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ABSTRACT

A 2 x 4 factorial design (cultural dyads x levels of cultural adaptation) is used to investigate the effect of cultural adaptation on attraction, outcomes, perceived compliment, and perceived trustworthiness when Americans sell to Japanese and Thais. This dissertation extends the research of Francis (1989, 1991) by taking into account the influence of collectivism, perceived status differential, similarity-attraction, and social identity. The curvilinear relationship found by Francis to exist between cultural adaptation and attraction when Japanese adapt to American norms and behaviors is not replicated by the experiments. Both Thai and Japanese subjects generally perceive Americans as having a higher status than themselves. They are not threatened by Americans' adaptation to their cultural norms and practices. For Thai subjects, the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction, outcomes, and perceived compliment appears to be monotonic positive. For Japanese subjects, the relationship reaches a plateau beyond moderate adaptation. The no adaptation condition is rated lower in perceived trustworthiness than is the substantial adaptation condition in both the Thai and the Japanese experiments, contradicting the findings of Francis.
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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

THE IMPORTANCE OF UNDERSTANDING
CROSS-CULTURAL BUYER-SELLER NEGOTIATIONS

Modern business often involves interactions between people from different cultures. Firms involved in international business, either trade or foreign investment, must deal with clients of different cultures and ethnicity. Within these firms, coworkers from various cultures are common. Often the employees of firms interacting within the same country represent a variety of cultures.

A variety of factors may influence relations between buyers and sellers and can be mediated by an understanding of cross-cultural influences (Sheth 1983). For example, marketing failures in business at the international level are very common, in spite of good opportunities and extensive market research (Ricks, Fu, and Arpen 1974). Analyses of such marketing miscues reveal that reliance on marketing schemes that are based on interpersonal communication, negotiations, and mass communication, rather than on sound basic planning, leads to mistakes. In addition, there is now an almost universal awareness of the interdependence of advanced industrial and developing nations. One cannot survive without access to the markets, natural resources, and the capital of others. Cross-cultural influences must be understood to make this interdependence effective. Also, international trade is growing rapidly for most nations (Sheth 1980); extending beyond simple bilateral agreements to more complex multilateral agreements and arrangements, and involving increased marketing of technical/industrial products. Thus, interactions between buyers and
sellers are increasingly subject to cross-national and cross-cultural influences. Further, growth in most traditional consumer and industrial products will likely occur in Asian and African markets, which have their own unique cultures, still poorly understood by North Americans.

The importance of cross-cultural business skills is best illustrated in situations wherein the perceived foreignness of participants of other cultures is accommodated by altering communication styles (see Exhibit 1) and adjusting to differences in beliefs (Ellingsworth 1983, 1988). Such adaptive behaviors are intended to reduce cultural distance, thus improving communications with, and gaining acceptance from, contacts with foreign cultures (Francis 1991). This minimizes distractions due to perceptions of major cultural difference between participants, thus maintaining focus on the task at hand (Ellingsworth 1988) and minimizing the risk of failure.

Adaptation has been suggested as a strategy for improving the process and outcomes of business negotiations across cultures (Deutsch 1984; Graham and Sano 1984; Hall and Hall 1987; Harte 1990; Kotler 1994; Tung 1984; Zimmerman 1985). Training programs for American managers preparing for inter-cultural exchanges regard an adaptive approach as wholly beneficial. Orientation programs for international executives stress the need to adapt to the communication style, perceived value system, norms, customs, rules and other aspects of the target market's culture (Francis 1989). Kale and Barnes (1992) suggest that the optimal matching of buyers and sellers, along the dimensions of national character, organizational culture, and individual personality will produce the greatest chances of closure and satisfaction about the interaction.
Use of an adaptive approach assumes that the more similar foreigners’ behaviors are to the natives’, the more acceptable foreigners will be. Adaptation is expected to lower the risk of inappropriate behaviors and misunderstandings. However, this approach overlooks the possibility that native forms of communication and behavior may sometimes be considered inappropriate for foreigners and vice versa, because foreigners are not ingroup members (Francis 1991). Group membership typically leads to differences in the treatment and perception of “outgroup” contacts (Doise, Csepeli, Dan, Gouge, Lansen, and Ostell 1972; Tajfel and Billig 1974; Turner 1978). The general goal of this study is to investigate whether adaptation is beneficial in inter-cultural negotiations, what degree of adaptation is appropriate, and whether this varies for different cultural dyads.

INCONCLUSIVE FINDINGS ON THE BENEFITS OF ADAPTATION

The adaptive approach is strongly supported in that most current research in psychology, sociolinguistics, communication, business, and related fields supports similarity and adaptation as being advantageous. However, some researchers are now suggesting that beyond an optimal level, adaptation can become dysfunctional. Social identity theory (Tajfel 1974, 1978b; Tajfel and Turner 1979) posits that differences between groups may be valuable to maintain unique group identities. Therefore, substantial adaptation may be undesirable because it could threaten group distinctiveness, and also provide an uncomplimentary or too simplistic picture of the target culture (Giles and Smith 1979). In addition, research in social attribution (Hayden and Mischel 1976; Kelly 1973; Regan, Straus, and Fazio 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982) suggests that adaptive
behaviors counter to the perceiver's expectations may be discounted so that the positive intentions of the adaptive behaviors are destroyed.

Despite growth in international business and an increase in the number of inter-cultural business encounters, very little research has been done on the effectiveness of the popularly prescribed business approach of attempting to adapt to the norms and behaviors of those in other cultures. Inter-cultural and intra-cultural negotiations seem to differ. This study addresses the need for an empirical investigation of the effectiveness of adaptation in inter-cultural buyer-seller negotiations.

**REPLICATION OF THE CURVILINEAR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN CULTURAL ADAPTATION AND ATTRACTION**

To date, there are very few studies which test the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction, and outcomes in business negotiation contexts. A very interesting study by Francis (1991), using MBA students, manipulated three levels of adaptation to investigate American responses to the selling behavior of Japanese and Korean sales teams.

Subjects were asked to play the role of an American purchasing agent, because pretests indicated that they were uncomfortable giving their own reactions about other cultures. A written script of a sales presentation made by a team of three Japanese businessmen to the American buyer was used. The script was described as a pretest of a potential video to train foreign business people to deal effectively with Americans. Pretesting indicated that communication style was the most prominent factor subjects relied on to categorize the behavior of Japanese business people, so the degree of adaptation was manipulated by varying the communication style in the script. The first style alteration was
in linguistic adaptation, which included speech form, syntax, and the use of idioms. The second variable was the sociolinguistic protocol, which included differences in salutations, degree of formality, and communication conventions.

Manipulation of the three levels of cultural adaptation was successful. However, the degree of 'substantial adaptation' might have been excessive. "(T)he trait 'informality,' while viewed essentially as American may, when taken to excess as in the 'substantial adaptation' case, be undesirable even for an American" (Francis 1991, p. 423). 'Substantial adaptation' should remain within the realm of behaviors deemed appropriate and acceptable among members of the observer's culture. It would be valuable for inter-cultural business practices to understand the curvilinear relationship between adaptation and attraction found in Francis (1991).

**FOCUS ON AMERICANS-JAPANESE AND AMERICANS-THAIS NEGOTIATIONS**

In this study, the Japanese and Thai cultures were selected, on both theoretical and practical grounds, to represent cultures being adapted to by American businessmen. On theoretical grounds, both Japan and Thailand share the cultural value of collectivism (Hofstede 1980) which is expected to influence the effectiveness of cultural adaptation on attraction and negotiation outcomes. Japanese and Thai people are mainly Mongoloid by ethnicity. Both countries are close geographically -- Japan in East Asia and Thailand in Southeast Asia. Both have the same political system -- monarchial democracy. The main differences between these two countries are the level of economic development, the official language, and the fact that Thailand is not influenced by Confucianism like Japan. Japan is
a developed country, whereas Thailand is a developing one, or at best is becoming a newly industrialized country (see Table 1 for per capita gross national products of the U.S., Japan, and Thailand). The dyads of Americans adapting to Japanese and to Thai cultures thus provide a matched sample with which to investigate the influence of status differences between the adaptor and the perceiver (the native) on the effectiveness of cultural adaptation. This issue has not been addressed before.

On practical grounds, Japan is one of the U.S.’ largest trading partners (see Figure 1). In addition, because of its’ large trade surplus and high savings rate (Axtell 1989, see Table 1) Japan is the world’s largest creditor nation, which allows the Japanese to make extensive investments overseas, with the U.S. a favorite target (Figure 2). American foreign direct investment in Japan is moderately large (Figure 3). Finally, Japan accounts for a large proportion of foreign direct investment in the U.S. (see Figure 4).

American-Japanese negotiations, however, have met with difficulties. Copeland and Griggs (1985) have reported a success rate of only one out of every 25 business negotiations started between the two countries. Defining failures as managerial inability to perform effectively in a foreign country, often leading to their firing or recall, Tung (1987) found that over 50% of the U.S. companies had failure rates of 10-20%, and 7% had failure rates of 30%. Caudron (1992) reported a failure rate of 36% for U.S. companies’ Tokyo subsidiaries. In addition to personal costs, Caudron cited a cost estimate of $250,000 to $1,000,000 for a failure, depending on the employee’s salary, location, and whether a family transfer was involved. This high failure rate could result mainly from the problems in cultural adaptation (Lanier 1979; Tung 1987), on the part of both the manager and his or her spouse (Tung 1987).
The volume of business between the U.S. and Thailand, although not as great as between the U.S. and Japan, is increasing and deserves attention (see Figure 1). Thailand represents one of the most appealing targets for foreign investment. Glowing accounts of Thailand as the newest Pacific Basin 'tiger' and 'newly industrializing' country in Asia have been written in western magazines such as Fortune (March 28, 1988) and Newsweek (July 11, 1988), based on its excellent export performance, energetic entrepreneurs, and resulting favorable foreign investment climate. Thailand exhibited the most rapid economic growth in the world (36%) during the 1987-1990 period, with an average growth in real GNP of more than 6% per year during the past three decades. The Thai economy is becoming increasingly internationalized and has achieved considerable success in diversifying its' industrial and agricultural sectors and international export markets, reducing risk and improving long-term chances for economic survival and prosperity. In this environment of steady economic growth, it has usually managed to avoid the inflationary patterns of many developing countries (Fry 1992).

Several factors explain Thailand's remarkable economic success (Fry 1992). The country has a rich and diverse agricultural base, unlike the four other 'little tigers' of Southeast Asia (South Korea, Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Singapore). Labor costs may be kept low as workers have access to a varied, inexpensive, high-quality diet. Fertility rates and population growth have been reduced dramatically. Thailand is strongly committed to human resource development, having rapidly expanded educational facilities at all levels over the past several decades. Success in integrating its' Chinese minority into the economic and political systems has provided a pool of dynamic entrepreneurs. Further, Thailand has benefited from conservative economic and monetary policies, and has adopted
an export-oriented development strategy, as pursued earlier by the other newly industrialized Asian countries rather than following the Latin American style internal import-substitution strategies. According to Mardon and Paik (1992), foreign direct investment, open policies, and minimal government intervention in economic affairs have also contributed to Thailand's economic growth. There has been little done to control patterns of foreign investment, or to emphasize domestic ownership and control of production.

Given the large volume of business between the U.S. and Japan, and very attractive business opportunities in Thailand, it is important for American business people to understand how to deal with Japanese and Thai business people effectively. Specifically, American businessmen should know whether the advocated strategy of adapting to the norms and behaviors of Japanese and Thais will be beneficial in their negotiation with Japanese and Thai business people, respectively.

The importance of cross-cultural business skills is best summarized in the following quote:

...Cross-cultural business skills cannot replace a good product, nor can they guarantee success in a foreign market. What they can do, however, is ensure that opportunities are not missed and negotiations aborted because of lack of understanding (Richards 1987, p.1).

**RESEARCH QUESTIONS**

Given the emerging need to interact inter-culturally, one very interesting question arises: what are the most effective ways to approach colleagues and clients from different cultures? Two types of difficulty generally affect inter-cultural negotiations: differences in
the norms of behavior acceptable to different cultures (Gudykunst 1983), and misunderstandings which commonly result from differences in world views and expectations (Francis 1991). One strategy usually recommended to handle these communication difficulties is adaptation to the norms of a foreign culture.

Adaptive behavior may be considered an attempt to accommodate differences, and considerable empirical evidence shows that the varying values placed on individualism and collectivism impacts differently on the negotiation processes used by members of individualistic and collectivistic cultures (Bond and Forgas 1984; Gudykunst and Nishida 1986b; Hofstede 1980; Hui and Triandis 1986; Ting-Toomey 1987; Triandis 1988). Individualistic cultures, such as American, emphasize individual goals over group goals in the negotiation process. Their negotiators are verbally more self-assertive, direct, and more efficient with time management (monochronic-oriented) than those from collectivist cultures. In contrast, collectivistic cultures such as Japanese and Thai emphasize group goals more than individual goals in the negotiation process. Their negotiators are verbally more self-effusive, indirect, and more flexible with time management (polychronic-oriented) than those from individualistic cultures (Gudykunst and Kim 1984; Hofstede 1980, 1986; Okabe 1983; Ting-Toomey 1985, 1988b). Individualistic culture members tend to value straight talk and overtly verbalize their individual needs whereas those of collectivistic cultures tend to value contemplative talk and discretion in expressing opinions and feelings (Ting-Toomey 1988a). In particular, the Japanese negotiation style is more patient, initially more concerned with general principles rather than details, more interested in establishing interpersonal trust and the long term, and less legalistic than the American approach (Deutsch 1984; Graham and Sano 1984; Hall and Hall 1987; Tung 1984;
Zimmerman 1985). On the other hand, the American style emphasizes decisiveness, reliance on systems rather than persons, legal tradition, personal responsibility and creativity, and short-term management orientation (Francis 1989). Given these differences in negotiation style and in many other cultural norms, values, and behaviors, and given the significance of Japan and Thailand to the U.S., this study aims to investigate whether, and at what level cultural adaptation by Americans to Japanese and Thai people will work in the context of buyer-seller negotiations.

**SUMMARY OF THE OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY**

1. To investigate the effects of cultural adaptation by Americans to Japanese (wherein the adaptor and the native have essentially equal status) and to Thais (wherein the native has lower status than the adaptor) on attraction, trustworthiness, and outcomes in the contexts of buyer-seller negotiations.

2. To investigate the mechanisms by which cultural adaptation affects outcomes.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

SIMILARITY-ATTRACTION PARADIGM

Similar to the framework used by Francis (1989), theoretical support for adaptation can be found in the similarity-attraction paradigm. This holds that individuals find those perceived to be similar to themselves in values, attitudes, and beliefs to be more attractive than those perceived as different (Byrne 1969, 1971; Byrne and Griffith 1973; Heider 1958; Huston 1974; Newcomb 1978). This, of course, assumes that by adapting to the norms, behaviors, and manners of the other party, the adaptor will be perceived as more similar in those aspects to the perciever. Attraction in this case refers to one person’s affective orientation towards another (Huston 1974).

Brown (1984b) has reviewed a range of theories that fall under this paradigm and that differ in explaining how similarity results in attraction. For example, ‘social comparison theory’ (Festinger 1954) considers that without self-appraisal life can become dangerous and oppressive, therefore people must be able to evaluate themselves, their opinions, and their abilities. According to Festinger, if objective validators are absent, then people must rely on social methods of evaluation. They choose similar others for comparison in order to achieve accuracy in these appraisals. On this basis, it is presumed that people will be attracted to individuals or groups similar to themselves in opinions, and abilities. ‘Balance theory’ (Heider 1958; Newcomb 1961) proposes that two people would be attracted to each other as a result of similarities in their attitudes, and their desire to achieve a ‘balanced’ or ‘congruent’ set of cognitions about the world. Similarity in
attitudes or beliefs is agreement reinforcing because it confirms one's world view, and thus should result in attraction.

Many studies have provided support for the similarity-attraction paradigm over a variety of similarity dimensions; for example: (a) in human assortative mating (D. M. Buss 1985), wherein hierarchies of characteristics exist based on the strength of association between partners for variables such as age, education, race, religion, and ethnic background, as well as by attitudes and opinions, mental abilities, socioeconomic status, height, weight, eye color, behavioral and personality variables, number of siblings, and a host of other physical characteristics; (b) in the correlations between evaluations of groups of other ethnicity and perceived similarity to the own group (Berry, Kalin, and Taylor 1977); (c) in initial attraction for intimate couples (Vinacke et al. 1988); (d) between buyer and seller, where similarity increases the chance of favorable outcomes and the likelihood of sales (Evans 1963; Mathews, Wilson, and Monoky 1972); and (e) in employment interview situations where both actual and perceived similarities were fairly strongly related to attraction and to the decision to recruit the candidates, with perceived similarity being the more influential (Orphen 1984).

Social anxiety may be an important factor because socially anxious individuals are influenced by an internal negatively evaluative monologue which may be driven by preferential attention to social-evaluative information and because they are preoccupied with the opinions of others (A. H. Buss 1980; Nichols 1974). Heimberg, Acerra, and Holstein (1985) felt that socially anxious persons may be less receptive to non-evaluative data about a potential interaction partner. Thus, they may be less capable at managing information about that partner that might otherwise affect their attraction to or their desire
for future interaction with that partner. It was also found that non-anxious subjects greatly preferred partners similar in background, experience, and other attributes. On the other hand, socially anxious subjects showed no discrimination between similar and dissimilar partners and were much less extreme in their ratings of both partners than were non-anxious subjects.

Wetzel and Insko (1982) proposed that individuals are attracted to others because the others are similar to an ideal image and to themselves. Experimental results indicated a consistent effect on liking for ideal similarities but not for similarity to the self. Previous studies using similarity manipulation have confounded these two components.

COMMUNICATION STYLE SIMILARITY

In examining communication style similarity, Levine and Campbell (1972) used linguistic and other cultural factors to cluster Kenyan groups, finding similarity and perceived favorability strongly correlated. Cultural and linguistic similarity, and attraction had a strong linear relationship, while the relationship between similarity and evaluative ratings was indeterminate (Brewer 1979; Brewer and Campbell 1976). Further, the evaluative and attraction factors were quite orthogonal.

Speech rate similarity was associated with greater intimacy, immediacy, and sociability / character interpretations (Buller and Aune 1992), and also with attractiveness (Putman and Street 1984; Street, Brady, and Putman 1983). In addition, some intercultural communication studies have supported that people react more favorably to those converging with them (Giles, Taylor, and Bourhis 1973; Harris and Baudin 1973; Simard, Taylor, and Giles 1976).
ATTITUDE SIMILARITY

The most researched aspect of similarity seems to be similarity in the values prevalent within groups, or attitude similarity (Brown 1984a). It has frequently been observed that subjects are more attracted to others with similar attitudes (Byrne 1969, 1971; J. M. Davis 1984; Duck 1977; Good and Nelson 1973; Gonzales et al. 1983; Heider 1958; Kerber 1981; Royal and Golden 1981). Attitude similarity affects such things as the amount of money one will lend, independent of relevant financial information (Golightly, Huffman, and Byrne 1972). It affects attraction and satisfaction outcomes, although some behavioral similarities may reduce the effects of attitude similarity (Cappella and Palmer 1990). Similarity in religious attitude produced the highest attraction, while political attitude similarity produced the lowest (Rai and Rathore 1988).

Lydon, Jamieson, and Zanna (1988) found that respect judgments were supported by attitude similarity, whereas liking judgments were supported by activity similarity. For low self-monitors, initial attraction to stimulus persons was more strongly influenced by attitude similarity than by activity preference similarity, while for high self-monitors the converse was true (Jamieson, Lydon, and Zanna 1987).

Several intercultural studies have found perceived ethnocultural similarity to be a higher correlate of attraction than perceived attitude similarity (Allen 1976; Gudykunst and Nishida 1984; Jones and Diener 1976; Triandis 1961) whereas others have found the opposite (Byrne and Wong 1962; Hendrick, Stikes, and Murray 1972; Kim 1991; Simard 1981). Rabbie and Huygen (1974) found that intergroup attitude similarity positively influenced intergroup cooperation, while Diehl (1988) found that interpersonal attitude
similarity influenced liking of similar over dissimilar individuals more than intergroup similarity did, independent of group membership.

Brown (1984a) reported two experiments wherein status and attitude similarity were independently manipulated, and different goal orientations could be examined for their effects. Results in one experiment supported similarity-attraction theories. Subjects’ evaluations of similar status outgroups showed less bias than shown towards superior and inferior outgroups. Outgroups with different attitudes were less liked, and differentiated against more, than those of similar attitudes and status. In the second experiment, similarity of attitudes produced intergroup attraction only for less competitive subjects, while for competitive subjects the reverse was true. Brown and Abrams (1986), in an actualistic study, found that regardless of the goal, attitude similarity led to an increase in liking for and cooperation with the outgroups.

Subjects whose ingroup was formed on a chance basis were positively biased toward an outgroup with similar attitudes towards both important and trivial issues (Moghaddam and Stringer 1988). Similarity was shown to affect intergroup bias more than social categorization did. It seemed that when ingroups were formed on a chance basis, subjects identified more with the outgroups, and redefined their group membership on the basis of similarity.

Neimeyer and Mitchell (1988) studying interacting student dyads observed that attitude similarity was significantly predictive of initial attraction across pairs, whereas later attraction was predicted by personality and cognitive-structural similarity. Dyads with similar attitudes increased their mutual attraction over time, whereas those with dissimilar attitudes decreased their attraction. Golightly-Eberly and Eberly (1979) surveyed
physical, occupational, and corrective therapists and found significantly greater attraction to patients that were 80% similar, with a greater achievement expected for those patients.

Zuckerman’s (1974) suggests that high sensation seekers prefer relatively high levels of arousal whereas low sensation seekers find such arousal unpleasant and try to minimize it. Since persons of dissimilar attitude are more arousing than those of similar attitude are (Clore and Gormly 1969; Gormly 1971), it was hypothesized that individual differences in levels of sensation seeking moderate the relationship between attitude similarity and attraction. As expected, high sensation seekers found dissimilar others more attractive, whereas low sensation seekers were more attracted to people with similar attitudes (Williams, Ryckman, Gold, and Lenney 1982).

Perceivers must be sensitive to others’ viewpoints in order to determine the degree of similarity of other viewpoints with their own, regardless of whether similarity’s effect on attraction is mediated by primarily affective processes as asserted by the reinforcement model of Byrne (1969, 1971) or by primarily cognitive mechanisms of the balance theory as proposed by Heider (1958) and Newcomb (1961). Thus, it was hypothesized that the perceivers’ empathic tendency, or ability to recognize others’ affective experiences and to take their point of view, should moderate relationships between attitude similarity and attraction. Consistent with this, subjects with strong empathic tendencies showed a stronger relationship between attitude similarity and attraction (Grover and Brockner 1989).

Research conditions may be a factor in the results observed. For example, Sunnafrank (1984) felt that conflicting evidence about the relationship of attitude similarity and interpersonal attraction in early acquaintance was due to differences in the communication environments used in the research. When examining attitude similarity and
interpersonal attraction, particularly in early stages of acquaintance, Sunnafrank (1983) found that they were positively related only in highly atypical communication situations, thus producing results of questionable generalizability. His observation of same-sex dyads indicated that subjects with dissimilar attitudes were more attracted to one another following an initial conversation, or an initial conversation and discussion of the attitude related topic, than they were prior to conversing. Subjects with similar attitudes generated more attraction than did dissimilar subjects only during the pre-conversation stage. Consequently, Sunnafrank suggested that we cannot generalize the positive similarity-attraction relationship observed in most studies to normal communicative relationships in which attitude discussions occur in the context of more typical communicative processes.

PERSONALITY SIMILARITY

High levels of personality similarity result in positive reinforcement or gratifying situations, and consequently increase attraction (Suman and Sethi 1985). Nondepressed subjects felt that nondepressed targets were more similar than depressed targets, and hence preferred (Rosenblatt and Greenberg 1988). Subjects liked one another more when they were similar in self-esteem, public self-consciousness (Lloyd, Paulsen, and Brockner 1983), and self-concepts (but with no effects due to similarity of subjects' ideal self-concept with the other's self-concepts) (Griffitt 1966). Further, Type A and B subjects preferred dating partners of identical behavior type (Morell, Twillman, and Sullaway 1989; Berrenberg, Canjar, Klein, and Bugosh 1987), with the exception that Type A females with high Personal Attributes Questionnaire Masculinity scores selected Type A dates, whereas Type A females with low scores preferred Type Bs.
SIMILARITY IN PHYSICAL APPEARANCE

Similarity in physical appearance increased the attraction of an outgroups, following intergroup cooperation (Worchel, Axsom, Ferris, Samaha, and Schweizer 1978). Individuals developed an attraction to faces similar to their own through repeated exposure to their own face and the faces of others genetically similar to themselves (Hinsz 1989), regarding similar appearing people as both more likeable and more familiar (Moreland and Zajonc 1982). According to Chambers, Christiansen, and Kunz's (1983), similar physical appearance may be an important factor in the formation of interpersonal relationships.

OTHER DIMENSIONS OF SIMILARITY

Other relatively less researched similarity aspects include caste, religion, geography, activity preference, and status. Similarity in caste was found to lead to attraction (Rai and Mehta 1989; Mehta and Rai 1984), while similarities of religion (i.e. Hindu and Muslim) generated significantly more attraction in Muslim than in Hindu subjects (Rai and Rathore 1986).

Social distance seemed to be negatively correlated with the degree of cultural and geographical similarity between different African tribal groups (Mitchell 1956), thus favoring the similarity-attraction paradigm, even though the definition of 'cultural similarity' lacked explicitness and precision. Michael, Gilroy, and Sherman (1984) observed that athletic similarity was related to perceived liking, but only for athletic subjects.

A consistently positive relationship has been observed between status similarity, or the proximity of groups on some dimension of value or prestige (Brown 1984a), and liking (e.g. Reagor and Clore 1970; Senn 1971).
Summary of similarity-attraction theory. Similarity in the following characteristics have been shown to lead to attraction: communication style (e.g. Buller and Aune 1992; Giles et al. 1973; Harris and Baudin 1973; Simard et al. 1976; Putman and Street 1984; Street et al. 1983), attitude (e.g. Byrne 1969; Byrne and Wong 1962; J. M. Davis 1984; Gonzales et al. 1983; Hendrick et al. 1972; Heider 1958; Kerber 1981; Royal and Golden 1981; Simard 1981), activity preference (e.g. Lydon et al. 1988; Michael et al. 1984), ethnocultural similarity (e.g. Allen 1976; Gudykunst and Nishida 1984; Jones and Diener 1976; Triandis 1961), personality (e.g. Berreberg et al. 1987; Lloyd et al. 1983; Rosenblatt and Greenberg 1988; Suman and Sethi 1985), physical appearance (e.g. Chambers et al. 1983; Hinsz 1989; Moreland and Zajonc 1982), caste (e.g. Rai and Mehta 1989; Mehta and Rai 1984), religion (e.g. Rai and Rathore 1986), and status (e.g. Reagor and Clore 1970; Senn 1971). The similarity-attraction paradigm, which consists of a variety of theories such as social comparison theory, balance theory and so forth, appears to have enjoyed much empirical support over several decades.

However, not all studies investigating the similarity-attraction relationship obtained positive results. Weitz’s (1979) literature review found the similarity-attraction hypothesis to be weakly supported. The idea that client-counselor group membership or other similarity information favorably influences client perceptions of counselor expertise or attractiveness was not supported by Strohmer and Biggs’ (1983) or Peca-Baker and Friedlander’s (1989) data.

Persons who esteem themselves highly will likely think highly of those similar to themself and less of those that are dissimilar (Griffitt 1966). A person with negative self-
concept may be less attracted to similar others, associating them with unpleasant outcomes. In support of this, Leonard (1975) found that individuals with a positive self-concept were more attracted to others with similar attitudes, while those with a negative self-concept were not.

In a large-scale experiment using U.S. Navy recruits, previous acquaintance and proximity strongly influenced the frequency of interaction, but demographic and attitude similarities had only a small effect, and these factors alone did not explain the observed frequencies of interaction (Sykes 1983). Further, subjects seeking information were more attracted to dissimilar than to similar strangers (Russ, Gold, and Stone 1979). Also, it has been observed that the similarity-attraction relation weakens when the similarity relates to negative characteristics of the target (Cooper and Jones 1969; Fromkin 1972; Jellison and Zeissett 1969; Lerner and Agar 1972; Novak and Lerner 1968; Taylor and Mettee 1971).

Gudykunst (1985) found no effect of perceived cultural similarity on attraction. Although Kim (1991) hypothesized that a native partner's efforts to accommodate speech would be taken to indicate a positive attitude and increased attraction to the native partner, no correlation was seen between perceived speech accommodation and attraction. Kim presented two explanations for this. First, speech accommodation measures contained linguistic cues too subtle to be picked up by the nonexpert, nonnative partners, as indicated by the lack of correlation between the nonnative partner's perceptions and the native partner's self-report on speech accommodation. Second, the nonnative partners were advanced second-language speakers, so they might have interpreted the native partner's accommodations as reflecting social distance and condescension and thus felt uncomfortable (Klein 1986). Campbell, Graham, Jolibert, and Meissner (1988) found
support for the similarity-attraction theory only among American subjects but not among French, German, and the United Kingdom ones. This suggests that the similarity-attraction paradigm may be culture-specific.

As mentioned above, Brown’s (1984a) second study revealed that attitude similarity led to attraction in less competitive subjects but rejection in highly competitive subjects, and that status similarity did not influence attraction. Consequently, Brown (1984b) warned that the unanimous conclusion of interpersonal relations studies that similarity leads to attraction must be qualified when we deal with intergroup situations.

The relationship between similarity among religious groups and attraction was seen to be positive for moderate degrees of similarity but reversed for extreme levels of similarity (Rokeach 1960). Further, in intergroup relations, similarity and attraction may be positively related only at moderate levels of similarity (Giles and Smith 1979). Thus substantial levels of adaptation may produce less attraction, and may in fact be dysfunctional (Copeland and Griggs 1985). The negative relationship between similarity and attraction may be accounted for by social identity theory (Tajfel 1974, 1978b; Tajfel and Turner 1979).

**SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY**

It seems that both an interpersonal and an intergroup perspective are necessary for a complete understanding of intercultural negotiations (Francis 1991). The interpersonal approach views the negotiation outcomes as depending on individual’s characteristics (Rubin and Brown 1975), while the intergroup approach views them as partially depending on individuals being representatives of a group (Francis 1991). Social identity theory

A person’s self-concept consists of both private and public aspects. The private self is what they think about themselves whereas the public self refers to the way they present themselves to others. Both private and public selves consist of personal and social identities. Personal identity derives from unique characteristics of the individual, such as intelligence, interpersonal skills, and so on (Gudykunst 1988). Social identity1 “derives from his [or her] knowledge of his [or her] membership in a social group (or groups) together with the value and emotional significance attached to that membership” (Tajfel 1978b, p.63), and is based on shared social beliefs (Doise and Sinclair 1973) and social representations (Hewstone, Jaspars, and Lalljee 1982). Tajfel (1972, 1974) argues that individuals identify and evaluate themselves largely in terms of their social groups. Groups provide a social identity that may contribute positively or negatively to their members’ self-concepts, depending on the subjective status of the groups.

Intergroup contact promotes comparisons important to group members, along dimensions such as personal attributes, abilities, material possessions, and so forth (Tajfel 1974). Such comparisons will lead individuals to seek or generate positive distinctions between ingroup and outgroups (perceived to favor the ingroup) which provide satisfactory

---

1 What European social psychologists like Tajfel and Turner call “social identity” is equivalent to “collective identity” in American terms (Luhtanen and Crocker 1992). Cheek (1989) distinguishes between three aspects of identity. Personal identity refers to personal values, ideas, goals, emotions, and so on of an individual. In this sense, it is equivalent to personal identity in social identity theory. Social identity refers to the self relative to others and is used in reference to interpersonal domains and social roles (e.g. one’s attractiveness and reputation), and thus differs from the same term in social identity theory. The last aspect—collective identity denotes the aspects of the self-concept that are relating to race, ethnic background, religion, sense of belonging in one’s community and so forth. This is equivalent to social identity used in social identity theory.
social identity, as opposed to negative distinctions (perceived to favor the outgroups) resulting in unsatisfactory social identity. According to social identity theory, the tendency to favor the ingroup over the outgroups in evaluation and behavior (i.e., ingroup favoritism or bias, intergroup discrimination or differentiation) (Tajfel and Turner 1979) is intended to make the ingroup positively distinct.

Any intergroup similarities are likely important in motivating the search for distinctiveness (Brown 1984b). So, social identity theory predicts that similarity of attitudes or status should have repulsive effects on relations between groups, which is in contrast to similarity-attraction theories. Ingroup distinctiveness may be threatened when an outgroup member displays ingroup attributes (e.g. adapting behaviors and communication style to fit those of the ingroup) and group membership is salient (Abrams, Carter, and Hogg 1989). As posited by social identity theory, at substantial levels of adaptation where group identity is threatened by outgroups members, group members will react unfavorably, because they desire distinctiveness. A negative relationship between similarity and attraction is likely to occur at the point at which group identity is threatened. Empirical support for the negative effect of substantial adaptation was found in Francis (1989).

Two major differences exist between social identity and similarity-attraction theories (Brown 1984b). First, social identity theory focusses on common group values and category identifications, whereas such group related factors are not considered significant to similarity-attraction theories. Second, similarity-attraction theories consider similarity to have positive and reinforcing properties due to the emphasis on the information-seeking nature of social comparisons, which seem to generate further uniformities. Whereas, emphasis on the evaluative and competitive nature of comparisons makes similarity seem
aversive under social identity theory, and instrumental in creating disparities rather than uniformities between groups. Consequently, the predictions of the two approaches are concerned with slightly different kinds of behavior. Social identity theory makes predictions based primarily on the cognitive aspects of intergroup behavior, whereas similarity-attraction theories’ predictions relate more to affective attitudes.

EVIDENCE FOR THE NEED FOR POSITIVE IDENTITY

In support of social identity theory assertion that group members strive for positive identity, it has been observed that while membership in a stigmatized minority was highly identifying, it was not satisfying, with members of the minority attempting to secure a positive social identity via social competition and creativity (Simon, Glassner-Bayerl, and Stratenwerth 1991). The assumption that people strive for a favorable social identity deriving from group membership was supported when Gaskell and Smith (1986) found that for a sample of Black and White young British males the importance of belonging to a self-assigned group correlated with its perceived rank.

EVIDENCE FOR INTERGROUP DIFFERENTIATION

RESULTING FROM THE NEED FOR POSITIVE IDENTITY

The observation that subjects evaluated ingroup members more favorably than they did outgroup members (Platow, McClintock, and Liebrand 1990) supports social identity theory’s idea that ingroup favoritism results from the need for positive identity. For example, members of High Caste Hindu, Muslim, and Scheduled Caste groups differentially evaluated self, ingroup, and outgroups (Majeed and Ghosh 1982), with the differentiation between ingroup and outgroups being reduced when the more common attributes were shared. Similar results were reported for Hindu and Muslim evaluations of
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self and ingroup in Bangladesh and India (Ghosh and Huq 1985), ingroup-outgroup evaluations in Africa (Brewer and Campbell 1976), and observations on European subjects (Peabody 1985).

**Ingroup bias decreasing as a function of ingroup status.** Social identity theory predicts that strong ingroup bias will help lower status groups satisfy a stronger need to feel good about themselves. The accentuation of intergroup differences in descriptions given by lower status groups, as well as lower status subjects perceiving a difference between ingroups and outgroups on a set of traits for which they rated themselves superior, supports this prediction (Anisfeld, Bogo, and Lambert 1962; Cheyne 1970).

Students from two Hong Kong universities made group-serving attributions when they were asked to explain eight generally accepted facts distinguishing the two groups, with the lower status group showing stronger bias (Hewstone, Bond, and Wan 1983). These findings support social identity theory’s applicability in a collectivistic culture that emphasizes harmony.

Disadvantaged groups have been seen to achieve positive ingroup distinctiveness by downgrading, or devaluing the comparison group. For example, male players on a last place ice hockey team in a competitive league rated their opponents as “dirtier” in their play regardless of their past and present performance, and rated their opponents as superior on attributes that were critical for success (Lalonde 1992). Relatively deprived Muslims in India would sort out their negative social identity problems by devaluing or downgrading the comparison Hindu outgroups (Tripathi and Srivastava 1981).

It has been found that minority group members of a political party in the United Kingdom showed higher levels of intergroup differentiation than majority members, and
that within each group, the level of ingroup identification was positively related to intergroup differentiation (C. Kelly 1990). Mummendey et al. (1992) found that only minority and low status group members favored the ingroup over the outgroup. Also, groups with stable and legitimate superiority display the least ingroup bias, presumably because the inferior outgroup is not perceived to be status threatening (Turner and Brown 1978).

**Self-esteem as both a result and a cause of intergroup differentiation.** In social identity theory self-esteem is considered a central motivator of intergroup discrimination, which leads to two corollaries, that: (a) self-esteem is increased by successful intergroup discrimination; and (b) intergroup discrimination is enhanced by depressed or threatened self-esteem conditions. The latter corollary was confirmed by Hogg and Sunderland (1991), while Corollary 1 received support from Hogg, Turner, Nascimento-Schulze, and Spriggs (1986) who found that low-esteem subjects showed a significant increase in self-esteem, whereas high-esteem subjects did not, after allocating points to ingroup and outgroups. Lemyre and Smith (1985) found higher self-esteem levels in categorized subjects with the opportunity to discriminate between groups, and noncategorized subjects who did not discriminate, than in both categorized subjects who could not engage in discrimination and noncategorized subjects who could discriminate. Also, higher self-esteem was reported for subjects who were categorized and allowed to allocate rewards than for control subjects who just sat and read newspapers, indicating that intergroup discrimination tends to increase self-esteem (Oakes and Turner 1980).

**Positive association between ingroup identification and ingroup favoritism.** Social identity theory suggests that the dependency of self-esteem on a positive social
identity deriving from group membership increases as one identifies more with a group, and thus the greater need to maintain favorable ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation (C. Kelly 1988). Ingroup favoritism has indeed been found to be influenced by the degree of identification with the group. For example, ingroup identification and perceived material conflict were consistent predictors of intergroup differentiation, with regard to evaluative and affective dimensions, for adults in the United Kingdom (C. Kelly 1988). C. Kelly (1990) also found that ingroup identification was positively related to intergroup differentiation within each of the minority and majority factions of a political party in the United Kingdom. Using a film in which an American boxer either defeated or was defeated by a Russian boxer, Branscombe and Wann (1992) observed that subjects who identified strongly with America showed an increase in both diastolic and systolic blood pressure pre- or postfilm, while weakly-identified subjects showed no change. Also, strongly-identifying subjects were more derogatory towards threatening targets than were weakly-identifying ones.

In a survey of Scottish teenagers from Dundee, ingroup favoritism correlated positively with identification with Scotland, and Glasgow (outgroups) English accents were evaluated negatively when contrasted with Dundee (ingroup) accents, but positively when contrasted with received pronunciation accents (Abrams and Hogg 1987). Subjects who regarded their ethnic identity very important or who evaluated their ethnic identity favorably showed more ingroup preference (Verkuyten 1991).

A clear differentiation between factory departments was evident on the part of subgroups of workers, based on perceived contribution to the running of the factory and expressed friendliness toward outgroups. The relationship between group identification and
intergroup differentiation was not consistently positive but varied between subgroups and
between attitude dimensions, however (Brown and Williams 1984a).

**Null / significant interaction effect on ingroup favoritism.** J. D. Brown, Schmidt
and Collins (1988) observed a significant bias in group product evaluations, in that
own-group and ingroup products were rated superior to outgroup products, independent of
whether the subjects were assessing a product they had helped create.

It has been found that the amount of ingroup bias is mediated by the reality of
group categorization, the relative status of the ingroup, and the relevance of the evaluated
items. For example, Mullen, Brown, and Smith (1992) integrated the results from 5,746
subjects in 137 tests of the ingroup bias hypothesis and found that ingroup bias had a
moderate but highly significant effect, but became stronger when the ingroup was made
salient (by way of proportionate size and reality of the group categorization). A significant
increase in ingroup bias as a function of status in artificial groups were observed. Also,
higher status groups showed more ingroup bias on more relevant items, while lower status
groups did so on less relevant attributes, for both real and artificial groups.

When subjects had to evaluate the performance of different groups on a perceptual
estimation task, and on general characteristics less directly related to task performance,
Vanbeselaere (1987) found significant intergroup discrimination favoring the own group
when the male teenagers were divided into groups either randomly or on the basis of a
trivial similarity (simple categorization), but this discrimination was greatly reduced when
the two categories were criss-crossed. Similarly, when membership in social groups was
crossed (when individuals become members of an outgroup on one criterion and of an
ingroup on another criterion), ingroup bias was reduced (Deschamps and Doise 1978).
Discrimination toward outgroups is more moderate in members of collectivistic cultures than in members of individualistic cultures. For example, individualist Europeans and collectivist Polynesians from New Zealand both showed bias in minimal group situations, but the Polynesians displayed more generosity to outgroup members and moderated their discrimination more than the Europeans did (Wetherell 1982). Wetherell’s results agree with Triandis, Vassiliou, and Nassiakou’s (1968) study of role perception in ingroups and outgroups in Greece and the U.S., Feldman’s (1968) field study in Paris, Boston, and Athens, and Bond and Hewstone’s (1986) work with British and Chinese students in Hong Kong.

The effect of intergroup similarity on attraction and ingroup favoritism. Sociolinguistic research (e.g. Garg, Inder, Shekar, and Taylor 1972; Wolff 1959) has found that similarity in languages of different ethnic groups can cause those groups to dissociate from each other (see Giles 1977). It is argued that status systems increase social distance and decrease perceived similarity, and also inhibit comparisons or comparability between different status groups (e.g. Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975). Thus, ingroup bias should not occur between different status groups. A number of authors have observed marked discrimination between groups similar in status and attitudes (Brown 1978; Sachdev and Bourhis 1987; Wagner, Lampen, and Syllwasschy 1986). Deschamps and Brown (1983) found that comparability of roles led to more intergroup differentiation when the group classification was made explicit and reduced liking for the outgroup when it was not. Turner (1978) found that intergroup similarity tended to increase ingroup favoritism and reduce outgroup attraction when the ingroup and outgroups status relations were stable. Ingroup favoritism was greater for dissimilar rather than for similar groups.
when status relations were unstable. According to Moghaddam and Stringer (1988), if subjects from both ingroup and outgroups were similar in attitude toward important issues, repulsion rather than attraction was promoted.

Diehl (1988) tested Rokeach's (1960) belief congruence theory (which assumes that outgroups are discriminated against because they hold different attitudes) against Tajfel's (1978b) social identity theory (which predicts greater discrimination to establish positive distinctiveness from outgroups with similar attitudes). Under the minimal group paradigm, greater liking was evident for attitudinally similar rather than dissimilar individuals, regardless of group membership, thus supporting the belief congruence theory. Reward distribution among members of the ingroup and outgroups was affected by both attitude similarity and group membership. A member of a similar outgroup was favored over members of a dissimilar one, but discriminated against relative to a members of a similar ingroup. Greater discrimination was exhibited against members of the similar rather than the dissimilar attitude outgroup in terms of allocation of rewards. From this study, it seems that when the attitude similarity was limited to the interpersonal level, similar outgroup members were discriminated against less than were dissimilar outgroup members. This must have been due to the observed greater liking for similar others, regardless of group membership. However, when the attitude was at intergroup level, similar outgroups members were discriminated against more than were dissimilar outgroup members. This is in line with social identity theory: intergroup similarity poses a threat to ingroup distinctiveness and results in unfavorable outcomes (in this case, biased allocation of rewards).
In an implicitly competitive context, subjects showed no less liking for, but greater intergroup discrimination against an outgroup with similar aesthetic preferences, than against outgroups whose aesthetic preferences seemed to differ (Turner, Brown, and Tajfel 1979). Brown (1984a) saw that status similarity had no effect on attraction, while attitude similarity led to attraction for less competitive subjects and rejection for more competitive subjects. Brown and Abrams (1986), using actual instead of anticipated competition and cooperation, found that on evaluation of group performance, similarity in status and attitude combined promoted intergroup differentiation, regardless of goal relations, although their results generally supported similarity-attraction theories.

