NATIONAL RATINGS

R.D.H. SALLERY

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The writer wishes to express thanks to all the staff of the Department of Psychology, at the American University of Beirut. Their continual advice and guidance, both formally and informally has made this research project more meaningful professionally and personally.

Special thanks are due to the thesis committee, Professor E.T. Prothro, Chairman of the Committee, Professor E. Dalrymple-Alford and Professor L. Diab, and to Professor H.C. Lindgren, member ex-officio.

Thanks are also extended to Miss Nadia Zahr for the long hours spent typing the draft proposal, the proposal itself, and finally the thesis.

Last, but not least, special thanks are offered to my wife, Jan. A full-time job with considerable travelling, a thesis and continual course examinations might have made family life rather tight had it not been for her interest, encouragement and patience.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Acknowledgements	iii
List of Tables	v
Chapter	
I Outline of the Problem and Background of Theory and Research	1
II Review of Research	8
III Hypotheses	38
IV Method and Procedure	44
V Results and Discussion	49
Summary	63
Appendix	67
References	70

LIST OF TABLES

Table		Page
1	The relationship between how subjects perceive other national groups rating the subjects home nationality and how these subjects, in turn, rate these other national groups	50
2	The significance of differences between the means for standard of living, cultural standards, political standards and personal characteristics in the self-rating responses of 92 Arab subjects	54
3	Data for the rating of home nationalities by American, Lebanese, and Sudanese subjects	56
4	The rating of "others" by subjects rating their own nationalities low and perceiving 'these others' as also rating the subject's nationality low	60

CHAPTER I
OUTLINE OF THE PROBLEM
AND
BACKGROUND OF THEORY AND RESEARCH

Research efforts in the last decade have shown a sustained interest in the topics of social distance and attitude change and in the effects on these variables of the estimations of attitudes and personality characteristics of other persons. This interest has found expression not only in research but also in the development of theoretical models dealing with the attitudes held by two or more persons toward an object of common interest or relevance. The purpose of this first chapter is twofold: (1) to outline the problem; and (2) to present a summary statement of a theoretical model and to relate the present study to it.

It must be appreciated from the outset, however, that any model of behavior is, at best, one of many interpretations of the data obtained and that many questions are usually left unanswered. Still there is value in theorizing, if for nothing else, than for stimulating further research.

OUTLINE OF THE PROBLEM

The topic of social distance has been, and continues to be, an important area for social-psychological research. Studies from many parts of the world, (some of which are

reported in Chapter II) from diverse cultural and national groups, have accumulated in journals and reports during the last four or five decades.

The way in which people perceive or think others rate them, very often determines how, or at least is related to how, people will rate 'these others'. This perception of others by individuals without actual interaction can be called 'intra-personal perception.'

This study is, by design, a study of social distance and intra-personal perception. Hence the title of this paper: "Intra-personal perception and national ratings". Selected nationality groups are utilized and ratings of how these groups perceive other national groups as rating them are related, in turn, to how these others are rated. ✓ For example, ratings are obtained for how Lebanese subjects think or perceive the "Swiss" rate Lebanon and how the Lebanese, in turn, would rate Switzerland. Similarly with other specific national groups

A THEORETICAL BASIS FOR THE PRESENT STUDY

A. Newcomb's A-B-X Model

Newcomb's A-B-X model of orientation systems, although not directly concerned with the present study, can be conceptually related to the main variables in the

study. Newcomb's first formal statement appeared in 1953⁽¹⁾. Subsequently, brief enlargements of the model appeared in 1956⁽²⁾, 1958⁽³⁾, 1959⁽⁴⁾, 1960⁽⁵⁾ and 1961⁽⁶⁾.

Newcomb's model is potentially applicable to groups of any size but is most readily discussed in the context of two-person interaction. The symbols 'A' and 'B' refer to persons, and the symbol 'X' refers to an object about which A and B are communicating with each other. Essentially, however, the A-B-X model deals with systematic relationships among the attitudes one person, A, has toward another person, B, and toward an object X;

(1) Newcomb, T.M. An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psych. Rev., 1953, 60, 393-404.

(2) Newcomb, T.M. The prediction of inter-personal attraction. Amer. Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.

(3) Newcomb, T.M. The cognition of persons as cognizers. In R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Standford Univ. Press, 1958, Pp. 179-190.

(4) Newcomb, T.M. Individual systems of orientation. In Koch, S. (Ed.), PSYCHOLOGY: A study of a science. Vol. 3. New York; McGraw Hill, 1959; Pp. 384-422.

(5) Newcomb, T.M. Varieties of interpersonal attraction. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics: Research and theory. Evanston, Ill.: Row. Peterson, 1960, Pp. 104-119.

(6) Newcomb, T.M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston: 1961.

and the attitudes of B toward A and X, as perceived by A. That is, the model, is concerned primarily with an "intra-personal" system. Newcomb's A-B-X model, or the 'individual systems of orientation' does not address itself to actual relationships between A and B and their respective attitudes, but only to the relationships as perceived by A.

Newcomb applies the term "orientation" in a manner that approximates the general use of "attitudes." Use of the former term allows for the distinction between two objects of attitudes: (1) persons as co-communicators, (2) objects of communication. Within the model a person is seen as having either positive or negative attraction toward another person and as having either a positive or negative attitude toward the object in question. "Orientations" are regarded as having both cathetic and cognitive aspects. The cathetic aspects of an orientation refer to approach-avoidance tendencies and have the conceptual properties of sign and strength.

An individual system of orientation is said to be in a state of strain when A judges (perceives) that there is a discrepancy between his own attitudes toward X and B's attitude toward X. Newcomb postulates that systems in a state of strain tend to move toward states of lesser strain or balance. Such 'movement' is brought about by change in at least one of the system elements - A's own orientations and/or the orientations he attributes to B.

A final concept of Newcomb's which will concern us here, and which is of major importance to the model is "communicative behavior". By this term Newcomb means nothing other than the transmission and receipt of information by persons. Communication according to Newcomb consists in the exchange of symbols from which people or co-communicators draw inferences concerning the orientations of others. The relevance of communicative behavior for the model is that the inferences drawn from received information (or perceived information) are held to have an effect upon the recipient's behavior as it relates to the transmitter, to the object of the communication or to both.

There are five variables that Newcomb postulates as co-variates of the amount of system strain: (1) degree of perceived discrepancy between A's and B's attitude, (2) sign and degree of attraction of A toward B, (3) importance of the object of communication, (4) object relevance and (5) certainty (committedness) of own orientation.

The interrelationships among the preceding variables and the hypothetical construct "system strain" having been specified, it is appropriate to indicate the effects ascribed to this construct. According to Newcomb, "...forces toward states of equilibrium within individual systems of orientation determine both existing attitudes towards two classes of objects and the behavior by which further

information concerning those objects is obtained and evaluated... and by which, therefore, those attitudes are maintained or changed"(7). That is, behavior is conceptualized as being embedded in a cognitive-emotional-motivational matrix in which no true separation is possible. A change in one part of the system threatens the entire system so that the resistance of a particular attitude derives its strength actually from the whole structure of which it is only a part.

B. The Present Study in Terms of the A-B-X Model

As mentioned earlier the A-B-X model is an 'intra-personal' model and, as such, addresses itself only to relationships as perceived by A. In the present study the individual S's can be treated as 'A' in the model. The subject's conception of the attitudes of other national groups can be treated as B and X, the object of 'orientation' or 'communication' would then be A's home country or his national status.

As within the theoretical model B was seen as having either positive or negative attitudes, as perceived by A, toward X, and A accordingly, it was predicted, should have either positive or negative attitudes respectively toward B.

(7) Newcomb, Individual system of orientation, op cit., p. 288.

A 'state of strain' was said to exist if a discrepancy between A's perceived attitude of B towards X and A's own attitude or orientation towards X occurs. This 'state of strain', according to the model could be reduced by a change in one of the system's elements - either in A's own orientations toward B or X and/or in the orientations attributed to B.

Theoretically and in terms of the present study the higher the degree of discrepancy between A's attitude towards X and A's perception of B's attitude toward X the more extreme or negative will be A's attitude toward B (or the nationality B represents). The object of communication (A's national country) was assumed to be of high importance since A, it was argued, could be assumed to identify with it. (Some subjects in the study did not identify or, at least, were extremely critical of it, with their home country and these were treated separately). The 'object relevance' was also assumed to be important since subjects (A's) were asked how they thought others (B's) rated X, or, in a sense, how B is rating A himself.

CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RESEARCH

The preceding summary of Newcomb's A-B-X model will be supplemented as needed in the chapter on Method, but the material already presented sets out the theoretical source of the variables to be investigated. The variables of major interest to the present study are given in the title of this thesis: intra-personal and national ratings. Accordingly the review of the research will fall into the following categories: (1) studies dealing with national ratings and social distance and (2) those studies dealing with intra-personal perception. A third group of studies which do not lend themselves to the above classification but which are relevant for the study are grouped under the title of "miscellaneous studies".

A. National Ratings

Bogardus⁽⁸⁾ developed a 'social distance scale' which was designed to measure attitudes in terms of the action a person may be expected to take rather than in terms of the verbal stereotypes or expressed opinions which may not be too closely related to the actions an individual might take. Attitudes of the individual toward a nationality were measured by the closeness of tolerated

(8) Bogardus, Emery S. Immigration and race attitudes; New York: D.C. Heath and Co., 1928.

relationships which the individual indicated on a seven point scale. A remarkably similar picture of social distance for national and ethnic groups in the U.S. is found in different strata of the population and in different regions. In spite of "rapid change and earth shaking events", social distances have remained consistent over a period of time. Bogardus repeated his study with a similar group 20 years after the first test was administered and concluded that:

"The population groups to which the greatest nearness was expressed in 1926... maintained this role for the most part in 1946... Likewise the groups which were placed at the greatest distance in 1926 maintained this position with only one major exception, the Chinese, in 1946. It is likewise true that the groups which occupied middle positions on the scale in 1926 were accorded similar positions in 1946." (9)

Very similar ratings on the 'social distance scale' have been found in far-flung parts of the United States - Florida, New York, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, and Washington. Furthermore members of minority groups in the U.S. have been found to make rankings strikingly similar to those of majority group members. There is one important difference, however, in this latter point, and that is that the minority group retains the established scale but moves its own group from its lower position to a rank near or at the top.

(9) Bogardus, E.S. Changes in racial distances. Interest J. Opin. and Attit. Res., 1947, 1: 55-62.

The 'social distance scale' has also been used extensively in various parts of the world. Dodd⁽¹⁰⁾, in 1935, used the 'social distance scale' on Middle (Near) Eastern students. The greatest social distances, at that time, appeared to prevail between religious groupings.

Prothro and Melikian⁽¹¹⁾ repeated Dodd's study some fifteen years later. Syrians, Lebanese and Egyptians, who were most like the subjects were ranked first. "Various technologically advanced" countries, like America, France, Japan, followed. Next were "... more backward people or those with backward governments: Chinese, Saudi Arabs, Iraqi, and Sudanese." Last came the Turks "... whose government and soldiers dominated the Arab world for many years"⁽¹²⁾. Prothro and Melikian also pointed out that social distances were greater between national groups than religious groups as reported by Dodd 15 years earlier. This shift from religious to national emphasis was attributed by the authors to the strong surge of nationalist sentiment and activity in the years since 1935.

(10) Dodd, S.C. A social distance test in the Near East. Amer. J. Sociol., 1935, 41, 194-204.

(11) Prothro, E.T., and Melikian, L. Social distance and social change in the Near East. Sociol. and soc. Res., 1952, 37; 3-11.

(12) Ibid, p.10.

Buchanan and Cantril⁽¹³⁾ in a rather extensive report on public opinion research deal with the topic of national stereotypes. Positive evaluation or friendliness these authors suggest is related to the following factors: (1) where the subject's nation is immediately in terms of the dichotomous ideologies of the United States and Russia; (2) the place of the subject's nation during the last great war; (3) the existence of common boundaries between the subject's nation and others whom he is rating; (4) the existence of common languages; and (5) the neutrality of the nation being stereotype during wars or heated political crises.

Prothro and Melikian⁽¹⁴⁾ noticed considerable similarity in the stereotypes held by Arab and American subjects with respect to the Germans, Jews and Negroes. In addition, they suggest a close correspondence to situational changes. Utilizing the Katz and Braly⁽¹⁵⁾ technique with Arab S's both before and after extensive contact with Americans (through visits of the 7th fleet

(13) Buchanan, W., and Cantril, H. How nations see each other: A study in public opinion. Urbana: Univ. of Ill. Press, 1953.

(14) Prothro, E.T. and Melikian, L. Studies in stereotypes: III. Arab students in the Near East. J. soc. Psychol., 1954, 40, 237-243.

(15) Katz, D. and Braly, K. Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1933, 28, 280-290.

and Point IV personnel), the stereotypes of other groups remained unchanged but the American stereotype was enlarged by the inclusion of other characteristics such as "sociable, jolly, superficial, and simple". According to Triandis⁽¹⁶⁾. "This stereotype did not differ very much from the stereotype obtained from students in East Pakistan (Zaidi and Ahmed⁽¹⁷⁾)". Rath and Das⁽¹⁸⁾ in Orissa, India, recorded the stereotypes of freshmen towards themselves, the Chinese and three other nationalities. The stereotype of the Chinese obtained subsequently by Sinha and Upadhyaya⁽¹⁹⁾ from a similar sample of Ss during the Sino-Indian border dispute indicated "marked changes of this stereotype in the unfavourable direction".

The fact that stereotypes may correspond to real changes in political and/or social conditions or that they may not correspond to known facts has been reviewed by

(16) Triandis, H.C. Cultural Influences upon cognitive processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed), Advances in Experimental Social Psychology. New York: Academic Press, vol. 1, 1964, p.36.

(17) Zaidi, S.M.H., and Ahmed, M. National stereotypes of university students in East Pakistan. J. soc. Psychol., 1958, 47, 387-395.

(18) Rath, R., and Das, J.P. J. soc. Psychol., 1958, 47, 373-385. Study in stereotypes of college freshmen and service holders in Orissa, India, towards themselves and four other nationalities.

(19) Sinha, A.K.P., and Upadhyaya, O.P. Change and persistence in the stereotypes of university students toward different ethnic groups during Sino-Indian border dispute. J. soc. Psychol., 1960, 52, 31-39.

Fishman⁽²⁰⁾. He points out that although stereotypes may be conceived of as "inferior judgemental processes", they are not necessarily "rigid" nor "in opposition to reality".

The renewed interest in social distance has been discussed by Banton⁽²¹⁾. In his review a study by Mitchell is reported which shows that social distance of different African tribes toward each other follow a particular law: the more the similarity in social organization and religion the less is the social distance between them.

According to Triandis⁽²²⁾ despite the rather wide use of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale it has at least one serious defect - "The use of a single stimulus such as 'Negro' or 'Irishman' permits only ambiguous interpretations of the results"⁽²³⁾. That is a subject may respond to different aspects of the stimulus one - to nationality, religion, social class, race, etc. The results obtained with single stimuli, these authors suggest, cannot help

(20) Fishman, J.A. An examination of the process and function of social stereotype. J. soc. Psychol., 1956, 43, 27-64.

(21) Banton, M. Social distance: A new appreciation. Soc. Rev., 1960, 8, 169-183.

(22) Triandis, op.cit.

(23) Ibid, p. 49.

but be ambiguous. Furthermore, many recent studies of social distance have the same defect (Ansari⁽²⁴⁾, with Moslems and Hindus; Hunt⁽²⁵⁾ with Phillipinos, etc.).

Of the various methods used in studying stereotypes the most frequent is the checklist. This method, however, does pose serious methodological problems when cross-cultural work is attempted. According to Triandis⁽²⁶⁾ significant differences have been found between various cultures in the affective properties of stimulus words - for example "aggressive" may be good in some cultures and bad in others. Additionally, differences have been found between cultures in the subject's conception or notion of the number of checks that they "ought" to place. The social desirability of traits may be similar for some cultures (see Klett and Youkey⁽²⁷⁾ for Norwegian, American and Arab samples) and different for others.

Another problem with the checklist has been nicely illustrated by Diab⁽²⁸⁾. He has shown that the results

(24) Ansari, A. A study of the relation between group stereotypes and social distance. J. Educ. Psychol., Baroda, 1956, 14, 28-35.

(25) Hunt, C.L. Social distance in the Phillipines. Sociol. soc. Res., 1956, 40, 253-260.

(26) Triandis. op.cit. p.13.

(27) Klett, J.C., and Yaukey, D.W. A cross-cultural comparison of judgements of social desirability. J. soc. Psychol., 1959, 49, 19-26.

(28) Diab, L.N. Factors affecting studies of national stereotypes. J. soc. Psychol., 1963, 59, 29-40.

obtained are affected by the number and kind of national groups used in the study of stereotypes. Arrangements of national groups may appear in such a way that a 'contrast effect' is produced. For example, if the U.S. and U.S.S.R. were placed one after the other subjects are more likely to 'contrast' the two and therefore assign different descriptive adjectives than if they were treated separately.

An important group of studies has emerged originating from the work of Osgood et al^(29, 30). Such studies as Kumata and Schramm⁽³¹⁾ with Japanese and Korean bilingual students and monolingual American students, Triandis and Osgood⁽³²⁾ with Greeks, and Suci⁽³³⁾ with Southwest Indian

(29) Osgood, C.E. Method and theory in experimental psychology. New York: Oxford University Press, 1953.

(30) Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J., and Tannenbaum, P.M. The measurement of meaning. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois Press, 1957.

(31) Kumata, H., and Schramm, W. A pilot study of cross-cultural meaning. Publ. Opin. Quart., 1956, 20, 229-237.

(32) Triandis, H.C., and Osgood, E.E. A comparative factorial analysis of semantic structures in monolingual Greek and American college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 110-118.

(33) Suci, G.J. A comparison of semantic structures in American Southwest Culture Groups. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 25-30.

cultures etc. have indicated that in all cultures an 'evaluative factor' was present and dominant in the measurement of stereotypes, and in all of the cultures a 'potency' and 'activity' or a dynamism (combination of potency and activity) factor was also observed.

The development and use of the factor analytic technique has proven itself to be of great importance in the analysis of the cultural constituents or components in national stereotyping.