Seemingly, group members, self-aware or not, can focus attention on either social identity or personal identity, depending on which level of self-categorization is operant at the moment (Abrams 1988). When an individual is concerned with private aspects of the self (private attitudes, commitments, feelings, moral stances, needs), their standards may derive from self-definition or identity, whereas when focused on the public aspects of the self, their standards may derive from social norms of equality, fairness, interpersonal attractiveness, and social desirability (Abrams and Brown 1989). This leads to the prediction that when social identity is important, focus on self-identity will increase the impact on behavior of group membership. Also, the desire for positive distinctiveness may have more impact when subjects are privately self-focused because self-evaluation and self esteem are enhanced then (Brockner 1979a, 1979b; Carver and Scheier 1982). This goes against the deindividuation / self-awareness theory's prediction that through high levels of self-focus group members become individuated and the impact of groups on behaviors is reduced.
Accordingly, subjects having high levels of private self-consciousness accentuated their social identity, showed ingroup loyalty, and preserved ingroup distinctiveness. That is, they became more competitive when the groups were in competition, showed the most ingroup bias when a competing outgroup held attitudes similar to those of their ingroup, and showed the greatest antipathy towards similar-attitude outgroups. On the other hand, individuals with high public self-awareness tended to behave in a more socially desirable way and sought to increase their personal acceptability rather than display ingroup bias, and thus exhibited the most favor towards similar outgroups (Abrams and Brown 1989).

**EVIDENCE AGAINST SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY**

Some studies have failed to support a number of social identity theory’s predictions. For example, Oaker and Brown (1986) found ingroup bias of nurses to be negatively rather than positively correlated with group identification. Similarly, Brown and Williams (1984a, 1984b) and Brown et al. (1986), in support of realistic conflict theory, found that the degree of perceived material conflict between ingroup and outgroups was the most consistent predictor of intergroup differentiation, and that positive correlation between ingroup identification and intergroup differentiation, as indicated by social identity theory, was not consistent.

Some studies, such as Hogg and Sunderland (1991) and Wagner et al. (1986) have not supported the implicit corollary that intergroup discrimination enhances social identity and / or self-esteem. Also, Vickers, Abrams, and Hogg (1988) observed strong intergroup discrimination but lowered self-esteem in subjects with a salient local norm of cooperation, perhaps due to violation of the cooperation norm.
The implicit corollary that low or threatened self-esteem promotes discrimination was not always supported either. There was no evidence that low self-esteem subjects showed greater ingroup favoritism than high self-esteem subjects (Crocker and Schwartz 1985; Crocker, Thompson, McGraw and Ingerman 1987). Sachdev and Bourhis (1984) found that both minorities and majorities showed similar degrees of discrimination, although they had predicted that minorities, due to a relatively insecure and negative social identity, should display more discrimination than majorities to achieve favorable social identity. In addition, subjects with high collective self-esteem (i.e., high social identity) varied their evaluations of above-average and below-average scorers on a test in an ingroup-elevating fashion, whereas those with low collective self-esteem did not (Crocker and Luhtanen 1990). Crocker and McGraw (1985) found that greater ingroup favoritism occurred in lower self-esteem subjects from higher status groups, and in higher self-esteem subjects from lower status groups. Further, high self-esteem subjects, particularly when their status was at stake, showed more discrimination (Crocker et al. 1987).

The assertion that lower group status produces lower self-esteem contingent on group-identity, and thus more intergroup discrimination, was not supported in some studies (e.g. Doise and Sinclair 1973; Knippenberg 1978). In some instances higher status groups displayed more ingroup bias than lower status did (Brewer 1979; Hinkle and Brown 1990; Sachdev and Bourhis 1985). Canadian students rated the creativity of products, seemingly produced by ingroup or outgroup members (Sachdev and Bourhis 1987). They found that equal status groups discriminated against each other, showing the minimal intergroup discrimination effect; high and equal status group members were more discriminatory
against outgroups than were low status group members; low status group members revealed outgroup favoritism, in contrast to the findings of Mummendey et al. (1992).

As mentioned above, a significant increase in ingroup bias as a function of status was found in artificial groups (Mullen, Brown, and Smith 1992). Further, higher status groups showed greater ingroup bias on more relevant attributes, while lower status groups showed it on less relevant attributes, for both real and artificial groups. The last finding can be interpreted through social identity theory and the different identity maintenance strategies adopted by subordinate groups (Tajfel and Turner 1986). Higher status group members may want to show superiority on consensually relevant attributes, which will enable them to exhibit outgroup bias on the unimportant dimensions. Lower status group members may do poorly on relevant dimensions (which likely contribute to their lower status) and may gain by elevating themselves on the unimportant attributes (Mullen et al. 1992). This concurs with Mummendey and Schreiber (1984a) in that groups tend to favor the ingroup on dimensions relevant to ingroup identity and simultaneously favor outgroups on other dimensions.

Mullen et al. (1992) carefully examined the characteristics of the studies included in their meta-analysis. They found that use of artificial groups, specific and short-lived status cues (e.g. higher scores on some task), and / or highly relevant or important evaluative attributes generated more ingroup bias in higher status groups, whereas the use of real groups, global and static status cues, and / or evaluative dimensions of low relevance or importance led to more ingroup bias in lower status groups.

Tajfel (1972) postulates that status differences enhance or reduce mutual ethnocentrism depending on whether the groups recognize alternatives to the existing social
order. Tajfel (1974) distinguishes status differences through secure comparisons, which diminish comparability because other "cognitive alternatives" are not present, and through insecure comparisons, in which cognitive alternatives to the existing outcomes are possible. For example, the academic performance of schoolteachers and infants is not comparable; but, status differences between two football teams ranked first and second in their league can change, so comparison will not be reduced. The perceived illegitimacy of status differences (Tajfel 1978a) and the ease of changing the group's status positions or the perceived instability of the status (Turner 1975) both influence the awareness of cognitive alternatives.

Brown (1984a, Experiment 2) found no effect on attraction due to status similarity, and later argued that similarity of status alone does not increase the pressures for distinctiveness as was hypothesized by social identity theory (Brown 1984b). In studies where status relations were legitimate and stable (e.g. Brown 1984a; Turner and Brown 1976), status similarity did not promote intergroup differentiation. Where status differences are illegitimate and unstable (Brown 1978) or simply unstable (Mummendey and Schreiber 1984b; Turner 1978), similarity between comparable status groups has been associated with more intergroup differentiation. Thus, instability seems to be a necessary factor for status similarity to increase pressures for distinctiveness, as predicted by social identity theory.

Wilson and Kayatani (1968) found no reliable effects of ethnic similarity on cooperation or ingroup bias. Allen and Wilder (1975) and Tajfel, Billig, Flament, and Bundy (1971) found no overall effect on the amount of ingroup favoritism because of belief similarity with the outgroups.
CRITIQUES OF SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY

Social identity theory has received criticism. For example, when discussing motivational hypotheses in social identity theory, Abrams and Hogg (1988) mention a desire for cognitive coherence or good structure and a need for positive self-esteem as two important motives for intergroup discrimination, with the latter receiving the most attention. Although the theoretical and empirical bases of the self-esteem hypothesis both stem from minimal group research, it remains unclear whether self-esteem is primarily a cause or an effect of discrimination. In real contexts self-esteem provides only a partial explanation, as other sociological factors, such as the distribution of wealth and power (Ng 1982), material resources (Caddick 1981), and the nature of goal relations between groups (Brown 1978; Brown and Abrams 1986; Sherif 1967) seem to underly discrimination.

Rabbie, Schot, and Visser (1989) see ingroup favoritism as an instrumental, rational behavior to maximize economic self-interests, rather than to achieve a positive social identity. They argued that the allocations commonly used in standard minimal group studies (Tajfel et al. 1971), which provide most support for social identity, can be reinterpreted. They found that when subjects perceived an outcome interdependence with ingroup members, ingroup favoritism increased. However, when it was with outgroups members, outgroup favoritism increased; and under two-sided dependence conditions, an intermediate level of ingroup favoritism was observed. According to Rabbie et al., such favoritism (e.g. in allocation of money) is expected to be reciprocated, maximizing the subjects’ economic self interests.

C. Kelly (1988) found that the relationship of intergroup differentiation and self-esteem was not consistent, suggesting that concept of self-esteem having a central role in
social identity theory may require modification. Kelly suggested that other motives may be more important than self-esteem (e.g. Knippenberg and Van Oers 1984), and people may use means besides intergroup differentiation to achieve self-esteem (e.g. Brown and Williams 1984a). Also, there has been little consideration of the dimensions of self-esteem and how they relate to group memberships. Possibly only some aspects of self-esteem are affected by increasing one’s distinctiveness in a particular ingroup.

The term “self-esteem” used in social identity theory permits considerable variation in its operationalization because it is so general (Abrams and Hogg 1988). Many studies rely on global self-esteem measures, which are insensitive to the significance of social-identity-dependent self-images which fluctuate with context (Fleming and Courtney 1984; Fleming and Watts 1980). However, Tajfel and Turner’s (1979) and Turner’s (1982) hypothesis is reliant upon social-identity-dependent self-esteem.

Summary of social identity theory. Social identity theory posits that group members want positive distinctiveness (support provided by e.g. Gaskell and Smith 1986; Simon et al. 1991) and will react negatively if this group identity is threatened as when members of an outgroup are similar to ingroup members. Ingroup favoritism or intergroup differentiation is a result of the endeavor to distinguish the ingroup favorably (support provided by e.g. Platow et al. 1990). Groups having a lower status may have a higher need to feel good about themselves which can be accomplished through a strong ingroup bias. Thus, it is predicted that ingroup favoritism increases as ingroup status decreases (support provided by e.g. Anisfeld et al. 1962; Cheyne 1970; Hewstone et al. 1983; C. Kelly 1990; Lalonde 1992; Tripathi and Srivastava 1981; Turner and Brown 1978 but not Doise and

Two corollaries implied in social identity theory have received empirical support: (a) successful intergroup discrimination boosts self-esteem (e.g. Hogg et al. 1986; Lemyre and Smith 1985; Oakes and Turner 1980 but not e.g. Hogg and Sunderland 1991; Vickers et al. 1988; Wagner et al. 1986); and (b) threatened self-esteem and/or social identity enhances intergroup discrimination e.g. Crocker and McGraw 1985 for subjects in high-status groups only; Hogg and Sunderland 1991; Mummendey et al. 1992 but not e.g. Crocker and Schwartz 1985; Crocker et al. 1987; Sachdev and Bourhis 1984). It has been found that the more one identifies with the group, the stronger is the desire to maintain favorable ingroup identity via ingroup favoritism or intergroup differentiation (Abrams and Hogg 1987; Branscombe and Wann 1992; partial support by Brown and Williams 1984a, 1984b and Brown et al. 1986; C. Kelly 1988, 1990; Verkuyten 1991 but not Oaker and Brown 1986).

Intergroup similarity which is considered a threat to ingroup's distinctiveness in social identity theory has been found to lead to repulsion and / or ingroup favoritism or intergroup differentiation (e.g. Brown 1978; Brown 1984a; Brown and Abrams 1986; Deschamps and Brown 1983; Garg et al 1972; Moghaddam and Stringer 1988, Experiment 2; Sachdev and Bourhis 1987; Turner 1978; Turner et al. 1979; Wagner et al. 1986; Wolff 1959).

Mullen et al. (1992) concluded from their meta-analysis that the use of artificial groups, specific and short-lived status cues and / or high relevance / importance attributes lead to more ingroup bias among higher status groups; whereas, the use of real groups,
global and static status cues, and/or low relevance/importance dimensions induce more ingroup bias among lower status groups. Brown (1984b) proposed that when the status relations were stable and legitimate (e.g. Brown 1984a; Turner and Brown 1976), similarity of status did not affect intergroup differentiation but when they are unstable and illegitimate (Brown 1978) or simply unstable (Mummendey and Schreiber 1984b; Turner 1978), status similarity has been associated with more ingroup favoritism. Brown (1984a) suggested that similarity-attraction processes seem to work in non-competitive contexts e.g. Brewer and Campbell 1976; Brown 1984a Experiment 1; Good and Nelson 1973; Worchel et al. 1978) whereas social identity processes appear more salient in competitive situations (e.g. Brown 1984a, Experiment 2; Garg et al. 1972; Turner 1978).

**SIGNALLING EFFECTS OF ADAPTATION**

In intercultural situations, an observer might take adaptive behaviors to indicate the adaptor's perception of the target culture. Under extreme adaptation conditions, the adaptor may have more opportunities to display seemingly unsuitable behaviors, which may be perceived as presenting a more simplistic caricature or a less complimentary view of the observer's culture (Giles and Smith 1979) than in moderate or no adaptation situations (Francis 1989).

It has been shown that speakers who tried to adapt substantially were perceived as having a less complimentary view of their audience than those who adapted marginally, or not at all (Giles and Smith 1979). Moderate adaptation may reflect respect and sensitivity to the target culture without seeming presumptuous, while substantial adaptation may be considered so (Francis 1991). Adaptation that is perceived as gauche, compromising or
insulting, can be labeled "non-functional" and may be even more negative than an absence of attempt to adapt; however, when it is regarded as sensitive, complimentary, and supportive, it can be "functional" (Ellingsworth 1988). Further, even when it is well-intentioned, inappropriate convergence is negatively interpreted (Platt and Weber 1984).

Platt and Weber (1984) have identified some of the reasons for failure of attempts at convergence in verbal exchange. The first is interference from background languages and cultural strategies common in intragroup communication. This is often due to the different intonation patterns and general customs of background languages and cultures, such as greeting exchanges and leave-takings. The second is insufficient knowledge about communicative strategies and stylistic variations in the other language, on the part of the speaker. The third occurs when the speaker applies accommodation strategies indiscriminately, incorrectly, or insufficiently, to all age groups, social classes, or ethnic groups, thus failing to recognize the correct membership of the addressee.

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN

INGROUP FAVORITISM AND ATTRACTION

The effects of similarity on measures of attraction are not always paralleled by those on measures of evaluation and behavioral discrimination (Brown 1984b), making the cognitive and affective aspects of intergroup situations seem orthogonal (Brewer and Campbell 1976; Turner et al. 1979). However, as shown below, both variables did correlate in studies examining the effects of intergroup similarity on intergroup differentiation and attraction. For example, intergroup similarity tended to decrease outgroup attraction and increase ingroup favoritism (Turner 1978); attitude similarity
elicited more liking and less discrimination for similar rather than dissimilar individuals (Diehl 1988), and also towards an outgroup (Brown and Abrams 1986); and, comparability of roles increased intergroup differentiation in cases when the group categorization was made explicit, decreasing liking for the outgroup in cases when it was not (Deschamps and Brown 1983). So, it appears reasonable, based on empirical results, to assume that ingroup favoritism or intergroup differentiation (cognitive response) correlates negatively with attraction toward outgroup members (affective response).

THE LINK BETWEEN ATTRACTION AND OUTCOMES

Attraction, or liking, which involves affective rather than cognitive evaluations, is the key dependent variable in similarity-attraction theories, whereas, in social identity theory the key dependent variable is ingroup favoritism, or intergroup differentiation, which correlates negatively with attraction, as discussed above. Clearly, the ultimate goal of business negotiations is not developing attraction, but maximizing sales. Research has suggested that attraction, or the presence of a positive affect, influences outcomes, by reducing aggressiveness (Baron 1984) and making people more receptive to persuasion (Janis, Kaye, and Kirschner 1965). In an integrative bargaining situation, people with a positive affect exhibited a more cooperative attitude towards problem solving, and were more successful than those with a neutral affect (Carnevale and Isen 1986).

Similarity seems to lead to attraction which in turn results in more favorable outcomes or more cooperation (Davis and Silk 1972; Bagozzi 1976; and Evans 1963). Several studies have confirmed this link between attraction and favorable outcomes. Upon reviewing the negotiation literature, Rubin and Brown (1975) concluded that interpersonal
attraction generally improves negotiation outcomes and enhances future dealings between parties (cf. Benton 1971; Berscheid and Walster 1978; Morgan and Sawyer 1967; Swingle 1966). Attracted to the other party, negotiators appear to share favorable reactions, and often make sacrifices to maintain good social relations (McGuire 1968). At the same time, attractiveness or likability of the negotiators or sellers has been found to increase the opponent’s or buyer’s satisfaction (Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a, 1985b), which was true for the American, Japanese, Taiwanese, and Korean groups (Graham, Kim, Lin, and Robinson 1988). Although not all studies found a positive relationship between attraction and evaluative ratings (e.g. Brewer 1979; Brewer and Campbell 1976), it is expected that attraction will positively correlate with outcomes in this study.

**A CURVILINEAR RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ADAPTATION AND ATTRACTION**

**Summary of the literature.** Similarity-attraction theory suggests that greater levels of perceived similarity will increase attraction. Substantial adaptation by an outgroup can have an unfavorable effect because: (a) it threatens the distinctiveness of the ingroup, according to social identity (Giles and Smith 1979); (b) it may represent a less complimentary view of the ingroup than do either no or moderate adaptation (Asante and Vora 1983; Giles and Smith 1979); and (c) it may be viewed as presumptuous whereas moderate adaptation may reflect respect and sensitivity to the native culture (Francis 1991).

It is now apparent that native speaker receptors expect optimal levels of accommodation to their speech. Foreigners are generally expected to converge in some, but not all, behaviors (Argyle 1982) with inappropriate convergence or attuning (usually based
on stereotypes about another's group, rather than on actual behavior) leading to overaccommodation (see Coupland, Coupland, Giles, and Henwood 1988). However, insufficient adaptation or inappropriate retention of one’s own speech style produces underaccommodation, which is viewed as inconsiderate or unhelpful (Coupland et al. 1988).

Taken together, the similarity-attraction paradigm, the social identity theory, and the empirical findings seem to suggest a curvilinear relationship between adaptation and attraction in intergroup interactions, with moderate adaptation being the best. This attraction in turn has been found to result in favorable outcomes such as cooperativeness (Baron 1984; Carnevale and Isen 1986), openness to persuasive communication (Janis et al. 1965), satisfaction with the negotiation (Graham et al. 1988; Graham 1985b), improvements in the negotiations outcomes and future dealings between the parties (Benton 1971; Berscheid and Walster 1978; Morgan and Sawyer 1967; Swingle 1966; Rubin and Brown 1975) and buyer satisfaction (Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a).

Evidence for the curvilinear relationship. Relying on the similarity-attraction paradigm and social identity theory, Giles and Smith (1979) found that speakers who converged content, pronunciation, and speech rate were less favorably rated (in terms of likability of the speaker and perceived speaker’s view of the audience) than those who converged only content and speech rate, and least favorably rated if there was no convergence. This study thus suggests a curvilinear relationship between adaptation and attraction.

Further evidence for a curvilinear relationship between adaptation and attraction is provided by Francis (1991), who found that a Japanese sales team in a video script was
considered more attractive by American subjects role playing as the buyer in the script when under “moderate adaptation” conditions than under “no adaptation” and “substantial adaptation” conditions. This was not the case for a Korean sales team, whose attractiveness was not noticeably affected by the degree of adaptation. The signalling effect of adaptation was confirmed for both the Japanese and Korean sales teams, in that substantially adapted teams were perceived as having a less positive view of American buyers than were teams under “no” and “moderate adaptation” conditions, hence leading to more caution and suspicion on the part of the American buyer\(^2\), and reducing the chance that the substantially adapted teams would get the contract. Substantial adaptation may have worsened the outcomes of negotiations, but moderate adaptation did not seem to improve them.

According to Francis (1991), one possible explanation for not seeing the similarity-attraction relationship for the Korean sales team was that subjects did not perceive the manipulation of adaptation in the same way in both studies. Their relative ignorance of the Korean culture may have left them insensitive to important differences between the “no adaptation” and “moderate adaptation” conditions. However, if this was the case, it is not clear why the Koreans substantially adapting to Americans condition produced more caution and suspicion on the part of the subjects, less chance to reach a contract, and a less positive view of Americans than under “no” or “moderate adaptation” conditions. That is,

\(^2\) An alternative explanation is that this may be strategic and have nothing to do with similarity or attraction. Instead, considerable adaptation may imply that the adaptor has invested in his or her negotiation strategy, and the other party may simply reciprocate defensively (Keith Murnighan, personal discussion).
the "substantial adaptation" manipulation did produce adverse effects on several dependent variables except attraction for the Korean teams³.

THE EFFECT OF CULTURAL ADAPTATION
ON PERCEIVED TRUSTWORTHINESS

Trustworthiness is another major component of business relations and has been identified as an important factor in negotiation processes and outcomes (Pruit 1981), especially in Japan (Hall and Hall 1987) and Thailand (Richards 1987). When there is a high level of trust between them, negotiators are more likely to cooperate in problem-solving and to share information. However, persuasive arguments, threats, and other contentious forms of behavior become common when trust is low (Kimmel, Pruitt, Magenau, Konar-Goldband, and Carnevale 1980).

Francis (1989) provided an excellent framework of how cultural adaptation can affect perceived trustworthiness through two stages: the violation of stereotypic expectations, and, the causal attribution of behaviors.

VIOLATION OF STEREOTYPIC EXPECTATION

Stereotypes, or simplified mental images or cognitive schema about some category or person (Hamilton 1979), offer cognitive shortcuts, increase predictability, and reduce uncertainty (Allport 1954; Hamilton 1979; Hewstone and Jaspars 1982). They heavily influence expectations about interactions between groups (Hamilton 1979).

The encoding Cantor and Mischel 1979; Duncan 1976; Markus 1977) and retrieval (Cohen 1977; Dutta, Kanungo, and Freibergs 1972; Snyder and Uranowitz 1978) of

³ See the previous footnote.
information about others’ behavior are both affected by stereotypes, such that people attend to confirming behaviors more than disconfirming ones, perhaps in a self-fulfilling way. No adaptation and moderate adaptation conditions are perceived as equal in confirming expectations (Francis’s 1989). Extreme deviations from expectation, as during substantial adaptation, tend to be causally attributed as elaborated below, whereas minor deviations from expectation, as during moderate adaptation, appear to be ignored.

CAUSAL ATTRIBUTIONS FOR THE ADAPTIVE BEHAVIORS

Social attribution research provides evidence that observers will retain their stereotypes by discounting the authenticity of adaptive behaviors. Causal attributions are generated to enable interpretation and explanation of the events one encounters (Heider 1958; Jones and Davis 1965; H. H. Kelly 1967, 1973). Stereotypic confirming behavior does not trigger this attribution process (Pyszczynski and Greenberg 1987). Because stereotypes provide expectations about one’s disposition, an observer can explain confirming behavior by making a strongly dispositional attribution, with no consideration of other causal factors (Hayden and Mischel 1976; Regan et al. 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982). On the other hand, disconfirming behavior, as seen during substantial adaptation, is likely to trigger more elaborate attribution processing (Hastie 1984; Pyszczynski and Greenberg 1981; Wong and Weiner 1981; see Pyszczynski and Greenberg (1987) for a review) and tend to be attributed to situational factors (Hayden and Mischel 1976; Regan et al. 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982). In support of these, Francis (1989) found that less stable and more situational causes were given to substantial adaptation, or disconfirming behaviors, than to the no and moderate adaptation, or
stereotypic behaviors. Moderate adaptation condition was seen as more situationally caused than no adaptation condition.

An explanation for these phenomena is that people often discount a particular attribution for an action if there exists another facilitating factor (H. H. Kelly 1973). An observer will discount an adaptor’s sincere intention to reduce a cultural gap if there are other facilitating factors (e.g. being in a foreign country and thus being pressured to conform). In contrast, according to Kelly’s augmentation principle, an observer is likely to augment a stereotypic (dispositional) explanation for stereotypic, non-adaptive behavior of a foreigner because the behavior occurs in spite of a mitigating situation (e.g. being in a foreign country and subject to pressure to adapt but not adapting).

THE RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN ATTRIBUTION AND TRUSTWORTHINESS

Trustworthiness is composed of predictability, dependability, faith (Rempel, Holmes, and Zanna 1985), and sincerity (Sullivan and Peterson 1982). In early relationships it appears to rely most heavily on sincerity, predictability, and dependability, while a more generalized state of trust, based on dependability and faith, becomes important as relationships develop further (Kaplan 1973; Rempel et al. 1985; Sullivan and Peterson 1982).

Francis (1989) related attribution to trustworthiness. Information about an individual’s self or disposition is obtained from observing only behavior that is not explained by situational conditions (Bem 1972; Ross and Fletcher 1985). Dispositional attributions give information about an actor’s true self, supporting an image of sincerity, and because they relate to cross-situational consistency (H. H. Kelly 1973), they make the behavior appear predictable, dependable, and consistent as well. Disconfirming behaviors,
such as occur during substantial adaptation, invite extreme situational explanations and are thus considered uninformative of the adaptor's true self and intentions, sincerity or cross-situational consistency, resulting in low predictability and dependability. Consistent with this proposition, the sales teams in no and moderate adaptation conditions (confirming of expectations and caused by relatively more dispositional factors) were considered more trustworthy than those undergoing substantial adaptation (disconfirming of expectations and caused by relatively more situational factors) (Francis 1989).

Summary of how cultural adaptation affects trustworthiness. The encoding (Cantor and Mischel 1979; Duncan 1976; Markus 1977) and retrieval (Cohen 1977; Dutta et al. 1972; Snyder and Uranowitz 1978) of information about others' behavior are both affected by stereotypes, such that people attend to confirming behaviors more than disconfirming ones. Research supports that stereotypic confirming behaviors are attributed to dispositional factors alone whereas disconfirming behaviors tend to be attributed to situational factors (Francis 1989; Hayden and Mischel 1976; Regan et al. 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982).

Trustworthiness is composed of predictability, dependability, faith (Rempel et al. 1985), and sincerity (Sullivan and Peterson 1982). Dispositional attributions give information about an actor's true self, supporting an image of sincerity, and because they relate to cross-situational consistency (H. H. Kelly 1973), they make the behavior appear predictable, dependable, and consistent too. Disconfirming behaviors invite extreme situational explanations and are thus considered uninformative of the adaptor's true self and intentions, sincerity or cross-situational consistency, resulting in low predictability and dependability.
The theories reviewed suggest four mechanisms through which cultural adaptation can influence outcomes. The first is that adaptation increases the similarity (or reduces the cultural differences) between the adaptor and the native. According to the similarity-attraction paradigm, this perceived similarity results in attraction (e.g. Byrne 1969, 1971; Byrne and Griffith 1973; Heider 1958; Huston 1974; Newcomb 1978), which leads to favorable outcomes (e.g. Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a, 1985b; Graham et al. 1988). Second, social identity theory views that substantial adaptation may be aversive because it threatens the distinctiveness of the in-group (Giles and Smith 1979). This threat may impact on the outcomes. Third, substantial adaptation may reflect less compliment to the native culture than does either no or moderate adaptation (Asante and Vora 1983; Giles and Smith 1979) and may be considered presumptuous whereas moderate adaptation may show respect and sensitivity to the native culture (Francis 1991). Finally, cultural adaptation does not fit the expectation of the adaptor’s stereotypic behaviors. This disconfirmation influences the degree of situational attribution for the behaviors which in turn affects perceived trustworthiness of the adaptor which in turn influences outcomes.

The four mechanisms can be depicted in the conceptual model in Figure 5. This model assumes that the impact of cultural adaptation (operationalized here as perceived attempt to adapt) on attraction and perceived threat to social identity is mediated by perceived similarity to the native culture, and that cultural adaptation impacts on perceived compliment to the native culture and disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes directly.
CHAPTER 3
HYPOTHESES OF THE STUDY

THE IMPACT OF COLLECTIVISM AND STATUS DIFFERENTIAL
ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CULTURAL ADAPTATION

CHARACTERISTICS OF COLLECTIVISM

Culture is an interactive aggregate of common characteristics that affects a group’s responses to its environment (Hofstede 1980). Hofstede (1979, 1980, 1982) conducted an ecological factor analysis (i.e. using country means as opposed to individuals as a unit of analysis) on employees’ ways of looking at the world, across 40 countries, and later across an increased data base of 50 countries (Hofstede 1983). Four cultural dimensions were identified1 (Hofstede 1979, 1980, 1982, 1983; Hofstede and Bond 1984). The first dimension is power distance, defined as “the extent to which the less powerful members of institutions and organizations accept that power is distributed unequally” (Hofstede and Bond 1984, p. 419). The second dimension is uncertainty avoidance, defined as “the extent to which people feel threatened by ambiguous situations, and have created beliefs and institutions that try to avoid these” (Hofstede and Bond 1984, p. 419). Individualism versus collectivism is the third dimension. Individualism is “a situation in which people are supposed to look after themselves and their immediate family only” whereas collectivism is

1 Mead (1994) summarized the criticisms for Hofstede’s analysis (see comments and references in Jaeger 1986). It assumes that national territory corresponds with the limits of the culture. Next, conceptual and methodological problems exist. Some connotations of the cultural dimensions overlap each other. In addition, not all major value dimensions are represented (Triandis 1982). The research is culture-bound The questions and the analysis reflect Western concerns and are less relevant to other cultures (Roberts and Boyacigiller 1984). Finally, Robinson (1983) pointed out that the values of IBM employees were not typical of their countries and some social classes were not included.
“a situation in which people belong to ingroups or collectivities which are supposed to look after them in exchange for loyalty” (Hofstede and Bond 1984, p.419). The last dimension is masculinity versus femininity. The masculinity dimension is “a situation in which the dominant values in society are success, money, and things” whereas the femininity dimension is “a situation in which the dominant values in society are caring for others and quality of life” (Hofstede and Bond 1984, p. 419-420).

In a study covering 22 countries using a Chinese-developed questionnaire, Hofstede and Bond (1988) found a fifth dimension termed “Confucian Dynamism” (See Mead (1994, p. 478-479) for the evaluation of the model). This refers to long- vs. short-term orientations. Long-term orientations connote an ability to adapt to new situations, a willingness to accumulate and to be frugal in using scarce resources, to persevere and to subordinate one’s own interests in order to achieve a goal, and a concern with virtue. Short-term orientations connote a smaller savings quota, a desire for quick results, and a focus on face and truth.

Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, and Lin (1991) summarized the significance of the individualism-collectivism dimension. Individualism-collectivism has been considered a major aspect of cultural differences by theorists in many disciplines (e.g. Kluckhohn and Strodbeck 1961; Parsons and Shils 1951; Triandis 1988) and has been supported by empirical evidence (Chua and Gudykunst 1987; Gudykunst and Nishida 1986a; Hofstede and Bond 1984; Hui and Triandis 1986; Triandis, Bontempo, Villareal, Asai, and Lucca 1988). In both Western and Eastern philosophy it has been a key construct in analyzing the

---

2 According to the list of Hofstede (1991), the top eight countries for long-term orientation include China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, Japan, South Korea, Brazil, India, and Thailand. The lower eight countries include New Zealand, the U.S., United Kingdom, Zimbabwe, Canada, the Philippines, Nigeria, and Pakistan.
norms and rules of various cultures (Hsu 1981; Yum 1988). Triandis et al. (1988) found it to be an important dimension in explaining intercultural differences in social relationships. Research found that individualism-collectivism affects communication with ingroup and outgroup members (Gudykunst, Chua, and Gray 1987; Gudykunst, Yoon, and Nishida 1987; Triandis 1988). Group memberships have been shown to be more influential on self-conceptions in collectivistic cultures than in individualistic ones (See Marsella, Devos, and Hsu 1985). This suggests, and evidence has been provided, that collectivistic cultures stress social identity whereas individualistic cultures focus on personal identity (Bond and Cheung 1983; Driver and Driver 1983; Gudykunst 1988). The dimension of individualism-collectivism is a focus here because of its significance and its implication on the effectiveness of cultural adaptation in achieving favorable responses.

Besides the above definition of individualism-collectivism (Hofstede and Bond 1984), there are additional characteristics of this construct. Researchers from many countries agree on the following characteristics of collectivism (Hui and Triandis 1986): (a) consideration of costs and benefits of one's own actions for other people, (b) sharing of resources, (c) sensitivity to social influences, (d) belief in the agreement of one's own outcomes with those of others, (e) concern about face-saving and self-presentation, and (f) a feeling of involvement in others' lives. Following this, Hui and Triandis proposed a definition of collectivism as the subordination of individual goals to collective ones, harmony, interdependence, and concern for others. Individualism was defined as the subordination of collective goals to individual ones, independence, and lack of concern for others.
Triandis (1988) defined collectivism as “great emphasis on: (a) the views, needs, and goals of the ingroup rather than of oneself, (b) social norms and duty defined by the ingroup rather than behaviour to get pleasure, (c) beliefs shared with ingroup rather than on beliefs that distinguish oneself from the ingroup, and (d) great readiness to cooperate with ingroup members” (p. 74). This definition subsumes concepts of interdependence, interpersonal sensitivity, conformity, mutual sympathy, personalism (a desire to deal only with people known personally), self-sacrifice for ingroup members, and external control. In groups are groups of persons about whose welfare one is worried, with whom one cooperates without asking fair returns, and from whom separation is aversive. Extreme collectivism happens when the individual’s and the ingroup’s goals, attitudes, and values are identical.

According to Markus and Kitayama (1991), fulfilling the goal of independence (or individualism) entails thinking of oneself as an individual whose behavior is shaped primarily by one’s own internal thoughts, feelings, and actions, rather than by those of others. An interdependent (or collectivistic) construal of the self includes fitting in with relevant others, fulfilling and creating obligations, and becoming part of various relationships. One’s behavior is determined by the thoughts, feelings, and actions of others. Some direct effects of a collectivistic construal of the self are (a) relationships are often ends by themselves rather than being means for accomplishing individual goals; (b) maintaining connections requires being constantly aware of others’ needs, desires, and goals. Attention to others, however, is highly selective; and (c) given the significance of others in regulating one’s behavior, the ingroup-outgroup distinction is essential and the boundary of the collectivists’ ingroup tends to be narrower than that of the individualists.
Feeling good for an individualistic self requires being unique, expressing one's attributes, and asserting oneself. In contrast, feeling good for a collectivistic self comes from being interdependent with relevant others, i.e., fitting in, possessing one's proper place, supporting others' goals, and maintaining harmony.

Some criticisms of the individualism-collectivism dichotomy have been made (Schwartz 1990). First, it overlooks values that serve both individual and communal interests (e.g. wisdom, broadmindedness, and inner harmony). Furthermore, in ideal collectivistic cultures, identification with an ingroup may be so strong that conflict between personal and ingroup interests is nonexistent. Second, it ignores values that enhance the goals of collectives other than the ingroup (e.g. universal prosocial values such as equality, social justice, and preserving the natural environment). Third, it incorrectly assumes that individualistic and collectivistic values are opposed to one another. It does not recognize that the subtypes of these values sometimes do not covary and sometimes do not contradict each other. It should be noted, however, that in the samples examined in Schwartz (1990) the subtypes of individualistic and of collectivistic values held together about two thirds of the time. So, the dichotomy remains useful for general analyses.

HYPOTHESES RELATING TO THAI CULTURE

Generally, one would expect that people from a collectivistic culture, which values fitting in with relevant others, holding one's proper place, and preserving harmony, would appreciate a foreigner's attempt to adapt to their norms of behaviors and communication style. According to the similarity-attraction paradigm's prediction, the more the foreigner adapts, the more similar to and the more harmonious with the host culture the foreigner will be, and the more favorable the responses toward the adapting foreign partner will be.
In predicting the effect of adaptation on attraction and outcomes when Americans adapt to Thais, there are two possibilities. The first argues that status systems are institutions which enhance social distance between groups and thus *prevent comparisons between different status groups* (e.g. Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975). Tajfel (1972) postulated that status differences can increase or decrease mutual ethnocentrism depending on whether the groups perceive cognitive alternatives to the current social hierarchy. According to Tajfel (1974), an insecure comparison is one in which "cognitive alternatives" to the present outcomes are possible and therefore will not reduce comparison because the status inequality can be changed. A *secure comparison, on the other hand, reduces comparability* because other cognitive alternatives are not perceived.

*Thailand is relatively non-comparable to the U.S.* for two main reasons. First, relative to the U.S., Thailand is consensually of lower status in a number of dimensions. Thailand is less developed than the U.S. in economy, technology, education, standards of living, social welfare, and so on. Geographically, Thailand is much smaller than the U.S. (513,115 square kilometers vs. 9,158,960 square kilometers according to Hunter (1993)). In terms of physique, Thai people on average are smaller and shorter than Americans. These differences can be regarded as relatively permanent, at least for the next few decades, providing a secure comparison which mitigates comparability. Second, Thai culture scores high in power distance, willingly accepting power inequality (Hofstede 1980). Such a cultural value also tends to alleviate comparability.

Tajfel (1974) proposed that when members of different groups interact, they compare themselves by relevant aspects, such as personal characteristics, abilities, possessions, and so forth. These intergroup comparisons induce individuals to seek, and
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even create, aspects by which they can differentiate themselves positively from the outgroup. However, because different status groups are basically noncomparable, it follows that without intergroup social comparisons, people in the lower status group would not feel any pressure to make themselves favorably different from the higher status outgroup. (This argument is in line with Turner (1978) who deduced from Festinger (1954) that ingroup bias should not exist in the relations between groups differing in status). This implies that members in the lower status group would not feel threatened at all when people from the higher status group converge towards their norms of behavior and communication style. In addition, if the lower status group is collectivistic and values harmony, the more adaptation people from the higher status group show, the more favorable the attitudes people from the lower status group should have toward them, according to similarity-attraction theories. People from the lower status group would also tend to favorably perceive the higher status outgroup’s adaptation as a compliment and an attempt to reduce the cultural distance.

Besides status differential, there are other characteristics of Thai culture which favor the prediction that the more Americans adapt to Thai behaviors, the more favorable the outcomes (see also Table 2 for comparisons of key attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai cultures). Thailand is a collectivistic culture (Hofstede 1980). Thais encourage adapting to others’ behaviors and customs, as reflected in the proverb: Kao muang ta liu, liu ta taam (= When coming to a town where the people wink, wink as they do), which is equivalent to “When in Rome do as the Romans do.” Thai character is largely influenced by Buddhism, which teaches selflessness, patience, and mercy towards others of any race or nationality. Thais in general welcome strangers from other groups and cultures with friendship (Sagarik 1989). They are generally said to be hospitable and friendly (Tilleke &
Gibbins, R.O.P. 1989). It has been found that individuals in collectivistic cultures moderate discrimination toward outgroups more than do those of individualistic ones (Bond and Hewstone 1986; Feldman 1968; Triandis et al. 1968; Wetherell 1982). An emphasis on the individuals in outgroup relationships was found more in collectivistic communities than in individualistic ones (Gudykunst et al. 1987). This is consistent with the Thai people’s disposition to welcome and accept foreigners.

It seems that the ingroup-outgroup distinction is not so sharp in Thailand. Words connoting family members are normally used to address friends, co-workers and anybody else. Thailand is a feminine culture (Hofstede 1980). It has been found that feminine cultures’ members identify less with the ingroup than do masculine cultures’, and see less distinct boundaries between groups than do masculine cultures’ members (Gudykunst 1987).

The noncomparability arguments point to an absence of threatened social identity when Americans adapt to Thai culture. Based on Thai peoples’ disposition to accept foreigners, their relatively soft ingroup-outgroup distinction, and the predominance of research findings that similarity leads to attraction, Hypothesis 1a is formed as follows:

H1a: There will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when people in a higher status culture (American) adapt to the norms and behaviors of people in a lower status and collectivistic culture (Thai).

Extant research suggests that attraction or positive affect mediates outcomes. Positive affect has been found to lead to cooperativeness (Baron 1984; Carnevale and Isen 1986; Janis et al. 1965). Davis and Silk (1972), Bagozzi (1976), and Evans (1963)
suggested that similarity induces attraction, which leads to more favorable outcomes or more cooperation. Rubin and Brown (1975), reviewing the negotiation literature, concluded that attraction improves negotiation’s outcomes and future contacts between the parties (cf. Benton 1971; Berscheid and Walster 1978; Morgan and Sawyer 1967; Swingle 1966). Negotiators may sacrifice in order to maintain social relations when they like the other party (McGuire 1968). Negotiators’ attractiveness increases partners’ satisfaction (Graham 1985b; Graham et al. 1988). Likability of the seller has been found to positively correlate with buyer satisfaction (Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a). Although a few studies did not find positive relationship between attraction and evaluative ratings (Brewer 1979; Brewer and Campbell 1976), given the majority of findings, H1b is formed as follows:

H1b: There will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes when Americans adapt to Thai norms and behaviors.

In addition, H1c and H1d postulate that:

H1c: There will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived compliment to the native culture when Americans adapt to Thai norms and behaviors.

H1d: There will be no relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity when Americans adapt to Thai norms and behaviors.
The opposing line of argument leads to competing hypotheses with the H1 set. Social identity theory views substantial adaptation as disadvantageous because it poses threats to the distinctiveness of the group being adapted to (Giles and Smith 1979). Positive comparisons (intergroup differences perceived to favor the ingroup) lead to satisfactory social identity and negative comparisons (intergroup differences perceived to favor the outgroup) result in unsatisfactory social identity (Tajfel 1974). In comparison to Americans, Thais may have unsatisfactory social identity and self-esteem due to their lower status in the various aspects discussed earlier.

According to social identity theory, lower status groups may have a higher need to feel positive about themselves, which can be achieved through strong intergroup differentiation. Thus, it is predicted from social identity theory, that the lower the ingroup status, the higher the intergroup differentiation (support provided by Anisfeld et al. 1962; Cheyne 1970; Hewstone et al. 1983; C. Kelly 1990; Lalonde 1992; Tripathi and Srivastava 1981, Turner and Brown 1978 but not Doise and Sinclair 1973; Knippenberg 1978; Sachdev and Bourhis 1985, 1987). It has also been found that negative or threatened self-esteem and/or social identity causes intergroup discrimination (Crocker and McGraw 1985 for subjects in high-status groups only; Hogg and Sunderland 1991; Mummendey et al. 1992 but not Crocker and Schwartz 1985; Crocker et al. 1987; Sachdev and Bourhis 1984).

Mullen et al. (1992) concluded from analyzing the studies in their meta-analysis that the use of artificial groups, specific and transitory status signs, and / or high relevance / importance evaluative factors would bring about more intergroup differentiation among higher status groups. On the other hand, the use of natural groups, global and static status
cues, and/or low relevance/importance evaluative factors would give rise to more ingroup bias among lower status groups.

In effect, the lower status groups tend to display greater intergroup differentiation than the higher status groups. Because intergroup differentiation has been shown to correlate negatively with attraction (Brown and Abrams 1986; Deschamps and Brown 1983; Diehl 1988; Turner 1978), it follows that members of the lower status group (who tend to have strong intergroup differentiation) would exhibit minimal attraction, or even repulsion, when their distinctiveness is threatened by the higher status outgroup, who attempt to be substantially similar to them. If Thai people do have unfavorable social identity due to their lower status relative to the U.S., this line of argument leads to the following competing hypotheses:

H2a: There will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when people from a higher status culture (American) adapt to people from a lower status and collectivistic culture (Thai). Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more attraction than will no or substantial adaption.

H2b: There will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes when Americans adapt to Thais. Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more favorable outcomes than will no or substantial adaption.

H2c: Substantial adaptation by Americans will be perceived by Thais as less complimentary to the Thai culture than will no or moderate adaptation.

H2d: Substantial adaptation by Americans will result in a higher perceived threat to social identity than will no or moderate adaptation, which will not differ in perceived threat to social identity for Thais.
H2c is based on findings from cross-cultural communication research which suggest that adaptation signals the adaptor’s perception of the perceiver’s culture (Francis 1991) and that substantial adaptation reflects a less complimentary view than does no or moderate adaptation (Asante and Vora 1983; Francis 1991; Giles and Smith 1979).

**HYPOTHESES RELATING TO JAPANESE CULTURE**

According to social identity theory, *when groups are comparable, there will be pressure to differentiate themselves from each other* (Tajfel 1974). As stated earlier, Turner (1978) found that ingroup bias is higher the more comparable the two groups are. Comparable status groups were found to differentiate from each other (Sachdev and Bourhis 1987; Wagner et al. 1986). Brown (1984b) concluded that when status relations are unstable (Brown 1978; Mummendey and Schreiber 1984b; Turner 1978 when reinterpreting Turner’s stability condition as a situation of unstable status relations), similarity of status is associated with higher intergroup differentiation. So, if one group is being adapted to by another group comparable in status, it can be expected that at substantial adaptation levels the group being adapted to will feel their social distinctiveness is threatened and will react unfavorably. This effect is predicted to occur even though the group being adapted to is collectivistic.

Japan and the U.S. seem to be of comparable status. Their status relations can be said to be unstable because they can change. Both are developed countries, comparable in economy, technology, standards of living, social welfare, and so on. Although Japan was under U.S. control following World War II, the Japanese have little trouble in coping with the fact that the U.S. used to be superior. Japanese do not see dependency aversive in the light of *amae* in personal relationships (Fisher 1980), which refers to “dependence, the
desire to be passively loved, the unwillingness to be separated from the mother-child circle and cast into a world of objective ‘reality’” (T. Doi 1973, p. 7). It refers to the desire to rely on another’s good will (T. Doi 1971) and calls for nurturing and care (Jorden and Noda 1990). Probably the one dimension in which Japanese are inferior to Americans is in physique--Japanese people on average are smaller and shorter than Americans.