Standardizing an equal-interval scale of social distance and employing sixteen separate stimuli, Triandis and Triandis⁽³⁴⁾, in a study with Illinois students, factor analyzed the controlled variance in the social distance scores. The stimuli were chosen so that they had characteristics consisting of combinations of "one of two levels of race, occupation, religion and nationality." Stimuli were selected according to a factorial design, to determine the percentage of variance controlled by race, occupation, religion and nationality. According to the results 77 percent of the controlled variance of the social distance scores could be accounted for by 'race', 17 percent by 'occupation', about 5 percent by 'religion', and 1 percent for the 'nationality' of the stimulus person.

(34) Triandis and Triandis, op.cit.

Triandis and Triandis⁽³⁵⁾ repeated the above mentioned study with Greek and a new sample of Illinois Ss. The Illinois subjects again responded primarily in terms of the race of the stimulus person, while the Greeks were more concerned about the religion of the person; the data analysis indicated that in the social distance scores religion accounted for 55 percent of the controlled variance, 24 percent was accounted by race, 5 percent by occupation, and the rest by interactions. Furthermore, the authors, utilized in this study, both the semantic differential and social distance scales. On the basis of their results they suggest that large discrepancies may exist between the results obtained from the semantic differential (evaluations) and social distance scales (behavioral intentions).

The evaluation of nationals of other countries by means of the semantic differential have been obtained by several writers, employing Italian Ss, (Rosen⁽³⁶⁾), American and Greek Ss, (Triandis and Triandis⁽³⁷⁾).

(35) Triandis, H.C. and Triandis, L.M. A cross-cultural study of social distance. Psychol. Monogr., 76, No. 21.

(36) Rosen, E.A. A cross-cultural study of semantic profiles and attitudes differences. J. soc. Psychol., 1959, 49, 137-144.

(37) Triandis and Triandis, op.cit.

The above summary of research dealing primarily with social distance (national ratings) serve to emphasize seven major points:

(1) That national ratings are relatively similar in most of the U.S. and in many other parts of the world and that these ratings remain relatively constant over a period of time;

(2) That the group in question, whether minority or majority, usually always places itself at or near the top of the national ratings;

(3) That the criteria, or points of emphasis, for ranking other nationalities may vary from culture to culture;

(4) That stereotypes are not necessarily contrary to fact nor are they necessarily rigid;

(5) That, although the Bogardus Social Distance Scale has been widely used it has also been misused. Similarly for the checklist;

(6) That the factor analytic technique is becoming more and more useful in the study of national stereotyping.

(7) That when various constituents of a culture or national group are at play in the S's evaluation a principle of summation, based on the S's subjective probability that the

subject has a particular attribute, has proved to be highly correlated with the S's attitude toward the object in question.

B. Intra-Personal Perception

The individual system of orientations is composed of A's attitude toward X; his attraction toward B, and his perception of B's attraction toward himself, A, and of B's attitude toward X. While the question of perceptual accuracy is not raised explicitly in the A-B-X model, it should be readily apparent that the accuracy of A's estimates of B's orientations is important in his attempts to maintain system strain at minimal levels. These relationships are specified in Heider's⁽³⁸⁾ P-O-X model. This model, like Newcomb's model, involves the concept of system strain and is also intra-personal. Both Heider's and Newcomb's models are centered around balance theory: that is, unbalanced cognitive systems tend to shift toward a state of balance.

Perception and perceptual accuracy, then, can be an important factor in determining whether or not a 'state of strain' will come into being, will become greater or will be eliminated.

(38) Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.

The series of studies outlined immediately below deal primarily with the responses of individuals as a result of how that individual perceives the attitude (s) of other person(s).

A study by Lambert and Bressler⁽³⁹⁾ with Indian students in the U.S. suggested that the most powerful influence upon their perception of America and Americans was their perception of how they thought Americans viewed India. The series of "naive questions and unintentional insults" to Indian foreign students by Americans were examined and were found to be related to the Indian students' conception of Americans.

Byrne and Wong⁽⁴⁰⁾ investigated interpersonal attraction as a function of the interaction of race, racial prejudice, and attitude similarity-dissimilarity. A group of high - and a group of low-prejudiced subjects received faked background information (including race) of a non-existent stranger and of his responses to an attitude scale. One half of each group received scales

(39) Lambert, R.D., and Bressler, M. Indian students on an American Campus. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minn. Press., 1956.

(40) Byrne, D., and Wong, T.J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction, and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1962, 65, 246-253.

that were similar to scales they had filled out several weeks earlier, and the other half received scales that were dissimilar. The similar and dissimilar "strangers" were divided into two groups: one was represented as Negro, the other as Caucasian. The researches found that, regardless of race and prejudice of the subject, similarity of attitudes resulted in positive ratings of the strangers and dissimilarity resulted in negative ratings.

Beier, Rossi and Garfield⁽⁴¹⁾ had subjects respond to the Minnesota Multiphasic Personality Inventory three times, giving their own responses, their estimation of the way their best friend would respond, and their estimation of the way their least liked friend would respond. They found that there was greater similarity between the "self" responses and those estimated for the friend than there was between "self" and the least liked acquaintance.

Fiedler, Warrington, and Blaisdell⁽⁴²⁾ had fraternity members who had known one another for at least

(41) Beier, E.G., Rossi, A.M. and Garfield, R.L. Similarity plus dissimilarity of personality: Basis for friendship? Psychol. Rep., 1961, 8, 3-8.

(42) Fiedler, F.E., Warrington, W.G., and Blaisdell, F.J. Unconscious attitudes as correlates of sociometric choice in a social group. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 790-796.

three months sort a set of 76 statements on four bases: self description, ideal self description, prediction of the subject's best-liked fraternity brothers' self responses, and prediction of the subject's least-liked fraternity brothers self responses. They found greater attribution of similarity to those persons liked best by the subjects than to those liked least in spite of the fact that there were no significant differences in the actual similarities between the subjects' self descriptions and the persons they liked or disliked. The authors concluded that individuals distortedly perceive like persons as more similar to themselves than they do disliked persons.

Jordan⁽⁴³⁾ investigated the degree of pleasantness of 64 hypothetical situations as ranked by his subjects. The situations differed from each other in terms of the combinations of positive and negative relationships in each situation. This study derives from Heider's⁽⁴⁴⁾ model, and the relationships are those between two persons, and between each of those persons and an impersonal entity .

(43) Jordan, N. Behavioral forces that are a function of attitudes and of cognitive organization. Hum. Relat., 1953, 6, 273-288.

(44) Heider, op.cit.

The situation could be balanced or unbalanced, and either of these conditions could result from a variety of relationship combinations. Jordan found that a balanced situation in which there was a positive relationship between the two persons was rated as pleasant, while a balanced situation in which there was a negative relationship between the persons was rated as unpleasant. In other words, the presence of balance in a hypothetical situation is not sufficient to guarantee that it will be seen as a pleasant one.

Investigating the effects of cooperation and competition on the attribution of similarity, Rosenbaum⁽⁴⁵⁾, had subjects fill out a 'Self-Evaluation Form' and two weeks later fill out the same form under a different name as they believed another subject, whom they had just met, would fill it out. The two subjects then participated in a twenty minute discussion after which they again filled out the evaluation form as they estimated their partners would. He found that the post-discussion measure showed a significantly greater assumption of similarity under cooperative conditions than under competitive conditions.

(45) Rosenbaum, M.E. Social perception and the motivational structure of interpersonal relations. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1959, 59, 130-133.

Morris⁽⁴⁶⁾ working with large groups of foreign students in the U.S. suggests that foreign students experience "status shock" soon after their arrival in the U.S. This shock may be caused by such things as a shift in academic standing, a loss or gain of economic status, a change in judgement norms, etc. According to Morris, this experience of status shock and increased concern and awareness of status seem universal.

Morris and Davidson⁽⁴⁷⁾ devised a study attempting to classify the various kinds of status factors affecting the foreign student. That is, they tried to select the important indices of adjustment; to establish the relation between the status variables and the outcome variables; and to establish whether other commonly proposed factors such as language difficulties, race, previous experience, and nationality, were more closely related to adjustment than were the status factors.

(46) Morris, R.T.; National status and attitudes of foreign students. Jrnl. of Soc. Issues, 1956, Vol. 12. 20-25.

(47) Morris, R.T., and Davidson, O.M. The Two-way Mirror: National Status in Foreign Students Adjustment. Minneapolis: Univ. of Minnesota Press, 1960.

"National Status"⁽⁴⁸⁾ was selected by Morris and Davidson, as the main independent variable because foreign students must all handle this "new criterion of status" (i.e. nationality). The role of national status becomes more important in the self esteem of the student when he leaves his home ground because he is identified in countless ways as a foreign student. He is often singled out for special treatment, special advisors, special classes, special social events, etc.

Furthermore, Morris and Davidson suggest that the student himself may increase the importance of nationality in his self-image because he feels that he is representative of his home country while in the host country. This, the authors suggest, may be for a variety of reasons: "gratitude for a grant from his government, a sense of responsibility for getting special training which he can apply to his country's betterment when he returns, or the fact that he is alone among strangers who are ignorant of his country and to whom he must give a favourable, or at least fair, picture of his homeland."⁽⁴⁹⁾

(48) Ibid.

(49) Ibid., p.6.

The general theory of Morris and Davidson's study was that a student who believes members of host countries rated his country higher than he himself did experiences "national status gain", and one who believes that members of the host country rated his country lower than he did experiences "national status loss".