Despite their advice to themselves: *Goo ni haitte wa, goo ni shitagau* (= Obey the customs of the place where you are in), the Japanese possess some characteristics that suggest that in response to substantial adaptation by Americans they may react unfavorably due to threatened social identity (see also Table 2 for comparisons of key attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai cultures). A recognition of racial and cultural uniqueness forms part of the Japanese self image (Fisher 1980). The Americans do not discriminate between the concepts of *omote* (being public, formal, and traditional) and *ura* (being private, informal, and untraditional), whereas the Japanese tend to do so (R. Okabe 1983). This results in the Japanese tendency to make a clear-cut distinction between insiders and outsiders (Maruyama 1961), a conclusion supported by the findings that people in masculine cultures (Japanese culture is extremely masculine according to Hofstede (1980)) maintain stronger boundaries between groups than do people in feminine cultures (Gudykunst 1987). Japanese have different rules for dealing with insiders (*uchi*) and outsiders (*soto*). They may be merciless with outgroup members, and thus have been considered ethnocentric. The word *tanin* (outsider) is crucial, as “other persons” are approximately equivalent to “nonpersons” (Hall and Hall 1987). Foreigners have been considered to be nearly outside in various social relationships (Fisher 1980). At the national level, *all foreigners are treated as gaijin (outsiders)* (R. Okabe 1983). The
frequent use of *warenare-nihonjin* (=we Japanese) reflects that “we Japanese” is a cohesive group that excludes any non-Japanese (Jorden and Noda 1990). This exclusive attitude facilitates “the Japan-is-different syndrome” (Saisho 1975).

It has been found that collectivists moderate discrimination toward outgroups more than individualists do (Bond and Hewstone 1986; Feldman 1968; Triandis et al. 1968; Wetherell 1982). Because Japan’s score on collectivism is lower than Thailand (46 vs. 20 where 0 indicates the highest collectivism and 100 indicates the highest individualism, based on Hofstede (1980)), *Japanese may show more discrimination toward foreigners than Thais would.*

Japanese have been known for their relatively high patriotism and nationalism, reflecting *strong identification with their nation.* Also, Japan is a masculine culture (Hofstede 1980), members of which were found to identify more with the ingroup than do those of feminine cultures (Gudykunst 1987). It has been found that the more one identifies with the group, the greater is the need to preserve favorable ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation (Abrams and Hogg 1987; Branscombe and Wann 1992; partial support by Brown and Williams 1984a, 1984b and Brown et al. 1986; C. Kelly 1988, 1990 but not Oaker and Brown 1986). In particular, Verkuyten (1991) found that subjects who deemed their ethnic identity as very important or who perceived their ethnic identity positively showed more ingroup preference.

The above discussion on comparability of status between the U.S. and Japan, as well as Japanese people’s tendency to make sharp ingroup-outgroup distinction and to strongly identify with the nation, leads to the following hypotheses:
H3a: There will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when people from one culture (American) adapt to people from another comparable status culture (Japanese), despite the fact that the culture being adapted to is collectivistic. Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more attraction than will no or substantial adaptation.

H3b: There will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes when Americans adapt to Japanese. Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more favorable outcomes than will no or substantial adaptation.

H3c: Substantial adaptation by Americans will be perceived by Japanese as less complimentary to the Japanese culture than will no or moderate adaptation.

H3d: Substantial adaptation by Americans will result in a higher perceived threat to social identity than will no or moderate adaptation, which will not differ in perceived threat to social identity for the Japanese.

It should be noted that H3a, H3b, H3c, H3d are the reverse of Francis (1989, 1991), in which the Japanese adapted to the Americans.

HYPOTHESES ACROSS CULTURES: IDENTIFICATION WITH ONE'S OWN CULTURE

It is derived from social identity theory that the more a person identifies with a group, the more his or her self-esteem is based on a positive social identity emerging from the group membership, and hence the stronger is the need to protect positive ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation (C. Kelly 1988). High identification with the group has indeed been found to increase or be associated with high ingroup favoritism (Abrams and Hogg 1987; Branscombe and Wann 1992; partial support by Brown and Williams 1984a, 1984b and Brown et al. 1986; C. Kelly 1988, 1990; Verkuyten 1991 but
not Oaker and Brown 1986). Because ingroup favoritism or intergroup differentiation has been found to correlate negatively with attraction (Brown and Abrams 1986; Deschamps and Brown 1983; Diehl 1988; Turner 1978), it follows that highly-identified people (who need to maintain positive ingroup distinctiveness) should exhibit low attraction or even repulsion when the adaptors adapt substantially to their cultural norms and behaviors. Given this reasoning and empirical evidence, the following hypotheses are formed:

**H4a:** For Thai and Japanese subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture, there will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction. Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more attraction than will no or substantial adaptation.

**H4b:** For Thai and Japanese subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture, there will be a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes. Specifically, a moderate level of adaptation will result in more favorable outcomes than will no or substantial adaptation.

**H4c:** Japanese and Thai subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture will perceive substantial adaptation by Americans as being less complimentary to the Japanese and Thai culture, respectively, than will no or moderate adaptation.

**H4d:** Substantial adaptation by Americans will result in a higher perceived threat to the social identity of Japanese and Thai subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture than will no or moderate adaptation, which will not differ in perceived threat to social identity.

Following the same line of argument, the self-esteem of people who weakly identify with their group should not depend on favorable social identity springing from that group membership, and therefore there is no need to protect positive ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation. During substantial adaptation by outgroup members, they should
not feel that their social identity is threatened. Coupled with the similarity-attraction theory, the hypotheses for people who weakly identify with their nation / culture are formulated as follows:

H5a: For Japanese and Thai subjects who weakly identify with their nation / culture, there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when Americans adapt to their norms and behaviors.

H5b: For Japanese and Thai subjects who weakly identify with their nation / culture, there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes when Americans adapt to their norms and behaviors.

H5c: For Japanese and Thai subjects who weakly identify with their nation / culture, there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived compliment to the native culture when Americans adapt to their norms and behaviors.

H5d: For Japanese and Thai subjects who weakly identify with their nation / culture, there will be no relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity when Americans adapt to their norms and behaviors.

HYPOTHESES ACROSS CULTURES: PERCEIVED TRUSTWORTHINESS

The process by which cultural adaptation affects perceived trustworthiness is presumed to be the same when Americans adapt to Japanese and when Americans adapt to Thais. The process of encoding and retrieval of information about others is self-fulfilling such that individuals focus on confirming behaviors more than disconfirming ones (Cantor and Mischel 1979; Cohen 1977; Duncan 1976; Dutta et al. 1972; Markus 1977; Snyder and Uranowitz 1978). So, minor deviations from expectation tend to be ignored. In support
of this notion, Francis (1989) found that the no adaptation and the moderate adaptation conditions were perceived as equally confirming of expectations. Following this reasoning and evidence the following hypotheses are derived:

**H6a:** The behaviors of the American adaptors in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions will be perceived as equally confirming of stereotypic expectations in both the Americans adapting to Japanese dyad and Americans adapting to Thais dyad.

**H6b:** The behaviors of the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be perceived as most disconfirming of stereotypic expectations in both the Americans adapting to Japanese dyad and Americans adapting to Thais dyad.

Research suggests that behaviors confirming stereotypic expectations are attributed to dispositional causes. Disconfirming behaviors, in contrast, tend to be explained by situational factors (Hayden and Mischel 1976; Regan et al. 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982). Francis (1989) found that substantial adaptation (disconfirming behaviors) was explained away more by situational causes than was the moderate adaptation condition (relatively stereotypic behaviors), which in turn was seen as more situationally caused than was the no adaptation condition. Following this reasoning and evidence the following were derived:

**H6c:** The behaviors of the Americans in substantial adaptation will be attributed to more situational causes than those in the moderate adaptation condition, which in turn will be attributed to more situational causes than those in no adaptation. This pattern will be the same in both the Americans adapting to Japanese dyad and Americans adapting to Thais dyad.
Trustworthiness includes four components: predictability, dependability, faith (Rempel et al. 1985) and sincerity (Sullivan and Peterson 1982). Dispositional attributions reveal the actor’s true self, so the actor will be perceived as sincere. Because dispositional attributions relate to consistency across situations (H. H. Kelly 1973), they make the behaviors appear predictable, dependable, and consistent as well. In sum, dispositional attribution leads to perceived trustworthiness. Situational attributions do not give information about the self, thus failing to show evidence of the actor’s sincerity and consistency, resulting in low predictability and dependability. In support of these predictions, Francis (1989) found that substantial adaptation (which was perceived as disconfirming of expectations and caused by relatively situational causes) was seen as less trustworthy than were no and moderate adaptation (which were perceived as confirming of expectations and caused by relatively dispositional factors). Following this reasoning and evidence the following is hypothesized:

H6d: The American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be rated as less trustworthy than those in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions, for both the Americans adapting to Japanese dyad and Americans adapting to Thais dyad.

LINKAGE BETWEEN THE HYPOTHESSES

AND THE CONCEPTUAL MODEL

The model shown in Figure 5 depicts the four mechanisms by which cultural adaptation influences outcomes in interactions. The specific nature of the relationship of each path in the model is determined through the above hypotheses. H1a and H2a predict
the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction for Thai subjects, whereas H3a predicts the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction for Japanese subjects. H4a predicts the nature of the relationship between the two variables for Thai and Japanese subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture, whereas H5a speculates on the nature of the relationship between the two variables for Thai and Japanese subjects who weakly identify with their nation / culture.

Based on the empirical evidence that attraction leads to favorable outcomes, prediction of the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction laid out in H1a, H2a, H3a, H4a, and H5a is extended to the relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes, and is accordingly specified in H1b, H2b, H3b, H4b, and H5b. H1c and H2c predict the nature of relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived compliment to the native culture for Thai subjects whereas H3c predicts the nature of the relationship between the two variables for Japanese subjects. H4c postulates the nature of the relationship between the two variables for Thai and Japanese subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture whereas H5c predicts the nature of the relationship between the two variables for those who weakly identify with their nation / culture.

For both Thai and Japanese subjects, H6a and H6b together hypothesize the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes. H6c speculates the nature of the relationship between disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes and situational attribution, and H6d predicts the nature of the relationship between situational attribution and perceived trustworthiness.

Finally, H1d and H2d postulate the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity for Thai subjects whereas H3d predicts
the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity for Japanese subjects. H4d predicts the nature of the relationship between the two variables for Thai and Japanese subjects who strongly identify with their nation / culture whereas H5d speculates on the nature of the relationship between the two variables for those who weakly identify with their nation / culture.

**RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF THE MECHANISMS**

**BY WHICH CULTURAL ADAPTATION AFFECTS OUTCOMES**

While the above hypotheses specify the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and various variables, the relative influence or explanatory power of each mechanism is still not known. This relative influence can be assessed by looking at the multiple R-Squared value for each path in the multiple regression analyses.

As depicted in Figure 5, there are four mechanisms through which cultural adaptation affects outcomes. The first is that adaptation increases the similarity (or reduces the cultural differences) between the adaptor and the native. According to the similarity-attraction paradigm, this perceived similarity results in attraction (e.g. Byrne 1969, 1971; Byrne and Griffith 1973; Heider 1958; Huston 1974; Newcomb 1978) which leads to favorable outcomes (Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a, 1985b; Graham et al. 1988; McGuire 1968; Rubin and Brown 1975). Second, social identity theory views substantial adaptation as unfavorable because it threatens the distinctiveness of the ingroup relative to an outgroup (Giles and Smith 1979). This threat may impact on the outcomes. Third, substantial adaptation may reflect less compliment to the native culture than does either no or moderate adaptation (Asante and Vora 1983; Giles and Smith 1979) and may be
considered presumptuous, whereas moderate adaptation may show respect and sensitivity to the native culture (Francis 1991). The perceived compliment to the native culture somehow influences outcomes. Finally, cultural adaptation does not fit the expectation of the adaptor's stereotypes. This disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes influences the degree of situational attribution for the behaviors which in turn determines perceived trustworthiness of the adaptor which in turn affects outcomes.

The multiple R-Squared value for each path will show the relative explanatory power of each of the four mechanisms for outcomes, which has not been investigated before. Because extant research has not provided enough evidence regarding the relative impact of the four paths on outcomes, this investigation is exploratory. The only possible prediction is that because Thais and Japanese differ in some significant characteristics, such as ingroup-outgroup distinctions, identification with one's own culture, the perceived status differential between the American and native cultures, the relative impact of the four routes is likely to differ between the two countries. Thus, the following is hypothesized:

H7: The relative impact of each mechanism in the conceptual model will differ between the Americans adapting to Japanese dyad and the Americans adapting to Thais dyad.
CHAPTER 4
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

DESIGN AND INDEPENDENT VARIABLES

The design was a 2 (cultural dyads: Americans adapting to Japanese and Americans adapting to Thais) x 4 (cultural adaptation: none, moderate, substantial using English, substantial using the native language) factorial design. H1 set, H2 set, H3 set, and H6 set were tested by (a) for intra-culture analyses, one-way ANOVA based on level of cultural adaptation; and (b) for inter-culture analyses, 2-way ANOVA using the above two factors. H4 set and H5 set were tested by dividing Thai and Japanese subjects into three groups based on their strength of identification with one’s own culture and then tested with 2-way ANOVA (strength of identification with one’s own culture x cultural adaptation). The assessment of the relative influence of each path on outcomes (as laid out in the model in Figure 5) for each culture, to address H7, was achieved by conducting a series of multiple regression analyses with the variables in each path as predictor variables, and the outcomes as the dependent variable, and then comparing the multiple R-Squared value for each path.

SAMPLE DESIGN

The samples should be comparable because noncomparable ones will give rise to alternative explanations for the discrepant results (Douglas and Craig 1983). Subjects for the Americans adapting to Thais conditions consisted of 145 Thai professionals in Bangkok, a few of which were MBA students. Subjects for the Americans adapting to Japanese conditions were 101 Japanese professionals in Bangkok and large urban cities in Japan and Canada. All subjects were volunteers solicited in person or by mail.
INSTRUMENTS AND PROCEDURES OF THE EXPERIMENTS

MANIPULATION OF STATUS DIFFERENTIAL

Status differential between the adaptor and the perceiver was manipulated by countries. The dyad of Americans adapting to Japanese was presumed to represent comparable status (mainly in terms of economy and level of development). The dyad of Americans adapting to Thais was presumed to represent a higher status culture adapting to a lower status one (again mainly in terms of economy and level of development).

MANIPULATION OF CULTURAL ADAPTATION

Medium of presentation. Subjects were presented with a description of a sales presentation made by an American sales team to the Thai/Japanese purchasing manager (See Exhibits 2 and 3 for the stories used in the Thai and Japanese studies, respectively), as opposed to real interaction with American confederates or a video tape of an enacted sales presentation. The use of a written scenario offers many advantages over the other two approaches. First, it permits manipulation of the cultural character of the sales team while ensuring control over extraneous factors (Francis 1991). If real people are used as in a video enactment or real interaction with American confederates, they would probably possess some other traits which are difficult to keep constant and which can affect the dependent variables, such as physical appearances, personalities, voice quality, acting ability, and so on. Second, written description allows full control over variables that are difficult to manipulate, such as level of adaptation (Francis 1991). Third, by reading and processing the information themselves, subjects will be more involved than when viewing a video, which is passive and distant (Keith Murnighan, personal discussion). Fourth, this
approach is more efficient, simpler to execute and administer, and can be done through survey.

The use of a confederate is very costly and has to be carried out in laboratory settings which may not be appropriate for subjects who often are very busy and find it too troublesome to come to a laboratory. It is nearly impossible for the American confederates to act exactly the same way towards every subject. In addition, it is extremely difficult to control the dynamism of the interaction.

A video presentation is life-like, more interesting to watch than reading a story, and can deliver much richer verbal and nonverbal information. It can convey a lot of information in a short time, as in the saying “One picture is better than a thousand words.” With very careful control, extraneous variables can be kept constant across adaptation conditions. However, it is much more costly and difficult to produce and administer than a written story. In a video, many cues are going on which are likely to distract subjects (June Francis, personal discussion). Although written description can only provide a verbal description of nonverbal behaviors and cannot offer as rich and subtle stimuli as those offered by video, a written scenario was adopted after all the above advantages and disadvantages were compared.

Aspects of the manipulation of cultural adaptation. Cultural adaptation in this study was operationalized as encompassing three components. It was the degree to which the verbal and nonverbal behaviors of the adaptor were judged by the native (perceiver) as (a) showing attempts to adapt to the native culture, (b) being similar to the native presentation style, and (c) being similar to behaviors and practices in the native culture. The manipulation of cultural adaptation consisted of variations in the following components
which were pretested to reflect the typical American norms of behavior in the no adaptation condition, and to reflect the typical norms of behavior of Thais / Japanese in the substantial adaptation condition (see Table 2 for the comparisons of key attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai cultures).

(a) *Linguistic adaptation.* This includes linguistic style with respect to form of speech, syntax and idioms (Francis 1989). In substantial adaptation, it involved a complete switch to the language of the native.

(b) *Social etiquette.* This includes salutations, level of formality and communication traditions (Francis 1989).

(c) *Nonverbal communication.* This includes dress and body motion or kinesic behavior (see Exhibit 1 for notes on communication style and nonverbal communication).

Tables 3 and 4 delineate the components of cultural adaptation for the four adaptation levels for Americans adapting to Thais and Japanese, respectively. As in Francis (1989), the scenario covered three phases of the sales call: greetings, presentation, and termination. Subjects were told that the questionnaire was part of a dissertation (the introduction letter comes from the researcher and the Centre for International Business Study of the Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration of the University of British Columbia) which was studying how to improve the relations between North American and Thai / Japanese executives. Subjects were instructed to role play as the purchasing manager in the story, read the story and describe how they would perceive and react to the behaviors of the American sales team.

Subjects were asked to role play a Thai / Japanese purchasing manager rather than to provide their own reactions because people generally feel more comfortable giving
reactions concerning other cultures under another role (Francis 1991). Relative to
deception, role play can provide more realistic and more accurate information (Sawyer
1977; Stricker 1967; Tybout and Zaltman 1974). In addition, role play avoids the potential
problem of social desirability on the part of the subjects.

Common characteristics across adaptation levels. Following Francis (1989),
cultural difference was emphasized to highlight the inter-cultural nature of the interaction
and to increase the salience of stereotypes. Cultural difference is defined, following Francis
(1989), as the perception by the perceiver that the adaptor is culturally different. This
perception is typically based on symbols of cultural distinctiveness such as race, name,
dress, and manner (Ellingsworth 1983). To achieve cultural difference, the sales team was
identified as an American sales team from CommTech Industries New York office, coming
to Bangkok / Tokyo to make a presentation to a prospective Thai / Japanese buyer of
component parts. The members of the team were given stereotypic American names:
Michael Smith and Robert Brown. The Japanese buyer was named Hiroshi Watanabe, the
Thai, Wiwat Saranwong, a Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation.

The merits of the product are relatively neutral to avoid ceiling / floor effects. If the
product is extremely good and better than the competition’s in every dimension, subjects
may choose the sales team regardless of their manners. On the other hand, if the product
is mediocre in every dimension, subjects will reject the sales team regardless of their
manners and likability.

Materials and procedures of the experiments. All instruments (namely, the cover
sheet, the story, and the questions) were developed in English and translated into Thai or
Japanese accordingly by a bilingual whose mother tongue is Thai (the researcher) or
Japanese, respectively. A different bilingual whose mother tongue is Thai or Japanese reviewed the translation. Discrepancies were discussed and resolved.

Subjects were assigned to each adaptation condition at random. They were given a questionnaire in person or by mail. The cover sheet of the questionnaire stated that the research is part of a dissertation which studies how to improve the relations between Americans and Thais / Japanese. This was broad enough not to reveal the specific research questions. At the same time, it did not deceive subjects because the findings will suggest how much Americans should adapt their behaviors and manners to maximize the chance of success in dealing with Thais / Japanese. Subjects were instructed to role play as the Thai / Japanese purchasing manager in the attached story, read the story of a sales presentation made by an American sales team to the manager, and describe how they perceived and reacted to the behaviors of the sales team by answering the questions (see Exhibit 2 and Exhibit 3 for the stories and questionnaire used in the Thai and the Japanese experiments, respectively). The story provided manipulation of the level of cultural adaptation. The questions measured the variables discussed below. Questionnaires were collected in person or returned by mail.

MEASUREMENT SCALES OF VARIABLES

The measurement scales are shown in Exhibit 2 (the Thai questionnaire) and Exhibit 3 (the Japanese questionnaire) and are described below with the item name shown in the Thai questionnaire only:

Attraction. The attraction measures followed those used in similar empirical studies (e.g. Adler and Graham 1989; Campbell et al. 1988; Francis 1989; Griffitt and Nelson 1970). The items consisted of three 9-point semantic differential scales measuring
comfortable vs. uncomfortable, interested vs. uninterested, and like very much vs. dislike very much. See items q1attr, q2attr, and q3attr.

**Perceived trustworthiness.** The scale for measuring perceived trustworthiness (items q4tw, q5tw, q6tw which measure sincere vs. insincere, trustworthy vs. untrustworthy, and predictable vs. unpredictable) was adapted from the items in Francis (1989) which were loaded on the factor Trustworthy and which were shown to be highly reliable and unidimensional. In the pretests, subjects were asked to rate the American sales team relative to other American sales teams to test how trustworthy the presentation was perceived to be for Americans. This allowed distinction between the base-line trustworthiness associated with a specific culture and the effects of the manipulation (Francis 1989). However, it appeared that subjects who never dealt with an American sales team before had great difficulty answering these questions and thus gave neutral answers. Given that the objective is to learn whether adaptation affects perceived trustworthiness for this particular sales team, it was decided that a simpler question “You feel that this American sales team is...” would do a better job.

**Outcomes.** Outcomes measures examined the perception of the effectiveness of the sales team’s presentations on the future success of the relationship. The three 9-point semantic differential items were items q7outc which asked for the likelihood that the sales team would be granted the sales contract, q8outc which asked for the likelihood that the sales team’s company would be considered for a future joint venture, and q9outc which asked for the likelihood that the sales team’s company would be considered for other product lines.
Perceived compliment to the native culture. These items measured how complimentary a view of Thais / Japanese the American adaptor was perceived to possess using a 9-point semantic differential scale. Items q16evamn, q17evamn, and q18evamn measured the evaluation of the sales team’s behaviors as presumptuous vs. modest, insulting vs. respecting, and ill-mannered vs. mannerly. Items q19posv and q20under measured the perceived positivity of the sales team’s view of Thai / Japanese people and the perceived understanding of Thai / Japanese culture, respectively.

Perceived threat to social identity. Despite the importance of the “threat to ingroup identity” construct in social identity theory, there has not been any measurement of this construct. Most research inspired by social identity theory focused on measuring ingroup bias or intergroup differentiation (which were posited to be the outcomes of the need for positive social identity) either by examining the difference between evaluation of the ingroup and of the outgroup or the difference between allocation of resources to the ingroup and to the outgroup (Mullen et al. 1992). The scale measuring perceived threat to ingroup identity developed here consisted of three semantic differential items. Items q23thr, q24thr, and q25thr asked how much subjects feel their cultural identity is shaken, how much the sales team is violating or derogating their cultural identity, and how likely they would feel that their culture is less unique than they have thought.

Disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes. These items measured the degree to which the behaviors of the American sales team matched subjects’ expectations of a typical Thai / Japanese sales team (q10disco) and differed from their expectations of a typical American sales team (q11disco).
Situational attribution for the adaptation. It referred to the causal explanations given by the Thai / Japanese perceiver to explain the behavior of the American sales team as inspired by the sales team’s disposition (the internal makeup of the actor) vs. situation (the temporary condition in which the actor finds himself or herself) (Francis 1989). The scale was adapted from Russell’s (1982) Causal Dimension Scale. Items q13situ, q14situ, and q15situ asked whether the behaviors and the presentation style of the sales team reflect being in Thailand / Japan vs. reflect American cultural norms, reflect that they are dealing with a Thai / Japanese vs. reflect their character, and are a result of effort vs. are a result of habit.

Respondents’ characteristics. These consisted of age (q26age), nationality (q27nat), sex (q28sex0m), education (q29edu), position in the company (q31pos), business type of the company (q32btype), years of working experience (q33wkexp), dealings with American or Canadian culture (q34amexp), dealings with Europeans (q35euexp), dealings with East Asians (q36orexp) (except Japanese in the Japanese questionnaire), dealings with other cultures (q37othex), knowledge of American customs and behaviors (q38amkno), base-line evaluation of Americans’ trustworthiness and business practices (q39ameva and q40ameva, respectively), years spent abroad (q411tyab), individualism and collectivism (q46nhedo, q47gdep, and q48harmo), ethnocentrism (q49ethno and q50ethno, adapted from Gudykunst (1991), p. 69), strength of identification with one’s own culture (q51idst, adapted from Gudykunst (1991), p. 56), social identity (q52idst, q53sid, and q54sid, adapted from Luhtanen and Crocker (1992), p. 307), social anxiety (q55soanx and q56soanx, adapted from Watson and Friend (1969)), sensation seeking (q57sensk and q58sensk, adapted from Zuckerman, Kolin, Price, and Zoob (1964)), empathic tendencies
(q59empa, adapted from Mehrabian and Epstein (1972)), and private vs. public self-consciousness (q60prise, q61pubse, and q62pubse, adapted from Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss (1975)).

The individualistic and collectivistic tendencies were measured to see whether subjects were really collectivistic. The scale was adapted from the Individualism-Collectivism Scale of Triandis et al. (1986) and the Idiocentric and Allocentric Tendencies Scale of Gudykunst (1991). There are a number of scales for measuring individualism-collectivism. For example, Triandis et al. (1986) measured the etic (pan-cultural) aspects of individualism-collectivism across nine countries: U.S.A., Hong Kong, Chile, Costa Rica, Indonesia, India, Greece, The Netherlands, and France. Twenty-one items thought to influence the construct were chosen from previous studies (e.g. Hui 1984; Triandis et al. 1985). Subjects answered on a 6-point scale (extremely agree to extremely disagree). The scale of Triandis et al. (1986) seems appropriate to use if cultures are to be compared for individualism-collectivism. The correlation between Hofstede's (1980) individualism score for the nine countries and Triandis et al.'s (1986) for those countries is quite high (r=.67 for unstandardized scores and r=.73 for standardized scores), indicating convergent validity (Triandis et al. 1986). It is short and easy to implement. However, the reliability has not been reported.

The INDCOL scale was developed by Hui (1988) to measure the target-specific construct of individualism-collectivism. Items were derived from a group of cross-cultural researchers (Hui and Triandis 1986). Reliabilities of the subscales ranged from .38 to .79, most of which were in the .60s. Validation studies of the INDCOL scale (Hui 1988) have shown the convergence between the content of the scale and the academic community’s
conceptualization of the construct. The subscale scores and the general collectivism index correlated positively with social interest and social desirability. They were indicative of psychological reactions to sharing of responsibility. In addition, they were associated with consistency between felt obligation and behavioral intention (i.e. positive correlation between obligation and intention among collectivists with respect to both close friends and acquaintances but negative correlation among individualists with respect to acquaintances). The construct validity and discriminant validity of the INDCOL Scale were confirmed from other personality scales (e.g. locus of control scale, achievement motivation, F scale, and tolerance of ambiguity) (Triandis et al. 1985). In addition, Hui (1984) and Villareal (1985) demonstrated that the INDCOL Scale was not measuring self-monitoring. The scale seems appropriate as a measure of individuals' degree of individualism-collectivism. However, to obtain the general collectivism index, all the six subscales (spouse, parent, kin, neighbor, friend and co-worker subscales), totaling 63 items, have to be summed. Obviously, the task is too time-consuming for subjects.

The Idiocentric and Allocentric Tendencies Scale of Gudykunst (1991) is short and aims to measure individuals' degree of individualism-collectivism. Some items have the same meaning as in Triandis et al. (1986) and others carry additional meaning. However, the reliability and validity have not been reported. Considering all the above advantages and drawbacks of the three scales, it seems that the combination of the individualism-collectivism scale of Triandis et al. (1986) and the Idiocentric and Allocentric Tendencies Scale of Gudykunst (1991) with some items dropped out will be suitable. The adapted scale should access the pan-cultural aspects and the individual degree of individualism-
collectivism. *It is expected that the Thai and Japanese subjects will score approximately the same for collectivistic tendencies.*

The strength of identification with one's own culture was measured to see how much the subjects identified with being a member of their culture. This was to address H4a to H4d and H5a to H5d.

Social identity (or collective self-esteem) was measured because subjects' social identity may affect the results such that those with high social identity may feel threatened and react negatively under substantial adaptation whereas those with low social identity are not threatened and thus prefer a higher degree of adaptation, regardless of whether they are Japanese or Thai. An opposite possibility is that because it has also been found that depressed self-esteem and / or social identity motivate intergroup discrimination (e.g. Crocker and McGraw 1985 for subjects in high-status groups only; Hogg and Sunderland 1991; Mummendey et al. 1992 but not e.g. Crocker and Schwartz 1985; Crocker et al. 1987; Sachdev and Bourhis 1984), subjects low in social identity may exhibit negative reactions to substantial adaptation.

Because social identity is the key construct in this study, its measurement scale is described in more detail. Luhtanen and Crocker (1992) constructed the Collective Self-Esteem Scale to measure individual differences in social identity. The scale consisted of four subscales supported by exploratory factor analysis: Membership esteem, Private Collective Self-Esteem, Public Collective Self-Esteem, and Importance to Identity. Evidence for the reliability and construct validity of the scale was obtained from three studies with 1,463 university students. The reliability of the subscales and the total scale was supported by reasonably high Cronbach's alphas and item-total correlations and
adequate test-retest coefficients. Construct validity was exhibited through predictable correlations with other measures (cf. Luhtanen and Crocker 1992). In addition, the Collective Self-Esteem Scale was found to be predictive of intergroup behavior (Crocker and Luhtanen 1990). Although the scale was constructed as a global collective self-esteem scale, based on a number of ascribed group memberships, changing the scale for a specific achieved or ascribed group did not affect its psychometric properties. So, in this study, "Thai / Japanese nationality" was substituted for "social groups" in the original scale. It should be noted that the subscale "Importance to Identity" is quite similar to identification with the culture measurement in Gudykunst (1991).

Ethnocentrism was measured to see the base-line ingroup favoritism of subjects. It is expected that on average the Japanese should be higher than Thais in the strength of identification with one’s own culture, ethnocentrism, and social identity.

The personality variables were measured because of their potential effect on the similarity-attraction relation. First, it has been found that nonanxious subjects as measured by the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale greatly preferred similar to dissimilar partners. Socially anxious subjects gave similar ratings to similar and dissimilar partners (Heimberg, Acerra, Holstein 1985). The items for measuring social anxiety were adapted from the Social Avoidance and Distress Scale of Watson and Friend (1969) which has been shown to have very high indexes of homogeneity, adequate reliability, convergent and discriminant validity. A Likert format was used rather than the true-false format so that subjects could express the degree of their opinions.

Second, it has been found that high sensation seeking people were more attracted than low ones to dissimilar people, whereas low sensation seeking people were more
attracted than high ones to attitudinally similar people (Williams et al. 1982). The scale of sensation seeking was adapted from Zuckerman et al. (1964), which has been shown to have satisfactory reliability, to positively correlate with field independence, and to negatively correlate with anxiety. A Likert format was used rather than the forced-choice format so that subjects could express the degree of their opinions. The original scale contained 34 pairs of forced-choices which was too time-consuming.

Third, the association between similarity in attitude and attraction was higher among subjects with high rather than low empathic tendencies (Grover and Brockner 1989). The items for assessing empathic tendencies were adapted from the scale of Mehrabian and Epstein (1972), which has been shown to have high internal consistency (Adams, Schvaneveldt, and Jenson 1979; Mehrabian and Epstein 1972), predictive validity and discriminant validity (Mehrabian and Epstein 1972).

Finally, Abrams and Brown (1989) reported that individuals with higher private self-consciousness behaved more in terms of social identity, showed ingroup loyalty, and preserved ingroup identity. That is, they exhibited greatest ingroup bias when a competing outgroup shared similar attitudes with the ingroup, whereas high public self-conscious subjects revealed the most favorability towards similar outgroups, behaved in a more socially desirable manner, and tried to enhance their personal acceptability rather than show ingroup bias.

The scale for private and public self-consciousness was adapted from the Self-Consciousness Scale of Fenigstein et al. (1975), which has been shown to have reasonably high reliability and predictive validity. The original scale consisted of three subscales: Private Self-Consciousness, Public Self-Consciousness, and Social Anxiety.
There were a few ways to utilize these variables in the data analysis. First (which was the primary reason for measuring them in this study), subjects across groups were contrasted, whether they differed on these personality variables or not. If they did, the variables would be partialled out. Alternatively, each of these variables was included as another factor in an ANOVA analysis to investigate the interaction between cultural adaptation and each personality variable. This analysis would contribute to the empirical evidence regarding the moderating effect of personality on the similarity-attraction relationship.

**Manipulation checks of cultural adaptation.** Two items asked how similar to the Thai / Japanese presentation the sales team’s presentation style (q211sipr) and behaviors and practices (q12sibv) were. The other item asked how much the sales team tried to adapt to the Thai / Japanese culture (q22attem).

**Checks of perceived status differential.** Four items measured various aspects of perceived status differential between American and the native culture. Item q42a_tov examined the overall rating of the status of the U.S. relative to Thailand / Japan. Items q43a_twe, q44a_the, and q45a_tla examined the aspects of wealth, cultural heritage, and prestige of language, respectively.

**DATA ANALYSES**

The data were analyzed by multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA), analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), analysis of variance (ANOVA), Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts, which use a contrast-based error rate as opposed to a family-based error rate and thus is more powerful, multiple regressions, correlations, t-tests, and Chi-Square tests.
CHAPTER 5
PRETESTS OF THE THAI AND THE JAPANESE QUESTIONNAIRES

Pretests were conducted to make sure the manipulation of cultural adaptation was effective and the questions were clear. Pretests replacing the American sales team with a Thai / Japanese team were also conducted to make sure that the substantial adaptive behaviors remain within the domain of behaviors appropriate and acceptable to Thai / Japanese natives.

PRETEST OF THE THAI QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

A pretest was conducted with 11 Thai subjects, using stories and a questionnaire nearly identical to those shown in Exhibit 2. The majority of subjects were doing Ph.D. studies in Vancouver. Two had a bachelor degree. Age ranged from 26 to near 40. Work experience ranged from one year to about 12 years. The average time spent abroad was 5.8 years. Subjects rated themselves as moderately knowledgeable about American culture and customs. Their evaluation of American culture was quite neutral. As expected, in terms of overall and economic status, they perceived the U.S. as higher in status than Thailand (p < .01). However, in terms of cultural heritage, American was rated, with high consensus, lower in status than Thai (p < .001). This group of subjects was highly hedonistic (p < .0001) and self-reliant (p < .1), a characteristic of individualism. They were highly collectivistic in terms of maintaining harmony in interpersonal relationships (p < .0001). Subjects possessed a moderate level of identification with Thai culture, quite high social
identity which might partly be due to their pride in their cultural heritage. See Table 5 for detailed respondents’ characteristics.

Most subjects found the task interesting and were highly involved in completing the questionnaires. They felt the story and the questionnaire were just right in length.

PRETEST RESULTS

Table 6 presents the group means, the ANOVA results, and the Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts of the pretested Thai subjects. The manipulation of cultural adaptation appeared effective. The main effect of adaptation on perceived similarity of presentation style and manners and perceived attempt to adapt was significant (p < .01). The Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts revealed that substantial adaptation using the native language (TSubNve) was higher in similarity and attempt than were moderate adaptation (TMod) (p < .05), and no adaptation (TNo) (p < .001). Substantial adaptation using the English language (TSubEng) was higher in similarity and attempt than was TNo (p < .05). The differences between TMod and TNo, between TSubEng and TMod, and between TSubNve and TSubEng, despite being quite large and in the desired direction, were not significant due to the very small sample size.

H1a stated that there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when Americans adapt to the norms and behaviors of Thai people. The main effect of adaptation on attraction was significant (p < .1). The Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts showed that TSubNve resulted in higher attraction than TNo (p < .1). All other groups did not differ significantly. Failing to support H1b, the main effect of adaptation on outcomes was not significant, although the trend seemed to be monotonic positive.
H1c stated that there will be a monotonic positive relationship between the adaptation by Americans and the perceived compliment to the native culture. Results lent strong support for H1c. The main effect of adaptation on perceived compliment was significant (p < .05). TSubEng resulted in higher perceived compliment than TMod and TNo (p < .05). Similarly, TSubNve led to higher perceived compliment than TMod and TNo (p < .1). The differences between TMod and TNo and between TSubNve and TSubEng were not significant.

As hypothesized in H1d, subjects did not feel their social identity was threatened by the sales team’s adaptation. The main effect of adaptation on perceived threat to social identity was not significant. The perceived similarity to Thai presentation style and manners and attempt to adapt (as used in the manipulation check) was not correlated with perceived threat to social identity (r = .31, n.s.).

The main effect of adaptation on disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes was not significant. This supported H6a which stated that the behaviors of the American adaptors in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions will be perceived as equally confirming of stereotypic expectations. However, it failed to support H6b which hypothesized that the behaviors of the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be perceived as most disconfirming of stereotypic expectations.

H6c was partially confirmed. The behaviors of the American adaptors in TSubNve and TSubEng were attributed more to situational factors than those in TMod and TNo. However, TMod was not rated as more situational than TNo, and TSubNve was not rated as more situational than TSubEng.
Despite the support for situational attribution made for TSubNve and TSubEng, H6d which stated that the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be rated as less trustworthy (due to attribution to relatively situational causes) than those in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions was not supported. There was no difference in perceived trustworthiness across the levels of adaptation.

In summary the pretest showed that the questionnaire was appropriate and the manipulation was effective. Minor adjustment was made before using with real subjects.

PRETEST OF THE JAPANESE QUESTIONNAIRE

The pretest of the Japanese questionnaire was conducted after the actual Thai experiment was completed. Because Japanese subjects generally do not like answering questionnaires, it is important to keep the questionnaire as short as possible to increase response rate. The Japanese questionnaire, therefore, was shortened by deleting questions that were found in the Thai study to contribute little to the reliability of the scale or to have no influence on the key variables (i.e. attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, and perceived compliment to the native culture). These were items q10disco, q30stud, q32btype, q49ethno, q55soanx, q56soanx, q57sensk, q58sensk, q59empa, q60prise, q61pubse, and q62pubse (See Exhibit 2).

A pretest was conducted with 12 Japanese businessmen in Bangkok, using the questionnaire and stories identical to those shown in Exhibit 3. Four subjects had education lower than a bachelor degree; the rest had a bachelor degree. Three of them were in the 21-30 years of age category, two were 31-40, four were 41-50, and three in the older than 50 category. Two subjects had work experience of less than five years, two between 6-10
years, five between 11-20 years, two between 21-30 years, and one more than 30 years. Two subjects rated themselves as being in a low position in their organization, four as in the lower middle position, five as in the upper middle position, and one in the high position.

The goal of this pretest was to see whether the manipulation was effective and whether the questions were clear. Results in Table 7 showed that the manipulation appeared effective. The main effect of adaptation on perceived similarity of presentation style and manners and perceived attempt to adapt was highly significant ($p < .0005$). The Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts at the .05 level revealed that substantial adaptation using the native language (JSubNve) was higher in similarity and attempt than was moderate adaptation (JMod) which in turn was higher in similarity and attempt than was no adaptation (JNo). Substantial adaptation using the English language (JSubEng) was higher in similarity and attempt than JNo. There was no need to modify the questionnaire further. Consequently, data obtained from the Japanese sample were adopted as real experimental data, which are discussed in Chapter 6.

**PRETEST OF THE ACCEPTABILITY OF THE BEHAVIORS**

**IN THE SUBSTANTIAL ADAPTATION**

To avoid faulty adaptation, pretests replacing the American sales team in the substantial adaptation using the native language context with a Thai / Japanese team were conducted to make sure that the substantial adaptive behaviors were acceptable to Thai / Japanese natives.
Four Thai white-collar males age around 30 to 40 were approached at a restaurant in Bangkok. They were asked to read the story and respond to four 9-point semantic differential items asking for the acceptability of the sales team’s manners, the appropriateness of their language style and dress, and the typicalness of their presentation style. The four items were averaged. The mean score across the four subjects was 7.56 with a 0.55 standard deviation.

Four Japanese white-collar males age around 30 to 40 were approached at a Japanese restaurant in Bangkok. They were asked to read the story and respond to four questions similar to the Thai pretest. The four items were averaged. The mean score across the four subjects was 7.69 with a 0.24 standard deviation. The scores indicated that the behaviors and manners in the substantial adaptation using the native language condition, in both the Thai and Japanese experiments, were acceptable by native standards.
CHAPTER 6
RESULTS OF THE THAI
AND THE JAPANESE EXPERIMENTS

The answered questionnaires were investigated as to whether subjects were aware of the hypotheses of the study. It appeared that subjects were ignorant of the hypotheses of the study, especially those in the no and moderate adaptation conditions. As revealed in Table 8, Thai subjects did not differ significantly across groups in awareness of the hypotheses. 16.6% of the Thai respondents did not answer the probing question about awareness of the hypotheses. 48.3% of the respondents were totally unaware of the objectives or the hypotheses; 25.5% had some idea of the main objective of the study; and only 9.7% could be categorized as being aware of the objective of the study. None of the Thai subjects could specify the hypotheses of the study. Thus, all Thai questionnaires were retained for further analyses.

Similar to the Thai experiment, Japanese subjects were ignorant of the hypotheses of the study, especially those in the no and moderate adaptation conditions. As revealed in Table 8, subjects did not differ significantly across groups in awareness of the hypotheses. 36.6% of the respondents were totally unaware of the objectives or the hypotheses, 22.8% had some idea about the main objective of the study, and only 9.9% could be categorized as being aware of the objective of the study. None of the Japanese subjects could specify the hypotheses of the study. As a result, all Japanese questionnaires were retained for analysis.
RELIABILITY OF THE SCALES

RELIABILITY OF THE THAI SCALES

Cronbach Alpha coefficient was used to test the reliability of various scales. Table 9 lays out the scales and the items in the scales with associated alpha coefficients. Single-item measures were not assessed for reliability. They were simple questions and expected to be reliable. The reliability coefficients of the key measures (i.e. attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, situational attribution, perceived compliment to the native culture, perceived threat to social identity, and manipulation check) were very high, ranging from .76 to .93. Overall, reliability of the scales ranged from .45 to .93. This range is considered acceptable to excellent for research purposes.

RELIABILITY OF THE JAPANESE SCALES

Similar to the Thai study, the reliability coefficients of the key measures (i.e. attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, situational attribution, perceived compliment to the native culture, perceived threat to social identity, and manipulation check) in the Japanese study were very high, ranging from .64 to .94 (see Table 9). Overall, reliability of the scales ranged from .56 to .94. This range is considered acceptable to excellent for research purposes.

PRINCIPAL COMPONENTS ANALYSIS

As shown in Tables 10 and 11, many originally conceived variables were highly correlated. In line with previous findings (e.g. Benton 1971; Berscheid and Walster 1978; Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a, 1985b; Graham et al. 1988; Morgan and Sawyer 1967; Swingle 1966), the correlation between attraction and outcomes was high (.83 for
Thais, .77 for Japanese, p < .01). Attraction also correlated highly with perceived trustworthiness and perceived compliment to the native culture (.75 and .77 respectively for Thais, .74 and .75 respectively for Japanese, p < .01). Other highly-correlated pairs were perceived trustworthiness and outcomes (.71 for Thais, .79 for Japanese, p < .01), perceived compliment to the native culture and outcomes (.71 for Thais, .69 for Japanese, p < .01), situational attribution and perceived compliment to the native culture (.71 for Thais, .60 for Japanese, p < .01), and perceived compliment to the native culture and perceived trustworthiness (.68 for Japanese, p < .01).

Moderately-correlated pairs included situational attribution and attraction (.50 for Thai, .52 for Japanese, p < .01), situational attribution and perceived trustworthiness (.45 for Japanese, p < .01), perceived compliment to the native culture and perceived trustworthiness (.51 for Thais, p < .01), situational attribution and outcomes (.48 for Thais, .39 for Japanese, p < .01). Disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes had low correlation with other variables. The patterns of bivariate correlations in both the Thai and the Japanese data sets were almost identical in both direction and magnitude.

Principal components analysis in which all the variance in the measured variables contributes to the solution is recommended for an empirical summary of the data (Tabachnick and Fidell 1983). Because of the relatively high correlations among variables, principal components analysis was conducted on the 20 items that measured attraction (q1attr, q2attr, and q3attr), perceived trustworthiness (q4tw, q5tw, and q6tw), outcomes (q7outc, q8outc, and q9outc), perceived compliment to the native culture (q16evamn, q17evamn, q18evamn, q19posv, and q20under), situational attribution (q13situ, q14situ,
and q15situ), and perceived threat to social identity (q23thr, q24thr, and q25thr) for the Thai and the Japanese data sets to identify those that can be aggregated.