'National Status gain' and 'national status loss' were defined in terms of a comparison between two ratings made by the student, his own rating of his country's position, and his estimate of the members of the host countries ratings.

The studies cited immediately above provide evidence for and general support of the idea, advanced in the A-B-X model, that perceived similarity of attitudes and attraction are positively related, and that the perceiver tends to adopt attitudes different from those held by a person to whom he is negatively attracted; that the perceiver may ascribe attitudes, opposite to his own, to a person(s) to whom he is negatively attracted. Furthermore, perceived similarity tends to produce a situation which is favourably looked upon while perceived dissimilarity is viewed unfavourably. Using a physiological measure of tension, disagreement with a positively

attractive person is shown to be tension inducing, which supports the notion that an asymmetrical system of orientation results in strain.

The studies by Morris⁽⁵⁰⁾ and Morris and Davidson⁽⁵¹⁾ provide some evidence for relating (at least in the U.S.) perceived similarity of attitudes towards a 'home' country to a socio-economic theory of stratification and mobility.

C. Miscellaneous Studies

There are some reports of research of direct interest to the present study which do not correspond to either of the preceding classifications and which are briefly considered here. These studies deal primarily with the method used in the measurement of stereotypes.

Dennis⁽⁵²⁾ using word associations suggests that cultural orientations may be indicated by the subject's response to certain common objects or experiences. For example, 51 percent of a Lebanese sample associated "mother" with providing food while only 16 percent of Americans and 7 percent of Sudanese subjects had the same association.

(50) Morris, op.cit.

(51) Morris and Davidson. op.cit.

(52) Dennis, W. Uses of common objects as indicators of cultural orientations. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 21-28.

Recent studies by Osgood et al⁽⁵³⁾ suggest that bipolar rating scales may be utilized in the study of attitudes. Osgood suggests that certain groupings occur in which an individual tends to place a given object in a similar position on each scale. Three dimensions of attitude are inferred to be measured by these scales, namely: (1) the individuals evaluation of the object or concept being rated; (2) the individuals perception of the potency or power of the object or concept; (3) his perception of the activity of the object or concept.

Sherif and Hovland⁽⁵⁴⁾ suggest that an individual's response to a stimulus is seldom made in terms of the "discrete physical properties of that stimulus"⁽⁵⁵⁾ but rather is made in terms of a "psychological reference scale" which the individual has formed through previous associations with similar stimuli. This "psychological reference scale" the authors refer to as the 'latitude of acceptance or rejection'. That is, an individual's stand or position on an issue may incorporate several adjacent

(53) Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum. op.cit.

(54) Sherif, M., and Hovland, C.I. Social Judgement. New York: Yale Univ. Press. 1961

(55) Ibid. p.51

positions which he accepts or tolerates. The "latitude of rejection" consists of the positions he finds objectionable. Both these concepts are conceived in motivational terms. That is, high ego-involvement on an issue produces a "raised threshold of acceptance of positions on the issue" and thus a lowering of the threshold for the latitude of rejection.

In a major study by Bettelheim and Janowitz⁽⁵⁶⁾ hostility of outgroups was validated to be a function of the hostile individual's feeling that he has suffered deprivations in the past. Several characteristics singled out for study by Bettelheim and Janowitz such as age, education, religion, political affiliation, income and social status, suggested that, subject to certain limitations, these factors alone could not of themselves account for differences in the degree or nature of intolerance. The rating or measurement of the individual's hostility or prejudice was done by means of an extensive interview. This technique was appropriate since their major hypothesis was based on ego psychology.

Finally, Triandis⁽⁵⁷⁾ points out that the evidence from cross-cultural research suggests that the structure

(56) Bettelheim, B., and Janowitz, M., Dynamics of Prejudice. New York: Harper and Bros., 1950.

(57) Triandis, op.cit.

of connotative meaning is invariant across cultures. These cultures may vary, however, in their judgement of concepts against the three major dimensions of this semantic structure. In this connection, Osgood et al⁽⁵⁸⁾ outlined eight octants of a semantic-meaning space for high-low values on the evaluation, potency and activity factors. The location of a specific term, these authors suggested, could therefore be defined in terms of its location in 'semantic space'. For example, Americans, Flemish and Japanese subjects see "PROGRESS" as E+, P+, A+; while Finnish subjects see "PROGRESS" as E+, P- A-. That is, Americans, Flemish and Japanese subjects see 'PROGRESS' as more active than do the Finnish subjects.

(58) Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum. op.cit.

CLOSURE
AND
SUMMARY OF RESEARCH CITED

"The most significant theoretical development in social psychology in the last ten years", writes Triandis, "is the intensive interest in consistency theories"⁽⁵⁹⁾. Reference is made, for example, to the works of Heider^(60, 61), Newcomb^(62, 63), Osgood et al⁽⁶⁴⁾ and Festinger⁽⁶⁵⁾. These authors have provided important theoretical models which have been tested and reviewed.

(59) Triandis. op.cit., p.45.

(60) Heider, op.cit.

(61) Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. J. Psychol., 1946, 21, 107-112.

(62) Newcomb. Individual systems of orientation. op.cit.

(63) Newcomb. The acquaintance process. op.cit.

(64) Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, op.cit.

(65) Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston Illi. Row, Peterson, 1957.

As pointed out by Krech et al⁽⁶⁶⁾: "Balance theory asserts that unbalanced cognitive systems tend to shift toward a state of balance". That is, a state of balance is defined to exist in a cognitive system "... to the extent that the elements of the system form units which have non-contradictory relationships"⁽⁶⁷⁾. Furthermore, these authors relate that the most important application of balance theory, for social psychology deals with the affective cognitions of the individuals which pertain to people and social objects, or in the authors words "... the individual's own positive and/or negative evaluations of people and objects and his cognition of the positive and/or negative evaluative relations that exist among these people and objects."⁽⁶⁸⁾

Both of the publications by Newcomb^(69, 70) upon which the first part of Chapter I of this study was related stress the properties of inter-dependency and

(66) Krech, D., Crutchfield, R.S., and Ballachey, E.L. Individual in Society. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.

(67) Ibid. p.41.

(68) Ibid.

(69) Newcomb. Individual systems of orientation. op.cit.

(70) Newcomb. The acquaintance process. op.cit.

co-variation among system variables rather than present any one variable as a function of another variable. As Newcomb⁽⁷¹⁾, himself, relates he chose to emphasize "system properties" rather than the "single variables" which contribute to them, and consequently none of the variables has an enduring status either as an independent or as dependent variable.

Consistent with the position taken by Newcomb, the hypotheses presented in the next chapter are not intended as final statements of causal relationships. The present stage of development of the A-B-X and other models does not permit the precise specification of the occurrence of one or another of the several alternative modes of system strain reduction.

Newcomb touches on this latter aspect of the model in his discussion of alternative strain-reducing system changes. "In any given instance, once any one of these changes has occurred with strain-reducing effects, the probabilities that any others will occur are reduced."⁽⁷²⁾

op.cit. (71) Newcomb. Individual systems of orientation. p.388.

(72) Ibid., p.404.

The findings of several groups of studies dealing with the broad topic of national stereotypes and intra-personal perception can briefly be summarized as follows:

Many studies during the last decade or so have focused attention on cross cultural research. Many of these studies have dealt specifically with the measurement of attitudes which pertain to national groupings other than the home country. The concept of social distance has been extensively used. Evidence available for the last 40 years indicates that the ratings on social distance scales have been remarkably stable and that the majority of the people, in the U.S. at least, accept the established social distance scales in some degree. Shifts in ranks, however, are found and these are attributed mainly as to whether or not the country in question was on the side of the allies or the axis powers during the last war.

'All humans use categories, organize them into schemata, and experience subjective probabilities between the categories.'⁽⁷³⁾ The problem of attitude measurement in general and national stereotyping in

(73) Kluckhohn, C. Culture and Behavior. M. G. Lindzey, Handbook of Social Psychology. Cambridge: Addison - Wesley, 1954.

specific seems as much a problem of 'perception' as it does anything else. All humans organize the world in terms of its affective impact - or evaluation, power and activity (Osgood's⁽⁷⁴⁾ three main factors), or some combination of these factors. Furthermore, perceptual responses are modified by both the frequency of occurrence of a particular stimulus (the more frequent stimuli are recognized easily) and by the kind of previous reinforcements received in the presence of the stimulus.

In the absence of actual interaction between the source of a communication and its recipient, a communication representing a position that is extremely different from that held by the recipient will result in less attitude change than will a communication that is less discrepant.

Many studies in the past dealing with foreign students have been somewhat of a "shotgun" approach in that they have tried to include every conceivable variable which might influence or explain in some regular way the adjustment patterns of the student during his stay in the host country. The studies by Morris⁽⁷⁵⁾,

(74) Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum, op.cit.

(75) Morris, op.cit.

and Morris and Davidson⁽⁷⁶⁾, in which an attempt is made to relate the foreign students' adjustment to a theory of socio-economic stratification and mobility, seem to be of this type.

Bettelheim and Janowitz^(77, 78) have suggested that such variables as age, education, religion, political affiliation, etc. cannot of themselves account for differences in the degree of nature of intolerance and prejudice. They point out, however, that the picture begins to change when the dynamic concept of social mobility replaces these other status criteria. Aggressive attitudes, both spontaneous and elicited, were found to be most highly concentrated in the downwardly mobile group, while the pattern was significantly reversed for those who had advanced in social-economic status. That is to say, that while the previously discussed social and economic characteristics, viewed, as it were, in a static context, proved relatively unrelated to anti-semitism, they were significantly

(76) Morris and Davidson, op.cit.