The EQUAMAX rotated component pattern matrix (or factor matrix) for each data set is shown in Table 12 (Thai data) and Table 13 (Japanese data). The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measures of sampling adequacy were .907 for the Thai data and .902 for the Japanese data which were considered marvelous (Kaiser 1974) and indicated that a principal components analysis on the variables was very appropriate. Bartlett tests of sphericity in both data sets were strongly significant (p < .00001), meaning that it was not likely that the population correlation matrix was an identity and thus principal components analysis could be safely used.

It can be seen from Tables 12 and 13 that the Thai and the Japanese data sets had the same latent structure. Both sets generated three components with eigenvalues greater than one. Nearly the same variables highly loaded on the different components. Thus, both data sets were pooled and submitted to principal components analysis, the rotated component pattern matrix of which is shown in Table 14. The rotated component pattern matrix had a simple structure and was interpretable. The items measuring attraction (q1attr, q2attr, and q3attr), outcomes (q7outc, q8outc, and q9outc), and perceived trustworthiness (q4tw, q5tw, and q6tw) loaded highly on Component 1 which was named "connectedness," i.e., feeling connected to the sales team and their company (Keith Murnighan, personal discussion). The items measuring perceived compliment to the native culture (q16evamn, q17evamn, q18evamn, q19posv, and q20under) and situational attribution (q13situ, q14situ, and q15situ) loaded highly on Component 2 which was named "perceived respectfulness." The items measuring perceived threat to social identity
(q23thr, q24thr, and q25thr) loaded highly on Component 3 and thus the original name was used.

Based on the above pattern, to measure connectedness, the average of q1attr, q2attr, q3attr, q4tw, q5tw, q6tw q7outc, q8outc, and q9outc was used. To measure perceived respectfulness, the average of q13situ, q14situ, q15situ, q16evamn, q17evamn, q18evamn, q19posv, and q20under was used. The average of q23thr, q24thr, and q25thr was used to measure perceived threat to social identity. Cronbach Alpha coefficients for the scale of connectedness were .94 for the Thai data and .95 for the Japanese. Those for the scale of perceived respectfulness were .92 for both the Thai and the Japanese data (See Table 9).

EXAMINATION OF THE DATA AND RESPONDENTS

ASSUMPTIONS FOR ANOVA

ANOVA tests were used for addressing H1’s to H6’s which involved differences in group means. The assumptions for the ANOVA procedure were examined for both data sets. The normal distribution of the dependent variables was not a concern here because sample size for each group in both the Thai and the Japanese studies was large and there were approximately the same number of cases in all groups (Tabachnick and Fidell 1983). Missing data were very few and were excluded from analyses for each comparison. No outliers were evident in the dependent variables. With the use of two-tailed tests, with ratio of largest to smallest sample size less than four to one, and with absence of outliers, robustness to departure from homogeneous variances was assured (Tabachnick and Fidell 1983). So, the data were appropriate for the ANOVA procedure.
THAI RESPONDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

The Thai sample consisted of 145 Thai professionals in Bangkok solicited in person or by mail with an introduction letter from someone that the subjects know personally: 40 for the substantial adaptation using native language condition (TSubNve), 36 for the substantial adaptation using English condition (TSubEng), 44 for the moderate adaptation condition (TMod), and 25 for the no adaptation condition (TNo). The response rate categorized by mode of solicitation is as follows:

**Response Rate of the Thai Sample**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Mode of Solicitation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 summarizes the mean characteristics of Thai respondents. Tables 16 to 20 show the frequency distribution of age, gender, education level, work experience, and work position of the sample.

Thai subjects did not differ significantly across the four groups in age, gender, education level, work position, work experience, exposure to American culture, exposure to foreign culture, perceived status differential between American and the native culture (all aspects), collectivism (non-hedonism and group dependence aspects), strength of identification with one's own culture, social identity and most personality variables found to moderate the effect of similarity on attraction (i.e. social anxiety, sensation seeking, empathic tendency, and private self-consciousness). However, they differed significantly...
across groups in expectation for the Americans to adapt, collectivism (harmony orientation aspect), ethnocentrism, and public self-consciousness (See Table 15).

As expected, Table 15 shows that in terms of overall status and wealth, subjects across groups perceived the U.S. as higher in status than Thailand (score higher than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001). However, in terms of cultural heritage, the American was rated as lower in status than the Thai culture (score lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001).

This group of subjects was highly hedonistic (score on nonhedonism lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001) and quite self-reliant (score on group dependence lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001), a characteristic of individualism. They were highly collectivistic, however, in terms of maintaining harmony in interpersonal relationships (score on harmony orientation higher than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001). Subjects moderately identified with Thai culture possessed quite high collective self-esteem (or social identity) which might partly be due to their pride in their cultural heritage.

A few of the ANCOVA results (cultural adaptation x respondent characteristics) with expectation for the Americans to adapt, collectivism in terms of harmony orientation, ethnocentrism, and public self-consciousness as covariates, shown in Table 21, reached significance for Thai subjects. Figures 6 to 23 show the pattern of these significant effects. Subjects older than 30 (Figure 6), or with more than 10 years’ work experience (Figure 7), or moderately sensation seeking (Figure 8) generally felt more disconfirmed of the adaptor’s stereotypes than those younger, having less experience, or being higher and lower sensation seeking. Subjects who had work experience between 6-10 years (Figure 10) or who had a high expectation for the Americans to adapt (Figure 11) generally felt more
threatened by the adaptive behaviors than did those with more than 10 years’ or five or less years’ work experience, or those with a lower expectation. Subjects who had moderate and high exposure to American culture generally felt more connected to the American sales team than those who had low exposure (Figure 15). Subjects with a low expectation for the Americans to adapt (Figure 20) or being moderately sensation seeking (Figure 23) generally perceived Americans as showing more attempt to adapt and being more similar to Thai culture than those with a high expectation or being higher or lower sensation seeking. Further interpretation of these graphs can best be summarized in Table 22.

According to Table 21, because the covariates ‘expectation for the Americans to adapt’ and ‘public self-consciousness’ did not affect the three key variables (connectedness, perceived respectfulness, and perceived threat to social identity), they were not included in the subsequent one-way ANOVA analyses used to address the hypotheses in the intra-culture analysis for the Thai respondents. Of the three key variables, ethnocentrism interacted with cultural adaptation only on perceived respectfulness, so it was not used as a covariate in subsequent analyses either. All subjects scored high on harmony orientation. Although subjects differed significantly statistically across groups on harmony orientation, the difference was not practically significant. Thus, this variable was not used as a covariate in subsequent one-way ANOVA.

It should be noted from Table 21 that awareness of hypotheses (that most subjects could guess the purpose of the study but none of them could specify the hypotheses) did not have any main or interaction effects on any of the dependent variables. This assures that retaining all the questionnaires as discussed in the beginning of this Chapter is appropriate.
JAPANESE RESPONDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Subjects consisted of 101 Japanese professionals (62 subjects were recruited in Bangkok, 34 from Japan, and five from Canada), being solicited in person or by mail with an introduction letter from someone the subjects know personally. 31 were used for the substantial adaptation using native language condition (JSubNve), 21 for the substantial adaptation using English condition (JSubEng), 24 for the moderate adaptation condition (JMod), and 25 for the no adaptation condition (JNo). Because subjects were recruited from three different countries, a two-way MANOVA (cultural adaptation x location of subjects) was conducted on five dependent variables: manipulation check, connectedness, disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes, perceived respectfulness, and perceived threat to social identity. Neither the main effect of location nor the interaction effect was significant. This assures that subjects from the three countries had similar reactions towards cultural adaptation. The response rate categorized by mode of solicitation is as follows:

Response Rate of the Japanese Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Mode of Solicitation</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>Mail</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Out</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>90.8</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 16 to 20 compare the frequency distribution of age, gender, education level, work experience, and work position between Thai and Japanese subjects. Table 23 shows the mean characteristics of Japanese subjects.

Japanese subjects did not differ significantly across the four groups in age, gender, education level, work experience, work position, expectation for the Americans to adapt,
exposure to foreign culture, perceived status differential between American and the native culture (in terms of wealth, cultural heritage, and language), collectivism (all aspects), strength of identification with one's own culture, ethnocentrism, and social identity. However, subjects did differ significantly across the four groups in base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices, exposure to American culture, and perceived status differential between American and the native culture in terms of overall rating (See Table 23).

Table 23 shows that in terms of overall status, wealth, and language, Japanese subjects across groups perceived the U.S. as higher in status than Japan (score higher than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001). However, in terms of cultural heritage, American was rated as lower in status than Japanese (score lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001). The pattern was generally similar to that of Thai subjects but deviated from the expectation, based on objective economic factors, that Japanese would perceive Americans as having comparable status to themselves.

This group of Japanese subjects was highly hedonistic (score on nonhedonism lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001) and quite self-reliant (score on group dependence lower than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .01), a characteristic of individualism. This pattern was exactly the same as that of Thai subjects. Similar to Thai subjects, they were highly collectivistic in terms of maintaining harmony in interpersonal relationships (score on harmony orientation higher than 5) (two-tailed t-test, p < .001). They also possessed a moderate level of identification with one's own culture and quite high social identity.

A few of the ANCOVA results (cultural adaptation x respondent characteristics), with base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices, exposure to
American culture, and perceived status differential between American and the native culture (in terms of overall rating) as covariates, shown in Table 21, were significant for Japanese subjects. Figures 24 to 30 show the pattern of these significant effects. Subjects who perceived Americans as having a lower status than Japanese (in terms of language) felt more threatened by the adaptive behaviors than those who perceived Americans as having a comparable status to or a higher status than Japanese (Figure 25). Subjects who had a bachelor degree or lower (Figure 29) or being weakly ethnocentric (Figure 30) perceived the Americans as showing more attempt to adapt and being more similar to Japanese culture than those who had a master's degree or higher or being strongly ethnocentric. Further interpretation of these graphs can best be seen in Table 22.

According to Table 21, all the three covariates (i.e., base-line evaluation of Americans’ trustworthiness and business practices, exposure to American culture, and perceived status differential in terms of overall rating) did not affect the three key variables (i.e., connectedness, perceived respectfulness, and perceived threat to social identity). So, they were not included in subsequent one-way ANOVA analyses used to address the hypotheses in the intra-Japanese culture analyses.

RESULTS BASED ON MANIPULATED CULTURAL ADAPTATION

THAI VS. JAPANESE INTRA-CULTURE ANALYSES

The intra-culture analyses did not “statistically equalize” the Thai and Japanese subjects by partialling out the differences in some respondent characteristics. Instead, the interest was on each culture as it really was. Although the principal components analysis reported earlier indicated that attraction, perceived trustworthiness, and outcomes loaded
on the same component, they are *theoretically distinct constructs* at a more micro level. To enable the investigation of the explanatory power of each path in the conceptual model in Figure 5, as well as to address H1’s to H6’s, the hypotheses were tested using their original variables rather than the components.

A one-way MANOVA was conducted on seven dependent variables for each culture: attraction, outcomes, perceived compliment to the native culture, perceived threat to social identity, disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes, situational attribution, and perceived trustworthiness. The significance level based on all three criteria (Wilk’s lambda, Hotelling’s trace criterion, and Pillai’s criterion) for both the Thai and Japanese cultures was very high (p < .001). As a result, a one-way ANOVA was conducted on each dependent variable in each culture as follow-up tests.

Table 24 presents the group means, the ANOVA results, the Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts at .05 level, and Levine test of homogeneity of variance on key variables for the Thai and the Japanese experiments. Figures 31 to 38 show the graphs depicting the group means of these variables (i.e., manipulation check, attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes, situational attribution, perceived compliment to the native culture, and perceived threat to social identity) for the Thai and Japanese subjects.

The manipulation of cultural adaptation was generally effective. In both studies, the main effect of cultural adaptation on perceived similarity of presentation style and manners and perceived attempt to adapt as an aggregated variable was strongly significant (p < .0001). As desired, the Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts revealed that TSubNve and TSubEng were higher in similarity to Thai presentation style and behaviors.
and attempt to adapt than TMod (p < .05) which in turn was higher in similarity and attempt than TNo (p < .05). The results were the same in the Japanese experiment except that JSubEng was not perceived to be higher in similarity and attempt to adapt than JMod.

The Effect of cultural adaptation on attraction, outcomes, and perceived compliment. Two competing sets of hypotheses were formed for Thai subjects. Data supported the H1 set (as opposed to the H2 set) which were derived from the noncomparability/no threat to social identity proposition together with some Thai idiosyncrasies. H1a stated that there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction when Americans adapt to the norms and behaviors of the Thai culture. As shown in Table 24, the main effect of adaptation on attraction was highly significant (p < .0001). The Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts showed that TSubNve resulted in higher attraction than TSubEng and TMod, both of which induced more attraction than TNo. TSubEng did not result in significantly higher attraction than TMod, in spite of being perceived as similar to Thai style and behaviors and as effortful as TSubNve. Supporting H1b, the main effect of adaptation on outcomes was strongly significant (p < .0001). The Student-Newman-Keuls contrasts revealed exactly the same pattern as those for attraction discussed above.

Results from the Japanese subjects failed to support H3a which hypothesized a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction. The main effect was significant (p < .0001). JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod induced more attraction than did JNo (p < .05). Although JSubNve resulted in lower attraction than JSubEng (5.65 vs. 6.35), the difference was not significant. JSubEng induced equal attraction as did JMod (6.35 vs. 6.18). The pattern for outcomes was exactly the same as that for attraction and
thus failed to support H3b which hypothesized a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and outcomes when Americans adapt to Japanese.

H1c predicted that there will be a monotonic positive relationship between the adaptation by Americans and the perceived compliment to the native culture (in terms of subjects’ evaluation of the manners of the adaptor, perceived favorability of the adaptor’s view of Thai culture, and rating on how much the adaptor truly understands the Thai culture). Results lent strong support for H1c. The main effect of adaptation on perceived compliment to the native culture was highly significant (p < .0001). The Student-Newman-Keuls contrasts indicated that TSubNve led to higher perceived compliment than TSubEng, which in turn led to higher perceived compliment than TMod, which in turn induced higher perceived compliment than TNo.

H3c hypothesized that substantial adaptation to Japanese will be perceived as less complimentary to the Japanese culture than will no or moderate adaptation. Results did not support H3c. The pattern was the same as that for attraction and outcomes above. That is, JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod were perceived to be equally complimentary with each other but more complimentary than JNo (p < .05).

As hypothesized in H1d, Thai subjects did not feel that their social identity was threatened by the sales team’s adaptation. The main effect of adaptation on perceived threat to social identity was not significant. In addition, the perceived similarity to Thai presentation style and manners and attempt to adapt (as used in the manipulation check) was not correlated with perceived threat to social identity (r = -.15, n.s.). This result was not in accord with the position of social identity theory, that people will feel threatened when outgroup members are too similar to themselves.
H3d which stated that substantial adaptation by Americans will result in higher perceived threat to Japanese social identity than will no or moderate adaptation was not supported either. The main effect was not significant, meaning that there was no difference in perceived threat to social identity across the four groups in the Japanese study.

In summary, both Thai and Japanese subjects generally perceived Americans as having a higher status than themselves. They were not threatened by the substantial or moderate adaptation by Americans. For Thai subjects, the relationship between cultural adaptation and the three variables (attraction, outcomes, and perceived compliment to the native culture) appeared to be monotonic positive. For Japanese subjects, the relationship seemed to reach a plateau beyond moderate adaptation.

High- vs. low-identified subjects. H4's and H5's together predicted the pattern of interaction between cultural adaptation and strength of identification with one's own culture. In both experiments, none of the main effects, reported in Table 21, of strength of identification with one's own culture on manipulation check, connectedness (which was an average of attraction, perceived trustworthiness, and outcomes), disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes, situational attribution, perceived compliment to the native culture, and perceived threat to social identity were significant. All the interaction effects between cultural adaptation and strength of identification with one's own culture were not significant except on connectedness in the Thai experiment (See Figure 16). For Thai subjects who weakly identified with one's own culture, the relationship appeared to be monotonic positive. For those who moderately or strongly identified, the relationship appeared to level off beyond moderate adaptation. Given the null effects of strength of
identification with one’s own culture on any of the key variables, there was no need to address H4’s and H5’s.

**The effect of cultural adaptation on perceived trustworthiness.** The main effect of cultural adaptation on disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes was highly significant (p < .0001 for Thai and p < .01 for Japanese subjects) (See Table 24). The Student-Newman-Keuls contrasts revealed no significant difference between TMod and TNo, and between JMod and JNo, supporting H6a which stated that the behaviors of the American adaptors in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions will be perceived as equally confirming of stereotypic expectations.

Both TSubNve and TSubEng (which did not differ in disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes) resulted in higher disconfirmation than TNo and TMod (p < .05). JSubNve resulted in higher disconfirmation than JMod and JNo (p < .05). These findings supported H6b which hypothesized that the behaviors of the American adaptor in the substantial adaptation condition will be perceived as most disconfirming of stereotypic expectations.

H6c which stated that the behaviors of the Americans in substantial adaptation will be attributed to more situational causes than those in the moderate adaptation condition which in turn will be attributed to more situational causes than those in the no adaptation condition was supported for the Thai subjects and partially supported for the Japanese subjects. The main effect of adaptation on situational attribution was highly significant (p < .0001 for both Thai and Japanese subjects). As revealed by the Student-Newman-Keuls contrasts, TSubNve and TSubEng were perceived to be more situational than TMod which was perceived to be more situational than TNo. JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod were perceived to be more situational than JNo for the Japanese subjects.
Despite the general support for situational attribution made for the substantial adaptation condition, H6d which stated that the American adaptor in the substantial adaptation condition will be rated as less trustworthy than those in the the no and the moderate adaptation conditions (due to the posited low sincerity, low predictability and low reliability associated with situational causes) was contradicted in both experiments. As shown in Table 24, the main effect of cultural adaptation on perceived trustworthiness was significant (p < .01 for Thai and p < .001 for Japanese subjects). TSubNve led to higher perceived trustworthiness than TSubEng and TNo for Thai subjects (p < .05). For Japanese subjects, JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod created higher perceived trustworthiness than JNo (p < .05).

INTER-CULTURE ANALYSES

Because the Thai and the Japanese subjects may possess different characteristics which make the two groups unparallel and might lead to non-comparable results, the differences need to be investigated and controlled if necessary. A 2 (Thai vs. Japanese subjects) x 4 (levels of cultural adaptation) ANOVA was performed on each respondent characteristic variable to investigate the differences between the two cultures (See Table 25). A significant effect of culture of subjects indicated that the Thai and Japanese subjects differed on that characteristic.

It can be seen from Table 25 that Thai and Japanese subjects differed on a variety of characteristics. Generally, compared with Japanese subjects, Thai subjects had more exposure to foreign culture (p < .001), more exposure to American culture (p < .001), higher base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices (p < .001), lower expectation for the Americans to adapt (p < .001), larger perceived status
differential between American and the native culture (p < .01 in terms of overall rating and language, p < .001 in terms of wealth and cultural heritage), lower ethnocentrism (p < .001), stronger identification with one’s own culture (p < .01), and higher social identity (p < .01).

In addition, the Chi-square tests in Tables 16 to 20 show that Thai and Japanese subjects differed on the distribution of age (p < .00001), gender (p < .0001), education (p < .00001), work experience (p < .0001), and work position (p < .01). Compared to Japanese subjects, Thai subjects were generally younger, consisted of more females, had higher education, and had less working experience. These differences need to be partialled out if they impact statistically and conceptually on the key variables of interest.

The differences in the following variables could be ignored outright because they did not affect key variables of interest (i.e. connectedness and perceived respectfulness) in both the Thai and the Japanese data sets (See Table 21). These were expectation for the Americans to adapt, exposure to foreign culture, base-line evaluation of Americans’ trustworthiness and business practices, perceived status differential between American and the native culture (all aspects), social identity, and gender.

The remaining seven variables (namely, exposure to American culture, ethnocentrism, strength of identification with one’s own culture, age, education, work position, and work experience) were used as covariates in the 2 (culture of subjects) x 4 (cultural adaptation) ANCOVA reported in Table 26 because they had some influence on the key variables (as shown in Table 21). This was to statistically equalize the Thai and Japanese subjects on critical characteristics. The two way ANCOVA results were compared with those of the two-way ANOVA, also reported in Table 26. The pattern of significant
main and interaction effects in the ANCOVA and the ANOVA was the same except the following:

(a) The main effect of culture of subjects on attraction was significant (p < .05) in the ANCOVA but not significant in the ANOVA. The main effect of culture of subjects on attraction, however, was not relevant to the hypotheses of the study.

(b) The main effect of culture of subjects on disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes was not significant in the ANCOVA but significant in the ANOVA (p < .05). As in the discussion in (a), the main effect of culture of subjects on disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes was not relevant to the hypotheses of the study.

(c) The main effect of culture of subjects, as well as of cultural adaptation, on perceived threat to social identity was not significant in the ANCOVA but significant in the ANOVA (p < .001 and p < .05, respectively).

Given these generally similar results between the ANCOVA and ANOVA, it could be concluded that although the Thai and Japanese subjects did differ on various respondent characteristics, the differences did not systematically interfere with the impact of cultural adaptation on the variables of interests. In other words, these differences could be ignored without posing any threat to the internal validity of the study.

As protection against the inflation of type I errors, a two-way MANOVA (culture of subjects x cultural adaptation) was also conducted on seven dependent variables: attraction, outcomes, perceived compliment to the native culture, perceived threat to social identity, disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes, situational attribution, and perceived trustworthiness. The interaction effect based on all three criteria (Wilk's lambda, Hotelling's trace criterion, and Pillai's criterion) was significant (p < .05). The main effects of
culture and cultural adaptation were highly significant (p < .001). So, the results from the intra-culture analyses reported above could be used to represent the step-down analyses for each of the subjects’ cultures.

The main effects of cultural adaptation were highly significant (p < .001 in both ANCOVA and ANOVA) on manipulation check, attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes, situational attribution, and perceived compliment to the native culture. These confirm the findings in the intra-culture analyses.

The significant interaction effect on attraction (p < .05 ANCOVA, p < .01 ANOVA) confirmed the intra-culture analyses results that the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction differed between the Thai and the Japanese subjects. Adaptation had a monotonic positive effect on attraction for the Thais and became saturated or reached a critical point (Donald Wehrung, personal discussion) beyond moderate adaptation for the Japanese.

### RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF THE MECHANISMS BY WHICH CULTURAL ADAPTATION AFFECTS OUTCOMES

#### RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF THE MECHANISMS IN THE THAI DATA

To investigate the relative influence of each mechanism in the model in Figure 5, hierarchical regression analyses were conducted.\(^1\) The path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived similarity to the native culture ⇒ Perceived threat to social identity ⇒ Outcomes was dropped out because the Thai respondents across groups did not feel threatened by the

---

\(^1\) In a hierarchical regression model, variables enter the regression in a specified order based on logic or theory. Each variable is evaluated in terms of what it contributes to the equation at its own point of entry (Tabachnick and Fidell 1983).
American sales team's behaviors. The variable used to represent perceived attempt to adapt is q22attem. The variable used to represent perceived similarity to the native culture is xsimprbr which is the average of perceived similarity in presentation style (q211sipr) and perceived similarity in behaviors (q212sibv).

The predictor variables were added into the model, one at a time, according to the order shown in Figure 5. For the path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived similarity to the native culture ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes, the R-Squared value from including only perceived attempt to adapt as a predictor variable was .27. Adding perceived similarity to the native culture into the model increased the R-Squared value to .30. The change in R-Squared was significant (p < .01). Finally, adding attraction into the model increased R-Squared to .69, a significant increment (p < .0001). However, perceived similarity to the native culture was not a significant predictor in the final equation, consisting of the three predictors. So, it was dropped out of the path.

For the path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes ⇒ Situational attribution ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes, the R-Squared value from including only perceived attempt to adapt as a predictor variable was .29. Adding disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes and situational attribution into the model did not increase R-Squared. Finally, adding perceived trustworthiness into the model increased R-Squared to .64. The significant predictors in the final equation consisted of perceived attempt, situational attribution, and perceived trustworthiness. So, disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes was dropped out of the path.

The revised paths were submitted to hierarchical regression analyses again. The Durbin-Watson Tests for all paths were close to 2, meaning that the assumption of
regression analysis that the residuals for consecutive observations are not correlated was met. The final model, together with the coefficients associated with each route is shown in Figure 39. From R-Squared in Figure 39, it could be concluded that the most influential mechanism in which cultural adaptation affected outcomes for Thai subjects was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes with R-Squared = .69. Next was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Situational attribution ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes with R-Squared = .65.

The revised model in Figure 39 treated the three mechanisms as being independent in explaining outcomes. It is interesting, however, to see the relative contribution of each of the predictors in the same equation. As a result, a regression analysis was conducted, having perceived attempt to adapt, attraction, perceived compliment to the native culture, situational attribution, and perceived trustworthiness as predictors, with outcomes as the dependent variable. The results are shown in the attachment to Figure 39. The only two significant predictors out of the five predictors were attraction, with beta weight = 0.44 (p < .0001), and perceived trustworthiness, with beta weight = 0.28 (p < .001). These two variables together explained 71.7% of the variance in outcomes (i.e., R-Squared = .717).

RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF THE MECHANISMS IN THE JAPANESE DATA

Following the procedures used in the Thai culture, a series of hierarchical multiple regression analyses was used to test the paths shown in the model in Figure 5. The path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived similarity to the native culture ⇒ Perceived threat to social identity ⇒ Outcomes was also dropped out because the Japanese respondents did not feel threatened by the American sales team’s behaviors.
For the path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived similarity to the native culture ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes, the R-Squared value from including only perceived attempt to adapt as a predictor variable was .28. Adding perceived similarity to the native culture into the model increased R-Squared to .30, a non-significant increment, and adding attraction into the model increased R-Squared to .60. Perceived similarity to the native culture was not in the final equation consisting of the three predictors, so it was excluded from the path.

For the path Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes ⇒ Situational attribution ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes, the R-Squared value from including only perceived attempt to adapt as a predictor variable was .26. Adding disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes and situational attribution into the model did not increase R-Squared. Finally, adding perceived trustworthiness into the model increased R-Squared to .63. Because disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes and situational attribution were not significant predictors in the final equation, both were deleted from the path.

The revised paths were submitted to hierarchical regression analyses again. The Durbin-Watson Tests for all paths were close to 2. The final model, together with the coefficients associated with each route, is shown in Figure 40. From R-Squared in Figure 40, it could be concluded that the most influential mechanism by which cultural adaptation affected outcomes for Japanese subjects was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes with R-Squared = .63. Next was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes with R-Squared = .60. So, H7 which hypothesized that the
relative impact of each mechanism on outcomes will differ between the Americans adapting to Japanese and Americans adapting to Thai dyads was supported.

Similar to the Thai model, the revised model of Japanese data in Figure 40 treated the three mechanisms as being independent in explaining outcomes. However, it is interesting to see the relative contribution of each of the predictors in the same equation. As a result, a regression analysis was conducted having perceived attempt to adapt, attraction, perceived compliment to the native culture, and perceived trustworthiness as predictors, and outcomes as the dependent variable. The results were shown in the attachment to Figure 40. The only two significant predictors out of the four were perceived trustworthiness, with beta weight = 0.45 (p < .0001), and attraction, with beta weight = 0.35 (p < .001). It could be seen then that perceived trustworthiness was more important than attraction in explaining outcomes for Japanese subjects, whereas attraction was more important than perceived trustworthiness in predicting outcomes for Thai subjects. These two variables together explained 69.5% of the variance in outcomes in the Japanese data (i.e., R-Squared = .695).

RESULTS BASED ON PERCEIVED CULTURAL ADAPTATION

Although the manipulation in both experiments was generally effective as discussed earlier, not all pairs of the level of cultural adaptation differed significantly (See Figure 31 and Table 24). In the Thai study, TSubNve and TSubEng were perceived as approximately equal in similarity to Thai presentation style and behaviors and attempt to adapt. Both were higher than TMod (p < .05) which in turn was higher in similarity and attempt than TNo (p < .05). The results were generally the same in the Japanese experiment.
To investigate the impact of cultural adaptation as perceived by subjects, subjects were divided into four groups according to their scores on perceived cultural adaptation (or manipulation check, which was an average of q22attem, q211sipr, and q212sibv). Subjects with scores from 1 to 3 were categorized as “low perceived cultural adaptation”, more than 3 to 5 as “moderate perceived cultural adaptation”, more than 5 to 7 as “high perceived cultural adaptation”, and more than 7 to 9 as “utmost perceived cultural adaptation.” This categorization method offered two main advantages. First, it eliminated the noise in perception of the manipulated adaptive behaviors. Second, it assured equidistance in the cultural adaptation.

Table 27 presents the 2-way ANOVA results (culture of subjects x perceived cultural adaptation) on key variables. Figures 41 to 47 compare the means of each variable by perceived cultural adaptation for Thai and Japanese subjects. It was clear from Table 27 that there were no significant interaction effects except on perceived trustworthiness. This means the pattern of relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and each of the key variables between the Thai and the Japanese experiments was identical. All the main effects of perceived cultural adaptation on the key variables were significant.

The Student-Newman-Keuls multiple contrasts at .05 in Table 27 revealed that in both the Thai and Japanese studies, utmost perceived adaptation and high perceived adaptation induced equal attraction and outcomes. Both levels induced higher attraction and better outcomes than moderate perceived adaptation which in turn elicited higher attraction and better outcomes than low perceived adaptation (See Figure 41 and 42). This result confirmed the finding in the Thai experiment based on manipulated cultural adaptation, but
differed from that in the Japanese experiment where JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod were equally effective and led to higher attraction and more favorable outcomes than JNo.

Figure 43 and Table 27 show that in both the Thai and the Japanese experiments, the relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and perceived compliment to the native culture was monotonic positive. The Student-Newman-Keuls contrasts at .05 showed that in both experiments, utmost perceived adaptation led to higher perceived compliment to the native culture than high perceived adaptation, which in turn led to higher perceived compliment than moderate perceived adaptation, which in turn induced higher perceived compliment than low perceived adaptation. This result confirmed the finding in the Thai experiment, based on manipulated cultural adaptation, but differed from that in the Japanese experiment where JSubNve, JSubEng, and JMod were equally effective and led to higher perceived compliment than JNo.

Figure 44 and Table 27 revealed that, as hypothesized, there was no relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity for Thai subjects. However, for Japanese subjects, low and moderate perceived adaptation resulted in higher perceived threat to social identity than did utmost perceived adaptation.

The main effect of perceived cultural adaptation on disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes was highly significant ($p < .001$) (See Figure 45 and Table 27). In the Thai study, utmost perceived adaptation was more disconfirming than high perceived adaptation, which in turn was more disconfirming than were moderate and low perceived adaptation. In the Japanese study, utmost perceived adaptation was more disconfirming than the other three levels, which did not differ in disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes. The pattern of results differed in details from that based on manipulated cultural adaptation but
generally could be regarded as supporting H6a and H6b which stated that the behaviors of the American adaptors in the no (low) and the moderate adaptation conditions will be perceived as equally confirming of stereotypic expectations and that the behaviors of the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be perceived as most disconfirming of stereotypic expectations, respectively.

Figure 46 and Table 27 revealed exactly the same relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and situational attribution in both the Thai and Japanese experiments. The relationship provided stronger and clearer support than did the results based on manipulated cultural adaptation for H6c, which stated that the behaviors of the Americans in the substantial adaptation condition will be attributed to more situational causes than will those in the moderate adaptation condition, which in turn will be attributed to more situational causes than will those in the no adaptation condition. In both the Thai and the Japanese experiments, the difference in situational attribution between low and moderate perceived adaptation, between moderate and high perceived adaptation, and between high and utmost perceived adaptation all reached .05 significance level.

Similar to the results based on manipulated cultural adaptation, despite the strong support for situational attribution made for the substantial adaptation, H6d which stated that the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be rated as less trustworthy than those in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions was contradicted in both the Thai and the Japanese experiments. As shown in Figure 47 and Table 27, in the Thai study, the utmost and the high perceived cultural adaptation conditions resulted in equal perceived trustworthiness. Both induced higher perceived trustworthiness than did moderate and low perceived adaptation. The relationship was apparently monotonic.
positive in the Japanese study, in which utmost perceived adaptation was more trustworthy than high perceived adaptation, which in turn was more trustworthy than moderate perceived adaptation, which in turn was more trustworthy than low perceived adaptation.

H4's and H5's together predicted the pattern of interaction between cultural adaptation and strength of identification with one's own culture. As discussed earlier, based on manipulated cultural adaptation, none of the main effects of strength of identification with one's own culture on the key variables was significant. Based on perceived cultural adaptation, all the main effects of strength of identification with one's own culture on the key variables were not significant either, except on perceived threat to social identity (See Table 28). Moderately identified subjects generally felt more threatened than either high- or low-identified subjects and lower perceived adaptation led to more perceived threat than did higher perceived adaptation (See Figure 48).

Strength of identification with one's own culture interacted with perceived cultural adaptation on attraction and perceived trustworthiness. For subjects who weakly and strongly identified with one's own culture, the relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and attraction appeared to be monotonic positive. For those who moderately identified, the relationship appeared to reach a plateau beyond moderate adaptation (See Figure 49).

Figure 50 shows that for high-identified subjects, the relationship between perceived adaptation and perceived trustworthiness appeared to reach a plateau beyond moderate adaptation. For moderately-identified ones, there was no relationship between perceived adaptation and perceived trustworthiness. Finally, for low-identified subjects,
utmost perceived adaptation and high perceived adaptation induced more perceived trustworthiness than did moderate and low perceived adaptation.

In summary, the results based on perceived cultural adaptation strongly revealed the monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and the key variables (i.e. attraction, perceived trustworthiness, outcomes, and perceived compliment to the native culture) for both Thai and Japanese subjects. The plateau shape obtained in the Japanese study, based on manipulated cultural adaptation, disappeared when the groups were categorized by perceived cultural adaptation. The relationships between perceived adaptation and attraction and perceived trustworthiness varied with the strength of identification with one's own culture, but none of them was curvilinear. Table 29 summarizes the results for each hypothesis based on manipulated cultural adaptation and perceived cultural adaptation.
Failures in cross-cultural business dealings can partly be attributed to the lack of understanding in each other's cultural norms and practices. To reduce difficulties in cross-cultural interactions, it has been strongly recommended that one adapt to the norms and behaviors of a foreign culture as much as possible (e.g. Deutsch 1984; Graham and Sano 1984; Hall and Hall 1987; Kale and Barnes 1992; Kotler 1994).

This study investigates whether adaptation is beneficial in inter-cultural negotiations in the context of selling. Japanese and Thai cultures were chosen because on a theoretical basis they form a matched sample on a number of dimensions, except level of economic development relative to the U.S., and, on a practical basis, Japan is a major trade partner of the U.S., while Thailand is an attractive market for the U.S. to invest in and to trade with.

Strong support for the effectiveness of cultural adaptation comes from the similarity-attraction literature which assumes that adaptation increases perceived similarity. The majority of extant research in psychology, sociolinguistics, communication, business, and related fields has supported the idea that the more similarity between two parties, the more attraction and the more favorable outcomes. Similarity research has covered various aspects, namely communication style (e.g. Buller and Aune 1992; Putman and Street 1984), attitude (e.g. Byrne 1969; J. Davis 1984; Gonzales et al. 1983), activity preference (e.g. Lydon et al. 1988; Michael et al. 1984), ethnocultural similarity (e.g. Gudykunst and Nishida 1984), personality (e.g. Lloyd et al. 1983; Rosenblatt and Greenberg 1988),
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physical appearance (e.g. Moreland and Zajonc 1982), caste (e.g. Mehta and Rai 1984),
religion (e.g. Rai and Rathore 1986), and status (e.g. Reagor and Clore 1970).

Social identity theory (Tajfel 1974) proposes that people identify and assess
themselves partly in terms of their social groups. In intergroup interaction, social
comparisons motivate individuals to seek or create dimensions on which they can
differentiate themselves positively. Ingroup favoritism (or ingroup bias or intergroup
discrimination or intergroup differentiation) is a means to make the ingroup favorably
distinct. In contrast to similarity-attraction theory, social identity theory predicts that
similarity from substantial adaptation will inflict unfavorable effects on intergroup
relationships because it motivates individuals to preserve their distinctiveness (Brown 1984
b). Support for this has been provided (e.g. Brown 1984a; Brown and Abrams 1986; Diehl
1988; Garg et al. 1972; Sachdev and Bourhis 1987; Turner et al. 1979; Wagner et al.
1986).

This study employed a 2 (cultural dyads: Americans adapting to Japanese and
Americans adapting to Thais) x 4 (levels of cultural adaptation: none, moderate, substantial
using English, and substantial using the native language) factorial design. Subjects read a
written scenario describing an American sales team’s presentation to a Thai / Japanese
purchasing manager and answered a questionnaire. Results supported the tenets of the
similarity-attraction paradigm. That is, in general the more Americans adapt to the Thai
and Japanese cultures, the more favorable the reactions.
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

RESPONDENTS' CHARACTERISTICS

Thai subjects consisted of 145 professionals in Bangkok. As expected, in terms of overall status and wealth, Thai subjects across groups perceived the U.S. as higher in status than Thailand. However, in terms of cultural heritage, the American was rated as lower in status than the Thai culture. This might be interpreted in terms of social identity theory and the different identity maintenance strategies discussed in Tajfel and Turner (1986) in that people in the lower status group may be inferior on the comparison aspects and may benefit by inflating themselves on the less relevant dimensions of comparison (Mullen et al. 1992). In terms of language prestige, American and Thai languages were perceived as equal in prestige. The overall perceived status differential was given highest priority in measuring this construct, based on the assumption that subjects weighed the pros and cons between the U.S. and Thailand in all aspects and came up with that response.

Thai subjects were highly hedonistic and quite self-reliant, a characteristic of individualism. They were highly collectivistic, however, in terms of maintaining harmony in interpersonal relationships. They possessed a moderate level of identification with one’s own culture, quite high social identity (or collective self-esteem) which might partly be due to their pride in their cultural heritage. Thais’ high social identity voided H2’s set which was based on the possibility that Thai people have unfavorable social identity and thus would have a strong need to feel good about themselves via a strong intergroup differentiation, as predicted by social identity theory.
Japanese subjects consisted of 101 professionals in Bangkok, Japan, and Canada. In terms of overall status, wealth, and language, Japanese subjects across groups perceived the U.S. as higher in status than Japan. However, in terms of cultural heritage, American was rated as lower in status than Japanese. The pattern is generally similar to that of Thai subjects but deviates from the expectation, based on objective economic factors, that Japanese would perceive Americans as comparable in status to themselves.

Some explanations for this “surprise” are below. First, Japan used to be under U.S. control after World War II. The psychological impact may persist. Second, recently, Japan has suffered from economic recession. Japanese may feel that Americans have a better life and are more wealthy than they are. Third, Japanese in general value demoting oneself as a courtesy to others (the trait of heteronomy and modesty). When asked to rate the perceived status between American and Japanese, they simply gave a slightly inflated rating for Americans, even though they may feel that both have equal status.

Although the fact that Americans were perceived as having a higher status than Japanese was not expected, it is in fact comprehensible when taking into account the stereotype of westerners held by Japanese. According to Haarmann (1984), an American or Canadian or West European is generally viewed with high prestige (as long as he or she is White). The image of a foreign sensei (= teacher, master) has not changed much since about a hundred years ago.

This group of Japanese subjects was highly hedonistic and quite self-reliant. This pattern was exactly the same as that of Thai subjects and contradicted what has been frequently said about Japanese -- that they are highly dependent on the group (Benedict 1946; Hall and Hall 1987; Lebra 1976; Nakane 1972). As expected, Japanese were similar
to Thais, in that they were highly collectivistic in terms of maintaining harmony in interpersonal relationships. This was in line with conventional thought (Argyle 1986; Argyle, Henderson, Bond, Iizuka, and Contarello 1986; Befu 1971; Hall and Hall 1987; Lebra 1976; Morsbach 1977; Nakane 1973; Zander 1983). The fact that both Thai and Japanese subjects were highly hedonistic and quite self-reliant but very harmony-oriented highlights the criticism of Schwartz (1990) that the dichotomy of individualism-collectivism wrongly assumes that each type of values form a set of syndromes that contradict each other. It does not realize that the subtypes of each type of values do not necessarily covary and oppose each other. Similar to the Thai subjects, Japanese subjects possessed a moderate level of identification with one's own culture and quite high social identity.

THE EFFECT OF ADAPTATION ON ATTRACTION, OUTCOMES, AND PERCEIVED COMPLIMENT

Table 29 summarizes the results for the hypotheses. Based on the similarity-attraction theory, Thai culture's emphasis on preserving harmony and fitting in with others, Thai people's lack of pressure to make themselves positively distinct when Americans adapt substantially to their norms and behaviors due to the noncomparability between different status groups (Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975; Turner 1978), Thai people's disposition to accept and welcome foreigners, and the relatively soft ingroup-outgroup distinction evidenced in a feminine culture (Gudykunst 1987), H1a, H1b, and H1c predicted that there will be a monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction / outcomes / perceived compliment to the native culture when
Americans adapt to the norms and behaviors of the Thai culture. Results supported all the three hypotheses.

As hypothesized in H1d, Thai subjects did not feel that their social identity was threatened by the sales team's adaptation. This result was not in accord with the position of social identity theory, that when group membership is salient, an outgroup member displaying ingroup attributes may pose a threat to ingroup distinctiveness (Abrams et al. 1989). Rather, this finding confirmed the reasoning that groups differing in status will not compare themselves, resulting in no pressure for Thais to make themselves positively distinct when Americans try to adapt to Thai culture and customs, and thus no part of the social identity is threatened.

For Japanese, both of the substantial adaptation conditions and the moderate adaptation condition induced more attraction, more favorable outcomes, and higher perceived compliment than did the no adaptation condition, failing to support H3a, H3b, and H3c, which were derived from assuming that Japanese perceive Americans as comparable in status to themselves. H3d which stated that substantial adaptation by Americans will result in higher perceived threat to Japanese social identity than will no or moderate adaptation was not supported either. Similar to the Thai study, there was no difference in perceived threat to social identity across the four groups.

In summary, both Thai and Japanese subjects generally perceived Americans as having a higher status than themselves. They were not threatened by substantial or moderate adaptation by the Americans. For Thai subjects, the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction, outcomes, and perceived compliment to the native culture...
appeared to be monotonic positive. For Japanese subjects, the relationship seemed to reach a plateau beyond moderate adaptation.

**THE EFFECT OF IDENTIFICATION WITH ONE’S OWN CULTURE**

It is derived from social identity theory that the more a person identifies with a group, the more his or her self-esteem depends on a positive social identity emerging from the group membership, and hence the more intense is the need to protect favorable ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation (C. Kelly 1988). High identification with the group has actually been found to increase or be associated with ingroup favoritism (e.g. Abrams and Hogg 1987; Branscombe and Wann 1992; C. Kelly 1988, 1990; Verkuyten 1991) which has been found to correlate negatively with attraction (e.g. Brown and Abrams 1986; Deschamps and Brown 1983). So it was predicted in the H4’s set that the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction / outcomes / perceived compliment to the native culture will be curvilinear for high-identified subjects.

The self-esteem of people who weakly identify with their group should not be based on a favorable social identity springing from the group membership, and therefore there is no need to retain positive ingroup distinctiveness via intergroup differentiation. Under substantial adaptation by outgroup members, they should not feel their social identity is threatened. Therefore, it was hypothesized in the H5’s set that the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction / outcomes / perceived compliment to the native culture will be positive monotonic.

However, in both experiments, there was no impact from strength of identification with one’s own culture on any of the key variables. Thus, H4’s and H5’s which together predicted the pattern of interaction were not supported. The null effect of strength of
identification with one's own culture in both experiments can be explained by the fact that Thai and Japanese subjects uniformly perceived Americans as having a higher status. Status difference prohibits comparability between groups (Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975; Turner 1978), resulting in no pressure / desire for Thais and Japanese to make themselves positively distinct when Americans try to adapt to Thai culture and customs regardless of their strength of identification with one's own culture, and thus no part of the social identity is threatened in such a way that high-identified subjects will react negatively to substantial adaptation.

THE EFFECT OF ADAPTATION ON PERCEIVED TRUSTWORTHINESS

Research suggests that the process of encoding and retrieval of information about others is self-fulfilling such that individuals concentrate on confirming behaviors more than disconfirming ones (Cantor and Mischel 1979; Cohen 1977; Duncan 1976; Dutta et al. 1972; Markus 1977; Snyder and Uranowitz 1978). So, minor deviations from expectation tend to be ignored. In line with this, Francis (1989), as well as the findings in this study, revealed that the no and the moderate adaptation conditions were perceived as equally confirming of expectations, supporting H6a; substantial adaptation resulted in the highest disconfirmation, supporting H6b.