(77) Bettelheim and Janowitz, op.cit.

(78) Bettelheim, B., and Janowitz, M. Social change and prejudice. New York: Free Press, 1964.

related to the expression of intolerance when viewed in the dynamic context of the individuals social mobility.

Finally, although the Bogardus Social Distance Scale (79) has been extensively used it has not been a completely satisfactory technique for all who have employed it. Various other methods including the adjective checklist of Katz and Braly⁽⁸⁰⁾, Sherif and Hovland⁽⁸¹⁾, Osgood et al⁽⁸²⁾ have been developed. So far it appears that the evaluative factor scales of the semantic differential provide good potential for the simple measurement of evaluation.

(79) Bogardus, op.cit.

(80) Katz and Braly, op.cit.

(81) Sherif and Hovland, op.cit.

(82) Osgood, Suci and Tannenbaum, op.cit.

CHAPTER III

HYPOTHESES

Since Morris and Davidson⁽⁸³⁾ had some success in their work with foreign students in the United States (verifying their hypothesis that foreign students who believed members of the host country think highly of the country from which they come are likely to have more favourable attitudes toward that host country than students who believe members of the host country look down on their home country) the primary purpose of this study was to expand and test, cross-culturally, their hypothesis. As such, the first hypothesis was stated as follows:

Hypothesis 1:

Any student (A) who believes members of another country (B) think highly of the country (X) from which he comes is more likely to have favourable attitudes toward this other country (B) than a student who believes members of another country (B) look down on his home country, X.

(83) Morris and Davidson, op.cit.

That is, we can expect to find significant correlations between the way in which subjects (A) perceive others (B) as rating them (X) and the way in which subjects, A, in turn, rate these others, B. A subject (A) who believes others (B) like him or the nationality he represents (X) is more likely to like these others, and vice versa.

Studies referred to in the previous chapter suggested that different cultural or national groups could emphasize different aspects when rating other cultures. Assuming that a rating scale could be devised it was hypothesized, then, that these aspects would reveal themselves in such a scale. The form of the rating scale utilized was dictated by the second hypothesis:

Hypothesis 2:

Arab subjects would show more critical opinion, and hence lower scores, when rating political standards than they would when rating other aspects of a culture.

This hypothesis, suggesting more critical evaluation, of political standards was expected since Prothro and Melikian⁽⁸⁴⁾ previously pointed out that

(84) Prothro and Melikian. Social distance and social change, op.cit.

social distance with Arab subjects was greater between national groups than any other. This, the authors attributed to the strong upsurge of nationalist sentiment and activity in the Near East.

Since cognitive theory deals more with a point of view than a theory it must be stated that, at least for the present stage of the theory's development, that there are really no testable hypothesis concerning the cognitive aspects of the theory. However, since the 'model' that the theory proposes could be applied to the present study it is useful to consider some of the hypotheses predicted by it.

In the A-B-X model we may say that there is balance if A likes B, B is perceived as liking X, and A likes X; or the system is also balanced if A likes B, B is perceived as disliking X and A dislikes X (i.e. 1 positive and 2 negatives); or the system is balanced if A dislikes B, A dislikes X and B is perceived as liking X.

According to Krech et al⁽⁸⁵⁾ "the triadic system is unbalanced if there are two positive relations and one negative". Interpreting this in terms of the variables of this study we would say the system is unbalanced, for example, if a person A liked another

(85) Krech et al. op.cit. p.42.

nationality group, B, perceived this other nationality group (B) as disliking the subjects home country or nationality (X) while the subject himself (A) rated his nationality (X) highly, etc. The system is also unbalanced if all three relations are negative; that is a subject dislikes his own nationality, perceives others as also disliking it, and dislikes these others.

In summary we can say that "... a system is balanced if there are no negative relations or if there is an even number of negatives; it is unbalanced if there is only one or any other odd number of negatives." (86)

The succeeding hypotheses, 3, 4, and 5 follow from hypothesis 1. They apply to different sets of conditions or relations which exist between the subject's rating of his own nationality and the perceived rating by others. They are treated as separate hypotheses, however, as a matter of convenience for the presentation and discussion of the results of this study. Furthermore, since each variation or relation is important in terms of the theoretical discussion of the A-B-X model the division into separate hypotheses is maintained.

(86) Ibid. p.42.

Hypothesis 3:

If A likes X and B is perceived as disliking X, A will balance the system by disliking B.

That is, as in hypothesis 1, we can expect significant correlations between the way the subjects (A) perceive other groups (B) rating A's home country (X) and the way in which subjects (A) rate these others (B). A likes his home country X. B is perceived as disliking A's home country, therefore, normally A dislikes B.

We might also expect that the more negatively A perceives B as disliking X, which A likes, the more negatively will A rate B. No suggestion is made here of a direct linear relationship but it is hypothesized that the intensity of relationships in the system are also related to the balance of that system.

Hypothesis 4:

If A likes X, and B is perceived as also liking X, then A's rating or liking of B will be good. Similarly if A likes X and B then B will be perceived as liking X. Balance will be achieved.

The last hypothesis, below, deals with special cases in which subjects dislike their own home country, and perceive others as also disliking the subject's home country.

Hypothesis 5:

If A dislikes X and B is perceived as also disliking X, then A should like B. Similarly, if A dislikes X and likes B then B should be perceived as disliking X. Or if A dislikes X and B is perceived as liking X then A should dislike B.

CHAPTER IV

METHOD AND PROCEDURE

Outline of the Problem:

The experimental conditions presented in this chapter were designed to investigate the relationship between intra-personal perception and national ratings. The investigation is an attempt to study how the personal perceptions of the subjects relate to their rating of other national groups.

The object of perception or rating, for all groups, is the nationality of each individual subject. The main focus of the study is on 'perceived similarity and dissimilarity'. Perceived similarity and dissimilarity of attitudes between the subject's rating of his own national status and how he thinks others rate his nationality is related to the subjects rating of these other groups.

The Variables:

The presentation of the theoretical basis of this study included discussions of the relevant variables, as described and defined by Newcomb⁽⁸⁷⁾.

op.cit. (87) Newcomb, Individual systems of orientation.

Consideration of the operational definitions of these variables has been reserved for this chapter and is contained in the following paragraphs. Comprehension of the relationships between the variables may be facilitated by a preliminary reference to the overview of the study presented in Chapter I, Section B.

The degree of perceived discrepancy between the subject's A own attitude and his perception of other's; B, attitudes is defined in terms of scores based on the subject's responses to two questions: first, how the subject rates his home country X; and second, how he thinks other national groups rate his home country. The responses to these questions are then related to the subject's actual rating of those he 'perceived' as rating himself.

Subjects:

The subjects in this study totaled 139 and comprised the following groups: Americans, N = 30; Lebanese, N = 40; Jordanians, N = 15; Sudanese, N = 20; and other Arab students, excluding any of the above, N = 34. All were students enrolled in the spring quarter at the American University of Beirut, and, excluding the Sudanese, all were registered in Freshman or Sophomore

classes in Psychology and/or Education. The Sudanese sample was obtained by calling a general meeting of all Sudanese students in the University specifically for the questionnaire. This sample, of necessity, includes students above the freshman and sophomore levels.

Administration and Procedure

A questionnaire (see Appendix B¹ and B²) was designed in which questions had to be answered by checking a number between pairs of bi-polar adjectives. These numbers were designated to represent the following: 2 = feel strongly; 1 = feel moderately; 0 = undecided.

Each subject was required to answer three questions. The first, asked that the subject rate his home country; the second, that he rate how he thought some other national group rated his home country; and the third, how the subject rated this other country. (Questions 2 and 3 were reversed in order for one half of each group to test for interaction effects.) American, Lebanese and Sudanese subjects were given specific countries to rate. These countries were selected from previous social distance studies indicating either extreme positive or negative social distance ratings. That is, one-half of the Lebanese sample was asked to

rate Switzerland and how they thought the "Swiss" rated Lebanon. The other half of the Lebanese sample was asked to rate Turkey and how they thought the "Turks" rated Lebanon. The American samples were asked the same questions about 'Canadians' and 'Red Chinese'. Sudanese subjects were asked about Egyptians. All other subjects rated how they thought the Lebanese would rate their own (i.e. the subject's) nationality and how, in turn, these subjects rate the Lebanon.

The rating questionnaire required that the subject check the appropriate position between pairs of bi-polar adjectives. In every case, the subject rated the 'standard of living', the 'cultural standards', the 'political characteristics', and the 'personal characteristics' of the group he was asked to rate⁽⁸⁸⁾.

Six pairs of bi-polar adjectives appeared in each of the four, above mentioned, aspects. These bi-polar adjectives were drawn from Osgood's⁽⁸⁹⁾ principal component factors of the concept-scale task as tested in the Middle East⁽⁹⁰⁾.

(88) The rationale for using these categories is explained in Appendix A.

(89) Osgood, C.E., Archer, W.K., and Miron, M.S. The cross-cultural generality of meaning systems: Urbana: Univ. of Ill. (mimeographed), 1963.

(90) Ibid. The Arabic Factor I accounted for 53.7% of the variance and the 'American' Factor I accounting for 45.5% of the variance.

All three pages of the questionnaire were identical except for the questions asked to each subject at the top of each page.

Scoring:

The Likert⁽⁹¹⁾ scaling technique was utilized in the scoring of the subject's responses. That is, a score of 5 was assigned for a check representing "Feel strongly", on the positive side of the evaluative dimension; a score of 4 for "Feel Moderately"; a score of 3 for "Undecided"; and scores of 2 and 1 for "Feel Moderately", and, "Feel Strongly", respectively, on the negative side of the evaluation.

The advantage of this scoring technique is that each response or item yields more information than do the strictly Yes-or-No type responses. That is, each item in the test is a rating device designed to reveal both the direction of the individual's stand on the issue and the intensity with which he holds it.

The overall test score is obtained by finding the sum of the numerical scores for the alternatives an individual checks on the various items.

(91) For discussion of this technique see: Krech D, and Crutchfield, R.S. Theory and problems of social psychology. New York, McGraw Hill, 1948, p. 218-220.

CHAPTER V

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The relevant statistical data for how subjects perceive others as rating the subject's national status and, how subjects, in turn, rate these others is summarized in Table 1.

In all but one group, significant or near significant correlations were found to exist between the way in which subjects thought or perceived others as rating their nationality, (i.e. the subjects) and how subjects rated these 'others'.

The exception, with Lebanese subjects, is an interesting one. As shown in Table 1, the first group of Lebanese thought or perceived the "Turks" as rating Lebanon highly yet the Lebanese subjects rating of Turkey is significantly lower (diff. between means: $t = 8.4$ $p < .001$). In the second group of Lebanese subjects the mean score for how Lebanese thought the "Swiss" rated Lebanon was significantly lower ($t = 5.1$, $p < .001$) than how the Lebanese rated Switzerland.

TABLE 1

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN HOW SUBJECTS PERCEIVE
OTHER NATIONAL GROUPS RATING THE SUBJECTS HOME NATIONALITY AND
HOW THESE SUBJECTS, IN TURN, RATE THESE OTHER NATIONAL GROUPS.

Nationality and (other group)	N	Perceived Others Rating	\bar{X}	S.D.	Subjects Rating of Others	\bar{X}	S.D.	r	p	Correlation and Significance	Significance of Difference Between Means
1. American (Canada)	15	91	8	8	93	8	8	.82	.001		1.1
2. American (Red China)	15	47	12.1	12.1	50	16.6	16.6	.42	.10		1.2
3. Lebanese (Turkey)	20	90	10.9	10.9	57	13	13	-.04	-		8.4
4. Lebanese (Switzerland)	20	80	13.2	13.2	99	9.7	9.7	.54	.05		5.1
5. Sudanese (Egypt)	20	87	14.	14.	75	18.	18.	.45	.05		2.3
6. Jordanians (Lebanon)	15	76	14	14	69	18.	18.	.40	.10		1.2
7. Arabs excluding the above (Lebanon)	34	70	16.7	16.7	75	14.	14.	.64	.001		1.3

A summary of the relevant statistical data for how subjects perceive others as rating the subject's national status (nationality) and how these subjects, in turn, rate these others.

1. American subjects were asked how they thought "Canadians" rated the United States, and how they would rate Canada. 2. American subjects were asked how they thought the "Red Chinese" rated the United States, and how they, in turn, rated "Red China". 3 and 4, Lebanese subjects were asked the same questions as 1 and 2, except, Turkey and Switzerland, respectively, were used as the referent countries. 5. Sudanese subjects rated how they thought Egyptians rated the Sudan and how they, in turn, rated Egypt. 6, 7. Jordanians and all other subjects were asked how they thought the Lebanese rated their home country and how they would rate Lebanon. One half of each group had the order of the questions reversed to control interaction effects.

In general, all groups studied, excluding the Lebanese sample, provided statistical evidence in support of the first hypothesis of this study, namely: that any student who believes members of another country think highly of the country from which he comes is more likely to have favourable attitudes toward that country than a student who believed members of another country looked down on his home country.

The question arises, however, out of the exception of the Lebanese subjects, as to whether this is strictly a phenomenon found with Lebanese, or at least certain subjects, or are there, in fact exceptions in most cases. That is, are there countries which subjects rate higher than their own and, at the same time, realize or perceive that these other countries rate the subject's home country lower than the subjects themselves do.

Bogardus⁽⁹²⁾ provides some indication that this is probably a general phenomenon. Following his 20-year follow-up study on social distance he reported, in addition to the fact that social distance ratings remain remarkably stable over time, that in most cases each

op.cit. (92) Bogardus. Changes in racial distance.

group (specifically minority groups in the U.S.) retained the established social distance scale but moved its own reference group from its lower position to a rank near the top. The implication being that if it is "near" the top there are one or two groups who are in some manner more highly valued.

In summary then, the hypotheses, that the perception of favorable or unfavorable attitudes by others towards one's national status is related to the way in which subjects rate these others, was supported in the present study. Important exceptions, however, did occur and further study is necessary.

According to the A-B-X model a system is unbalanced if there is one or any other odd number of negatives and if there is unbalance then there is also "system strain" which tends to be reduced. Newcomb⁽⁹³⁾ suggests that system strain varies with the degree of perceived discrepancy, the sign and degree of attraction, the importance of the object of communication, the certainty or committedness of one's own orientation and, finally, object relevance. Furthermore, if system strain exists it can be reduced by a reduction in the strength of attraction

op.cit. (93) Newcomb, Individual systems of orientation.

of A to B (Hypothesis 1) or by a reduction in object relevance either for the subject (A) or for the 'perceived other' (B); by a reduction in the importance of the object for either A or B; by a change in the "cognitive structuring" so that there is increased similarity with the others perceived attitudes, or finally by a change in the perceived attitude of the other such that there is increased similarity with one's own attitudes.

The important point, however, for the A-B-X model is to determine whether or not some of the above mentioned variables are operating. That is, in terms of this study, there can be discrepancy between "perceived" and "ascribed" ratings without system strain or cognitive imbalance. At minimum, the perceived rating of others must be of some importance to the subject otherwise discrepancies would not create cognitive imbalance. The fact that the Lebanese rate Turkey poorly yet perceived the "Turks" as rating Lebanon highly, then, would not be an inconsistency leading to cognitive strain.

The second hypothesis predicted that Arab subjects would tend to be more critical when evaluating themselves on 'political standards' than they would when evaluating other aspects of their culture. Table 2 presents the relevant statistical data for the significance of

TABLE 2

THE SIGNIFICANCE OF DIFFERENCES BETWEEN THE MEANS
 FOR STANDARD OF LIVING, CULTURAL STANDARDS, POLITICAL STANDARDS,
 AND PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS IN THE SELF-RATING RESPONSES OF 92 ARAB SUBJECTS

N = 92	Standard of Living	Cultural Standards	Political Standards	Personal Characteristics	t	p
Mean	20.9	20.7	18.5	23.3		
S.D.	6.1	8.4	5.9	4.4		
<u>Differences Between Means</u>						
Cultural standards and political standards					2.0	.10 > p > .05
Standard of Living and political standards					2.7	< .05

differences between the means of responses between standard of living, cultural standards, and political standards, as rated by 92 Arab subjects. Referring to the probability values of t it can be seen that the mean for "political standards" is significantly lower than the means for "personal characteristics" and "standard of living", and nearly so for "cultural standards." ($t = 2.0, 10 > p > .05$).

Table 3 gives the mean and standard deviations for ratings of 'standard of living', 'cultural standards', 'political standards' and 'personal characteristics' by American, Lebanese and Sudanese subjects when rating their own nationality. This data serves as a comparison for that given in Table 2.

American subjects rate political standards lowest but the mean for political standards is not significantly different than the mean for cultural standards. 'Standard of Living' is rated highest by American subjects along with 'personal characteristics'. The mean for 'standard of living' is significantly higher ($t = 3.2; p < .01$) than the means of 'cultural standards' and 'political standards'.

TABLE 3

DATA FOR THE RATING OF HOME NATIONALITIES
BY AMERICAN, LEBANESE AND SUDANESE SUBJECTS

Nationality	N	Standard of Living		Cultural Standards		Political Standards		Personal Characteristics		Total Scores	
		M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.	M	S.D.
American	30	24.	3.1	21	3.7	20	5.8	23	3.3	89.8	10.72
Lebanese	30	22.6	3.1	21.5	4.3	19.3	4.8	22.2	3.0	85.7	12.24
Sudanese	20	21.	5.5	22.9	5.0	22.5	4.7	26.3	3.01	93.8	15.0

Lebanese subjects rate 'political standards' lowest and 'standard of living' highest. The difference between these two means is significant ($t = 3.1$; $p < .01$). The mean for 'political standards' is significantly lower than the mean for 'personal characteristics' ($t = 2.6$; $p < .01$) but not for the mean of 'cultural standards'. The mean for 'standard of living' is not significantly different than the mean for 'cultural standards' or 'personal characteristics'.

Sudanese subjects rate 'standard of living' lowest but the mean is not significantly different than the means for 'cultural standards' or 'political standards'. 'Personal characteristics' are rated highest by Sudanese subjects and the mean for this is significantly higher than the means for 'cultural standards', 'political standards' and 'standard of living'.