Research suggests that behaviors confirming stereotypic expectations are attributed to dispositional causes whereas disconfirming behaviors tend to be attributed to situational factors (Hayden and Mischel 1976; Regan et al. 1974; Stephan and Rosenfield 1982). In line with this and the findings of Francis (1989), H6c which stated that the the behaviors of Americans in the substantial adaptation condition will be attributed to more situational causes than will those in the moderate adaptation condition, which in turn will be attributed
to more situational causes than will those in the no adaptation condition, was supported for the Thai subjects and partially supported for the Japanese subjects in that the substantial adaptation conditions and the moderate adaptation condition were perceived to be more situationally caused than was the no adaptation condition for the Japanese.

It is interesting to note that in both experiments, substantial adaptation in manners plus a complete linguistic shift did not lead to higher situational attribution (i.e. less dispositional attribution), higher perceived similarity to the native and attempts to adapt rather than merely adapting manners substantially. Language learning takes time, effort, and dedication but does not seem to signify these inputs to the perceivers.

Trustworthiness includes four components: predictability, dependability, faith (Rempel et al. 1985) and sincerity (Sullivan and Peterson 1982). Dispositional attributions reveal the actor's true self, so the actor will be perceived as sincere. Because they relate to consistency across situations (H. H. Kelly 1973), they make the behaviors appear predictable, dependable, and consistent as well. Situational attributions do not give information about the self, thus failing to show evidence of the actor's sincerity and consistency, resulting in low predictability and dependability. However, H6d which stated that the American adaptors in the substantial adaptation condition will be rated as less trustworthy than those in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions (due to the posited low sincerity, low predictability and low reliability associated with situational causes) was contradicted in both the Thai and the Japanese experiments.

The findings that supported H6a, H6b, and H6c replicated those in Francis (1989). However, the findings that substantial adaptation was rated higher in perceived trustworthiness than no adaptation in both experiments contradicted the findings of Francis.
It seemed that Thai and Japanese subjects did not relate disposition to cross-situational consistency as proposed by H. H. Kelly (1973), which would make their behaviors appear predictable and dependable and thus trustworthy (Kaplan 1973; Rempel et al. 1985; Sullivan and Peterson 1982).

**RELATIVE INFLUENCE OF THE MECHANISMS BY WHICH ADAPTATION AFFECTS OUTCOMES**

The conceptual model in Figure 5 depicts four mechanisms through which cultural adaptation affects outcomes, according to theory and empirical evidence. The first is that adaptation increases similarity (or reduces cultural differences) between the adaptor and the native. According to the similarity-attraction paradigm, this perceived similarity results in attraction (e.g. Byrne 1969, 1971; Huston 1974; Newcomb 1978). Research suggest that attraction leads to favorable outcomes (e.g. Campbell et al. 1988; Graham 1985a, 1985b; Rubin and Brown 1975). Second, social identity theory views substantial adaptation as unfavorable because it threatens the distinctiveness of the ingroup relative to an outgroup (Giles and Smith 1979). This threat may impact on the outcomes. Third, substantial adaptation may reflect less compliment than does either no or moderate adaptation (Asante and Vora 1983; Giles and Smith 1979) and may be considered presumptuous whereas moderate adaptation may show respect and sensitivity to the native culture (Francis 1991). Finally, cultural adaptation does not fit the expectation of the adaptor’s stereotypes. This disconfirmation of the adaptor’s stereotypes influences the degree of situational attribution for the behaviors, which in turn affects perceived trustworthiness of the adaptor, which in turn affects outcomes. While the hypotheses predicted the nature of the relationship between cultural adaptation and various variables in the model, the relative influence or
explanatory power of each mechanism was investigated by regression analyses by (a) eliminating variables that did not contribute to the explanatory power of each path; and (b) investigating the multiple R-Squared value of each revised path in regression analyses.

The final models of the Thai and the Japanese data, together with the coefficients associated with each path, are shown in Figure 39 and 40, respectively. From the R-Squared in Figure 39, the most influential mechanism in which cultural adaptation affected outcomes for Thai subjects was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes, with R-Squared = .69. Next was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Situational attribution ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes, with R-Squared = .65.

From the R-Squared in Figure 40, the most influential mechanism by which cultural adaptation affected outcomes for Japanese subjects was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes, with R-Squared = .63. Next was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes, with R-Squared = .60. So, H7 which hypothesized that the relative impact of each mechanism on outcomes will differ between Americans adapting to Japanese and Americans adapting to Thai dyads was supported. Perceived trustworthiness was more important than attraction in explaining outcomes for Japanese subjects, whereas attraction was more important than perceived trustworthiness in predicting outcomes for Thai subjects.

Perceived threat to social identity was irrelevant to the mechanisms whereby cultural adaptation affects outcomes in this study because both Thai and Japanese subjects did not feel threatened by cultural adaptation. Although perceived compliment to the native culture correlated highly with outcomes, its explanatory power was less than that of
attraction and perceived trustworthiness. Techniques other than cultural adaptation, that can increase attraction and perceived trustworthiness, should be considered as well. For example, research has frequently shown that physical attractiveness of the source elicits favorable effects from the perceiver, such as verbal and behavioral compliance, perceived trustworthiness and credibility (Debevec, Madden, and Kernan 1986), agreement and attraction (Snyder and Rothbart 1971). Other things approximately equal, firms may want to send representatives who are more physically attractive.

RESULTS BASED ON PERCEIVED CULTURAL ADAPTATION

To investigate the impact of cultural adaptation as perceived by subjects, subjects were divided into four groups according to their ratings on perceived cultural adaptation (or manipulation check). This categorization method eliminated the noise in perception of the manipulated adaptive behaviors, and assured equidistance in cultural adaptation between each level. In other words, two aspects of cultural adaptation were distinguished. The manipulated cultural adaptation dealt with adaptation as a strategic move planned and controlled by the adaptor, whereas the perceived cultural adaptation dealt with adaptation as seen and decoded by the perceiver, which may not be what the adaptor expected.

It was clear from Table 27 that there were no significant interaction effects between perceived cultural adaptation and culture of subjects except on perceived trustworthiness. This means the pattern of relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and each key variable was identical for the Thai and the Japanese experiments. All the main effects of perceived cultural adaptation were significant.

Figure 41 and 42 showed that in both the Thai and Japanese studies, utmost perceived adaptation and high perceived adaptation induced equal attraction and outcomes.
Both levels induced higher attraction and better outcomes than did moderate adaptation, which in turn elicited higher attraction and better outcomes than did low adaptation. In both experiments, utmost perceived adaptation led to higher perceived compliment to the native culture than did high perceived adaptation, which in turn led to higher perceived compliment than did moderate adaptation, which in turn induced higher perceived compliment than did low adaptation (See Figure 43 and Table 27).

One strange finding revealed in Figure 44 and Table 27 was that, as hypothesized, there was no relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity for Thai subjects, but for Japanese subjects low and moderate perceived adaptation resulted in higher perceived threat to social identity than did utmost perceived adaptation. This clearly contradicted social identity theory which posits that people will feel their social identity is threatened when an outgroup member tries to be substantially similar to themselves. It might be that at low and moderate perceived adaptation, the cultural difference between Japanese and Americans was salient. This apparent cultural distance may make Japanese subjects feel rather uneasy and vulnerable.

Results shown in Figure 45 supported H6a and H6b in that low and moderate perceived adaptation were equally confirming of stereotypic expectations and utmost perceived adaptation was the most disconfirming. The relationship between perceived cultural adaptation and situational attribution in Figure 46 and Table 27 provided stronger and clearer support for H6c than did the results based on manipulated cultural adaptation, which stated that the behaviors of Americans in substantial adaptation will be attributed to more situational causes than if they were in the moderate adaptation condition, which in turn will be attributed to more situational causes than will those in the no adaptation
condition. Similar to the results based on manipulated cultural adaptation, H6d, which stated that the American adaptors in substantial adaptation will be rated as less trustworthy than those in the no and the moderate adaptation conditions, was contradicted in both experiments.

In summary, the results based on perceived cultural adaptation strongly revealed the monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and the key variables (i.e. attraction, outcomes, perceived compliment to the native culture, and perceived trustworthiness) for both Thai and Japanese subjects. The plateau shape obtained in the Japanese study based on manipulated cultural adaptation disappeared when the groups were categorized by perceived cultural adaptation. This means theoretically, the higher the degree of cultural adaptation as perceived by the perceiver, the more beneficial it is to the adaptor, at least in this study. A problem arises when the transmitted adaptation is not always perceived as intended -- a problem beyond the adaptor's control. However, as perceived adaptation corresponded with transmitted adaptation very well (see Table 30), the chance of going wrong should be slim.

LIMITATIONS OF THE RESEARCH

Similar to any experimental study which aims to test the theoretical relationships between constructs, the external validity of the findings can be questioned. Generalization to other groups of people or to other cultural dyads or to real situations must be done with great care.

Cultural adaptation can be manipulated in various ways, however, the effectiveness of each was not investigated in this research. In particular, this study manipulated several
components simultaneously at each level of adaptation. So, the unique contribution of each component could not be assessed.

The use of Thai and Japanese language in the substantial adaptation using the native language might confound with “understandability.” That is, the sales presentation in the substantial adaptation using the native language condition is readily comprehensible to every subject whereas the English presentations in the no, moderate, and substantial adaptation using English conditions may not be easily understood by subjects with low proficiency in English. However, both Thai and Japanese volunteers were cooperative and highly involved in the task. They seemed to look up in the dictionary every word they did not know. So, it is very likely that all the four conditions were equally understandable. Care was taken to limit the language shift to a pure language shift, not to signal more familiarity with the native culture or to create the impression that the foreigners have become Thai / Japanese culture’s insiders. In addition, because increasing understandability is one of the goals and benefits of adaptation, it was deemed appropriate to include complete linguistic convergence in the manipulation of substantial adaptation. It is of practical value as well to know whether it is worth the time and effort for Americans to learn Thai / Japanese language when dealing with Thais and Japanese.

Another related question that can be raised is why English description was used in the no adaptation, moderate adaptation, and substantial adaptation using English conditions and why Thai / Japanese description was used in the substantial adaptation using the native language condition. The answer to both questions is that the story needs to read smoothly and to simulate as closely as possible the mind set of subjects if they were really put into those interactions. When one converses in any language, one adopts the traditions and
customs of that language in judging the appropriateness of the behaviors of the other party. For example, if the foreigner speaks Japanese, he or she must consider the relative status between the speaker and the listener, the familiarity between the two parties, the gender and age of the two parties and so forth and then choose a linguistic style that specifically fits these parameters. There is no neutral linguistic style in Japanese that can be used across situations. These parameters become nearly irrelevant if the language used is English. To describe the story in one language while the dialogues are in another language will not result in a coherent mind set in the interaction. So, it is deemed necessary that the description and the dialogues be in the same language.

The questionnaires were in Thai and Japanese rather than in English in order to increase the response rate and to reduce the fatigue of the respondents. In addition, questionnaires in the subjects' own native language should elicit responses that are free from the cultural influence associated with English.

The use of convenience sampling, as opposed to random sampling from the target population, prohibits generalization to the whole population. However, such generalization is not the first priority in this research. Rather, the major goal is to test the hypotheses formulated from extant theory and empirical evidence. As Mook (1983, p. 383) puts it, "Our theory specifies what subjects should do in the laboratory. Then we go to the laboratory to ask, Do they do it? And we modify our theory, or hang onto it for the time being..." Convenience samples are fine for this purpose.

Some questions might be raised regarding the representativeness of the Thai sample in this study in that they are relatively young. However, this concern will disappear when considering the economic expansion in Thailand during the past ten years or so. Firms
have expanded in number and scope of operation. Shortage of management executives has been so serious that even moderate quality people are "bidden" by firms at a high price. Job hopping is common in the capital and is used as a short-cut way to achieve higher remuneration. Demand for a master's degree graduates in business administration and some other fields exceeds supply. The result is that employees get promoted to management positions early. It is not uncommon to see a chief executive officer of a medium-size firm in his or her late twenties and a chief executive officer of a big corporation in his or her mid thirties. Coupled with the fact that 52% and 36% of the Thai sample in this study hold a master's or a bachelor degree, respectively, it can be expected that they will move to middle- and high-level management positions at a young age. This picture is certainly different from that in Japan where holders of management positions are normally quite senior in age.

Subjects who cooperated might be different from those who refused to cooperate and such differences might have affected the findings if they had been included. However, as a host of respondent characteristics, including personality traits, have been tested to have no interference with the relationship between cultural adaptation and the key variables of interest, this issue is of no major concern.
CONTRIBUTIONS OF THE RESEARCH

VERIFYING THE SIMILARITY-ATTRACTION PARADIGM

IN THAI AND JAPANESE CULTURES

The relationship between similarity and attraction may hold in certain cultures only. Campbell et al. (1988) studied four cultures in a simulated negotiation game and found a relationship between similarity and attraction only in the American group. It is of theoretical importance to test whether the similarity-attraction paradigm will hold in other cultures which are vastly different from American, like Japanese and Thai.

The findings of this study lend support to the similarity-attraction phenomenon which has received much empirical support over the years, as reviewed in Chapter 2. Although perceived similarity was dropped out of the model in Figure 5 because it did not help increase R-Squared after perceived attempt to adapt was entered into the regression equation, it did not mean that perceived similarity was not important. In this case, perceived attempt to adapt and perceived similarity were greatly intertwined and thus each explained nearly the same portion of variance.

TESTING THE EFFECT OF PERSONALITY

ON SIMILARITY-ATTRACTION RELATIONSHIPS

Many studies have found some personality traits to interact with similarity on attraction. For example, it has been found that nonanxious subjects much preferred similar to dissimilar partners whereas socially anxious subjects gave the same ratings to similar and dissimilar partners (Heimberg et al.). Social anxiety in this study did not have a main
effect on attraction, nor did it interact with cultural adaptation (which corresponded with perceived similarity to the native culture), however (See Table 21).

Second, it has been found that high sensation seeking people were more attracted than were low ones to dissimilar others, whereas low sensation seeking people were more attracted than were high ones to people with similar attitudes (Williams et al. 1982). In this study, two separate measures were used to measure sensation seeking. One asked about preference to climb mountains and the other asked about preference to explore an unfamiliar city by oneself. For both measures, there were no significant main or interaction effects with cultural adaptation on attraction (Table 21).

Third, the association between similarity in attitude and attraction was found to be higher among subjects with strong rather than weak empathic tendencies (Grover and Brockner 1989). However, as shown in Table 21, empathic tendency in this study did not have a main effect on attraction, nor did it interact with cultural adaptation.

Finally, Abrams and Brown (1989) reported that individuals with higher private self-consciousness exhibited the most ingroup bias (which has been found to correlate negatively with attraction) when a competing outgroup shared similar attitudes with the ingroup, whereas high public self-conscious subjects revealed the most favorability towards similar outgroups. However, in this study, neither private nor public self-consciousness had a main effect on attraction, nor did they interact with cultural adaptation (Table 21).

In brief, none of the personality variables measured in this study had any effect on attraction, whether directly or through interacting with cultural adaptation. It may be that these personality variables are sensitive to certain dimensions of similarity only. Alternatively, it may be the case that these personality variables operate differently for
individualistic and collectivistic subjects. The norm of “concealing and suppressing one’s feeling and emotions” for the sake of social harmony is deep-rooted in collectivistic cultures and can certainly mitigate the influence of personality traits in collectivistic cultures relative to individualistic ones.

TESTING SOCIAL IDENTITY THEORY IN THAI AND JAPANESE CULTURES

Although social identity theory has been shown to be applicable in several cultures such as American, British, French, Canadian, Indian, and Hong Kong, it has rarely been tested with Thai and Japanese cultures. The results of this study should provide evidence for the applicability of this theory in Thai and Japanese contexts.

The proposition of social identity theory does not hold for either the Thai or the Japanese culture in this study. Based on manipulated cultural adaptation, the relationships between cultural adaptation and the key variables were monotonic positive in the Thai culture and levelled off beyond moderate adaptation in the Japanese culture. Substantial adaptation which should threaten the social identity of the perceiver and should be disliked did not cause any adverse effects. Based on perceived cultural adaptation, the relationships between cultural adaptation and the key variables were monotonic positive in both cultures. Thai subjects did not feel threatened by any level of adaptation, manipulated or perceived. Interestingly, Japanese subjects felt more threatened when the American sales team was perceived to have low or moderate adaptation than when the team was perceived to have utmost adaptation (Figure 47 and Table 27).

One explanation why substantial adaptation did not instigate threat to social identity is that both Thai and Japanese subjects perceive Americans as having a higher status than themselves. Social identity theory (Tajfel 1974) posits that in intergroup interactions group
members compare themselves on relevant aspects. These social comparisons motivate individuals to seek or create dimensions on which they can distinguish themselves favorably and will pressure people to protect their social identity. However, because different status groups are basically noncomparable (Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975), it follows that in this case, there is no pressure to make group members seek positive distinction from the noncomparable outgroup, as posited by social identity theory. This implies that members in the lower status group would not feel threatened, no matter how much people from the higher status group converge to their norms of behavior.

That the Japanese subjects felt more threatened when the American sales team was perceived to have low or moderate adaptation than when the team was perceived to have utmost adaptation was clearly a surprise. As discussed earlier, it might be that at low and moderate perceived adaptation, the cultural distance between Japanese and Americans is apparent. This cultural distance may make Japanese subjects feel rather uneasy and vulnerable and rate themselves as feeling threatened. It may also be the case that the Americans’ no or moderate adaptation was perceived as challenging the Japanese. The fact that the Americans did not bother converging to any of the Japanese customs and practices even when they were selling to the Japanese in Japan may disturb the pride in Japanese culture, and hence become a threat to Japanese social identity.

In addition, this research provides another test of social identity theory which suggests that the more one identifies with the group, the more one’s self-concept is based on positive social identity of that group membership and thus the more one tries to maintain this social identity through intergroup differentiation (C. Kelly 1988). This prediction did not seem to be valid in this study. In both the Thai and Japanese
experiments, all the main effects of strength of identification with one's own culture on manipulation check, connectedness, disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes, perceived respectfullness, and perceived threat to social identity were not significant. Nearly all the interaction effects between cultural adaptation and strength of identification were not significant either. It could be that noncomparability between different status groups prevented the potential effect of strength of identification with one's own culture from happening.

INVESTIGATING THE INFLUENCE OF STATUS DIFFERENTIAL AND COLLECTIVISM ON THE EFFECTIVENESS OF CULTURAL ADAPTATION

The design of this study takes into account the influence of status differential between the interacting dyads on the effectiveness of adaptive behaviors, an issue that has not been investigated before. This is a major theoretical contribution that increases our understanding of the effectiveness of cultural adaptation.

The Japanese in this study perceived the Americans as having a higher status than themselves (rather than a comparable status as expected, based on objective factors). This clearly underlines the importance of perception as opposed to economic development in determining a country's relative status. This perception unexpectedly made the manipulation of status differential (adaptor's status higher than the perceiver's vs. adaptor's status comparable to the perceiver's) ineffective. However, this fact helps strengthen the findings, in that Thai and Japanese cultures served as a matched pair, verifying the findings of each other. It was clear that the Thai and the Japanese subjects reacted identically positively to the perceived cultural adaptation. As for the manipulated cultural adaptation, the higher the adaptation, the more favorable the responses from the Thai subjects, but the
favorable responses became saturated beyond moderate adaptation for Japanese subjects. Results from this study suggest that higher cultural adaptation, whether as manipulated by the adaptor or as perceived by the perceiver, results in more favorable reactions if the adaptor is generally perceived as higher in status than the perceiver (based on an overall rating) and the perceiver is collectivistic.

The discrepancy between the findings in this study and those of Francis (1989), which found a curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction and outcomes, stems from two main factors. First, the Thai and Japanese perceivers in this study belong to a collectivistic culture which emphasizes fitting in with others (Markus and Kitayama 1991), preserving harmony in social relationships (Hui and Triandis 1986), interpersonal sensitivity, conformity, and readiness to be influenced by others (Triandis 1988). On the contrary, in Francis (1989) the American perceivers belong to an individualistic culture which emphasizes independence and lack of concern for others (Hui and Triandis 1986), behaviors that are mainly based on one's own thoughts, feelings, and actions, rather than on those of others' (i.e., displaying individual differences and the true self) (Markus and Kitayama 1991). Substantial adaptation may be viewed by collectivists as showing compliment, respect, and readiness to fit in, but may be discounted or even rejected by individualists because it strongly opposes the value of displaying one's true self.

Second, the perceivers in this study perceive the adaptor as having a higher status whereas in Francis (1989) the American subjects may perceive themselves as having a higher status than Japanese and Koreans. The incorporation of status differential leads to significantly different hypotheses from Francis. As pointed out earlier, unequal status
prevents comparison between groups (Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975). So, there is no pressure to seek positive distinctions from the outgroup. This implies that members in the lower status group would not feel threatened by any degree of adaptation displayed by the higher status outgroup members and will react favorably to adaptation according to the similarity-attraction paradigm.

Another implication of status differential is that it may impact on the way adaptation is perceived. Power differences might shift the obligation of adaptation to the lower status party (Gudykunst 1983). The lower status party is typically expected to adapt, so adaptation from the higher status party may be received differently. Conversely, adaptation from higher status persons, who typically are not expected to adapt, may create surprise (the open-ended answers indicated that many Thai and Japanese subjects felt surprised that the Americans follow the manners and customs of their culture) and be received positively by lower status participants.

It is proposed that the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction can be predicted by considering two factors: the perceived status of the adaptor relative to the perceiver (higher vs. comparable vs. lower) and cultural orientation of the perceiver (individualism vs. collectivism). The cross-tabulation of these two factors results in six cells with each proposition as follows:
Prediction of the pattern of the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction is based on the following basic tenets:

(a) The more cultural adaptation, the higher the perceived similarity between the adaptor and the perceiver should be. The higher the perceived similarity between the adaptor and the perceiver, the higher the attraction, according to similarity-attraction theory.

(b) However, at extreme similarity social identity theory suggests that similarity should have negative effects on intergroup relations because it provokes the search for distinctiveness (Brown 1984b). Research support for this has been provided (e.g. Brown 1978; Brown 1984a; Brown and Abrams 1986; Diehl 1988; Garg et al. 1972; Moghaddam and Stringer 1988; Sachdev and Bourhis 1987; Turner et al. 1979; Wagner et al. 1986; Wolff 1959).
(c) The search for social distinctiveness will not happen in groups differing in status because status differential inhibits social comparisons (Festinger 1954; Kidder and Stewart 1975). The implication is that the similarity-attraction phenomenon will prevail in interactions between different status groups but the social identity theory’s prediction will occur in interactions between comparable status groups.

(d) A collectivistic culture emphasizes fitting in with others (Markus and Kitayama 1991), preserving harmony in social relationships (Hui and Triandis 1986), interpersonal sensitivity, and readiness to be influenced by others (Triandis 1988). On the contrary, an individualistic culture emphasizes independence (Hui and Triandis 1986), behaviors that are based mainly on one’s own thoughts, feelings, and actions rather than on those of others’ (Markus and Kitayama 1991) (i.e., displaying individual differences and the true self). Substantial adaptation may be perceived by collectivistists as showing respect and readiness to fit in and thus will be liked, but may be discounted or rejected by individualists because it opposes the value of displaying one’s true self.

(e) Power differences might shift the obligation of adaptation to the lower status party (Gudykunst 1983). The lower status party is typically expected to adapt, so adaptation may be received differently from the higher status party. Conversely, adaptation from higher status persons who typically are not expected to adapt may create surprise and be received positively by lower status participants.

By considering the joint effects of these tenets, propositions 1 to 6 are made, as follows:

**Proposition 1:** The more cultural adaptation, the more attraction will result if the adaptor is perceived as higher in status than the collectivistic perceiver.
Rationales: Because different status groups are noncomparable, there is no pressure for group members to seek positive distinctions from the noncomparable outgroup. Any level of cultural adaptation will not threaten the perceiver's social identity. Coupled with the fact that the perceiver is collectivistic and tends to appreciate the attempt to fit in via adaptation, the similarity-attraction phenomenon should operate..

**Proposition 2:** Cultural adaptation beyond a moderate adaptation level will no longer have an effect on attraction if the adaptor is perceived as comparable in status to the collectivistic perceiver.¹

Rationales: In intergroup contacts, members of comparable status groups attempt to differentiate themselves and maintain their social identity. Substantial adaptation from outgroup members threatens this social identity and should be disliked. However, because the perceiver is collectivistic and tends to appreciate the attempt to fit in, the repulsion to substantial adaptation is mitigated.

**Proposition 3:** Cultural adaptation beyond a moderate adaptation level will no longer have an effect on attraction if the adaptor is perceived as lower in status than the collectivistic perceiver.

Rationales: Because different status groups are noncomparable, there is no pressure for group members to seek positive distinctions from the noncomparable outgroup. Any level of cultural adaptation will not threaten the perceiver's social identity. So, similarity-attraction should operate. However, because the lower status party is typically expected to

---

¹ Proposition 2 is slightly different from the prediction in H3a, after reconsidering the impact of harmony orientation of collectivists.
adapt anyway, such substantial adaptation may be regarded as an obligation and thus the appreciation is discounted by the collectivistic perceiver.

**Proposition 4:** Cultural adaptation beyond a moderate adaptation level will no longer have an effect on attraction if the adaptor is perceived as higher in status than the individualistic perceiver.

Rationales: Because different status groups are noncomparable, there is no pressure for group members to seek positive distinctions from the noncomparable outgroup. Any level of cultural adaptation will not threaten the perceiver. So, similarity-attraction should operate. Substantial adaptation by a higher status party may be viewed as a compliment and respect for the lower status perceiver and thus should be liked. However, because an individualistic culture values displaying the true self, the attraction which should have increased with the substantial adaptation is mitigated by the perceivedunnecessariness of being “a chameleon.”

**Proposition 5:** Attraction as a function of cultural adaptation increases with adaptation under levels of low adaptation, reaches a maximum under levels of moderate adaptation, and declines under levels of substantial adaptation if the adaptor is perceived as comparable in status to the individualistic perceiver.

Rationales: In intergroup contacts, members of comparable status groups attempt to differentiate themselves and maintain their social identity. Substantial adaptation from outgroup members threatens this social identity and will be disliked. Coupled with the fact that the perceiver is an individualist who believes that one should display the true self rather than conform to others’ thought, feelings, and actions, substantial adaptation will be disliked and rejected.
Proposition 6: Attraction as a function of cultural adaptation increases with adaptation under levels of low adaptation, reaches a maximum under levels of moderate adaptation, and declines under levels of substantial adaptation if the adaptor is perceived as lower in status than the individualistic perceiver.

Rationales: Because different status groups are noncomparable, there is no pressure for group members to seek positive distinctions from the noncomparable outgroup. Any level of cultural adaptation will not threaten the perceiver. So, similarity-attraction should operate. Although the lower status party is typically expected to adapt, such substantial adaptation is likely to far exceed the expectation of an individualist who values displaying one’s true self, and thus be perceived as overshoot adaptation or even as a superficial attempt to raise the adaptor’s own status by imitating the higher status perceiver. This repulsion is predicted to outweigh the similarity-attraction phenomenon in this case.

EXAMINING THE RELATIVE IMPACT OF EACH MECHANISM ON OUTCOMES

This study examines the relative impact of attraction, perceived threat to ingroup distinctiveness, perceived compliment to the native culture, and the attribution process affecting trustworthiness in mediating the effect of cultural adaptation on outcomes. This issue has not been investigated before.

It turned out that perceived threat to social identity was irrelevant in this study because neither the Thai nor the Japanese subjects felt threatened by the sales team’s adaptation. The most influential mechanism in which cultural adaptation affected outcomes was Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Attraction ⇒ Outcomes for Thai subjects, and Perceived attempt to adapt ⇒ Perceived trustworthiness ⇒ Outcomes for Japanese. Whether these
patterns apply to perceivers in other cultures and other groups is a question for future investigation.

**SUGGESTING THAT DISPOSITIONAL ATTRIBUTION DOES NOT RELATE TO PERCEIVED TRUSTWORTHINESS AS FOUND IN AMERICAN CULTURE**

Although the no adaptation condition was attributed to relatively more dispositional (i.e., less situational) causes than the moderate and the substantial adaptation conditions, it was rated lower in perceived trustworthiness than was substantial adaptation in both the Thai and Japanese studies, contradicting the findings of Francis (1989). It seemed that Thai and Japanese subjects did not relate disposition to cross-situational consistency as proposed by H. H. Kelly (1973), which will make the behaviors appear predictable and dependable and thus trustworthy (Kaplan 1973; Rempel et al. 1985; Sullivan and Peterson 1982). Future research may investigate the validity of the proposition that disposition relates to cross-situational consistency, predictability, dependability, and sincerity in non-American cultures. Such a proposition seems to rely heavily on the assumption that people are rational and logical — an assumption that may be less true in many other cultures including Japanese. As suggested by Young and Nakajima-Okano (1985), Japanese emphasize concrete objects and situations rather than universals or generalizations. They rely heavily on intuitiveness and are not interested in following the Western type of logic to its end. According to Hall and Hall (1987), Japanese consider that logical, one-step-at-a-time thinking indicates immaturity. They want to see the long-term implications of actions (in this case the implications of the adaptive behaviors). They allow much leeway for sentiment and emotion (Young and Nakajima-Okano 1985).
Alternatively, the individualism-collectivism continuum may shed light on these contradictory findings. H6d was derived from the theory and findings based on individualistic cultures. As suggested by June Francis (personal discussion), because group harmony is valued above a person's own disposition, collectivists may trust people who adapt to situations more than those who display their own disposition without considering the circumstances. The latter kind of people are likely to be frowned upon for not fitting into the contexts at hand. On the other hand, in individualistic cultures, one is encouraged to display one's true self rather than to be a chameleon. Substantial adaptation may therefore be viewed by individualists as manipulative, inconsistent, insincere, and untrustworthy.

Consistent with the above explanation, as shown in the principal components analysis in Chapter 6, in both the Thai and Japanese data sets, the items measuring perceived compliment to the native culture (q16evamn, q17evamn, q18evamn, q19posv, and q20under) and situational attribution (q13situ, q14situ, and q15situ) loaded highly on the same Component. This seemed to indicate that collectivistic cultures, which emphasize harmony and fitting in with others, agree on the adjustment of oneself to suit the surrounding situations and conditions.

OFFERING PRACTICAL VALUES

The amount of business is very large between the U.S. and Japan and is growing between the U.S. and Thailand. The results of this study provide suggestions for Americans when dealing with Thais and Japanese. For Thai subjects, the relationship between cultural adaptation and the four variables (attraction, outcomes, perceived compliment to the native culture, and perceived trustworthiness) appeared to be monotonic
positive. Based on the result from this Thai sample, it seems to be beneficial to follow the rule “When in Rome do as the Romans do” as much as possible when dealing with Thais, including using the Thai language.

One caution is that not every person has exactly the same reactions. Some subjects reacted rather negatively (score less than four out of nine on the adjusted means of connectedness and perceived respectfulness) to substantial adaptation using English. These were subjects who had more than 10 years’ work experience (Figure 14). No types of Thai subjects reacted negatively to substantial adaptation using Thai language. So, the safest and most advantageous heuristic for Americans to deal with Thais appears to be:

(a) Behave like native Thais and communicate in Thai language;

(b) If the recommendation in (a) cannot be accomplished, it is generally beneficial to behave like native Thais but only adapt moderately when dealing with people who have more than 10 years’ work experience.

This recommendation should be followed with two cautions in mind. First, because of the convenience sample used, generalization to other groups of people must be done with care, as pointed out earlier. Second, learning a language certainly takes time, effort, and money. One has to weigh the costs and benefits of doing so and then decide whether it is worthwhile to learn Thai. Table 31 illustrates the cost and time of learning Thai at different levels, based on the courses offered for foreigners at Chulalongkorn University. Outside Thailand, Thai language courses may be offered at some community colleges or language institutes or by individual Thai natives residing abroad. If the duration of stay in Thailand is long, for example over six years, and the business stake involved is crucial, it
may be worthwhile to invest effort in learning Thai. Otherwise, moderate adaptation should be sufficient.

For Japanese subjects, the relationship between cultural adaptation and the four variables seemed to reach a plateau beyond moderate adaptation. Adaptation beyond moderate level does not increase the favorability but generally does not hurt either. So, to deal with Japanese, the strategy to follow is to adapt moderately in customs and manners. To invest time and effort to be fluent in Japanese, as well as to behave like a native Japanese, does not pay off at all.

This recommendation, again, should be followed with the caution of generalizability of the results to other groups of people. In addition, the duration of stay in Japan may be important. For example, if the Americans have resided in Japan for over 15 years but cannot speak or understand Japanese, they may be perceived negatively by Japanese. Such ignorance of learning Japanese may signal the Americans' lack of seriousness in doing business in Japan, lack of the willingness to adapt and to truly understand the Japanese culture, and so forth.

The most important caution is to keep the substantial or moderate adaptive behaviors within the circle of acceptable native practices. Careful verification must be made with natives to ensure that those manners and practices are real native standards.
FUTURE RESEARCH

Future research may complete or fill some cells of a factorial design needed to test the six propositions presented above. The minimal three factors to be included are (a) cultural orientation of the perceiver (individualism vs. collectivism), (b) perceived status of the adaptor relative to the perceiver (higher vs. comparable vs. lower). This can be achieved by either selection of cultures that are thought and measured to be different in perceived status or deliberate manipulation, and (c) cultural adaptation (three or more levels). Additionally, there may be two or more matched cultures for each of the individualism and collectivism orientations to strengthen the design.

It is not yet well understood which dimensions of perceived status differential are most related to the effectiveness of cultural adaptation. In this study, it is assumed that overall perceived status differential is the most influential. However, a secondary analysis on the pooled Thai and Japanese data sets, using two-way ANOVA (cultural adaptation x perceived status differential in various aspects), suggests that the only dimension that interacts with cultural adaptation is cultural heritage. Perceived status differential in terms of cultural heritage interacted with cultural adaptation on perceived trustworthiness ($p < .05$) and on perceived compliment to the native culture ($p < .01$). As shown in Figure 51 and Figure 52, for subjects who perceived Americans as having a higher status in terms of cultural heritage, the relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived trustworthiness and perceived compliment seemed to be curvilinear. This is in line with some findings in the past. According to social identity theory, lower status groups may have a higher need to feel positive about themselves which can be achieved through a strong intergroup

Because perceived trustworthiness and perceived compliment are highly correlated with attraction, this finding that the lower status groups show negative reactions at substantial adaptation can be regarded as being in line with H2a (attraction), H2b (outcomes) and H2c (compliment). However, subjects who perceived Americans as having a higher status than themselves in terms of cultural heritage, and thus reacted this way, were very few in number. Therefore, in a one-way ANOVA (adaptation) within each culture or a two-way ANOVA (adaptation x culture), this curvilinear relationship was overwhelmed by the monotonic positive relationship displayed by the majority of subjects who perceived themselves as having a higher status than Americans on the cultural heritage dimension (this can be explained by the non-comparability-no-threat argument in H1’s set).

Therefore, future research may want to identify the most relevant aspects of perceived status differential in predicting the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction. Also, this study only measured four aspects of perceived status differential, for a quick check, excluding perceived ethnic status. This aspect is a very sensitive question to ask (and therefore was not included in the questionnaire) and most likely will get a distorted answer. No one would want to admit that they feel that their ethnicity is of lower status than others’ or to declare that they see their ethnicity as superior to others’ for fear of being considered prejudiced. A more comprehensive and subtle measure of this construct will be useful and will enable an in-depth investigation of the impact of this construct.
This study is concerned with foreigners adapting to native cultures in the natives' home country. The issue of people from one culture adapting to the people from another culture in the adaptors' home country or in a third country has not been investigated and is a very interesting issue. For example, how much should Americans adapt to Japanese when the business dealings take place in the U.S. or in other countries outside of Japan?

Future research may investigate the validity of the proposition that disposition relates to cross-situational consistency, predictability, dependability, and sincerity in non-American cultures. Such a proposition seems to rely heavily on the assumption that people are rational and logical, which may be less true in some other non-American cultures.

A field study technique in which various real intercultural interactions are monitored can be employed to see the effectiveness of cultural adaptation. Apart from being more realistic than laboratory experiments, this technique will enable the analysis of who adapts to whom under what conditions, the dynamism of the adaptation, the reciprocity in adaptation, and so forth. Historical documentary analyses or in-depth interviews can also be done to investigate whether cultural adaptation by foreigners in the past threatened the social identity of the natives, and how the natives reacted to such cultural adaptation.

Each method of manipulation, such as written description, video presentation, use of confederates, has its own advantages and disadvantages as discussed in Chapter 4. Future research obviously may use different methods and compare the results associated with each technique. Other advanced technologies like virtual reality or interactive communication with the computer can be accommodated to increase external reality.
The variables that can be used to predict the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction are not limited to perceivers' cultural orientation and status differential only. Future research should investigate additional variables that can affect the effectiveness of cultural adaptation. For example, product types may invoke different aspects of perceived status differential and may thus interact with cultural adaptation and perceived status differential. The ethnic and nationality composition of the foreign team, the foreigners' duration of working in the natives' home country, and so on may affect the relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction. This will certainly increase our understanding of the mechanisms of how cultural adaptation influences attraction and outcomes and will help enrich the model in Figure 5.
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Communication style depicts a person’s familiar coding behavior in symbolic interaction, encompassing verbal pattern (voice quality, vocal volume, articulation through word selection and statement structure, use of a dialect or language) and nonverbal behavior (kinesic and proxemic mode and contact rituals) (Ellingsworth 1988).

The nonverbal communication behaviors can be categorized as follows (Knapp 1978):¹

1. **Body motion or kinesic behavior.** This includes gestures, movements of the body, limbs, hands, head, feet and legs, facial expressions, eye behavior (blinking, direction and length of gaze, and pupil dilation) and posture (Ekman and Friesen 1969). The body motion consists of many types as follows:

   a. **Emblems.** Emblems are nonverbal behaviors with a direct verbal translation or definition. Members of a culture agree on the verbal translation of these signals. Emblems are culture specific and are frequently used when verbal channels are not possible.

   b. **Illustrators.** Illustrators are nonverbal behaviors which are attached to speech to illustrate what is being said. They are used to help communicate, but not as deliberately as emblems.

   c. **Affect.** Affect displays are mainly facial expressions which display affective states. They can repeat, emphasize, contradict, or be unrelated to verbal statements.

   d. **Regulators.** Regulators are nonverbal behaviors which regulate the interactive nature of speaking and listening between two or more parties.

¹ It may overlap with verbal pattern as described by Ellingsworth (1988) above.
e. Adaptors. There are three types of adaptors to satisfy needs, perform actions, regulate emotions, develop social relationships and perform other functions: self-, object-, and alter-directed adaptors. Self-adaptors refer to management of one’s own body (e.g. holding, rubbing, pinching) which will increase with one’s anxiety. Object-adaptors involve manipulation of objects and may come from the performance of some task like smoking, writing with a pencil. Finally, alter-adaptors are learned together with early experiences with interpersonal relations e.g. giving and taking from one another, attacking or protecting, and so forth.

2. Physical characteristics. These are not related to movement. Examples include physique, general attractiveness, body or breath odors, height, weight, hair, and skin color or tone.

3. Touching behavior.

4. Paralanguage. Paralanguage deals with how something is said. This includes (a) voice qualities such as pitch range, rhythm control, tempo, and so on, and (b) vocalizations such as laughing, crying, pitch height, and vocal segregates.

5. Proxemics. Proxemics refer to the use and perception of social and personal space.

6. Artifacts. Artifacts covers manipulation of objects associated with the interacting persons which may serve as nonverbal stimuli. Examples are perfume, clothes, eyeglasses and all beauty aids.

7. Environmental factors. These impact on human relationship but are not a part of it. Examples are furniture, architectural style, music and so forth surrounding the interaction.
Argyle (1988) reviews research on cultural differences in bodily communication. Cultural differences have been found on facial expression, gestures, emblems, illustrators, gaze, spatial behavior, touching behavior, posture, bodily movements, vocalization, and appearance. Table 2 includes the differences in these aspects among the American, Japanese, and Thai cultures.
EXHIBIT 2
The Cover Sheet, Stories, and Questionnaire Used in the Thai Experiment

The Cover Sheet

The Thai Experiment: A Study of Survey Design with Reference to the Public Perceptions of the University of British Columbia in Thailand

Research Supervisor:
Professor Dr. L Vertinsky, Director
Centre for International Business Studies
Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration
The University of British Columbia
Vancouver, Canada
English Equivalent of the Cover Sheet

Purpose: This research is part of a dissertation which is studying how to develop and improve the relations between American and Thai executives.

Procedures: This questionnaire consists of a story and questions. The story describes a sales presentation of an American sales team to a Thai purchasing manager. Suppose you were the purchasing manager in the story, how would you perceive and react to the American sales team? Please give us your honest and straightforward opinions. About fifteen minutes are required. All questions are simple and do not need any hard data or references. Please answer every question and make any assumptions you want.

Confidentiality: Your answers are confidential. The investigators do not know your name. No one else has access to the data.

Your right: The participation is up to your will. You have no obligation to participate in this study. Your standing in class or your job will not be affected should you choose not to participate. Once you finish the questionnaire, we assume that consent has been given.

We highly appreciate your cooperation. Should you have any questions, please contact Chanthika (Lily) Pornpitakpan, Tel. 284-0196 or I. Vertinsky at (604) 822-3886.

Research Supervisor:

Dr. I. Vertinsky, Director

Centre for International Business Studies

Faculty of Commerce and Business Administration

The University of British Columbia, Vancouver, Canada
The Story in the
Americans Adapting to Thais: No Adaptation Condition

Note: Partly adapted from the substantial adaptation condition (Japanese adapting to Americans) in Francis (1989).

PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Thailand. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Khun Wiwat Saranwong, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Khun Wiwat. Khun Wiwat is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Khun Wiwat, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Khun Wiwat gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in blue suits and blue shirts. One, a bearded man, is about 40 years old; the other about 35.

"Hello, Mr. Smith?" Khun Wiwat greets the bearded man.

"Hello Mr. Saranwong. Nice to meet you. I’m Michael Smith, Southeast Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries. You can call me Mike.” Mr. Smith shakes Khun Wiwat’s hand very firmly making direct eye contact. He hands a business card with his right hand to Khun Wiwat and goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

"Hello Mr. Saranwong. Glad to meet you.” Mr. Brown shakes Wiwat’s hand very firmly making direct eye contact. “Just call me Rob.” He too hands Khun Wiwat his business card.

"Glad to meet you,” says Khun Wiwat with a smile. “Here’s my business card.” Khun Wiwat gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it briefly before putting it in their pockets. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

Mr. Brown shrugs his shoulders while saying, “We had a lousy trip but we made it. We know you’re on a tight schedule and so are we. So, we’d like to kick off presentation and see if we can make a go of it. OK?”

“Come on in and have a seat.” Khun Wiwat walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“No, thanks. As Rob mentioned, we’re both on a tight schedule,” replies Mr. Smith while sitting down. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown take documents out of their briefcases.

“I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve heard a lot of good things about your company,” says Khun Wiwat.

Mr. Smith crosses his legs, jiggles his foot and says, “That’s great. We’ve also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company.”

“Yeah. We’re really impressed with the questions you’ve been asking us in your letters,” says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

“Good. How would you like to proceed? ” Khun Wiwat asks.

Mr. Smith says, “Wiwat, we believe the best way to get to the bottom line quickly is to give you a brief overview on ourselves and our products. We have been producing high
quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in Southeast Asia."

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Khun Wiwat.

“I put a lot of heat on our R&D people to make sure the projects flew,” says Mr. Brown, who begins turning his chair back and forth slightly. “We had to bend a few of the company’s rules and throw some noses out of joint, but we always respond to the customers’ needs. We’re really excited at getting the production guys to put robots throughout all our plants. Those little mechanical tin cans are pushing our production capacity up by 25% and our quality has increased by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’.”

Mr. Smith leans forward, hits the table with his left palm before saying loudly, “And that’s the bottom line. We can give you a 10% better product than our competitors. Although our price may be a bit higher than our competitors, we’ve beefed up our service so you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries. We’ve pulled out the plugs to build our Southeast Asian service response.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Khun Wiwat for another 20 minutes. Mr. Brown frequently taps his pen, sighs a few times, occasionally looking at his watch.

Mr. Smith looks at his watch before saying, “Wiwat, that’s about it. We’re both busy. Do you have any more questions?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Khun Wiwat.
The Story in the
Americans Adapting to Thais: Moderate Adaptation Condition

PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Thailand. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Khun Wiwat Saranwong, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Khun Wiwat. Khun Wiwat is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Khun Wiwat, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Khun Wiwat gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in blue suits, white shirts, and matching ties. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

“Hello, Mr. Smith?” Khun Wiwat greets the older member of the sales team.