The preceding data particularly that presented in Tables 2 and 3 lends general support to the second hypothesis of this study: namely that Arab students would show a more critical evaluation, and hence, lower scores, when rating political standards, than they would when rating other aspects of their culture. The group of Sudanese students in Table 3 were not included in the 92 Arab subjects of Table 2 and although the mean for 'standard of living' is lower than the mean for 'political standards' with these Sudanese, the difference between the means is non-significant.

In contrast, American subjects rated both 'political standards' and 'cultural standards' significantly lower than 'standard of living' and 'personal characteristics'.

Triandis⁽⁹⁴⁾, in a study mentioned earlier, gave evidence that different groups of subjects (e.g. Americans and Greeks) responded to different aspects of the stimulus person in social distance studies. Greek subjects, for example, were more concerned about the religion of the stimulus person while Americans were more concerned about race. The evidence presented in this study lends general support to this idea of response variability or emphasis for different national groups.

The findings of this study also support the work of Prothro and Melikian⁽⁹⁵⁾ on social distance with Arab students. These authors suggested that social distances with Arab subjects were greater between national than religious groups and that this 'emphasis' was probably due to the strong surge of nationalist sentiment and activity in the Near East - hence a more critical evaluation of "political standards" as opposed to the other aspects of their culture.

(94) Triandis and Triandis, A cross-cultural study of social distance, op.cit.

(95) Prothro and Melikian, Social distance and social change in the Near East, op.cit.

Hypotheses 3 and 4 are modifications of hypothesis 1 and, as such, are subject to the same general treatment and discussion as is hypothesis 1. Hypothesis 3 predicted that if a subject (A) likes or rates highly his own nationality (X) and perceives others B as disliking the subject's nationality then he is more apt to dislike or rate poorly these others. The second group of Americans referred to in Table 1 provides statistical data supporting the suggestion that 'perceived dislike' and ratings of others tend to occur together. American subjects perceived the "Red Chinese" as rating the United States poorly and the Americans, in turn, rated "Red China" poorly. The difference between the means for these two ratings is non-significant.

Hypothesis 4 predicted that if a subject rates his own nationality highly and perceives others as also rating it highly then he is more apt to rate these others highly. Similarly if subjects like another nationality group then his other group is more apt to be perceived as liking the subject's nationality. Since the order of the questions (How do you think _____ rate your home country; and how would you rate _____?) were reversed for one half of each group, the correlations appearing in Table 1 provide support for the above hypothesis.

Hypothesis 5, based on the A-B-X model, predicted that subjects A who disliked their own home country X and, who perceive others B as also disliking it, would rate these others, or B in the model, higher. Table 4 presents

TABLE 4

THE RATING OF 'OTHERS' BY SUBJECTS WHO RATE THEIR OWN NATIONALITY LOW AND PERCEIVE 'THESE OTHERS' AS ALSO RATING THE SUBJECT'S NATIONALITY LOW

N = 19	Rating of Home Country	Perceived Others Rating	Rating of Others	t	p
Mean	65.4	54.9	74		
S.D.	13.7	12.9	14.7		
<u>Differences between Means</u>					
Rating of home country and perceived others' rating				2.4	.05
Rating of home country and rating of others				2.0	.05
Perceived others rating and rating of others				4.5	.001

the relevant statistical for subjects ($N = 19$) who disliked or rated low their home country⁽⁹⁶⁾ and believed others also dislike the subject's home country.

The mean for subjects rating of others was significantly higher than the mean for the subjects rating of his own nationality ($t = 2.0$; $p < .05$) and the mean for the perceived rating by others ($t = 4.5$; $p < .001$).

This, relatively small, sample of subjects who disliked their home country included four Lebanese, who were rating Switzerland, and the remaining fifteen were Arab subjects (Jordanians, Palestinians, Syrians, Iraqis, and Saudi Arabian) who were rating Lebanon. Although the statistical data presented in Table 4 supports the hypothesis that the "two dislikes" lead to a "like", or that 2 negative relations balance the system, it seems to be rather stretching the point. That is, subjects may desire to identify with the country they are rating (Lebanese with Swiss, Arab with Lebanese) or they may not.

(96) A low score for 'dislike' of home country and perceived rating of others is a score less than 72. This score could be achieved if the subject checked "undecided" for every pair of bi-polar adjectives given in the four areas of response. Although it is appreciated that such a score could also be achieved by checking both of the extreme ends of the bi-polar scales, a survey of all questionnaires revealed that this was not the case.

Although no experimental evidence is available from this study it is possible that subjects who rate their home country poorly, who perceive certain others as also rating it poorly, but who have no desire to identify or associate in any way with this other country and who therefore rate it poorly also. An example will suffice; a Lebanese may rate Lebanon poorly and perceive the "Turks" as rating Lebanon poorly but, at the same time, he also rates Turkey poorly.

Although the data collected and presented in this study lends general support to the theory or interpretation of cognitive dissonance, as outlined by Newcomb⁽⁹⁷⁾ the evidence is far from conclusive. Cognitive dissonance, at least within the framework of this study, can, at best, only be looked at as a point of view. The independent variables of "attraction", "importance", "committedness", etc. in the A-B-X model must be operationally defined and specified in terms of the relationship between the subjects rating of his home nationality, his perception of how 'others' rate his home nationality and how subjects, in turn, rate these 'others'.

op.cit. (97) Newcomb, Individual systems of orientation,

SUMMARY

A questionnaire requesting subjects to rate their home country, to rate how they perceive 'others' as rating the subject's home country, and how they would rate these 'others' was administered to 139 subjects. Three separate groups comprising American, Lebanese and Sudanese subjects rated countries selected on the basis of previous social distance studies. All other subjects (Arab, other than Lebanese) rated Lebanon. The rating procedure involved checking numbers, between sets of bi-polar adjectives, representing the subject's feeling on the question. Four aspects of each culture or national group were rated namely: cultural standards, political standards, standard of living and personal characteristics. Bi-polar adjectives were selected from Osgood's principal component factors of the concept-scale task and the numbers between each pair of bi-polar adjectives, checked by the subject, were scored by the Likert scale analysis technique.

The results, in general, supported the hypothesis that the perceived rating of one's own nationality by others is related to the way in which subjects rate these others. An exception to this was found, and an explanation offered, with Lebanese subjects.

A comparison of the significance of differences between the means for cultural standards, political standards, standard of living and personal characteristics for subjects (Arab and non-Arab) ratings of their own nationality supported the second hypothesis of this study, namely: that Arab subjects would be more critical, and hence give lower scores, for political standards than they would for the other aspects which they were required to rate.

Several hypotheses were offered as well as a theoretical interpretation based on Newcomb's A-B-X model of 'individual systems of orientation' and, although not conclusive, found facilitative to the interpretation of the results.

APPENDIX A

THE RATIONALE FOR SELECTING 'STANDARD OF LIVING', 'CULTURAL STANDARDS', 'POLITICAL STANDARDS' AND 'PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS' AS AREAS FOR NATIONAL RATINGS BY SUBJECTS

The four areas of 'standard of living', 'cultural standards', 'political standards' and 'personal characteristics' were chosen somewhat arbitrarily but for the following reasons. Much reading material is available both in the newspapers, weekly magazines and special reports on "newly developing countries". As such the standard of living in these various countries is an item of frequent mention. Furthermore many of the subjects in this study, it was assumed, would be from these "newly developing countries and that 'standard of living' would be of some importance to them.

Cultural standards were chosen because of the recent revival of interest in such things as the 'Worlds Fair', and because, when people travel, including students, the 'cultural' aspects of a foreign country are the things most frequently encountered. In this 'age of nationalism' political standards need no further mention. Finally, 'personal characteristics' was chosen because this has been the most frequently used in the past (Bogardus (1928); Katz and Braly (1933)).

Furthermore, studies cited in the 'Review of Research' section of this paper provided some indication that the use of multiple category rating scales, such as the above, could provide more information than those scales which were based on a single or unknown item. The use of multiple scales provided an opportunity to test this.

APPENDIX B₁

INSTRUCTIONS FOR SUBJECTS

Nationality _____ Sex _____

On the following pages a series of descriptive bi-polar adjectives are listed under four categories. These categories are:

- (1) Standard of Living (3) Political Standards
 (2) Cultural Standards (4) Personal Characteristics

Between each pair of bi-polar adjectives a series of numbers are given as follows: 2, 1, 0, 1, 2. These numbers represent the following:

- 2 = Feel Strongly
 1 = Feel Moderately
 0 = Undecided.

You are asked to circle one of these numbers to indicate where you feel it is appropriate for the question asked at the top of each page.

Example:

Question: "How would you rate the United States of America"?

	<u>Standard of Living</u>		<u>Cultural Standards</u>		<u>Etc.</u>
Callous	2 1 0 ① 2	Soft	Blunt	2 ① 0 1 2	sharp
Restless	2 ① 0 1 2	Relaxed	Colorful	② 1 0 1 2	Colorless
Past	2 1 0 ① 2	Present	etc.		

Continued on next page.

If you felt the standard of living in the United States was somewhat more 'soft' than 'callous' you would circle 1 on the side of 'soft'.

If you felt the standard of living in the United States was somewhat more 'restless' than 'relaxed' you would circle 1 on the side of 'restless', etc.

- You would circle the position you think most honestly represents your viewpoint.

- Please use all pairs of adjectives.