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat. Nice to meet you,” says one of the sales people while shaking Khun Wiwat’s hand very firmly. “I’m Michael Smith, Southeast Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries.” He hands a business card with his right hand to Khun Wiwat and goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat. Glad to meet you,” says Mr. Brown while shaking Khun Wiwat’s hand very firmly. He too hands Khun Wiwat his business card.

“Glad to meet you,” says Khun Wiwat with a smile. “Here’s my business card.” Khun Wiwat gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

“We had a terrible trip but we made it.” Mr. Brown replies.

“Come on in and have a seat.” Khun Wiwat walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“Yes please. Anything would do for us. Khopkhun Khrap,” says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Khun Wiwat walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk leisurely for a while before Khun Wiwat says, “I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve heard a lot of good things about your company, ”

Mr. Smith crosses the legs and says, “That’s great. We’ve also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company.”

“Yes. We’re really impressed with the questions you’ve been asking us in your letters,” says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

“Good. How would you like to proceed?” Khun Wiwat asks.

Mr. Smith says “Khun Wiwat, what I’d like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in Southeast Asia.”

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Khun Wiwat.
"I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers' needs," says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. "I'm very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors'."

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, "And that's the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we've expanded our service in Southeast Asia. So, you're guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries."

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Khun Wiwat for another 20 minutes. Mr. Brown occasionally glances at his watch.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, "That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Khun Wiwat. Do you have any other questions?"

"No, that's very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions," answers Khun Wiwat.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. "Khopkhun Mak Khun Wiwat." Both of them rise.

Khun Wiwat stands up. "Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision." All three walk to the door. "It's a pleasure meeting both of you. Now it's about lunch time. If you're free, how about going for a Thai lunch at a restaurant downstairs?"

"We're really sorry. We have another appointment at one o'clock and have to leave now. How about tomorrow dinner?" Mr. Brown asks.

"Fine with me. Let's meet at the lobby downstairs at seven o'clock, OK?" replies Khun Wiwat.

"Sure. See you tomorrow. Sawatdee Khrap," Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown reach out and shake Khun Wiwat's hand firmly before leaving the room.

Exhibit 2
The Story in the
Americans Adapting to Thais: Substantial Adaptation Using English Condition

PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Thailand. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Khun Wiwat Saranwong, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Khun Wiwat. Khun Wiwat is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Khun Wiwat, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Khun Wiwat gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in “Chut Phra Rachatan” suits. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

“Hello, Mr. Smith?” Khun Wiwat greets the older member of the sales team.

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat.” says the older person while performing a Thai ‘wai’ to Khun Wiwat. “I’m Michael Smith, Southeast Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries.” He hands a business card to Khun Wiwat with his right hand while raising the other hand to touch the right forearm and bowing slightly. Mr. Smith goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat.” Mr. Brown also performs a ‘wai’ to Khun Wiwat as Mr. Smith does. “This is my business card.” Mr. Brown hands Khun Wiwat his business card in the same manner as Mr. Smith does.

“Sawatdee Khrap,” says Khun Wiwat with a smile. “Here’s my business card.” Khun Wiwat gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

“The flight was slightly delayed but everything was alright.” Mr. Brown replies.

“Come on in and have a seat.” Khun Wiwat walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“Yes please. Anything would do for us. Khopkhun Khrap,” says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Khun Wiwat walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk leisurely for a while before Khun Wiwat says, “I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve heard a lot of good things about your company, ”

Mr. Smith sits in a formal manner and says, “That’s great. We’ve also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company. ”

“Yes. We’re really impressed with the questions you’ve been asking us in your letters,” says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

“Good. How would you like to proceed?” Khun Wiwat asks.

“Khun Wiwat, what I’d like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in Southeast Asia,” Mr. Smith explains.
“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Khun Wiwat.

“I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers’ needs,” says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. “I’m very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’.”

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, “And that’s the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we’ve expanded our service in Southeast Asia. So, you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Khun Wiwat for another 20 minutes. Each of them sits calmly while listening attentively to his colleague’s presentation.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, “That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Khun Wiwat. Is there anything you still had questions or concerns about?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Khun Wiwat.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. “Khopkhun Mak Khrap Khun Wiwat.” Both of them rise.

Khun Wiwat stands up. “Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision.” All three walk to the door. “It’s a pleasure meeting both of you.

Now it’s about lunch time. If you’re free, how about going for a Thai lunch at a restaurant downstairs?”

“Sounds excellent. We would love to go,” replies Mr. Brown.

“We’d better go now before it’s getting too crowded,” Khun Wiwat suggests while they leave the room.
The Story in the Americans Adapting to Thais:
Substantial Adaptation Using the Native Language Condition

Note: See attached for the English equivalent. All dialogs and descriptions in this version are in Thai (i.e., a translation of the “substantial adaptation using English” condition, except the first greeting by Khun Wiwat is in English and there is some probing from Khun Wiwat on how the American sales team can speak Thai). To reduce the problem of signalling more familiarity with Thai culture than in the English speaking versions, the sales team is presented as having an obligation to study Thai because of the company’s policy.

"สวัสดีครับคุณวิรัตน์" บรรยายเจาะจง ถูกต้องดีที่สิ่งที่กล่าวไปในลักษณะเดียวกับกรณี บรรยายที่มีไทยได้ออกและเข้าใจอย่างมีมิติลึกซึ้ง เข้าใจได้เลย “สวัสดีครับ นี่คันบัตรคุณ” คุณวิรัตน์ยินดีที่มีบัตรให้และระบุว่าจ่ายบัตรบัตรอย่างกลมกลืนจะทำเกินไปก่อนเป็นที่ “คุณมีตั๋วกีฬา ลูกนี้เรื่องภาษาไทยก็ได้หมด เรียนภาษาไทยมาแล้วยังครับ”

"อีกไม่กี่เดือนถึงเวรรอบครับ บรรยายมีเรื่องนี้ ไม่ให้ผู้รู้การทุกคนต้องจดจำภาษาของลูกค้าให้ หมดที่พูดไทยได้เลยป่วยแล้วครับ” สมัครสอบ

“ผู้ที่พูดไทยเป็นเหนือกว่า” บรรยายสมมท์

คุณวิรัตน์ชนะBadge โยก "การเดินทางเป็น ไร้บัตรครับ หวังว่างดงามที่สิ่งไม่เคยมีมากนัก"

เครื่องเป็นเรื่องนี้ดังนั้นแต่อย่างไรอยู่เรื่อง ร้อยครับ” บรรยายสมมท์

"เข้ามาหนึ่งที่ครับ" คุณวิรัตน์ฟังกีบุก ไปที่ห้องและเจ้าหน้าที่รับบริการไม่จง "จะสิ่งอะไรคีย์ ครับ?"

"อะไรให้ครับ ขอลง" บรรยายสมมท์ ตั้ง ตรงนี้จะ บนบนจากครั้งแรกและคุณวิรัตน์ชี้ เครื่องเฉพาะที่ที่ครับ คุณวิรัตน์ อีก และบริการ สามารถสามารถกับสิ่งที่ต้องการคุณวิรัตน์จะอย่างว่า “เรารอกฟังและเอื้อนั้นมากขึ้น” ได้ยินขึ้นเสียง ของคอมพิวเตอร์แล้ว"
สมัชฌาภิบาลฝ่ายความคืบหน้า กล่าวว่า “ เราได้
วินิจฉัยว่ามีความก้าวหน้าของที่ตั้งมั่นมากกว่า"
“ เราควรก้าวไปด้วยความที่ดูดงามใน
คอมเม้นต์” บางกล่าวจะแจ้งสถานะทางหน้า
“ เรายอม เราจะเริ่มกันอีกที” คุณวัลเลน

" คุณวัลเลน คุณgotaจะเป็นสัญญาบัตรของบริษัท
ต้นทุนหนี้ ปีถัดไปจะจัดการบริการและราคา คุณ
ที่กำหนดขึ้นต่างๆ มีความต้องการที่ยิ่งใหญ่ เราให้บริษัท
ที่มีการผลิตขึ้นต่างๆ เข้าให้บริการ
ตลาดในประเทศอย่างนั้น” สมิธ

" คุณวิเวศกิจมีความร่วมมือในการย้ายเครื่อง” คุณ
วัลเลน

" สมมุติงานอย่างไรก็ใช้เกิดก้อนบริษัท
และพัฒนาธุรกิจที่มีผลต่อส่วนที่ต้องการ
ของธุรกิจ” บางกล่าวจะมีการปรับปรุง
" สมมุติใจถ้าบริษัทมีทุ่มสวนเกินการผลิตก็ห้าม
ให้ เราสามารถขยายกลุ่มการผลิตได้ 25" และปรับปรุง
คุณภาพของสินค้า 10% นั้นถือเป็นส่วนของการทบทวน
การใช้งานในอนาคตและจะเกิดขึ้นได้มากกว่าของก่อน

สมิธยิ้มแล้วว่า " ไปทางหน้าและกล่าวว่า
" และนี่คือสิ่งสำคัญที่สำคัญ ดินดันถึงว่าบริษัทอีก
10% แม้ว่าเราจะจากรุ่งก้าวสู่สิ่งน้อย เราจะได้ขยายการ
บริการในอีกชั้นหนึ่ง เพราะฉะนั้นจะยืนยันได้ว่าบริการ
เรามันเหมา การก้าวไปจะเร็ว

สมิธและบริษัทมีข้อมูลที่เกี่ยวกับราคา (ซึ่ง
สูงกว่าบริษัทส่วนใหญ่ประมาณ 15%) รายละเอียดทาง
เทคนิค การจ้างงาน บริการและการตั้งค่า คือ ต้อง
20 นาที ที่ผ่านจะยังยืดยาวและตั้งใจที่จะเรียนรู้

สมิธยิ้มและกล่าวว่า “ เราพยายามจะ
ละเอียดทั้งหมดแล้ว ไม่ทราบว่าคุณวัลเลนยังมีข้อสงสัย
อะไรไหมครับ?”

Exhibit 2 200
PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Thailand. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Khun Wiwat Saranwong, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Khun Wiwat. Khun Wiwat is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Khun Wiwat, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Khun Wiwat gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in “Chut Phra Rachatan” suits. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

“Hello, Mr. Smith?” Khun Wiwat greets the older member of the sales team.

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat.” says the older person while performing a Thai ‘wai’ to Khun Wiwat. “I’m Michael Smith, Southeast Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries.” He hands a business card to Khun Wiwat with his right hand while raising the other hand to touch the right forearm and bowing slightly. He speaks Thai quite fluently. Although he speaks with a slight accent, it is completely comprehensible. He goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

“Sawatdee Khrap Khun Wiwat.” Mr. Brown also performs a ‘wai’ and hands his business card to Khun Wiwat in the same manner as Mr. Smith does. He speaks Thai not as well as Mr. Smith does but comprehensible. “Sawatdee Khrap, here’s my business card.” Khun Wiwat gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. “You both speak very good Thai. How long have you been studying Thai?”

“Not that good. It’s our company’s policy that every manager must be able to speak the clients’ language. I’ve been studying Thai for over two years,” Mr. Smith replies.

“I’ve been learning speaking Thai for over a year already,” adds Mr. Brown.

Khun Wiwat continues the conversation. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

“The flight was slightly delayed but everything was alright.” Mr. Brown replies.

“Come on in and have a seat.” Khun Wiwat walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“Yes please. Anything would do for us. Khopkhun Khrap,” says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Khun Wiwat walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk leisurely for a while before Khun Wiwat says, “I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve heard a lot of good things about your company.”

Mr. Smith sits in a formal manner and says, “That’s great. We’ve also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company.”

“Yes. We’re really impressed with the questions you’ve been asking us in your letters,” says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.
“Good. How would you like to proceed?” Khun Wiwat asks.

“Khun Wiwat, what I’d like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in Southeast Asia,” Mr. Smith explains.

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Khun Wiwat.

“I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers’ needs,” says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. “I’m very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’.”

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, “And that’s the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we’ve expanded our service in Southeast Asia. So, you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Khun Wiwat for another 20 minutes. Each of them sits calmly while listening attentively to his colleague’s presentation.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, “That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Khun Wiwat. Is there anything you still had questions or concerns about?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Khun Wiwat.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. “Khokkhun Mak Khrap Khun Wiwat.” Both of them rise.

Khun Wiwat stands up. “Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision.” All three walk to the door. “It’s a pleasure meeting both of you. Now it’s about lunch time. If you’re free, how about going for a Thai lunch at a restaurant downstairs?”

“Sounds excellent. We would love to go,” replies Mr. Brown.

“We’d better go now before it’s getting too crowded,” Khun Wiwat suggests while they leave the room.
Thai Questionnaire

Note: See attached for the English equivalent of the questionnaire.

ส่วนที่ 1

สมุนพฤติกรรมท่านเป็นคู่วิเคราะห์มีเปรียบ ท่านเคยตอบคำถามต่อไปนี้ ในแต่ละคำถามมีหน่วยเลข 1 ถึง 9 โดยหน่วยเลข 1 และ 9 จะแทนความคิดเห็นปานกลาง ท่านควรตอบคำถามที่แสดงความคิดเห็นหรือความรู้สึกของท่าน ไม่มีคำตอบอื่นใดที่เรียงความ ความคิดเห็นรายละเอียด เรารอให้ความคิดเห็นท่านให้ชัดเจนและตรงไปตรงมาของท่าน

ตรวจสอบว่าท่านมีปฏิสัมพันธ์หรือความคิดเห็นอะไรบ้าง ท่านสามารถระบุเฉพาะตัว

ท่านมีความรู้สึกอย่างไรต่อคุณในเรื่อง? ท่านสามารถระบุเฉพาะตัว

ท่านรู้สึกตามเวลาระหว่างกันต่างท่านเข้าใจเรื่อง?

รู้สึกอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 มีความหมายมาก

ท่านชอบเพียงอย่างนี้ที่คิดค้นยาเก็บต่างท่านเข้าใจเรื่อง?

อย่างน้อยอย่างนี้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีความหมาย

ท่านชอบเพียงอย่างนี้เพียงได้?

ไม่ชอบอย่างนี้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ชอบมาก

ท่านรู้สึกว่าตามท่านเข้าใจความมีวัตถุประสงค์ที่นั้น...

ไม่รู้ว่าอะไรอย่างนี้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 รู้ใจอย่างมาก

ไม่รู้ว่าอะไรอย่างนี้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่รู้ใจอย่างมาก

 фондหรือทุนสินทรัพย์ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ตัดสินใจลงทุน

ไม่ได้เลย ได้มาก

เอกสารที่ท่านจะเสนอต่อผู้บังคับบัญชาให้เสนอความเห็นชอบชี้นำแย่ที่สุดเป็นยะนี้เพียงใด?

ต่ำมาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ชุ่มชื้น

ไม่เห็นผล หากที่ท่านอยู่คู่ควรร่วมทางทุนที่มีบัตรหลักซึ่งกว้างที่สุด เอกสารที่ท่านจะเสนอต่อผู้บังคับบัญชาให้พิจารณาต่อลงทุนกับบริษัทที่มีลาย?

ต่ำมาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ชุ่มชื้น

Exhibit 2
ในอนาคต หากบริษัทของท่านต้องการทำธุรกิจข้ามอินเดียหรืออื่นๆซึ่งบริษัทที่เกี่ยวข้อง โอกาสที่ท่านจะพิจารณาบริษัทนี้ ฐานะเที่ยวไปหรือไม่

ตัวบวก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ดูมาก

พฤติกรรมของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งและเกลียดชังที่ท่านคาดว่าท่านจะเห็นจากต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยโดยทั่วๆไปในภาคพื้นริเริ่มไปข้างหน้า

ต่างจากที่คาดว่าจะเห็นจาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 เหมือนที่คาดว่าจะเห็น

ต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทย จากต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทย

ทั้งๆไปอย่างมาก ทั้งๆไปอย่างมาก

พฤติกรรมของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งและนี้ต่างไปจากที่ท่านคาดว่าจะเห็นจากต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยโดยทั่วๆไปในภาคพื้นริเริ่มไปข้างหน้า

เหมือนที่คาดว่าจะเห็น 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ต่างจากที่คาดว่าจะเห็นจาก

จากต้านทานแข็งแกร่ง ต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทย

ยอมรับทั้งๆไปอย่างมาก ทั้งๆไปอย่างมาก

ท่านควรระวังไว้ที่ให้ต้านทานแข็งแกร่งและนี้ประพฤติเหมือนต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยมากที่สุดไม่ใช่เรื่อง

ไม่ต้องหวั่นเฝ้าอย่างใด 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 คาดหวังอย่างมาก

ท่านที่พบว่าพฤติกรรมและวิธีการส่งเข้าของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้...

สะดวกเป็นความจริงที่ว่า 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 สะดวกเป็นความจริงที่ว่า

ก้าวหน้าในประเทศไทย ของคอมพิวเตอร์

สะดวกเป็นความจริงที่ว่า 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 สะดวกเป็นที่ท่านเจ้าอักษร

ก้าวการตอบสนองไทยอยู่ นิยามของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทย

หลากหลายสามารถ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 หลากหลาย

ท่านที่พบว่าพฤติกรรมและวิธีการส่งเข้าของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้...

อวดอ้างอิงเพื่อให้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 อวดอ้างอิงเพื่อให้

อวดอ้างอิงเพื่อให้ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 อวดอ้างอิงเพื่อให้

นำเข้ามาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 นำเข้ามาก

ท่านที่พิจารณาต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้มีที่ท่านคิดในทางบวกต่อการไทยพื้นริเริ่มไปข้างหน้า

บอกมาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 บอกมาก

ต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้เข้าใจวิธีการส่งเข้าของไทยโดยทั่วๆไป

ไม่เข้าใจเลย 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 เข้าใจเลย

วิธีการส่งเข้าของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้มีที่ท่านคิดในทางไทยพื้นริเริ่มไปข้างหน้า

เอกลักษณ์มาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 เอกลักษณ์มาก

กิจกรรมของคอมพิวเตอร์ของต้านทานแข็งแกร่งไทยและนี้ 2 คนมีที่ท่านคิดในทางไทยพื้นริเริ่มไปข้างหน้า

เอกลักษณ์มาก 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 เอกลักษณ์มาก
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คำถามที่ 2

กรุณาระบุอายุของท่าน

[ ] 20 ปีหรือต่ำกว่า
[ ] 21-30 ปี
[ ] 31-40 ปี
[ ] 41-50 ปี
[ ] 51 ปีขึ้นไป

กรุณาระบุเขตที่อยู่ของท่าน [ ] จังหวัด [ ] อำเภอ

ผู้มีสิทธิ์ที่จะทำให้มัตรตั้งคือ...

[ ] ค่าร่วมประกันภัย
[ ] ประกันภัย (ราคา........................................)
[ ] ประกันภัยไฟ (ราคา........................................)
[ ] ประกันภัยอุบัติ (ราคา........................................)

ท่านมีนักเรียนอยู่หรือไม่? [ ] ใช่ [ ] ไม่ใช่

หากมีนักเรียนอยู่ (ตามเวลาหรือของว่า) กรุณาระบุค่านอนร้องท่านในวันkubectl องค์การ

[ ] ระดับต่ำ
[ ] ระดับปานกลางตอนต่ำ
[ ] ระดับปานกลางตอนสูง
[ ] ระดับสูง
[ ] สถานที่เกิดการ
[ ] อื่นๆ (กรุณาระบุ........................................)
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ประกาศกิจกรรมของบริษัท/องค์การที่ท่านทำงานอยู่คือ...

[ ] ผลิตท่านนั้น
[ ] ผลิตและขาย
[ ] ขาย
[ ] บริการ
[ ] อื่นๆ (กรุณาระบุ..............................................)

ท่านมีประสบการณ์ทำงานนานเท่าไร?
[ ] ไม่มีประสบการณ์
[ ] 5 ปีหรือต่ำกว่า
[ ] 6-10 ปี
[ ] 11-20 ปี
[ ] 21-30 ปี
[ ] มากกว่า 30 ปี

ท่านเคยต่อธุรกรรมหรือต่อธุรกิจกับธนาคารต่างชาติต่อไปนี้บ่อยเท่าไร?

ช่วงระยะเวลาในแวดวงพาณิชย์
ไฟแสCID 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ป่วยมาก
ช่วงระยะเวลา
ไฟแสCID 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ป่วยมาก
ช่วงระยะเวลาในแวดวงธุรกิจธุรกิจ
ไฟแสCID 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ป่วยมาก
อื่นๆ (กรุณาระบุที่เหมาะสม.....................................)
ไฟแสCID 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ป่วยมาก

ท่านมีความรู้ที่สากลหรือตำแหน่งทางการเมืองและวัฒนธรรมของธุรกิจมากเท่าไร?

ไม่มีความรู้โ IDM 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 รู้มาก

ท่านคิดว่าถ้าท่านให้บริการที่ดีกับบริษัทที่มีการบริการที่ดีกับบริษัทที่ดีกี่?

นักธุรกิจไทย 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 นักธุรกิจธุรกิจ
ฝ่ายการเงิน ไว้วางใจก้าว

กรุณาให้ข้อมูลเกี่ยวกับการเงินที่มีปฏิบัติธุรกิจของออมริกาที่ดีที่สุด

ยอดเงินที่ปฏิบัติธุรกิจ 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ยอดเงินที่ปฏิบัติธุรกิจ
ของออมริกาก้าว
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ท่านเคยย้ายติดต่อกับประเทศไทยนานเกิน 1 ปีหรือไม่?

[ ] ไม่เคย
[ ] เคย กรุณาระบุประเทศและระยะเวลาที่ท่านพักอยู่ในแต่ละประเทศ

โดยทั่วไป กรุณาเรียงเรียงตามลำดับของผลการทดสอบไทย

ไทยมีส่วนผสม 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ผลศึกษาที่มีส่วนผสม
เห็นว่ามากเท่ากับ เห็นอย่างมาก

ในแต่ละความมั่นคงและความสมบูรณ์ของชีวิต ท่านมีความมั่นคงในส่วนการต่างประเทศอย่างไรที่เห็นบุคคลไทย?

ไทยมีส่วนผสม 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ผลศึกษาที่มีส่วนผสม
เห็นว่ามากเท่ากับ เห็นอย่างมาก

ในแต่ละระดับชั้นทางวัฒนธรรม ท่านเห็นว่ายอดศึกษาที่ส่วนการต่างประเทศอย่างไร?

ไทยมีส่วนผสม 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ผลศึกษาที่มีส่วนผสม
เห็นว่ามากเท่ากับ เห็นอย่างมาก

ในแต่ละภาษา ท่านเห็นปรากฏการณ์ที่ส่วนการต่างประเทศอย่างไร?

ภาษาไทยมีส่วนผสม 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ผลศึกษาที่มีส่วนผสม

กรุณาระบุว่าท่านเห็นด้วยกับข้อความเหล่านี้มากเท่าไร ไม่มีความระบุถูกหรือคิด เราสนใจในความคิดเห็นที่แท้จริงและตรงไปตรงมาของท่าน

ชื่อสัญญาณที่สูงในบริบทวิชาศึกษาที่ให้ตัวเองมีความสุข

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

ถ้ากลุ่มที่ใช้ข้อชี้แจงไม่ได้ทำหน้าที่ที่ควร ข้อชี้แจงจะออกจากกลุ่มและท่านเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

การมีส่วนพันธุ์ที่ไม่เข้าใจก็กลมกลืนขึ้นไปขึ้นเป็นสิ่งสำคัญ

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

ข้อชี้แจงที่จะมาเป็นพันธุ์ที่สิ้นสุดข้อชี้แจง

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

ข้อชี้แจงที่ใช้พิจารณาของท่านในการตัดสินที่ไม่ได้รับความเห็นใจกับข้อชี้แจง

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

โดยทั่วไป ความเป็นเหตุผลของข้อชี้แจงมีสิทธิ์ที่จะยอมให้ความรู้สึกที่มีกับตัวเองของข้อชี้แจง

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง

หากข้อชี้แจงที่สิ้นสุดข้อชี้แจง ข้อชี้แจงอาจถูกเปลี่ยนเป็นคนไทยเชื้อ

เห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 ไม่มีเห็นด้วยอย่างยิ่ง
ข้อบกพร่องคุณอย่างสูงในความร่วมมือของท่าน
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English Equivalent of the Thai Questionnaire

Note: The item codes are for reference only. They did not appear in the real questionnaire. From pretests, several subjects were confused with the mixed scales (i.e. positive extremes sometimes lying on the left and sometimes lying on the right). So, the scales were rearranged so that all positive extremes fall on one side.

PART I

Suppose you were Khun Wiwat in the story, please answer the following questions. In each question, there are numbers from 1 to 9, with 1 and 9 representing extreme opinions. Please circle the one that represents your opinion or feeling. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your honest and straightforward opinions.

What reactions/ideas went on in your mind while reading the story? Please describe them in details.

What are your impressions of the sales team in the story? Please describe them in details.

How comfortable do you feel with the sales team in the story? [q1attr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very uncomfortable Very comfortable

How interested would you be in dealing with the sales team again? [q2attr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very uninterested Very interested

How much do you like the sales team? [q3attr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Dislike Like very much very much

You feel that this American sales team is...

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 [q4tw]
Very insincere Very sincere

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 [q5tw]
Very untrustworthy Very trustworthy
How high is the chance that you would recommend to your boss that this company be granted the TV component sales contract? [q7outc]

In the future, if your company wants to set up a joint venture with a TV component manufacturer, how high is the chance that you would recommend to your boss that this company be considered? [q8outc]

In the future, if your company wants to make a sales contract on a product which is also in the product line of this company, how high is the chance that you would consider this company? [q9outc]

How much do the behaviors of the American sales team match your expectations of a “typical Thai sales team”? [q10disco]

How much do the behaviors of this American sales team differ from your expectations of a “typical American sales team”? [q11disco]

How much do you expect the American sales team to behave like a Thai sales team? [q12expst]

In your view, the behaviors and the presentation style of the American sales team...

Exhibit 2
In your view, the sales team's behaviors and manners are...

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 [q16evamn] Very presumptuous
Very modest

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 [q17evamn] Insulting you
Respecting you

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 [q18evamn] Very ill-mannered
Very mannerly

In your view, how positive is the American sales team's view of Thai people? [q19posv]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very negative
Very positive

How much does the American sales team truly understand the Thai culture? [q20under]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Not at all
Very much

How similar to the Thai presentation style is the American sales team's presentation? [q21lsipr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very different
Very similar

How similar to the Thai manners and behaviors are the two American salesmen 's manners and behaviors? [q212sibv]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very different
Very similar

How much does the American sales team try to adapt to the Thai culture? [q22attem]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Not at all
Very much

How much do you feel that your cultural identity or your “Thainess” is being shaken by the sales team's behaviors? [q23thr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Not at all
Very much

How much do you feel that the sales team's behaviors are violating or derogating your cultural identity or your “Thainess”? [q24thr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Not at all
Very much

After the presentation, how likely do you feel that the Thai culture is less unique than you had thought? [q25thr]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 Very unlikely
Very likely
PART II

Please indicate your age. [q26age]

[ ] 20 years or less
[ ] 21-30 years
[ ] 31-40 years
[ ] 41-50 years
[ ] over 50 years

Please indicate your nationality.............................................[q27nat]

Please indicate your sex.  [ ] Male  [ ] Female [q28sex0m]

What is your highest education received so far?  [q29edu]

[ ] Lower than bachelor degree
[ ] Bachelor degree (Field of study).................................
[ ] Master degree (Field of study).................................
[ ] Ph.D. (Field of study)...........................................

Are you currently a student?  [ ] Yes.  { } No. [q30stud]

If you are working (full-time or part-time), please indicate your position in the company/organization. [q31pos]

[ ] Junior
[ ] Lower-middle level
[ ] Upper-middle level
[ ] High level
[ ] Owner
[ ] Others (Please indicate).........................

What type of business is your company/organization? [q32btype]

[ ] Manufacturing only
[ ] Manufacturing and sale
[ ] Sale
[ ] Services
[ ] Others (Please indicate).........................

How many years of work experience do you have? [q33wkexp]

[ ] None
[ ] 5 years or less
[ ] 6-10 years
[ ] 11-20 years
[ ] 21-30 years
[ ] more than 30 years

How often have you had contacts or business dealings with the following foreigners?

Americans or Canadians [q34amexp]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Europeans [q35euexp]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Japanese or Korean or Chinese [q36orexp]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Others (Please indicate all)...........................** [q37othexj

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How knowledgeable are you about American customs and culture? [q38amkno]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, how trustworthy are American business people, as compared to Thai business people in general? [q39ameva]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai business people are more trustworthy.</td>
<td>American business people are more trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please compare American and Thai business norms and practices in general? [q40ameva]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai norms and practices are superior.</td>
<td>American norms and practices are superior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever lived outside Thailand for longer than one year? [q41lyab]

[ ] No.
[ ] Yes. Please indicate the countries and the total time that you spent in each country.

Overall, please compare the status of the United States relative to Thailand. [q42a_tov]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand is much higher in status.</td>
<td>The U.S. is much higher in status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of wealth and standards of living, how do you see the status of the United States relative to Thailand? [q43a_twe]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand is much higher in status.</td>
<td>The U.S. is much higher in status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of cultural heritage, how do you see the status of the United States relative to Thailand? [q44a_the]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thailand is much higher in status.</td>
<td>The U.S. is much higher in status.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In terms of language, how do you see the prestige of English relative to Thai language? [q45a_tla]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>English language is much more prestigious.</td>
<td>Thai language is much more prestigious.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[Exhibit\ 2\] 213
Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your honest and straight-forward opinions.

The most important thing in life is to make myself happy. [q46ahedo]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone. [q47gdep]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to have good or harmonious relations with others. [q48harmo]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I prefer to associate with people who are like me. [q49ethno]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I apply my values when judging people who are not in my groups. [q50ethno]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, my Thai nationality has very little to do with how I feel about myself. [q51idst]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If I were to be born again, I would want to be born as a Thai citizen. [q52idst]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I feel good/satisfied about the Thai nationality I belong to. [q53sid]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In general, others respect Thai people. [q54sid]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I often find social occasions upsetting. [q55soanx]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If the chance comes to meet new people, I often take it. [q56soanx]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I can't understand people who risk their necks climbing mountains. [q57sensk]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

I like to explore a strange city or section of town by myself, even if it means getting lost. [q58sensk]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

It is hard for me to see how some things upset people so much. [q59empa]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

I am generally attentive to my inner feelings. [q60prise]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

I am always concerned about what other people think of me. [q61pubse]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

I usually worry about making a good impression. [q62pubse]

1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

What do you think are the main research questions or the main hypotheses of this study? Please make your best guess and describe in details. [q63hgues]

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Other comments.
........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................
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Procedures: This questionnaire consists of a story and questions. The story describes a sales presentation of an American sales team to a Japanese purchasing manager. Suppose you were the purchasing manager in the story, how would you perceive and react to the American sales team? Please give us your honest and straightforward opinions. About fifteen minutes are required. All questions are simple and do not need any hard data or references. Please answer every question and make any assumptions you want.
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The Story in the
Americans Adapting to Japanese: No Adaptation Condition

Note: Partly adapted from the substantial adaptation condition (Japanese adapting to Americans) in Francis (1989).

PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Japan. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Mr. Hiroshi Watanabe, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Mr. Watanabe in Tokyo. Mr. Watanabe is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Mr. Watanabe, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Mr. Watanabe gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in blue suits and blue shirts. One, a bearded man, is about 40 years old; the other about 35.

“Hello, Mr. Smith?” Mr. Watanabe greets the bearded man.

“Hello Mr. Watanabe. Nice to meet you. I'm Michael Smith, East Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries. You can call me Mike.” Mr. Smith shakes Mr. Watanabe's hand very firmly making direct eye contact. He hands a business card with his right hand to Mr. Watanabe and goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

“Hello Mr. Watanabe, Glad to meet you.” Mr. Brown shakes Mr. Watanabe's hand very firmly making direct eye contact. “Just call me Rob.” He too hands Mr. Watanabe his business card.

“Glad to meet you,” says Mr. Watanabe. “Here's my business card.” Mr. Watanabe gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it briefly before putting it in their pockets. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

Mr. Brown shrugs his shoulders while saying, “We had a lousy trip but we made it. We know you're on a tight schedule and so are we. So, we'd like to kick off presentation and see if we can make a go of it. OK?”

“Come on in and have a seat.” Mr. Watanabe walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“No, thanks. As Rob mentioned, we're both on a tight schedule,” replies Mr. Smith while sitting down. Both Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown take documents out of their briefcases.

“I'm looking forward to your proposal. We've heard a lot of good things about your company,” says Mr. Watanabe.

Mr. Smith crosses his legs, jiggles his foot and says, “That's great. We've also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company.”

“Yeah. We're really impressed with the questions you've been asking us in your letters,” says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.
“Good. How would you like to proceed?” Mr. Watanabe asks.

Mr. Smith says, “Hiroshi, we believe the best way to get to the bottom line quickly is to give you a brief overview on ourselves and our products. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in East Asia.”

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Mr. Watanabe.

“I put a lot of heat on our R&D people to make sure the projects flew,” says Mr. Brown, who begins turning his chair back and forth slightly. “We had to bend a few of the company’s rules and throw some noses out of joint, but we always respond to the customers’ needs. We’re really excited at getting the production guys to put robots throughout all our plants. Those little mechanical tin cans are pushing our production capacity up by 25% and our quality has increased by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’ according to our research.”

Mr. Smith leans forward, hits the table with his left palm before saying loudly, “And that’s the bottom line. We can give you a 10% better product than our competitors. Although our price may be a bit higher than our competitors, we’ve beefed up our service so you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries. We’ve pulled out the plugs to build our East Asian service response.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Mr. Watanabe for another 20 minutes. Mr. Brown frequently taps his pen, sighs a few times, occasionally looking at his watch.

Mr. Smith looks at his watch before saying, “Hiroshi, that’s about it. We’re both busy. Do you have any more questions?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Mr. Watanabe.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. “Thanks for your time.” Both of them rise and go to the door.

Mr. Watanabe stands up and says, “Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision.” He gets to the door where Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown are waiting. “It’s a pleasure meeting both of you. Now it’s about lunch time. If you’re free, how about going for a Japanese lunch at a restaurant downstairs?”

“Sorry we’re in a rush now. How about tomorrow dinner?” Mr. Brown asks.

“Fine with me. Let’s meet at the lobby downstairs at seven o’clock, OK?” replies Mr. Watanabe.

“Sure. See you tomorrow.” Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown reach out and shake Mr. Watanabe’s hand firmly before leaving the room.
The Story in the
Americans Adapting to Japanese: Moderate Adaptation Condition

PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Japan. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Mr. Hiroshi Watanabe, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Mr. Watanabe in Tokyo. Mr. Watanabe is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Mr. Watanabe, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Mr. Watanabe gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in blue suits, white shirts, and matching ties. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

"Hello, Mr. Smith?" Mr. Watanabe greets the older member of the sales team.

"Konnichiwa, Watanabe-san. Nice to meet you," says one of the sales people while shaking Mr. Watanabe’s hand very firmly. "I’m Michael Smith, East Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries." He hands a business card with both hands to Mr. Watanabe and goes on to introduce his colleague. "This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown."

"Konnichiwa Watanabe-san. Glad to meet you," says Mr. Brown while shaking Mr. Watanabe’s hand very firmly. He too hands Mr. Watanabe his business card.

"Glad to meet you," says Mr. Watanabe. "Here’s my business card." Mr. Watanabe gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. "Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?"

"We had a terrible trip but we made it." Mr. Brown replies.

"Come on in and have a seat." Mr. Watanabe walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. "Would you like anything to drink?"

"Yes please. Anything would do for us. Arigatoo gozaimasu," says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Mr. Watanabe walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk about other matters for a while before Mr. Watanabe says, "I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve heard a lot of good things about your company,"

Mr. Smith crosses the legs and says, "We’ve also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company."

"Yes. We’re really impressed with the questions you’ve been asking us in your letters," says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

"Good. How would you like to proceed?" Mr. Watanabe asks.
Mr. Smith says “Watanabe-san, what I’d like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in East Asia.”

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Mr. Watanabe.

“I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers’ needs,” says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. “I’m very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’ according to our research.”

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, “And that’s the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we’ve expanded our service in East Asia. So, you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Mr. Watanabe for another 20 minutes. Mr. Brown occasionally glances at his watch.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, “That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Watanabe-san. Do you have any other questions?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Mr. Watanabe.
PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Japan. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Mr. Hiroshi Watanabe, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Mr. Watanabe in Tokyo. Mr. Watanabe is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Mr. Watanabe, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Mr. Watanabe gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in black suits, white shirts, and dark ties. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

"Hello, Mr. Smith?" Mr. Watanabe greets the older member of the sales team.

"Watanabe Buchoo, Hajimemashite, " says the older person while bowing deeply. "I'm Michael Smith, East Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries. Doozo yoroshiku." He hands a business card to Mr. Watanabe with both hands while bowing slightly. Mr. Smith goes on to introduce his colleague. "This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown."

"Hajimemashite." Mr. Brown also bows deeply. "Doozo yoroshiku." Mr. Brown hands Mr. Watanabe his business card in the same manner as Mr. Smith does.

"Hajimemashite," says Mr. Watanabe. "Here's my business card." Mr. Watanabe gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. "Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?"

"The flight was slightly delayed but everything was alright." Mr. Brown replies.

"Come on in and have a seat." Mr. Watanabe walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. "Would you like anything to drink?"

"Yes please. Anything would do for us. Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu," says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Mr. Watanabe walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk about other matters for a while before Mr. Watanabe says, "I'm looking forward to your proposal. We've heard a lot of good things about your company."

Mr. Smith sits in a formal manner and says, "We've also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company."

"Yes. We're really impressed with the questions you've been asking us in your letters," says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

"Good. How would you like to proceed?" Mr. Watanabe asks.

"Buchoo, what I'd like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind
marketing our products in East Asia," Mr. Smith explains.

“What was Rob’s involvement?” asks Mr. Watanabe.

“I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers’ needs,” says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. “I’m very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors’ according to our research.”

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, “And that’s the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we’ve expanded our service in East Asia. So, you’re guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries.”

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Mr. Watanabe for another 20 minutes. Each of them sits calmly while listening attentively to his colleague’s presentation.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, “That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Buchoo. Is there anything you still had questions or concerns about?”

“No, that’s very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions,” answers Mr. Watanabe.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. “Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu.” Both of them rise.

Mr. Watanabe stands up. “Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision.” All three walk to the door. “It’s a pleasure meeting both of you. Now it’s about lunch time. If you’re free, how about going for a Japanese lunch at a restaurant downstairs?”

“Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. Itadakimasu,” replies Mr. Brown.

“We’d better go now before it’s getting too crowded,” Mr. Watanabe suggests while they leave the room.
The Story in the Americans Adapting to Japanese: Substantial Adaptation Using the Native Language Condition

Note: See attached for the English equivalent. All dialogues and descriptions in this version are in Japanese (i.e., a translation of the “substantial adaptation using English” condition, except the first greeting by Mr. Watanabe is in English and there is some probing from Mr. Watanabe on how the American sales team can speak Japanese). To reduce the problem of signaling more familiarity with Japanese culture than in the English speaking versions, the sales team is presented as having an obligation to study Japanese because of the company’s policy.

PDMコーポレーションは、日本の会社で家電製品の大手製造会社です。この会社は、カラーテレビの新型モデルを開発する計画で、構成部品の供給元として、アメリカの供給会社を探しています。渡辺弘氏は、PDMコーポレーションの購買部長で、技術仕様に適合する数社のアメリカの供給会社との会合を予定しています。渡辺氏は、どの供給会社を契約を結ぶべきかについて、明日までに上司に提言をしなくてはなりません。今日は、ニューヨークに本社を有するCommTech産業からのセールスチームが、東京の渡辺氏に対して詳細を示すためにやって来ます。渡辺氏は、英語に適度に流暢で、このセールスチームに、通訳は不要であると伝えてあります。

渡辺氏は45歳で、文献を調べながら会議室に座っています。だれかがノックしました。渡辺氏は席を立ってドアを開けます。すると、黒いスーツに白いシャツと暗色のネクタイといういでたちの二人のアメリカ人ビジネスマンがいます。この二人の一人は40歳前後、もう一人は35歳くらいです。

「Hello, Mr. Smith?」と渡辺氏は年上の方のセールスマネーに英語で挨拶します。

「ワタナベ ブチウ、ハジメマシテ。」と年上の一人が深くお辞儀をしながら言います。「私はマイケル・スミスです。CommTech産業の東アジアの地域販売部長です。どうぞ、よろしく。」とスミス氏が日本語で挨拶、軽くお辞儀をしながら名刺を渡辺氏に手渡します。彼は日本語をかなり流暢に話します。彼の日本語には少し訛りがありますが、意味ははっきり分かります。彼は、彼の同僚の紹介のつもりに移ります。「わたしどもの技術部長のロバート・ブラウンです。」

「ハジメマシテ。」ブラウン氏も深くお辞儀をします。ブラウン氏は渡辺氏にスミス氏がしたのと同じ作法で名刺を手渡します。「ドウゾ、ヨロンク。」ブラウン氏はスミス氏ほどの流暢に日本語を話せませんが、意味は通じます。

「はじめまして。」と渡辺氏が言います。「これが私の名刺です。」渡辺氏はセールスチームの各々に一枚ずつ渡すと、各々はそれを注意深く読んだりから、ポケットにしまいます。「お二人とも日本語が大変上手ですね。どのくらい日本語を勉強していらっしゃるのですか？」

「いいえ、下手ですよ。わが社の方針で、各マネージャーは顧客の貿易商を話せなくてはなりません。私は、日本語を二年間勉強しています。」とスミス氏は応えます。「私は、日本語を話すことを習い始めから、すでに一年以上になります。」とブラウン氏が加えます。

渡辺氏は会話を続けます。「良い旅をなさいましたか？この会社を離なく見つけることができましたか？そうだったとよいのですが。」

「飛行機が少し遅れましたが、すべては順調でした。」ブラウン氏が応えます。
「どうぞ、お入りになって、お席にどうぞ。」渡辺氏は彼の席に戻り、彼に二つの
椅子をすすめます。「何かお飲み物はいかがですか？」
「いただきます。どんなものでもよろしいです。どうも、ありがとうございます。」と
ブラウン氏が言います。渡辺氏が電話をかけて飲料を注文する間に、二人は席に着き、ブ
リーフケースから書類を取り出します。皆はしばらくの間は仕事以外の話を持ちます。する
と、渡辺氏は「私は、貴社の提案を楽しみにしております。私どもは、貴社の良いことを
沢山うかがっております。」と言います。

スミス氏はあらたまった作法で座り、「私どもも貴社の成長についていろいろ良いこと
を聞いております。」と言います。

「はい。私どもは、渡辺部長が手紙の中でお尋ねになった質問に非常に感謝いたしまし
た。」とブラウン氏は、いくつかの文書を彼の前に配置しながら言います。
「それはよかったです。どのように進めましょうか？」と渡辺氏が尋ねます。
「部長、私が最初に、わが社について少し説明をさせていただきます。ロブがわが社の新
技術を概説し、私がサービスと価格について説明をさせていただきます。わが社は、１、５
年間にわたって高品質の製造品を製造してまいりました。私どもが、クォータ期に参
入したのは第四番目でした。私は、東アジアでのわが社の製品のマーケティングを支援し
ました。」とスミス氏は説明します。

「ロブの任務はどのようなものでしょうか？」と渡辺氏がきます。
「私は、研究開発課と緊密な関係を持ちながら仕事をしてきており、顧客のニーズに
あった製品を製造してまいりました。」と、お茶をすすった後にブラウン氏が言いま
す。「私どもは、わが社の製造装置のすべてがロボット化されていることを非常に興に
思っております。ロボットを使用することで、製造能力を２５％増やすことができ、品質を
１０％向上させることができるようになりました。すなわち、わが社の研究によれば、競
合社にくらべてわが社の製造品はより長持ちし、より信頼性があるのです。」

スミス氏は、前にのり车牌強調するように言います。「そして、このことが最も大切
です。わが社は、競合社より１０％高い製品をお渡しできるのです。わが社の価格は少々
高めでしょうが、わが社のサービスは東アジアで抜がってきました。ですから、わが社
は、優れたサービスと信頼できる配送をお約束できます。」

スミス氏とブラウン氏は、価格に関する情報を提示し（これらの価格は、他の供給会社
より約１５％高い）、技術的詳細、支払期間、注文書などを渡辺氏にさらに２０分間に
渡って提示します。チームの各人は、自分の同僚のプレゼンテーションを注意深く聞きな
がら静かに座っています。

お茶を飲み終わると、スミス氏は言います。「以上が我々のお話ししたかったことで
す。部長。まだ、何かご質問やご心配がありますでしょうか。」
「いいえ。これで、全く余すことわらないです。私も貴社の質問にすべてお答えしたこ
とを望みます。」と渡辺氏は応えます。

スミス氏とブラウン氏は、書類をプリーフケースにしまいます。「どうも、ありがとうございます。」二人とも、席をたたきます。

渡辺氏は立ち上がり、「プレゼンテーション、どうも、ありがとうございます。
決定にいたる前には、こちらも、こちらも、今は分析すべき情報が沢山あることと思いま
す。」三人とも扉のほうへ歩いていきます。「お二人にお会いできてよかったです。さて、
今はお昼時ですが、もし、よろしけれたら、隣のレストランで日本料理のお昼はいかが
でしょうか。」

「どうも、ありがとうございます。いただきます。」ブラウン氏が応えます。

渡辺氏は皆で居屋を出ながら「あまり混む前に、今すぐ行きましょう。」と勧めま
す。
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PDM Corporation is a major manufacturer of home electric appliances in Japan. They plan to introduce a new model of color television and are looking for an American supplier for component parts. Mr. Hiroshi Watanabe, the Purchasing Manager of PDM Corporation, has scheduled a meeting with a few American suppliers who meet the technical specifications. He has to make a recommendation to his boss which supplier be granted the contract by tomorrow. Today, a sales team from CommTech Industries, New York Head Office, is coming to present details to Mr. Watanabe in Tokyo. Mr. Watanabe is moderately fluent in English and told the sales team that an interpreter was not necessary.

Mr. Watanabe, aged 45, is sitting in a meeting room reviewing some notes. There is a knock. Mr. Watanabe gets up to open the door for two American businessmen dressed in black suits, white shirts, and dark ties. One of them is about 40 years old, the other about 35.

“Hello, Mr. Smith?” Mr. Watanabe greets the older member of the sales team in English.

“Watanabe Buchoo, Hajimemashite,” says the older person while bowing deeply. “I’m Michael Smith, East Asian Regional Sales Manager from CommTech Industries. Doozo yoroshiku.” Mr. Smith replies in Japanese and hands a business card to Mr. Watanabe with both hands while bowing slightly. He speaks Japanese quite fluently. Although he speaks with a slight accent, it is completely comprehensible. He goes on to introduce his colleague. “This is our Technical Manager, Robert Brown.”

“Hajimemashite.” Mr. Brown also bows deeply. Mr. Brown hands Mr. Watanabe his business card in the same manner as Mr. Smith does. “Doozo yoroshiku.” Mr. Brown speaks Japanese not as well as Mr. Smith does but comprehensible.

“Hajimemashite,” says Mr. Watanabe. “Here’s my business card.” Mr. Watanabe gives one to each of the sales team, who reads it carefully before putting it in their pockets. “You both speak very good Japanese. How long have you been studying Japanese?”

“Iie, heta desu yo. It’s our company’s policy that every manager must be able to speak the clients’ language. I’ve been studying Japanese for over two years,” Mr. Smith replies.

“I’ve been learning speaking Japanese for over a year already,” adds Mr. Brown.

Mr. Watanabe continues the conversation. “Did you have a good trip? No problems finding the office I hope?”

“The flight was slightly delayed but everything was alright.” Mr. Brown replies.

“Come on in and have a seat.” Mr. Watanabe walks back to his seat and directs them to two chairs. “Would you like anything to drink?”

“Itadakimasu. Anything would do for us. Doomo arigato gozaimasu,” says Mr. Brown. Both of them sit down and take their documents out of the briefcases while Mr. Watanabe walks to the phone and orders the drink. They talk about other matters for a while before Mr. Watanabe says, “I’m looking forward to your proposal. We’ve
Mr. Smith sits in a formal manner and says, "We've also heard a lot of good things about the growth of your company."

"Yes. We're really impressed with the questions you've been asking us in your letters," says Mr. Brown while arranging the documents in front of him.

"Good. How would you like to proceed?" Mr. Watanabe asks.

"Buchoo, what I'd like to do first is to tell you a little bit about our company. Rob will review our new technology and I will cover off our servicing and pricing. We have been producing high quality components for 15 years. We were the fourth firm into quartz components. I put the power behind marketing our products in East Asia," Mr. Smith explains.

"What was Rob's involvement?" asks Mr. Watanabe.

"I worked closely with the Research and Development people to produce components which were in line with our customers' needs," says Mr. Brown after sipping the tea. "I'm very pleased to tell you about our robotising of all of our production facilities. With robots we have been able to expand our production capacity by 25% and improve our quality by 10%. That is, our components last longer and are more reliable than our competitors' according to our research."

Mr. Smith leans forward and says emphatically, "And that's the most important. We can give you a 10% better product than other companies. Although our price may be a bit higher, we've expanded our service in East Asia. So, you're guaranteed excellent service and prompt deliveries."

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown present price information (which is about 15% higher than other suppliers), technical details, payment terms, order size, and so on to Mr. Watanabe for another 20 minutes. Each of them sits calmly while listening attentively to his colleague's presentation.

Finishing the tea, Mr. Smith says, "That concludes the information we wanted to cover, Buchoo. Is there anything you still had questions or concerns about?"

"No, that's very thorough. I hope I have also answered all your questions," answers Mr. Watanabe.

Mr. Smith and Mr. Brown put documents back into their briefcases. "Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu." Both of them rise.

Mr. Watanabe stands up. "Thanks for your presentation. I know you and I have a lot of information to analyze now before either of us can make a decision." All three walk to the door. "It's a pleasure meeting both of you. Now it's about lunch time. If you're free, how about going for a Japanese lunch at a restaurant downstairs?"

"Doomo arigatoo gozaimasu. Itadakimasu," replies Mr. Brown.

"We'd better go now before it's getting too crowded," Mr. Watanabe suggests while they leave the room.
Japanese Questionnaire

Note: See attached for the English equivalent of the questionnaire.

パート I

仮に、あなたはこのストーリーの中の渡辺氏だと想像してください。そして、以下の質問にお答えください。各質問には、1から9までの数字があり、1や9は極端な意見を表すものです。あなたの意見をよく表す数字を丸印で囲んでください。ここでは、良い答えも悪い答えはありません。我々は、あなたの正直で率直な意見に関心があります。

このセルフシステムに関するあなたの印象は、どのようなものですか？

このセルフシステムと一緒にいて、どのくらい快適に感じますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

非常に窮屈

非常に快適

このセルフシステムともう一度付き合いに、どのくらい関心がありますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

全く関心がない

非常に関心がある

このセルフシステムにはどのくらい好感がもてますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

非常に嫌い

非常に好き

あなたの感じるところでは、アメリカのセルフシステムは、

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

単に

口先だけそう

非常に誠実そう

全く

信用できない

非常に信用できる

非常に

むら気を起しそう

非常に

行動が予測できる

Exhibit 3
この会社とセールス契約をするようにあなたの上司に勧める確率は、どのくらい高いですか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に低い</td>
<td>非常に高い</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

将来、もしあなたの会社がテレビ部品の製造業者とのジョイント・ベンチャーを設立したいとしたら、あなたの上司にこの会社を勧める確率は、どのくらい高いですか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に低い</td>
<td>非常に高い</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

将来、もしあなたの会社が他の製品に関する販売契約を結ぶことを考え、そして、その製品がこのセールスチームの会社の製品群の一つだとしたら、あなたの上司にこの会社を勧める確率は、どのくらい高いですか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に低い</td>
<td>非常に高い</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

このセールスチームの振舞いは、あなたが期待している「典型的なアメリカのセールスチーム」と、どのくらい異なりますか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に類似</td>
<td>非常に異なる</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

アメリカのセールスチームが、日本のセールスチームと同様の振舞いをすることを、どのくらい期待しますか？

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>全く期待しない</td>
<td>非常に期待する</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

あなたの意見では、このセールスチームの振舞いとプレゼンテーションのスタイルは、

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>日本にいることを反映している</td>
<td>アメリカの文化規範を反映している</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>彼らが日本人を相手にしている</td>
<td>彼らの性格を反映している</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>事実を反映している</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>彼らの努力の結果である</td>
<td>彼らの習慣の結果である</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
あなたの意見では、セールスチールの振舞いと作法は、

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
とても優越だ
todo kan'etsu da

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
あなたを侮辱
したしている
ana to haizuru
sha te itte iru

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
非常に無作法だ
sousai ni wa zuuka da

あなたの意見では、このアメリカのセールスチールの日本人に対する観点は、どのくらい肯定的なものですか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
非常に否定的
sousai ni hyoten teki

このセールスチールは、日本の文化をどれくらい深く理解していると思いますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全く理解
kakko ryouki

このセールスチールのプレゼンテーション・スタイルは日本のスタイルと、どのくらい類似していますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
非常に異なる
sousai ni aramite iru

日本人の作法や振舞いは、二人のセールスマンの作法や振舞いと、どのくらい類似していますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
非常に異なる
sousai ni aramite iru

このセールスチールは日本の文化にどれくらい順応しようとしていますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全く順応しよう
kakko unyu sho you

あなたの文化的自我意識や「日本人であること」がこのセールスチールの振舞いによって侵害されていると、どのくらい感じますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全く感じない
kakko jaeru nai
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このセールスチームの振舞いが、あなたの文化的自我意識や「日本人であること」を侵害している、あるいは、損なっていると、どのくらい感じますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全く感じない 非常に感じる

プレゼンテーションの後、あなたが考えていたより日本文化がユニークな（一意的な）ものでは無いと、どのくらい感じましたか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
そんなことは 非常に
全く感じなかった そう感じた

パート II

以下の質問にお答えください。

あなたの年齢は、

[ ] 20歳以下
[ ] 21歳〜30歳
[ ] 31歳〜40歳
[ ] 41歳〜50歳
[ ] 51歳以上

あなたの国籍は、...................................................

あなたの性別は、 [ ] 男性 [ ] 女性

あなたの最高学歴は、

[ ] 大学の卒業資格が無い
[ ] 大学卒業（学士）（専攻分野は、..............................）
[ ] 大学院修士課程修了（専攻分野は、..............................）
[ ] 大学院博士課程修了（専攻分野は、..............................）

もし働いていらっしゃる場合、組織内のあなたの地位は、

[ ] 下
[ ] 中の下
[ ] 中の上
[ ] 上
[ ] 所有者
[ ] その他（簡単に説明してください：..............................）

何年間働いたことがありますか？

[ ] 全く働いたことがない
[ ] 5年間以下
[ ] 6〜10年間
[ ] 11〜20年間
[ ] 21〜30年間
[ ] 30年間以上
以下の人々との契約を、どのくらい頻繁に行ったことがありますか？

アメリカ人やカナダ人と、

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全都約束した 非常に頻繁に
ことが無い 契約する

ヨーロッパ人と、

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全都約束した 非常に頻繁に
ことが無い 契約する

韓国人や中国人と、

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全都約束した 非常に頻繁に
ことが無い 契約する

その他の人々と、（すべて示してください： ..............................）

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全都約束した 非常に頻繁に
することが無い 契約する

アメリカの習慣と文化について、どれくらいよく知っていますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
全く知らない 非常によく知っている

あなたの経験では、ビジネスに従事する日本人と比べて、ビジネスに従事するアメリカ人は、一般的にどのくらい信頼できますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本人ビジネスマン アメリカ人ビジネスマン
の方が信頼できる の方が信頼できる

アメリカのビジネス規範と習慣を、日本のそれと一般的に比べてください。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本の 規範と習慣の方が
規範と習慣の方が
優れている
一年以上日本の国外に住んだ経験がありますか？

[ ] いいえ。
[ ] はい。それは、どの国々ですか？また、それらの国々に各々合計で何年間暮らしましたか？

一般的に、アメリカ合衆国と日本の地位を比べてください。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本の地位の方向がかなり高い 合衆国の地位の方向がかなり高い

富と生活水準について、日本に比べて合衆国の水準はどうだと思いますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本の方がはるかに高い 合衆国の方がはるかに高い

文化的遺産について、日本に比べて合衆国の水準はどうだと思いますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本の方がはるかに高い 合衆国の方がはるかに高い

言語について、日本に比べて合衆国の水準はどうだと思いますか？

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
日本語の方が威信がある 英語の方が威信がある

以下の各々の意見について、どのくらい賛成するかを示してください。

人生で最も大切なことは、自分が幸福になることだ。

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
非常に賛成 非常に反対
もしグループが私をスローダウンさせているならば、グループを去って一人で働いた方がよい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

他人との良い関係を調和のとれた関係をもつことは重要である。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

私のグループに属しない人々を判断する場合に、私は自分の価値観を適用する。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

全体的に、私が日本国籍をもっていることは、私が私自身についてどう感じるかということにはほとんど関係ない。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

もし生まれ変わることができるとしたら、再び日本の市民として生まれたい。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

私の属する日本国籍について良い感じがある。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

一般的に、他の人々は日本人を敬っている。

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>非常に賛成</td>
<td>非常に反對</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

この研究が主に問題にしていることや、この研究の主な仮説は、どんなものだと思いますか？


その他のコメントをどうぞ。
English Equivalent of the Japanese Questionnaire

PART I

Suppose you were Mr. Watanabe in the story, please answer the following questions. In each question, there are numbers from 1 to 9, with 1 and 9 representing extreme opinions. Please circle the one that represents your opinion. There are no right or wrong answers. We are interested in your honest and straightforward opinions.

What are your impressions of the sales team?

How comfortable do you feel with the sales team?

How interested would you be in dealing with the sales team again?

How much do you like the sales team?

You feel that this American sales team is...

How high is the chance that you would recommend to your boss that this company be granted the sales contract?
In the future, if your company wants to set up a joint venture with a TV component manufacturer, how high is the chance that you would recommend to your boss that this company be considered?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very low Very high

In the future, if your company wants to make a sales contract on a product which is also in the product line of this company, how high is the chance that you would consider this company?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very low Very high

How much do the behaviors of this sales team differ from your expectations of a “typical American sales team”?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very similar. Very different.

How much do you expect the American sales team to behave like a Japanese sales team?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Do not expect any Expect a lot

In your view, the behaviors and the presentation style of the sales team...

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Reflect being in Japan. Reflect American cultural norms.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Reflect the fact that they are dealing with a Japanese. Reflect their character.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Are a result of effort. Are a result of habit.

In your view, the sales team’s behaviors and manners are...

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very presumptuous Very modest

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Insulting you Respecting you

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very ill-mannered Very mannerly

In your view, how positive is the American sales team’s view of Japanese people?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very negative Very positive

How much does the sales team truly understand the Japanese culture?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not at all Very much
How similar to the Japanese presentation style is the sales team's presentation?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very different Very similar

How similar to the Japanese manners and behaviors are the two American salesmen's manners and behaviors?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very different Very similar

How much does the sales team try to adapt to the Japanese culture?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not at all Very much

How much do you feel that your cultural identity or your "Japaneseness" is being shaken by the sales team's behaviors?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not at all Very much

How much do you feel that the sales team's behaviors are violating or derogating your cultural identity or your "Japaneseness"?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Not at all Very much

After the presentation, how likely do you feel that the Japanese culture is less unique than you had thought?

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Very unlikely Very likely

PART II

Please indicate:

your age.

[ ] 20 years or less
[ ] 21-30 years
[ ] 31-40 years
[ ] 41-50 years
[ ] over 50 years

your nationality...........................................

your sex. [ ] Male [ ] Female

your highest education received so far.

[ ] Lower than bachelor degree
[ ] Bachelor degree (Field of study)........................
[ ] Master degree (Field of study)........................
[ ] Ph.D. (Field of study)................................

If you are working, please indicate your position in the organization.

[ ] Junior
[ ] Lower-middle level
[ ] Upper-middle level
[ ] High level
[ ] Owner
[ ] Others (Please indicate)..............................
How many years of work experience do you have?

[ ] None
[ ] 5 years or less
[ ] 6-10 years
[ ] 11-20 years
[ ] 21-30 years
[ ] more than 30 years

How often have you had contacts with the following?

**Americans or Canadians**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Europeans**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Korean or Chinese**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Others (Please indicate all).................................**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Never before</td>
<td>Very often</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

How knowledgeable are you about American customs and culture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not at all</td>
<td>Very knowledgeable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In your opinion, how trustworthy are American business people, as compared to Japanese business people in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese business people are more trustworthy.</td>
<td>American business people are more trustworthy.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please compare American and Japanese business norms and practices in general?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese norms and practices are superior.</td>
<td>American norms and practices are superior.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Have you ever lived outside Japan for longer than one year?

[ ] No.
[ ] Yes. Please indicate the countries and the total time that you spent in each country.

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

---

*Exhibit 3* 238
Overall, please compare the status of the United States relative to Japan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. is much higher in status.

In terms of wealth and standards of living, how do you see the status of the United States relative to Japan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. is much higher in status.

In terms of cultural heritage, how do you see the status of the United States relative to Japan?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japan is</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>much higher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in status</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The U.S. is much higher in status.

In terms of language, how do you see the prestige of English relative to Japanese language?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Japanese language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>English language</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>is much more</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>prestigious</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please indicate how much you agree with the following statements.

The most important thing in life is to make myself happy.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a group is slowing me down, it is better to leave it and work alone.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It is important to have good or harmonious relations with others.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I apply my values when judging people who are not in my groups.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall, my Japanese nationality has very little to do with how I feel about myself.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If I were to be born again, I would want to be born as a Japanese citizen.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I feel good about the Japanese nationality I belong to.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

In general, others respect Japanese people.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9
Strongly agree Strongly disagree

What do you think are the main research questions or the main hypotheses of this study?

........................................................................................................................................
........................................................................................................................................

Other comments.
### TABLE 1
Gross National Product and Balance of Payment of the U.S.A., Japan, and Thailand

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>U.S.A.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP (1)</td>
<td>4,277,800</td>
<td>4,544,500</td>
<td>4,908,200</td>
<td>5,248,200</td>
<td>5,524,600</td>
<td>5,737,100</td>
<td>6,045,800</td>
<td>6,378,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2)</td>
<td>240.68</td>
<td>242.84</td>
<td>245.06</td>
<td>247.34</td>
<td>249.92</td>
<td>252.18</td>
<td>255.02</td>
<td>257.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GNP (3)</td>
<td>18,714</td>
<td>20,029</td>
<td>21,219</td>
<td>22,105</td>
<td>22,105</td>
<td>22,105</td>
<td>22,105</td>
<td>22,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall balance (1)</td>
<td>-33,780</td>
<td>-56,860</td>
<td>-36,270</td>
<td>16,930</td>
<td>-29,810</td>
<td>-21,780</td>
<td>-42,060</td>
<td>-67,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP (4)</td>
<td>335,838</td>
<td>350,479</td>
<td>373,731</td>
<td>399,046</td>
<td>427,469</td>
<td>454,487</td>
<td>468,118</td>
<td>473,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yen/U.S. Dollar</td>
<td>168.52</td>
<td>144.64</td>
<td>128.15</td>
<td>137.96</td>
<td>144.79</td>
<td>134.71</td>
<td>126.65</td>
<td>111.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2)</td>
<td>121.49</td>
<td>122.09</td>
<td>122.61</td>
<td>123.12</td>
<td>123.54</td>
<td>124.34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GNP (3)</td>
<td>16,403</td>
<td>19,847</td>
<td>23,786</td>
<td>23,493</td>
<td>23,898</td>
<td>27,226</td>
<td>29,726</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade balance (1)</td>
<td>92,820</td>
<td>96,420</td>
<td>95,000</td>
<td>76,890</td>
<td>63,580</td>
<td>103,090</td>
<td>132,400</td>
<td>141,570</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall balance (1)</td>
<td>14,840</td>
<td>37,940</td>
<td>16,520</td>
<td>-12,760</td>
<td>-6,590</td>
<td>-6,630</td>
<td>630</td>
<td>27,660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thailand</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GNP (5)</td>
<td>1,072,900</td>
<td>1,230,800</td>
<td>1,482,200</td>
<td>1,752,600</td>
<td>2,030,100</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% change</td>
<td>14.7</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Population (2)</td>
<td>52.51</td>
<td>53.43</td>
<td>54.33</td>
<td>55.21</td>
<td>56.08</td>
<td>56.92</td>
<td>57.76</td>
<td>58.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Per capita GNP (3)</td>
<td>777</td>
<td>896</td>
<td>1,079</td>
<td>1,235</td>
<td>1,415</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade balance (1)</td>
<td>388</td>
<td>-424</td>
<td>-2,074</td>
<td>-2,916</td>
<td>-6,751</td>
<td>-5,989</td>
<td>-4,155</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall balance (1)</td>
<td>714</td>
<td>945</td>
<td>2,596</td>
<td>5,029</td>
<td>3,235</td>
<td>4,618</td>
<td>2,925</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(1) In millions of US$ at current prices. (2) In millions. (3) In US$. (4) In billions of Yen at current prices. (5) In millions of Baht at current prices.

**TABLE 2**

A Comparison of Key Attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fatalism.</td>
<td>Man has dominion over nature and is in control of his or her life (Donald Wehrung, personal discussion).</td>
<td>View life as ephemeral and fatalistic but young generation holds more positive and aggressive attitudes toward life (Young and Nakajima-Okano 1985).</td>
<td>Fatalistic (Komin 1990), believe in supernatural (Komin 1990).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Familialism.</td>
<td>Low collective responsibility for members of the family (Young and Nakajima-Okano 1984).</td>
<td>High collective responsibility for members of the family (Young and Nakajima-Okano 1984).</td>
<td>High collective responsibility for members of the family.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 2
A Comparison of Key Attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rhetorical styles.</td>
<td>Like to use explicit words (Condon and Yousef 1975; Mead 1994), oversimplification, square words with square logic (Condon and Yousef 1975).</td>
<td>Like to use implicit and ambiguous words (Condon and Yousef 1975; Hirokawa 1987; Jorden and Noda 1990; Okabe 1987), understatement and hesitation rather than superlative expressions. Like to use round words with round logic (Condon and Yousef 1975).</td>
<td>Like to use implicit and ambiguous words to avoid bluntness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preference for formal contracts.</td>
<td>Take formal contracts seriously (Fisher 1980).</td>
<td>Prefer to operate on the basis of understanding and social trust (Fisher 1980; Hall and Hall 1987; Johnson, Sakano, and Onzo 1990).</td>
<td>Both trust and formal contracts are used for serious matters. Formal contracts can be waived when trust is present.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obedience to social norms that restrict freedom of behaviors.</td>
<td>Less tolerant (relative to Japanese) of social norms that restrict freedom of behaviors (Iwata 1991).</td>
<td>Endorse social norms that restrict freedom of behaviors (Iwata 1991), and that regulate conflicts (Argyle 1986; Argyle et al. 1986).</td>
<td>Prefer loose control and discipline, as reflected in the saying <em>Tham Arai Taamjai Khue Thai Thae</em> (=Doing anything at one's own will is authentic Thai).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monochronic time.</td>
<td>Monochronic time (do one thing at a time) (Hall and Hall 1987).</td>
<td>Polychronic time in interpersonal relations (do many things and be involved with many people at once) but monochronic in dealing with foreigners and in the use of technology (Hall and Hall 1987).</td>
<td>Relatively polychronic in interpersonal relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings.</td>
<td>Firm handshaking with direct eye contact (Axtell 1990b).</td>
<td>Bow. The deeper the bow, the more deference shown to the receiver of the bow (Hall and Hall 1987). Bow in the first meeting as well as daily meeting.</td>
<td><em>Wai</em>, the higher the hands the more respect shown (Axtell 1991; Manickavasagom 1986) but fingertips not raised higher than the face (Axtell 1991). <em>Wai</em> is usually performed by a lower status person to a higher status one in the first and subsequent meeting but can be omitted in daily contact within an organization.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attributes</td>
<td>American</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Style of Address.</strong></td>
<td>Titles are given less importance (Mead 1994). Use last name in formal relationships. Quickly switch to the use of first names (Axtell 1990a).</td>
<td>By last name plus honorifics; if the addressee possesses a title, he or she should be referred to by the title (Living Japanese for Business 1986). First names are used only in a close relationship and in a family when the addressee is younger than the speaker (Jorden and Noda 1987).</td>
<td>In addressing older people or unfamiliar people, an honorific Khun or some kinds of kinship terms or a title (followed by first name or omitting first name) is used; or else it can be offensive. In addressing people of lower seniority or status, Khun can be dropped. Among friends only first name or nick-name is usually used. Different rules apply to addressing the Royal Family, monks, high-ranking elites. The only commonality is Thais do not address each other by last name.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Customs in body language.</strong></td>
<td>Maintain large personal space (Axtell 1994). Avoid body contact when greeting men, e.g., hugs, kissing (Axtell 1990a). Middle-class Americans touch quite frequently (Goffman 1971). Touching between people of the same gender has sexual and intimacy connotations (Argyle 1988) and is disliked, especially if the person is a stranger and if the touch is in an intimate area. Women dislike being touched by strangers but men accept touch from female strangers (Heslin and Alper 1983).</td>
<td>Avoid touching (Axtell 1991, Barmlund 1975), spatial intimacy, public kissing, showing of an open mouth, standing with hands in the pockets, excessively demonstrative behaviors, blowing the nose in public, slouching, leaning back in a tipped chair (Axtell 1991). Young Japanese women touch each other frequently and there is a lot of touching when influenced by alcohol. In private there is a lot of touching (Ramsey 1984).</td>
<td>Avoid touching one’s head (Axtell 1990a; Manickavasagom 1986; Tilleke &amp; Gibbins R.O.P. 1989), pointing to anything with the foot (Axtell 1991; Tilleke &amp; Gibbins 1989, R.O.P. 1989), loud talk, excessive and demonstrative gestures, pointing to a person with one finger, talking with someone with hands in the pockets (Axtell 1991). Touching between people of the same gender is seen as friendly and has no sexual implications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Facial expression.</strong></td>
<td>The rapid eyebrow flash which is considered a universal sign of greeting or friendly attention (Eibl-Eibesfeldt 1972) is not common (Keating et al. 1981). Have different ways of showing emotion from Japanese (Seaford 1978).</td>
<td>Do not show negative emotions because it would result in loss of face for others (Argyle 1988). Fear and feel ashamed of a look of contempt (Izard 1979).</td>
<td>A lowered brow is not seen as dominant. A raised brow is seen as unhappy (Keating et al. 1981).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Posture.</strong></td>
<td>The friendly-hostile dimension of posture is more important than the dominant-submissive dimension (Kudoh and Matsumoto 1985).</td>
<td>The dominant-submissive dimension of posture is more important than the friendly-hostile dimension (Kudoh and Matsumoto 1985).</td>
<td>The dominant-submissive dimension of posture is more important than the friendly-hostile dimension.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
TABLE 2
A Comparison of Key Attributes of American, Japanese, and Thai Cultures

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attributes</th>
<th>American</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
<th>Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Vocalization.</td>
<td>Speak loudly with a low fundamental frequency and a low pitch range (Scherer 1979).</td>
<td>Modify the vocal style according to the gender and status of the other. Distinguish eight tones of voice (Morsbach 1973).</td>
<td>Modify the vocal style according to the status of the other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal relationships.</td>
<td>Short acquaintance time is needed before doing business (Mead 1994).</td>
<td>Longer acquaintance time is needed to do business (Mead 1994).</td>
<td>Longer acquaintance time is needed to do business (Mead 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business practices.</td>
<td>Promotion based on ability to make decisions and to take responsibility with or without consulting one’s associates (Hall and Hall 1987). Short business lunch is common but the business dinner rare (Hall and Hall 1987). Expect decisions to be made quickly (Hall and Hall 1987; Tilleke &amp; Gibbins R.O.P. 1989). Memos are sent before personal discussion (Mead 1994).</td>
<td>Paternalistic and wholistic approach to employees (Komin 1990), life-long employment (Komin 1990; Mead 1994). Promotion based on persistence, dependability, hard work, loyalty, courtesy, and ability to work well in groups (Hall and Hall 1987). Decision making by consensus among all parties involved (Hall and Hall 1987; Jorden and Noda 1987). Relaxing with clients or colleagues after work is crucial (Hall and Hall 1987). Gifts are frequently given at first business meetings (Axtell 1990a). Personal connections are very crucial for success (Axtell 1989; Hall and Hall 1987; Jorden and Noda 1990).</td>
<td>Promotion based on reciprocal relation of loyalty and trust with senior mentors, performance, and capability (Doing Business in Thailand 1987). Personal connections are very crucial for success (Doing Business in Thailand 1987; Komin 1990; Tilleke &amp; Gibbins R.O.P. 1989; Vichit-Vadakan 1989). Discuss before memos are made (Mead 1994).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


TABLE 3
Aspects of Cultural Adaptation of Americans Adapting to Thais Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>No Adaptation</th>
<th>Moderate Adaptation</th>
<th>Substantial Adaptation Using English¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Language</td>
<td>English as used with native English speakers. Lots of idioms. No Thai phrases.</td>
<td>Simplified English. No idioms.</td>
<td>Same as in moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manners</td>
<td>Time-conscious, signs of impatience, expressive manners.</td>
<td>Less time-conscious, fewer signs of impatience, less expressive manners.</td>
<td>No signs of impatience, restrained manners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greetings and gratitude</td>
<td>American style.</td>
<td>Mixture of American manners and Thai phrases. Regular style in exchanging business cards.²</td>
<td>Thai style both in manners and phrases. Modest style in exchanging business cards.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>expression</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>Blue Western suits and blue shirts.</td>
<td>Blue Western suits and white shirts.</td>
<td>Thai suit (i.e. “Chut Phra Rachatan” which is quite common among Thai males in formal occasions or in a workplace).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial relationship creation</td>
<td>Getting to business immediately.</td>
<td>Spend time in building initial relationship before getting to business.</td>
<td>Same as in the moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to invitation for</td>
<td>Refuse the invitation for drink.</td>
<td>Accept the offer for drink.</td>
<td>Accept both invitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>drink and lunch</td>
<td>Refuse the invitation for lunch but ask for another occasion.</td>
<td>Refuse invitation for lunch but ask for another occasion.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of address</td>
<td>Address the purchasing manager by last name. Switch to first name later ⁴.</td>
<td>Address the purchasing manager as “Khun Wiwat.”</td>
<td>Same as in the moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
<td>One member of the sales team is bearded.</td>
<td>Neither members is bearded. ⁵</td>
<td>Same as in the moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The story used in the substantial adaptation using the Thai language condition is translated from the one in the substantial adaptation using English condition, together with some probing of how the Americansales team can speak Thai.

² The Thai custom in business card exchange happens to be the same as the American way. That is, hand the card with one hand, usually with the right hand. This is referred to as a regular style here. However, with the left hand touching near the right elbow while handing the card will signify a high degree of modesty and deference to the recipient. This is referred to as a modest style here and is used in the substantial adaptation condition.

³ According to Graham and Herberger (1983), in the U.S. looking at the time usually speeds up things but in many countries, time is spent in developing trust before starting business matters.

⁴ In addressing older people or unfamiliar people, an honorific Khun or some kinds of kinship terms or a title (followed by first name or omitting first name) is used; or else it can be offensive. In addressing people of lower seniority or status, Khun can be dropped. Among friends only the first name or nick-name is usually used. Different rules apply to addressing the Royal Family, monks, high-ranking elites. The only commonality is that Thais do not address each other by last name.

⁵ It is much less common for Thai males than American males to keep a beard and mustache.
### TABLE 4
Aspects of Cultural Adaptation of Americans Adapting to Japanese Conditions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect</th>
<th>No Adaptation</th>
<th>Moderate Adaptation</th>
<th>Substantial Adaptation Using English&lt;sup&gt;1&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manners</td>
<td>Time-conscious, signs of impatience, expressive manners.</td>
<td>Less time-conscious, fewer signs of impatience, less expressive manners.</td>
<td>No signs of impatience, restrained manners.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dress</td>
<td>Blue Western suits and blue shirts.</td>
<td>Blue Western suits and white shirts.</td>
<td>Black Western suits with white shirts and dark ties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Initial relationship creation&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Getting to business immediately.</td>
<td>Spend time in building initial relationship before getting to business.</td>
<td>Same as in the moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Response to invitation for drink and lunch</td>
<td>Refuse the offer for drink. Refuse invitation for lunch but asks for another occasion.</td>
<td>Accept the offer for drink. Refuse invitation for lunch but asks for another occasion.</td>
<td>Accept both invitations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style of address</td>
<td>Address the purchasing manager as Mr. Watanabe. Switch to first name later&lt;sup&gt;3&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td>Address the purchasing manager as “Watanabe-san.”</td>
<td>Address the purchasing manager by title: Buchoo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physical appearance</td>
<td>One member of the sales team is bearded.</td>
<td>Neither members of the sales team is bearded&lt;sup&gt;4&lt;/sup&gt;.</td>
<td>Same as in the moderate adaptation.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>1</sup> The story used in the substantial adaptation using the Japanese language condition is translated from the one in the substantial adaptation using English condition, together with some probing of how the American sales team can speak Japanese.

<sup>2</sup> According to Graham and Herberger (1983), in the U.S. looking at the time usually speeds up things but in many countries, time is spent in developing trust before starting business matters.

<sup>3</sup> Japanese tend to utilize roles for address and third-person reference. Kinship terms (e.g. daughter), professions (e.g. book dealer), and ranks (e.g. section chief) are common designations for the ‘you’ and ‘s/he’ of a conversation (Jorden and Noda 1987). In business, if a person has a title, he or she should be referred to by it, rather than by -san (= Mr., Miss, Ms., Mrs.) (Living Japanese for Business 1986). While Japanese adapt to many Westerners’ use of first names when interacting with Westerners, within their own society they prefer the use of last names. Japanese is not a society that uses given names casually (Axtell 1991; Hall and Hall 1987; Jorden and Noda 1987). While women use and are addressed by given names more commonly than men, the use is limited among close relationships. In a family, only those younger than the speaker are addressed by their given names (Jorden and Noda 1987). Personal names are hardly used in the business world regardless of how close the relationship is, as children in Japan call each other by family names (with the addition of -san or -kun) from junior high school (Living Japanese for Business 1986).

<sup>4</sup> It is much less common for Japanese males than American males to keep a beard and mustache.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (TNo) (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (TMd) (n=4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using English (TSubEng) (n=2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using the native language (TSubNve) (n=3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>4.05 (1.96)</td>
<td>4.27 (0.52)</td>
<td>5.82 (4.14)</td>
<td>4.95 (1.13)</td>
<td>2.73 (0.90)</td>
<td>3.73 (1.27)</td>
<td>2.18 (0.98)</td>
<td>3.27 (1.68)</td>
<td>5.82 (0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One-tailed t-test on the grand mean whether different from 4</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>p &lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td>p &lt; .1</td>
<td>p &lt; .0001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Result</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 5

Group Means of Pre-tested Thai Subjects' Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Adaptation with One's Own Culture</th>
<th>Ethnocentrism</th>
<th>Strength of Identification</th>
<th>Social Identity</th>
<th>Social Anxiety</th>
<th>Sensation Seeking</th>
<th>Empathic Tendency</th>
<th>Private Self-Consciousness</th>
<th>Public Self-Consciousness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (TNo) (n=2)</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>6.50</td>
<td>3.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (TMod) (n=4)</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>4.75</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using English (TSubEng) (n=2)</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using the native language (TSubNve) (n=3)</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>5.17</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Mean (Std. Dev.)</td>
<td>4.23 (1.47)</td>
<td>4.41 (1.33)</td>
<td>5.05 (1.39)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.41)</td>
<td>5.36 (1.43)</td>
<td>4.64 (1.86)</td>
<td>5.27 (1.19)</td>
<td>4.55 (1.37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Result</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td>p &lt; .1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. Scores range from 1 to 7.
2 Scores lower than 4 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as higher in status than Americans. Scores equal to 4 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as comparable in status to Americans. Scores higher than 4 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as lower in status than Americans.
3 Scores higher than 4 indicate more collectivism; scores lower than 4 indicate more individualism (characterized by high hedonism, high self-reliance, and low emphasis on interpersonal harmony).
## TABLE 6

### Group Means of Pretest Results of Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Adaptation</th>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Perceived Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Disconfirmation of American Stereotypes</th>
<th>Situational Attribution</th>
<th>Perceived Compliment to the Native Culture</th>
<th>Perceived Threat to Social Identity</th>
<th>Manipulation Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (TNo) (n=2)</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.83</td>
<td>3.75</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (TMod)</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.18</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using English (TSubEng) (n=2)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.50</td>
<td>3.25</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>4.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using the native language (TSubNve) (n=3)</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Result</td>
<td>p &lt; .1</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>p &lt; .05</td>
<td>n.a.</td>
<td>p &lt; .01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 level</td>
<td>TSubNve &gt; TNo</td>
<td>TNo &gt; TSubEng</td>
<td>TSubEng &gt; TMod</td>
<td>TSubNve &gt; TNo</td>
<td>TSubEng &gt; TMod</td>
<td>TSubNve &gt; TMod</td>
<td>TSubEng &gt; TNo</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. Scores range from 1 to 7.
2. Sample size in this condition is either three or four due to missing data. The n is therefore put below the group mean of each variable.

2 Sample size in this condition is either three or four due to missing data. The n is therefore put below the group mean of each variable.
TABLE 7
Group Means of Pretest Results of Japanese Subjects *

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level of Adaptation</th>
<th>Attraction</th>
<th>Perceived Trustworthiness</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
<th>Disconfirmation of American Stereotypes</th>
<th>Situational Attribution</th>
<th>Perceived Compliment to the Native Culture</th>
<th>Perceived Threat to Social Identity</th>
<th>Manipulation Check</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>None (JNo) (n=3)</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>1.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate (JMod) (n=3)</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>6.77</td>
<td>6.33</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>5.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using English (JSubEng) (n=2)</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.67</td>
<td>5.33</td>
<td>6.22</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>6.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substantial using the native language (JSubNve) (n=3)</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>6.67</td>
<td>7.00</td>
<td>3.67</td>
<td>6.11</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>2.22</td>
<td>7.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANOVA Result</td>
<td>p = .11</td>
<td>p = .21</td>
<td>p = .13</td>
<td>p = .86</td>
<td>p = .10</td>
<td>p = .01</td>
<td>p = .61</td>
<td>p = .0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JMod &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JMod &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JMod &gt; JNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JSubEng &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JSubEng &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JSubEng &gt; JNo</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>JSubNve &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JSubNve &gt; JNo</td>
<td>JSubNve &gt; JMod</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. Scores range from 1 to 9.
TABLE 8
Distribution of Thai and Japanese Subjects’ Awareness of Hypotheses by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Awareness Level</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Innocent</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>35.5</td>
<td>47.2</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>56.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>17.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having some clues regarding objectives or independent variables.</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guessing objectives or independent variables correctly.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No answer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>32.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>18.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = n.s.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items in the Scale</th>
<th>Mean/Max/Min Inter-item Corr.</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>q1attr, q2attr, q3attr</td>
<td>.73/.84/65</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness</td>
<td>q4tw, q5tw, q6tw</td>
<td>.52/.81/37</td>
<td>.76</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>q7oute, q8oute, q9oute</td>
<td>.81/.85/78</td>
<td>.93</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>q1attr, q2attr, q3attr, q4tw, q5tw, q6tw, q7oute, q8oute, q9oute</td>
<td>.62/.85/27</td>
<td>.94</td>
<td>Average of the nine items, all of which loaded on Component 1.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes</td>
<td>q1disco</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for the Americans to adapt</td>
<td>q12expst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational attribution</td>
<td>q15situ, q14situ, q15situ</td>
<td>.73/.75/.69</td>
<td>.89</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived compliment to the native culture</td>
<td>q16evann, q17evann, q18evann, q19posv, q20under</td>
<td>.64/.78/.54</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>Average of the five items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived respectfulness</td>
<td>q13situ, q14situ, q15situ, q16evann, q17evann, q18evann, q19posv, q20under</td>
<td>.59/.78/.43</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>Average of the eight items, all of which loaded on Component 2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check of cultural adaptation</td>
<td>q211sipr, q212sibv, q22attem</td>
<td>.72/.84/.66</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat to social identity</td>
<td>q23thr, q24thr, q25thr</td>
<td>.53/.85/35</td>
<td>.78</td>
<td>Average of the three items, all of which loaded on Component 3.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to foreign culture</td>
<td>q34amexp, q35euexp, q36orexp, q37othex, rtyab</td>
<td>.27/.60/.06</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td>Average of the five items. The item rtyab was obtained by recoding years spent abroad into nine categories: 0 yr=1, 0.1 to 1 yr =2, 1.1 to 2 yrs =3, 2.1 to 3 yrs =4, 3.1 to 4 yrs =5, 4.1 to 5 yrs =6, 5.1 to 6 yrs =7, 6.1 to 7 yrs =8, more than 7 yrs =9.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to American culture</td>
<td>q34amexp, q38amkno, rynam</td>
<td>.51/.62/.39</td>
<td>.74</td>
<td>Average of the three items. The item rynam was obtained by recoding years spent in North America into nine categories: 0 yr=1, 0.1 to 1 yr =2, 1.1 to 2 yrs =3, 2.1 to 3 yrs =4, 3.1 to 4 yrs =5, 4.1 to 5 yrs =6, 5.1 to 6 yrs =7, 6.1 to 7 yrs =8, more than 7 yrs =9.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 9
Reliability of the Scales in the Thai and Japanese Experiments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items in the Scale</th>
<th>Mean/Max/Min Inter-item Corr.</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices</td>
<td>q39ameva, q40ameva</td>
<td>.41/.41/.41</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>Average of the two items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Overall</td>
<td>q42a_tov</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The mean inter-item corr. among the four items (q42a_tov, q43a_twe, q44a_thc, q45a_tla) was very low (.04 for the Thais and .12 for the Japanese) with alpha coefficient of .12 for the Thais and .34 for the Japanese. So, this construct was deemed to be composed of various aspects which need not be correlated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Wealth</td>
<td>q43a_twe</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Cultural heritage</td>
<td>q44a_thc</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Language</td>
<td>q45a_tla</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Nonhedonism</td>
<td>q46nethdo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>The mean inter-item corr. among the three items of collectivism (q46nethdo, q47gdep, q48harmo) was very low (.04 for the Thais and .00 for the Japanese) with alpha coefficient of .20 for the Thais and .10 for the Japanese. So, this construct was broken down into distinct aspects (c.f. Schwartz's (1990) criticism of the individualism-collectivism dichotomy).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Group dependence</td>
<td>q47gdep</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Harmony orientation</td>
<td>q48harmo</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>q50ethno</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>In the Thai study, the mean inter-item corr. between q49ethno and q50ethno was low (.17) with alpha coefficient of .30. Item q50ethno was chosen for its closer meaning to this construct.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of identification with one's own culture</td>
<td>q51idst</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>q52idst, q53sid, q54sid</td>
<td>.46/.68/.29</td>
<td>.72</td>
<td>Average of the three items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety</td>
<td>q55soanx, q56soanx</td>
<td>.29/.29/.29</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>Average of the two items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Mountain climb</td>
<td>q57senak</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>In the Thai study, the mean inter-item corr. between q57senak and q58senak was low (.17) with alpha coefficient of .29. So, the measure of this construct was separated into two single items.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Tables 255 Continued*
### TABLE 9

**Reliability of the Scales in the Thai and Japanese Experiments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Items in the Scale</th>
<th>Mean/Max/Min Inter-item Corr.</th>
<th>Cronbach Alpha</th>
<th>Remark</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking:</td>
<td>q58sensk</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Ditto.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Explore</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic tendency</td>
<td>q59emps</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-conscioussness</td>
<td>q60prise</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>q61pubse, q62pubsc</td>
<td>.65/.65/.65</td>
<td>.79</td>
<td>Average of the two items.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of hypotheses</td>
<td>q63hguess</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>Coded from the open-ended response into 0= Completely ignorant, 1=Having some clues about the main objective of the study, 2=Aware of the objective of the study, 3=No answer.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1 See Exhibits 2 and 3 for the questionnaire of the Thai and the Japanese experiment, respectively.
2 The upper row contains the figures of the Thai data, the lower one of the Japanese data.
**TABLE 10**  
Bivariate Correlations Between Key Variables: Thai Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XMCSIM</th>
<th>XATTR</th>
<th>XTW</th>
<th>XOUTC</th>
<th>Q11DISCO</th>
<th>XSITU</th>
<th>XCOMPLI</th>
<th>XTHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XMCSIM</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.5703**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.2558**</td>
<td>.7506**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XOUTC</td>
<td>.5604**</td>
<td>.8261**</td>
<td>.7085**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q11DISCO</td>
<td>.4504**</td>
<td>.1051</td>
<td>-.1242</td>
<td>.1172</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSITU</td>
<td>.7577**</td>
<td>.4967**</td>
<td>.1834*</td>
<td>.4758**</td>
<td>.3202**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPLI</td>
<td>.7689**</td>
<td>.7657**</td>
<td>.5048**</td>
<td>.7089**</td>
<td>.2364**</td>
<td>.7096**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTHR</td>
<td>-.1484</td>
<td>-.3673**</td>
<td>-.2275**</td>
<td>-.2774**</td>
<td>-.0387</td>
<td>-.1555</td>
<td>-.2719**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*  \( p < .05 \) (2-tailed)  
**  \( p < .01 \) (2-tailed)