- Each page has a new question; be sure to read the question first.

- Do not look at the questions on the following pages until you complete the preceding page.

- In each pair of adjectives circle one number only.

- Once you finish a page do not turn back.

- Complete each column before proceeding to the next - That is, complete the first column (standard of living) before you go on to the second (cultural standards), etc.

APPENDIX B₂

RESPONSE SHEETS FOR SUBJECTS*

Question: _____

2 = Feel Strongly

1 = Feel Moderately

0 = Undecided

Standard of Living			Cultural Standards		
Contempt- ible	2 1 0 1 2	Great	Good	2 1 0 1 2	Bad
Good	2 1 0 1 2	Bad	Heavenly	2 1 0 1 2	Hellish
Merciful	2 1 0 1 2	Cruel	Awful	2 1 0 1 2	Nice
Honest	2 1 0 1 2	Dishonest	Contempt- ible	2 1 0 1 2	Great
Nice	2 1 0 1 2	Awful	Sound	2 1 0 1 2	Dangerous
Mild	2 1 0 1 2	Harsh	Honest	2 1 0 1 2	Dishonest

Political Standards			Personal Characteristics		
Mild	2 1 0 1 2	Harsh	Bad	2 1 0 1 2	Good
Honest	2 1 0 1 2	Dishonest	Loyal	2 1 0 1 2	Treacherous
Hellish	2 1 0 1 2	Heavenly	Cruel	2 1 0 1 2	Merciful
Safe	2 1 0 1 2	Dangerous	Honest	2 1 0 1 2	Dishonest
Cruel	2 1 0 1 2	Merciful	Awful	2 1 0 1 2	Nice
Trea- cherous	2 1 0 1 2	Loyal	Happy	2 1 0 1 2	Sad

* Subjects were required to use the above sheet or form three times. Once when rating their own nationality; once when giving the 'perceived rating' of others; and once for rating another nationality. Only the question at the top of the page varied.

REFERENCES

1. Ansari, A. A study of the relation between group stereotypes and social distance. J. Educ. and Psychol. Baroda, 1956, 14, 28-35.
2. Banton, M. Social Distance: A new appreciation. Soc. Rev., 1960, 8, 169-183.
3. Beirer, E.G., Rossi, A.M., and Garfield, R.L. Similarity plus dissimilarity of personality: Basis for friendship? Psychol. Rep. 1961, 8, 3-8.
4. Bettelheim, B., and Janowitz, M. Dynamics of prejudice. New York, N.Y.: Harper and Bros., 1950.
5. Bettelheim, B., and Janowitz, M. Social change and prejudice. New York, Free Press, 1964.
6. Bogardus, E.S. Immigration and race attitudes. New York, N.Y.: D.C. Heath and Co., 1928.
7. Bogardus, E.S. A social distance scale. Sociol. and soc. Psychol., 1933, 41, 129-136.
8. Bogardus, E.S. Changes in racial distances. Internat. J. opin. and attit. Res., 1947, 1, 55-62.
9. Buchanan, W., and Cantril, H. How nations see each other: A study in public opinion. Urbana: Univ. of Illinois, 1953.
10. Byrne, D., and Wong, T.J. Racial prejudice, interpersonal attraction and assumed dissimilarity of attitudes. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1962, 65, 246-253.
11. Carlson, E.R., and Carlson, R. Male and female subjects in personality research. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 482-483.

12. Dennis, W. Uses of common objects as indicators of cultural orientations. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1957, 55, 21-28.
13. Diab, L.N. National stereotypes and the "reference group" concept. J. soc. Psychol., 1962, 57, 339-351.
14. Diab, L.N. Factors affecting studies of national stereotypes. J. soc. Psychol., 1963, 59, 29-40.
15. Dodd, S.C. A social distance test in the Near East. Amer. J. Sociol., 1935, 41, 194-204.
16. Festinger, L. A theory of cognitive dissonance. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1957.
17. Fiedler, F.E., Warrington, W.G., and Blaisdell, F.J. Unconscious attitudes as correlates of sociometric choice in a social group. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1952, 47, 740-796.
18. Fishman, J.A. An examination of the process and function of social stereotyping. J. soc. Psychol., 1956, 43, 27-64.
19. Heider, F. Attitudes and cognitive organization. J. Psychol., 1946, 21, 107-112.
20. Heider, F. The psychology of interpersonal relations. New York: Wiley, 1958.
21. Hunt, C.L. Social distance in the Phillipines. Sociol. soc. Res., 1956, 40, 253-260.
22. Jordan, N. Behavioral forces that are a function of attitudes and of cognitive organization. Hum. Relat., 1953, 6, 273-288.

23. Katz, D., and Braly, K. Racial stereotypes of one hundred college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1933, 28, 280-290.
24. Klett, J.C., and Yankey, D.W. A cross-cultural comparison of judgements of social desirability. J. soc. Psychol., 1959, 49, 19-26.
25. Kluckhohn, C. Culture and behavior. In G. Lindzey (Ed.) Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley 1954.
26. Krech, D., and Crutchfield, R.S. Theory of problems of social psychology. New York: McGraw Hill, 1948.
27. Krech, D., Crutchfield, R.S., and Ballachey, E.L. Individual in society. New York: McGraw Hill, 1962.
28. Kumata, H., and Schramm, W. A pilot study of cross-cultural meaning. Publ. Opin. Quart., 1956, 20, 229-237.
29. Lambert, R.D., and Bressler, M. Indian students on an American campus. Minneapolis, Minn.: Univ. Minn. Press, 1956.
30. Lindzey, G. (Ed.) Handbook of social psychology. Cambridge, Mass.: Addison-Wesley, 1954.
31. Morris, R.T. National status and attitudes of foreign students. Jrnl. of Soc. Issues, 1956, 12, 20-25.
32. Morris, R.T., and Davidson, O.M. The two way mirror: National status in foreign students adjustment. Minneapolis, Univ. of Minn. 1960.
33. Newcomb, T.M. An approach to the study of communicative acts. Psych. Rev., 1953, 60, 393-404.

34. Newcomb, T.M. The prediction of interpersonal attraction. Amer. Psychologist, 1956, 11, 575-586.
35. Newcomb, T.M. The cognition of persons as cognizers. In R. Tagiuri and L. Petrullo (Eds.), Person perception and interpersonal behavior. Stanford, Calif.: Stanford Univ. Press, 1958, Pp 179-190.
36. Newcomb, T.M. Individual systems of orientation. In S. Koch, (Ed.) Psychology: A study of a science. Study 1, Conceptual and Systematic, Vol. 3. Formulations of the person and the social context. New York; McGraw-Hill, 1959, Pp 384-422.
37. Newcomb, T.M. Varieties of interpersonal attraction. In D. Cartwright and A. Zander (Eds.) Group dynamics: Research and theory. Evanston, Ill.: Row, Peterson, 1960, Pp 104-119.
38. Newcomb, T.M. The acquaintance process. New York: Holt, Rinehart, and Winston, 1961.
39. Osgood, C.E. Method and theory in experimental psychology. New York: Oxford Univ. Press., 1953.
40. Osgood, C.E., Suci, G.J. Tannenbaum, P.H. The measurement of meaning. Urbana, Ill.: Univ. of Illinois, 1957.
41. Prothro, E.T. Cross-cultural patterns of national stereotypes. J. soc. Psychol., 1954, 40, 53-59.
42. Prothro, E.T., and Keehn, J.D. Stereotypes and semantic space. J. soc. Psychol., 1957, 45, 197-209.

43. Prothro, E.T., and Melikian, L. Social distance and social change in the Near East. Sociol. and soc. Res., 1952, 37, 3-11.
44. Prothro, E.T., and Melikian, L. Studies in stereotypes: III Arab students in the Near East. J. soc. Psychol., 1959, 40, 237-243.
45. Rath, R., and Das, J.P. Study in stereotypes of college freshmen and service holders in Orissa, India, towards themselves and four other foreign nationalities. J. soc. Psychol., 1958, 47, 373-385.
46. Rosen, E. A cross-cultural study of semantic profiles and attitude differences. J. soc. Psychol., 1959, 49, 137-144.
47. Rosenbaum, M.E. Social perception and the motivational structure of interpersonal relations. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1959, 59, 130-133.
48. Sinha, A.K.P., and Upadhyaya, O.P. Change and persistence in the stereotypes of university students toward different ethnic groups during the Sino-Indian border dispute. J. soc. Psychol., 1960, 52, 31-39.
49. Sherif, M., and Hovland, C.J. Social judgement. New York: Yale Univ. Press, 1961.
50. Suci, G.J. A comparison of semantic structures in American Southwest culture groups. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 25-30.
51. Triandis, H.C., and Osgood, C.E. A comparative factorial analysis of semantic structures in monolingual Greek and American college students. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1958, 57, 187-196.
52. Triandis, H.C., and Triandis, L.M. Race, social class, religion and nationality as determinants of social distance. J. abnorm. soc. Psychol., 1960, 61, 110-118.

53. Triandis, H.C., and Triandis, L.M. A cross-cultural study of social distance. Psychol. Monogr., 1962, 76, No. 21.
54. Triandis, H.C. Cultural influences upon cognitive processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press, Vol. 1.
55. Zaidi, S.M.H., and Ahmed, M. National stereotypes of university students in East Pakistan. J. soc. Psychol., 1958, 47, 387-395.