XMCSIM  =  Manipulation check  
XATTR  =  Attraction  
XTW  =  Perceived trustworthiness  
XOUTC  =  Outcomes  
Q11DISCO  =  Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes  
XSITU  =  Situational attribution  
XCOMPLI  =  Perceived compliment to the native culture  
XTHR  =  Perceived threat to social identity
# TABLE 11
Bivariate Correlations Between Key Variables: Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>XMCSIM</th>
<th>XATTR</th>
<th>XTW</th>
<th>XOUTC</th>
<th>Q1IDISCO</th>
<th>XSITU</th>
<th>XCOMPLI</th>
<th>XTHR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XMCSIM</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.6431**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.5858**</td>
<td>.7373**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XOUTC</td>
<td>.5547**</td>
<td>.7716**</td>
<td>.7890**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1IDISCO</td>
<td>.3989**</td>
<td>.2090*</td>
<td>.2727**</td>
<td>.1767</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSITU</td>
<td>.7819**</td>
<td>.5216**</td>
<td>.4505**</td>
<td>.3885**</td>
<td>.4401**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPLI</td>
<td>.8061**</td>
<td>.7457**</td>
<td>.6838**</td>
<td>.6886**</td>
<td>.2676**</td>
<td>.5987**</td>
<td>1.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTHR</td>
<td>-.2410*</td>
<td>-.2984**</td>
<td>-.3385**</td>
<td>-.3032**</td>
<td>.0439</td>
<td>-.1144</td>
<td>-.3432**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < .05 (2-tailed)
** p < .01 (2-tailed)

XMCSIM = Manipulation check
XATTR = Attraction
XTW = Perceived trustworthiness
XOUTC = Outcomes
Q1IDISCO = Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes
XSITU = Situational attribution
XCOMPLI = Perceived compliment to the native culture
XTHR = Perceived threat to social identity
TABLE 12
Rotated Component Pattern Matrix: Thai Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5TW</td>
<td>.85649</td>
<td>.14876</td>
<td>-.16298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4TW</td>
<td>.84043</td>
<td>.11665</td>
<td>-.11706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2ATTR</td>
<td>.78359</td>
<td>.36744</td>
<td>-.17660</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8OUTC</td>
<td>.76753</td>
<td>.37138</td>
<td>-.13796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7OUTC</td>
<td>.75544</td>
<td>.44691</td>
<td>-.10543</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3ATTR</td>
<td>.73726</td>
<td>.47805</td>
<td>-.23424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9OUTC</td>
<td>.72989</td>
<td>.38573</td>
<td>-.16913</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1ATTR</td>
<td>.65716</td>
<td>.33752</td>
<td>-.27639</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6TW</td>
<td>.58713</td>
<td>-.20323</td>
<td>-.02735</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19POSV</td>
<td>.53356</td>
<td>.51697</td>
<td>-.05495</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13SITU</td>
<td>.04030</td>
<td>.87476</td>
<td>-.06258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14SITU</td>
<td>.08770</td>
<td>.84253</td>
<td>-.05909</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15SITU</td>
<td>.06161</td>
<td>.82838</td>
<td>-.03505</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16EVAMN</td>
<td>.28785</td>
<td>.80113</td>
<td>-.18894</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18EVAMN</td>
<td>.42436</td>
<td>.71820</td>
<td>-.20333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17EVAMN</td>
<td>.43185</td>
<td>.64286</td>
<td>-.14378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20UNDER</td>
<td>.45366</td>
<td>.62407</td>
<td>-.06215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24THR</td>
<td>-.19873</td>
<td>-.11372</td>
<td>.89342</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23THR</td>
<td>-.06614</td>
<td>-.21908</td>
<td>.88414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25THR</td>
<td>-.01597</td>
<td>.11383</td>
<td>.66606</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy  =  .90746
Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 2366.7050, Significance  =  .00000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q8OUTC</td>
<td>0.87417</td>
<td>0.21280</td>
<td>0.14137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q5TW</td>
<td>0.85147</td>
<td>0.21068</td>
<td>0.15489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9OUTC</td>
<td>0.84026</td>
<td>0.14544</td>
<td>0.17954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7OUTC</td>
<td>0.83502</td>
<td>0.27299</td>
<td>0.14743</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4TW</td>
<td>0.78775</td>
<td>0.32087</td>
<td>0.17169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2ATTR</td>
<td>0.78142</td>
<td>0.36356</td>
<td>0.10524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3ATTR</td>
<td>0.73869</td>
<td>0.42472</td>
<td>0.17599</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1ATTR</td>
<td>0.66925</td>
<td>0.40219</td>
<td>0.15928</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17EVAMN</td>
<td>0.61204</td>
<td>0.32481</td>
<td>0.21429</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6TW</td>
<td>0.55423</td>
<td>0.29987</td>
<td>0.30402</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q13SITU</td>
<td>0.10026</td>
<td>0.90933</td>
<td>0.00077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14SITU</td>
<td>0.08627</td>
<td>0.86810</td>
<td>-0.09293</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15SITU</td>
<td>0.22725</td>
<td>0.85532</td>
<td>0.09562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2OUNDER</td>
<td>0.47110</td>
<td>0.67456</td>
<td>0.23583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18EVAMN</td>
<td>0.44220</td>
<td>0.59829</td>
<td>0.32020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19POSV</td>
<td>0.51264</td>
<td>0.54683</td>
<td>0.36266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16EVAMN</td>
<td>0.49439</td>
<td>0.52962</td>
<td>0.30891</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q24THR</td>
<td>-0.10870</td>
<td>-0.13199</td>
<td>-0.91922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23THR</td>
<td>-0.28409</td>
<td>-0.15577</td>
<td>-0.83767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25THR</td>
<td>0.12090</td>
<td>0.21634</td>
<td>-0.41453</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = 0.90153
Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 1810.5085, Significance = 0.0000
### TABLE 14
Rotated Component Pattern Matrix: Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Component 1</th>
<th>Component 2</th>
<th>Component 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q5TW</td>
<td>.87185</td>
<td>.16086</td>
<td>-.09186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q4TW</td>
<td>.83582</td>
<td>.19115</td>
<td>-.09060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q8OUTC</td>
<td>.80156</td>
<td>.32411</td>
<td>-.14980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q7OUTC</td>
<td>.77146</td>
<td>.39774</td>
<td>-.13661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q2ATTR</td>
<td>.76535</td>
<td>.38555</td>
<td>-.15567</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q9OUTC</td>
<td>.74882</td>
<td>.31344</td>
<td>-.20898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q3ATTR</td>
<td>.72880</td>
<td>.47184</td>
<td>-.19661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q1ATTR</td>
<td>.62969</td>
<td>.38347</td>
<td>-.26471</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q6TW</td>
<td>.62333</td>
<td>-.03546</td>
<td>-.01865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q13SITU</td>
<td>.05077</td>
<td>.87540</td>
<td>-.03985</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q14SITU</td>
<td>.07498</td>
<td>.85213</td>
<td>.01940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q15SITU</td>
<td>.12025</td>
<td>.83730</td>
<td>-.03583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q16EVAMN</td>
<td>.34233</td>
<td>.72943</td>
<td>-.22809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q18EVAMN</td>
<td>.41925</td>
<td>.69453</td>
<td>-.21790</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q20UNDER</td>
<td>.45303</td>
<td>.65557</td>
<td>-.10191</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q17EVAMN</td>
<td>.45856</td>
<td>.55563</td>
<td>-.20602</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q19POSV</td>
<td>.52004</td>
<td>.54863</td>
<td>-.15358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q24THR</td>
<td>-.17008</td>
<td>-.12540</td>
<td>.88967</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q23THR</td>
<td>-.17057</td>
<td>-.20229</td>
<td>.84718</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q25THR</td>
<td>.08680</td>
<td>.12978</td>
<td>.63604</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy = .92111
Bartlett Test of Sphericity = 3986.3216, Significance = .00000
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>TSubNve (n=40)</th>
<th>TSubEng (n=36)</th>
<th>TMod (n=44)</th>
<th>TNo (n=25)</th>
<th>Total (n=145)</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Dif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to foreign culture</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>3.73</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to American culture</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>5.23</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>5.64</td>
<td>5.42</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.14</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.04</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for the Americans to adapt</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.84</td>
<td>3.60</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>(142)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Wealth</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>7.23</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>7.08</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>(143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Cultural heritage</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>2.66</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.57</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.91</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>(143)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Language</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.14</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>1.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Nonhedonism</td>
<td>3.50</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>2.44</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>2.62</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Group dependence</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Harmony orientation</td>
<td>8.35</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>8.32</td>
<td>7.95</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.89</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>2.32</td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of identification with one's own culture</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.61</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.39</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>4.44</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>1.53</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Mountain climb</td>
<td>5.70</td>
<td>5.66</td>
<td>5.45</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>5.55</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>(144)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathetic tendency</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>4.58</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>(145)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TABLE 15**

Mean Characteristics of Thai Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>TSubNve (n=40)¹</th>
<th>TSubEng (n=36)¹</th>
<th>TMod (n=44)¹</th>
<th>TNo (n=25)¹</th>
<th>Total (n=145)¹</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Dif.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>5.19 (35)</td>
<td>4.26 (36)</td>
<td>5.57 (44)</td>
<td>5.86 (25)</td>
<td>5.19 (145)</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td>1.81 (144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-consciousness</td>
<td>6.30 (35)</td>
<td>7.06 (36)</td>
<td>6.75 (44)</td>
<td>6.84 (25)</td>
<td>6.72 (145)</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.75 (144)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The first row of the cell entries refers to the group mean; the second row refers to the standard deviation; the third row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at the column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable.

² Scores lower than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as higher in status than Americans. Scores equal to 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as comparable in status to Americans. Scores higher than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as lower in status than Americans.
## TABLE 16
Distribution of Age of Thai and Japanese Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 20 years</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>12.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40 years</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50 years</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 50 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = < .00001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>35.0</td>
<td>87.1</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>15.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>30.7</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>30.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = < .0001
TABLE 18
Distribution of Education of Thai and Japanese Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; Bachelor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>45.0</td>
<td>74.2</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>68.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>52.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>52.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ph.D.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>24.8</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = <.00001
**TABLE 19**

Distribution of Work Experience of Thai and Japanese Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;= 5 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>9.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 years</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>37.1</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-20 years</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-30 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>24.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = < .0001
**TABLE 20**
Distribution of Work Position of Thai and Japanese Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Position</th>
<th>SubAdapNve*</th>
<th>SubAdapEng*</th>
<th>ModAdap*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>10.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Middle</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Middle</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>64.9</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>61.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>.7</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.6</td>
<td>32.2</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column; the third row refers to % to total.

Pearson Chi-square test for the Thai data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the Japanese data = n.s.
Pearson Chi-square test for the entire data (eight groups) = < .01
### TABLE 21
Two-Way ANCOVA Results (Cultural Adaptation x Respondent Characteristic) on Key Variables for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Characteristics Used as a Second Factor</th>
<th>Effect Tested</th>
<th>Manipulation Check</th>
<th>Connectedness</th>
<th>Disconfirmation of the Adaptor’s Stereotypes</th>
<th>Perceived Respectfulness</th>
<th>Perceived Threat to Social Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work position (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work experience (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for the Americans to adapt (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to foreign culture (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to American culture (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-line evaluation of Americans’ trustworthiness and business practices (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrans test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respondent Characteristics Used as a Second Factor</td>
<td>Effect Tested</td>
<td>Manipulation Check</td>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes</td>
<td>Perceived Respectfulness</td>
<td>Perceived Threat to Social Identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Overall (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cochran test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Wealth (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cochran test</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Cultural heritage (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cochran test</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cochran test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of identification with one's own culture (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-Cochran test</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Two-Way ANCOVA Results (Cultural Adaptation x Respondent Characteristic) on Key Variables for Thai and Japanese Subjects
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### TABLE 21
Two-Way ANCOVA Results (Cultural Adaptation x Respondent Characteristic) on Key Variables for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Respondent Characteristics Used as a Second Factor</th>
<th>Effect Tested</th>
<th>Manipulation Check</th>
<th>Connectedness Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes</th>
<th>Perceived Respectfulness</th>
<th>Perceived Threat to Social Identity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Jap.</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Jap.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety (2 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Mountain climb (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Explore (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic tendency (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-consciousness (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness (3 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Awareness of hypotheses (4 levels)</td>
<td>-Main Adapt.</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Main Charac.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Interaction</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-Cochrants</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 For the Thai subjects, all analyses were done with four covariates: expectation for the Americans to adapt, harmony orientation, ethnocentrism, and public self-consciousness. For the Japanese subjects, all analyses were done with three covariates: base-line evaluation of Americans’ trustworthiness and business practices, expectation for the Americans to adapt, and perceived status differential (overall). When one of the covariates was entered as a second factor, only the remaining covariates were used in the analyses. The three aspects of collectivism, namely nonhedonism, group dependence and harmony orientation were not analyzed because both Thai and Japanese subjects across the four cultural adaptation levels were uniform in these aspects.

2 The four levels are 0 = Innocent; 1 = Having some clues regarding objectives or independent variables; 2 = Guessing objectives or independent variables correctly; 3 = No answer.
TABLE 22
Characteristics of Thai and Japanese Respondents Who React Favorably, Neutrally, and Unfavorably at Each Cultural Adaptation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Reaction</th>
<th>Favorable Reaction (Score ≥ 6)</th>
<th>Neutral Reaction (Score between 4-6)</th>
<th>Unfavorable Reaction (Score ≤ 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Connectedness</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Age &gt; 30 years</td>
<td>Work experience between 4-10 years</td>
<td>Low exposure to American culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low experience</td>
<td>Moderate to high experience</td>
<td>Moderate identification with own culture</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Exposed to American culture</td>
<td>Low or high identification</td>
<td>Any level of ethnocentrism, any level of education</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Low or high position</td>
<td>Low work experience</td>
<td>High work position</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 22
Characteristics of Thai and Japanese Respondents Who React Favorably, Neutrally, and Unfavorably at Each Cultural Adaptation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Reaction</th>
<th>SubAdapEng: Connectedness</th>
<th>Perceived respectfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable Reaction (Score ≥ 6)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Reaction (Score between 4-6)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable Reaction (Score ≤ 4)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Favorable Reaction:**
  - Low work experience ≤ 10 years
  - Low ethnocentrism

- **Neutral Reaction:**
  - Low work experience ≤ 10 years
  - Low ethnocentrism

- **Unfavorable Reaction:**
  - High work experience > 10 years
  - High ethnocentrism

- **Perceived respectfulness:**
  - Any level of exposure to American culture
  - Any level of identification with one's own culture

- **SubAdapEng:**
  - Low work experience ≤ 10 years
  - Low ethnocentrism

- **Continued**
### TABLE 22

Characteristics of Thai and Japanese Respondents Who React Favorably, Neutrally, and Unfavorably at Each Cultural Adaptation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Reaction</th>
<th>ModAdap: Connectedness</th>
<th>Perceived respectfulness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Favorable Reaction (Score ≥ 6)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neutral Reaction (Score between 4-6)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unfavorable Reaction (Score ≤ 4)</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Favorable Reaction**
  - Thai:
    - Work experience > 10 years
  - Japanese:
    - Low ethnocentrism

- **Neutral Reaction**
  - Thai:
    - Any level of work experience
    - Any level of exposure to American culture
    - Any level of identification with one's own culture
  - Japanese:
    - Any level of work experience
    - Any level of ethnocentrism

- **Unfavorable Reaction**
  - Thai:
    - Any level of work experience
    - Any level of ethnocentrism
  - Japanese:
    - High ethnocentrism
    - ≤ Bachelor degree

- **Perceived respectfulness**
  - Thai:
    - High
  - Japanese:
    - Low
TABLE 22
Characteristics of Thai and Japanese Respondents
Who React Favorably, Neutrally, and Unfavorably at Each Cultural Adaptation Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Aspect of Reaction</th>
<th>Favorable Reaction (Score ≥ 6)</th>
<th>Neutral Reaction (Score between 4-6)</th>
<th>Unfavorable Reaction (Score ≤ 4)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NoAdap: Connectedness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any age</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Work experience ≤ 5 years.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived respectfullness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Low work position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any length of work experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Any level of ethnocentrism.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### TABLE 23
Mean Characteristics of Japanese Subjects by Group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>JSubNve (n=31)</th>
<th>JSubEng (n=21)</th>
<th>JMod (n=24)</th>
<th>JNo (n=25)</th>
<th>Total (n=101)</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Diff.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to foreign culture</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.13</td>
<td>1.95</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to American culture</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.85</td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for the Americans to adapt</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>4.51</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.26</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.31</td>
<td>2.16</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Overall</td>
<td>6.01</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>5.96</td>
<td></td>
<td>&lt;.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>0.93</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(29)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Wealth</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.80</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Cultural heritage</td>
<td>3.36</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>3.24</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Language</td>
<td>5.85</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>5.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>1.49</td>
<td>1.70</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(99)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Nonhedonism</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Group dependence</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(30)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Harmony orientation</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>7.52</td>
<td>7.75</td>
<td>8.04</td>
<td>7.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>1.83</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(24)</td>
<td>(100)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>4.55</td>
<td>4.71</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td>2.30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of identification with one's own culture</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.96</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>4.72</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>2.47</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The first row of the cell entries refers to the group mean; the second row refers to the standard deviation; the third row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at the column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable.

2 Scores lower than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as higher in status than Americans. Scores equal to 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as comparable in status to Americans. Scores higher than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as lower in status than Americans.
### TABLE 24
ANOVA Results on Key Variables by Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>Levine Test of Homogeneity of Variance</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Diff.</th>
<th>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; ModAdap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; NoAdap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; NoAdap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; SubAdapEng</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; NoAdap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational attribution</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; NoAdap</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived compliment to the native culture</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt;.0001</td>
<td>SubAdapNve &gt; NoAdap</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**TABLE 24**

ANOVA Results on Key Variables by Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>Levine Test of Homogeneity of Variance</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Dif.</th>
<th>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat to social identity</td>
<td>2.64 (1.36)</td>
<td>3.66 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.83 (1.89)</td>
<td>3.24 (1.70)</td>
<td>2.89 (1.46)</td>
<td>3.46 (1.49)</td>
<td>3.45 (1.69)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the group mean. The second row refers to the standard deviation; the third row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at the column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. See Figures 31 to 38 for the graphs depicting these group means for the Thai and Japanese subjects, respectively.
TABLE 25
Two-Way ANOVA Results (Culture of Subjects \(\times\) Cultural Adaptation) on Respondent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SubAdapNev</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Difference</th>
<th>2-Way ANOVA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n=20)</td>
<td>(n=31)</td>
<td>(n=21)</td>
<td>(n=24)</td>
<td>(n=25)</td>
<td>Adapta-</td>
<td>Adaptation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>tion action</td>
<td>Interaction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cochran</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to foreign culture</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.04</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exposure to American culture</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>5.97</td>
<td>4.15</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Base-line evaluation of Americans' trustworthiness and business practices</td>
<td>3.59</td>
<td>4.48</td>
<td>4.65</td>
<td>4.83</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expectation for the Americans to adapt</td>
<td>3.61</td>
<td>4.90</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.13</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Overall $^2$</td>
<td>6.25</td>
<td>6.51</td>
<td>6.59</td>
<td>5.48</td>
<td>6.18</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Wealth $^2$</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>6.30</td>
<td>7.25</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>7.30</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Cultural heritage $^2$</td>
<td>6.55</td>
<td>2.94</td>
<td>2.15</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived status differential between American and the native culture: Language $^2$</td>
<td>5.30</td>
<td>6.03</td>
<td>5.43</td>
<td>5.86</td>
<td>5.16</td>
<td>5.88</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Nonhedonism</td>
<td>2.50</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.88</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collectivism: Group dependence</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>4.87</td>
<td>3.74</td>
<td>4.67</td>
<td>4.73</td>
<td>4.04</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
## TABLE 25
Two-Way ANOVA Results (Culture of Subjects x Cultural Adaptation) on Respondent Characteristics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Sig. of Mean Difference</th>
<th>2-Way ANOVA</th>
<th>Cochran Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collectiveism: Harmony orientation</td>
<td>Jap (n=30)</td>
<td>Jap (n=31)</td>
<td>Jap (n=24)</td>
<td>Jap (n=21)</td>
<td>Jap (n=25)</td>
<td>Jap (n=15)</td>
<td>Jap (n=14)</td>
<td>Jap (n=10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethnocentrism</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>4.77</td>
<td>4.12</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>3.39</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.91</td>
<td>4.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strength of identification with one's own culture</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>2.56</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>2.49</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>2.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social identity</td>
<td>6.62</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>5.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social anxiety</td>
<td>1.51</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>1.60</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>1.59</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>1.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Mountain climb</td>
<td>3.79</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>3.45</td>
<td>2.07</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sensation seeking: Explore</td>
<td>6.13</td>
<td>6.78</td>
<td>5.18</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>6.27</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empathic tendency</td>
<td>5.39</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>3.89</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public self-consciousness</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>5.79</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.34</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Private self-consciousness</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>7.06</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>6.54</td>
<td>6.75</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>n/a</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The first row of each cell entries refers to the group mean; the second row refers to the standard deviation; the third row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at the column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable.

1 Scores lower than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as higher in status than Americans. Scores equal to 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as comparable in status to Americans. Scores higher than 5 mean Thais/Japanese being rated as lower in status than Americans.
### TABLE 26

Two-Way ANCOVA and ANOVA Results (Culture of Subjects x Cultural Adaptation) on Key Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>SubAdapNve SubAdapEng</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>Two-Way ANCOVA and ANOVA¹</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Jap ( n=31 ) Jap ( n=36 )</td>
<td>Jap ( n=21 ) Jap ( n=24 )</td>
<td>Jap ( n=25 ) Jap ( n=25 )</td>
<td>Culture of Subjects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manipulation check</td>
<td>6.73 ( 6.20 ) 6.48 ( 5.91 )</td>
<td>4.53 ( 5.24 ) 4.50 ( 5.28 )</td>
<td>2.27 ( 2.00 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>6.30 ( 5.99 ) 5.90 ( 5.65 )</td>
<td>6.50 ( 6.17 ) 5.53 ( 6.18 )</td>
<td>2.07 ( 3.49 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.05 ) ( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.05 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness</td>
<td>5.39 ( 6.09 ) 4.56 ( 5.48 )</td>
<td>5.01 ( 6.24 ) 4.57 ( 6.07 )</td>
<td>2.23 ( 4.54 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>5.94 ( 5.52 ) 5.15 ( 5.71 )</td>
<td>5.06 ( 6.01 ) 4.95 ( 5.31 )</td>
<td>2.77 ( 3.35 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation of the adaptor's</td>
<td>6.48 ( 5.78 ) 4.62 ( 5.53 )</td>
<td>4.81 ( 4.54 ) 4.34 ( 4.05 )</td>
<td>2.23 ( 3.87 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stereotypes</td>
<td>2.10 ( 2.44 ) 2.02 ( 2.02 )</td>
<td>2.34 ( 2.10 ) 2.14 ( 2.00 )</td>
<td>2.93 ( 1.99 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.05 ) ( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational attribution</td>
<td>6.70 ( 7.00 ) 6.78 ( 6.53 )</td>
<td>4.91 ( 6.17 ) 5.09 ( 4.11 )</td>
<td>2.50 ( 3.11 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.05 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived compliment to the</td>
<td>6.34 ( 6.34 ) 6.23 ( 6.23 )</td>
<td>5.19 ( 5.94 ) 5.19 ( 5.94 )</td>
<td>3.26 ( 3.90 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native culture</td>
<td>1.17 ( 1.09 ) 1.46 ( 1.43 )</td>
<td>1.24 ( 1.28 ) 1.24 ( 1.28 )</td>
<td>1.23 ( 1.28 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.05 ) ( &lt;.05 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat to social</td>
<td>3.52 ( 3.08 ) 3.08 ( 3.40 )</td>
<td>3.04 ( 3.35 ) 3.04 ( 3.35 )</td>
<td>3.59 ( 4.16 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.001 ) ( &lt;.001 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>identity</td>
<td>1.33 ( 1.33 ) 1.19 ( 1.70 )</td>
<td>1.46 ( 1.49 ) 1.46 ( 1.49 )</td>
<td>1.69 ( 1.65 )</td>
<td>( &lt;.05 ) ( &lt;.05 ) n.s.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ The first row of the cell entries refers to the adjusted mean based on seven covariates (i.e., exposure to American culture, ethnocentrism, strength of identification with one's own culture, age, education, work experience, and work position). The second row refers to the observed mean. The third row refers to the standard deviation of the observed mean. The fourth row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at each column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. See Figures 31 to 38 for the graphs depicting the adjusted vs. the observed group means of these variables for the Thai and Japanese subjects (The observed group means in the graphs may be slightly different from those shown in this table due to different exclusion of cases with missing data. The observed means in this table are based on ANOVA analyses; those in the graphs are based on ANCOVA analyses).

² The top row is ANCOVA. The bottom row is ANOVA.
TABLE 27
Two-Way ANOVA Results (Culture of Subjects x Perceived Cultural Adaptation) on Key Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Utmost Adaptation</th>
<th>High Adaptation</th>
<th>Moderate Adaptation</th>
<th>Low Adaptation</th>
<th>Two-Way ANOVA</th>
<th>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 for Each Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai n=24*</td>
<td>Jap. n=16*</td>
<td>Thai n=35*</td>
<td>Jap. n=25*</td>
<td>Thai n=32*</td>
<td>Jap. n=22*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.29</td>
<td>6.19</td>
<td>5.36</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>3.30 n.s. &lt; .001 n.s. n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>Utmost &gt; Low Utmost &gt; Low</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness</td>
<td>5.22</td>
<td>6.88</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>4.97</td>
<td>4.32</td>
<td>&lt; .001 &lt; .001 &lt; .05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>1.37</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>1.57</td>
<td>High &gt; Low High &gt; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>6.10</td>
<td>5.56</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>n.s. &lt; .001 n.s. n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.19</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>Utmost &gt; Low Utmost &gt; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation of the adaptor's</td>
<td>7.58</td>
<td>6.81</td>
<td>6.16</td>
<td>4.11</td>
<td>4.47</td>
<td>n.s. &lt; .001 n.s. n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>stereotypes</td>
<td>1.47</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>2.18</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>Utmost &gt; Moderate Utmost &gt; Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational attribution</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>7.73</td>
<td>6.85</td>
<td>5.38</td>
<td>2.67</td>
<td>n.s. &lt; .001 n.s. n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.40</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>Low &gt; Utmost Low &gt; High</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived compliment to the</td>
<td>7.05</td>
<td>7.38</td>
<td>6.24</td>
<td>5.49</td>
<td>3.41</td>
<td>n.s. &lt; .001 n.s. n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>native culture</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.22</td>
<td>Utmost &gt; Low Utmost &gt; Moderate</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Utmost Adaptation</th>
<th>High Adaptation</th>
<th>Moderate Adaptation</th>
<th>Low Adaptation</th>
<th>Two-Way ANOVA</th>
<th>Student-Newman-Keuls Multiple Contrasts at .05 for Each Culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Thai n=24* Jap. n=16*</td>
<td>Thai n=25* Jap. n=38*</td>
<td>Thai n=25* Jap. n=28*</td>
<td>Thai n=22* Jap. n=27*</td>
<td>Culture of Subjects</td>
<td>Perceived Adapt.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat to social identity</td>
<td>2.44 1.61</td>
<td>2.37 1.36</td>
<td>2.75 1.62</td>
<td>3.31 1.74</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
<td>&lt;.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* The first row of the cell entries refers to the group mean; the second row refers to the standard deviation. The third row refers to the sample size if different from that indicated at each column heading. Scores range from 1 to 9. Higher scores show higher degrees of the variable. See Figures 41 to 47 for the graphs depicting the means of these variables for the Thai and Japanese subjects.


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Perceived Adaptation</th>
<th>Strength of Identification</th>
<th>Interaction</th>
<th>Cochran Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Attraction</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived trustworthiness</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt; .01</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Outcomes</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situational attribution</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived compliment to the native culture</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived threat to social identity</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
<td>n.s.</td>
<td>&lt; .05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### TABLE 29
Summary of the Results for the Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results Based on Manipulated Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Results Based on Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1c: Monotonic positive relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived compliment to the native culture for Thais.</td>
<td>Supported: TSubNve &gt; TSubEng &gt; TMod &gt; TNo.</td>
<td>Supported: Utmost &gt; High &gt; Moderate &gt; Low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H1d: No relationship between cultural adaptation and perceived threat to social identity for Thais.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2's which are the rival of H1’s set are not supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3a: Curvilinear relationship between cultural adaptation and attraction for Japanese.</td>
<td>Not supported: (JSubNve, JSubEng, JMod) &gt; JNo.</td>
<td>Not supported: (Utmost, High) &gt; Moderate &gt; Low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3c: (JSubNve, JSubEng) &lt; (JMod, JNo) on perceived compliment to the native culture.</td>
<td>Not supported: (JSubNve, JSubEng, JMod) &gt; JNo.</td>
<td>Not supported: Utmost &gt; High &gt; Moderate &gt; Low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3d: (JSubNve, JSubEng) &gt; (JMod, JNo) on perceived threat to social identity.</td>
<td>Not supported: No difference.</td>
<td>Not supported: Utmost &lt; (Moderate, Low).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Continued
## TABLE 29
Summary of the Results for the Hypotheses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Results Based on Manipulated Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Results Based on Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H4's and H5's which together predict the pattern of the interaction between cultural adaptation and strength of identification with one's own culture are not supported.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6a: No = Moderate adaptation on disconfirmation of the adaptor's stereotypes for Thais and Japanese.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td>Supported: Low = Moderate.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6c: Substantial &gt; Moderate &gt; No on situational attribution for Thais and Japanese.</td>
<td>Supported: (TSubNve, TSubEng) &gt; TMod &gt; TNo. (JSubNve, JSubEng, JMod) &gt; JNo.</td>
<td>Supported: Utmost &gt; High &gt; Moderate &gt; Low.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: The relative impact of the mechanisms in which cultural adaptation affects outcomes differs between the Thais and the Japanese.</td>
<td>Supported.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
TABLE 30

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Adaptation</th>
<th>Manipulated Adaptation*</th>
<th>NoAdap*</th>
<th>Row Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SubAdap*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>Japanese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Umost</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>38.0</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>22.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>38.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Column Total</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*The first row of the cell entries refers to the number of subjects; the second row refers to % to column.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Courses</th>
<th>Formal Class Time (Hours)</th>
<th>Duration (Weeks)</th>
<th>Fees per Course (US$)</th>
<th>Expected Achievement at Completion of the Level</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Basic I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Have a general background in Thai, understand basic spoken Thai, converse with a native Thai speaker in some social context, read and understand simple texts, and write simple descriptions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic II</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Basic III</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Acquire the skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing Thai at the level equivalent to that of a Thai upper primary school graduate (Grade 6). That is, understand spoken Thai at normal speed, converse socially with native Thai speakers in real-life situations, read and understand book and newspaper extracts, write letters and paragraphs, and have a considerable degree of knowledge of Thai life.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate II</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate III</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced I</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td>Acquire the skills of speaking, listening, reading, and writing Thai at the level equivalent to that of a Thai lower secondary school graduate (Grade 9). Develop accuracy and fluency in the appropriate use of Thai in real-life situations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced II</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advanced III</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Compiled from “Intensive Thai” brochure. Post-advanced courses are available for learners who have special academic or professional purposes (prerequisite: Advanced Thai) upon request. For more information, contact:

Program Director
Intensive Thai, Faculty of Arts
Chulalongkorn University
Bangkok 10330 Thailand
Tel. (662) 218-4837
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FIGURE 6
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation and Age for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=30 Year Obs.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=30 Year Adj.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 Year Obs.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30 Year Adj.</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Age n.s., Interaction < .01
FIGURE 7

Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation and Work Experience for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Work Experience < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 8
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation and Sensation Seeking (Mountain Climb) for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Sensation Seeking < .01, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 9
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation and Expectation for the Americans to Adapt for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Adaptation</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod Adaptation</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sub Adaptation</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .01, Main Expectation n.s., Interaction < .05
**FIGURE 10**
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation and Work Experience for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation n.s., Main Work Experience < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 11

Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation and Expectation for the Americans to Adapt for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Expec. Obs.</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Expec. Adj.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expec. Obs.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expec. Adj.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation n.s., Main Expectation < .01, Interaction n.s.
### Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation and Social Anxiety for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety Obs.</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Anxiety Adj.</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Anxiety Obs.</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Anxiety Adj.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation n.s., Main Social Anxiety n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 13
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Connectedness
by Cultural Adaptation and Age for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Age n.s., Interaction < .01
FIGURE 14
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Connectedness
by Cultural Adaptation and Work Experience for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=5 Years Obs.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=5 Years Adj.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years Obs.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10 Years Adj.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 Years Obs.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;10 Years Adj.</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Work Experience n.s., Interaction < .001
FIGURE 15
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Connectedness
by Cultural Adaptation and Exposure to American Culture for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Exposure < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 16
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Connectedness
by Cultural Adaptation and Strength of Identification with One's Own Culture for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Identification n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 17
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Respectfulness
by Cultural Adaptation and Work Position for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Position Obs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Position Adj.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Position Obs.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Position Adj.</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Work Position n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 18
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Respectfulness
by Cultural Adaptation and Work Experience for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Work Experience n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 19
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Respectfulness
by Cultural Adaptation and Ethnocentrism for Thai Subjects

Mean Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Ethnocentrism n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 20
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check
by Cultural Adaptation and Expectation for the Americans to Adapt for Thai Subjects

![Figure showing observed vs. adjusted means]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Expec. Obs.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Expec. Adj.</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expec. Obs.</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Expec. Adj.</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Expectation < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 21
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check
by Cultural Adaptation and Perceived Status Differential (Wealth)
for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Perceived Wealth n.s., Interaction < .01
FIGURE 22
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check
by Cultural Adaptation and Ethnocentrism for Thai Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Ethnocentrism n.s., Interaction < .001
FIGURE 23
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check by Cultural Adaptation and Sensation Seeking (Mountain Climb) for Thai Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Sensation Seeking < .01, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 24
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor’s Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation and Perceived Status Differential (Cultural Heritage) for Japanese Subjects

Main Adaptation n.s., Main Perceived Heritage n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 25
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation and Perceived Status Differential (Language) for Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native&gt;American Obs.</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native&gt;American Adj.</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native=American Obs.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native=American Adj.</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native&lt;American Obs.</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native&lt;American Adj.</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation n.s., Main Perceived Language Prestige < .01, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 26
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation and Ethnocentrism for Japanese Subjects

Mean Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .05, Main Ethnocentrism n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 27
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Respectfulness by Cultural Adaptation and Education for Japanese Subjects

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Education < .01, Interaction < .01
FIGURE 28
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Respectfulness by Cultural Adaptation and Ethnocentrism for Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Ethnocentrism n.s., Interaction < .01
FIGURE 29
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check by Cultural Adaptation and Education for Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=Bachelor Obs.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt;=Bachelor Adj.</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=Master Obs.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;=Master Adj.</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Education < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 30
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check by Cultural Adaptation and Ethnocentrism for Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Obs.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Ethno. Adj.</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Ethnocentrism < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 31
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Manipulation Check by Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture n.s., Main Adaptation <.001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 32
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Attraction by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Mean Value

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Observed</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Adjusted</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Observed</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Adjusted</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture n.s., Main Adaptation < .001, Interaction < .01
FIGURE 33
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Trustworthiness by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture <.001, Main Adaptation <.001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 34
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Outcomes by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Observed</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Adjusted</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Observed</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Adjusted</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture n.s., Main Adaptation <.001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 35
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Observed</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Adjusted</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Observed</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Adjusted</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture < .05, Main Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 36
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Situational Attribution by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Observed</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Adjusted</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Observed</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Adjusted</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture n.s., Main Adaptation < .001, Interaction < .05
FIGURE 37
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Compliment to the Native Culture by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture n.s., Main Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 38
Observed vs. Adjusted Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

![Graph showing observed vs. adjusted means for Thai and Japanese subjects with group comparisons and mean values.]

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai Observed</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai Adjusted</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>2.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Observed</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese Adjusted</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture < .001, Main Adaptation < .05, Interaction n.s.
The Revised Model of How Cultural Adaptation Influences Outcomes: Thai Data

Figure 39

Attraction (x1)

Perceived trustworthiness (x2)

Perceived trustworthiness to the native culture (x3)

Situational attribution (x4)

Perceived attempt to adapt (x5)

Outcomes

Note: See attachment for regression coefficients for an equation consisting of these five predictors, as well as for each single predictor.
### ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 39
Regression Coefficients for An Equation Consisting of Five Predictors: Thai Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPLI</td>
<td>.127951</td>
<td>.090443</td>
<td>-.050871 -.306773</td>
<td>.127056</td>
<td>.243374</td>
<td>4.109</td>
<td>1.415</td>
<td>.1594</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.333373</td>
<td>.085876</td>
<td>.163580 -.503166</td>
<td>.279686</td>
<td>.378182</td>
<td>2.644</td>
<td>3.882</td>
<td>.0002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22ATTEM</td>
<td>.063466</td>
<td>.047690</td>
<td>-.030825 -.157758</td>
<td>.092104</td>
<td>.409828</td>
<td>2.440</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>.1854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XSITU</td>
<td>.035410</td>
<td>.050201</td>
<td>-.063846 -.134666</td>
<td>.06925</td>
<td>.396610</td>
<td>2.521</td>
<td>.705</td>
<td>.4818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.406484</td>
<td>.084951</td>
<td>.238521 -.574448</td>
<td>.227854</td>
<td>.4785</td>
<td>4.389</td>
<td>.0000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>- .116395</td>
<td>.323753</td>
<td>-.756511 -.523721</td>
<td>-.360</td>
<td>.7198</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Multiple R
- Multiple R = .85272
- R Square = .72714
- Adjusted R Square = .71732
- Standard Error = .90555

### Analysis of Variance
- Sum of Squares:
  - Regression = 303.74649
  - Residual = 113.98225

- F = 74.08305
- Signif F = .0000

- Durbin-Watson Test = 1.90887
ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 39
Regression Coefficients for Each Single Predictor: Thai Data

### Perceived Attempt to Adapt (q22atten)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q22ATTEN</td>
<td>.362220</td>
<td>.049019</td>
<td>.265324 .459117</td>
<td>.525665</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>7.389</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.800103</td>
<td>.323374</td>
<td>2.160497 3.439710</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R: .52567
R Square: .27632
Adjusted R Square: .27632
Standard Error: 1.45396

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>115.42358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>132.65151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 307.30447 Signif F = .0000
Durbin-Watson Test = 1.98446

### Attraction (xattr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.756076</td>
<td>.043130</td>
<td>.670821 .841331</td>
<td>.826098</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>17.530</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.966868</td>
<td>.244567</td>
<td>.483433 1.450302</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R: .82610
R Square: .68244
Adjusted R Square: .68244
Standard Error: .96315

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>285.07358</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>132.65151</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 307.30447 Signif F = .0000
Durbin-Watson Test = 1.98363

### Situational attribution (xsitu)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XSITU</td>
<td>.339528</td>
<td>.052483</td>
<td>.235785 .443270</td>
<td>.475823</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>6.469</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>3.108450</td>
<td>.320541</td>
<td>2.474840 3.742060</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R: .47582
R Square: .22641
Adjusted R Square: .22641
Standard Error: 1.50326

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>94.57707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>323.15166</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 41.85193 Signif F = .0000
Durbin-Watson Test = 1.98446

Continued
ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 39

**Perceived trustworthiness (xtw)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intvl B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.844470</td>
<td>.070345</td>
<td>.705419 - .983521</td>
<td>.708474</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>12.005</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.817396</td>
<td>.364001</td>
<td>.497877 - 1.336915</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.246</td>
<td>.0263</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple R** = .70847

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209.67312</td>
<td>209.67312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>207.82534</td>
<td>1.45332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 144.42987  Signif F = .0000

Darbin-Watson Test = 1.32310

**Perceived compliment to the native culture (xcompli)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Confidence Intvl B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPLI</td>
<td>.713857</td>
<td>.059400</td>
<td>.596443 - .831272</td>
<td>.708663</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>12.018</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.055580</td>
<td>.344606</td>
<td>.374400 - 1.736759</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.063</td>
<td>.0026</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple R** = .70866

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>209.90340</td>
<td>209.90340</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>207.82534</td>
<td>1.45332</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 144.42987  Signif F = .0000

Durbin-Watson Test = 2.03548
FIGURE 40
The Revised Model of How Cultural Adaptation Influences Outcomes: Japanese Data

Note: See attachment for regression coefficients for an equation consisting of these four predictors, as well as for each single predictor.
**ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 40**
Regression Coefficients for An Equation Consisting of Four Predictors: Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPLI</td>
<td>.148277</td>
<td>.116865</td>
<td>-0.083699 - .380253</td>
<td>.127977</td>
<td>.299525</td>
<td>3.339</td>
<td>1.249</td>
<td>.2076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.561697</td>
<td>.107773</td>
<td>-0.347699 - .775625</td>
<td>.445492</td>
<td>.111522</td>
<td>2.430</td>
<td>5.212</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q22ATTEM</td>
<td>-0.009873</td>
<td>.064736</td>
<td>-0.138373 - 0.118627</td>
<td>-0.01234</td>
<td>.466701</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>-1.153</td>
<td>.8791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.357370</td>
<td>.095020</td>
<td>-0.168758 - 0.545983</td>
<td>-0.01234</td>
<td>.466701</td>
<td>2.143</td>
<td>-1.153</td>
<td>.8791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-0.962291</td>
<td>.423393</td>
<td>-1.802719 - 0.121864</td>
<td>-2.273</td>
<td>.423393</td>
<td>2.04985</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Multiple R**  .84110  
**R Square**   .70746  
**Adjusted R Square** .69527  
**Standard Error**  1.02499  

**Analysis of Variance**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>243.90481</td>
<td>60.97620</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>100.85866</td>
<td>1.05061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>F</th>
<th>.0000</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signif F</td>
<td>.0000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Durbin-Watson Test**  2.04985

Continued
### ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 40
Regression Coefficients for Each Single Predictor: Japanese Data

#### Perceived Attempt to Adapt (q22attem)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>q22ATTEM</td>
<td>.427256</td>
<td>.068111</td>
<td>.292109 - .562402</td>
<td>.533313</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>2.475243</td>
<td>.415243</td>
<td>1.649311 - 3.297176</td>
<td>.533313</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Multiple R**: .53331
- **Analysis of Variance**
  - **R Square**: .28442
  - **R Square Change**: .28442
  - **DF**: 1
  - **Sum of Squares**: 98.05872
  - **Mean Square**: 98.05872
  - **F Change**: 39.34992
  - **Regression**: 1
  - **Residual**: 99
  - **Signif F Change**: .0000
  - **Durbin-Watson Test**: 1.69356

- **F** = 39.34992
- **Signif F** = .0000

#### Attraction (xattr)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XATTR</td>
<td>.782108</td>
<td>.064809</td>
<td>.653514 - .910702</td>
<td>.771568</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.684851</td>
<td>.367500</td>
<td>-.044349 - 1.414051</td>
<td>.771568</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Multiple R**: .77157
- **Analysis of Variance**
  - **R Square**: .59532
  - **R Square Change**: .59532
  - **DF**: 1
  - **Sum of Squares**: 205.24360
  - **Mean Square**: 205.24360
  - **F Change**: 145.63600
  - **Regression**: 1
  - **Residual**: 99
  - **Signif F Change**: .0000
  - **Durbin-Watson Test**: 1.84307

- **F** = 145.63600
- **Signif F** = .0000

#### Perceived trustworthiness (xtw)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XTW</td>
<td>.988213</td>
<td>.077327</td>
<td>.834779 - 1.141647</td>
<td>.789048</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>-.686033</td>
<td>.450570</td>
<td>-1.580061 - .207995</td>
<td>.789048</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Multiple R**: .78905
- **Analysis of Variance**
  - **R Square**: .62260
  - **R Square Change**: .62260
  - **DF**: 1
  - **Sum of Squares**: 214.64
  - **Mean Square**: 214.64
  - **F Change**: 163.31925
  - **Regression**: 1
  - **Residual**: 99
  - **Signif F Change**: .0000
  - **Durbin-Watson Test**: 1.91826

- **F** = 163.31925
- **Signif F** = .0000

---

Continued
ATTACHMENT TO FIGURE 40

Perceived compliment to the native culture (xcompl1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE B</th>
<th>95% Conf. Interval B</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>Tolerance</th>
<th>VIF</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig T</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>XCOMPL1</td>
<td>.797838</td>
<td>.084439</td>
<td>.630293</td>
<td>.965382</td>
<td>.688610</td>
<td>1.000000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>9.449</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.486901</td>
<td>.484501</td>
<td>-.474454</td>
<td>1.448257</td>
<td>1.005</td>
<td>.3174</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple R | .68861 |
R Square | .47418 |
Adjusted R Square | .46887 |
F Change | 89.27863 |
Signif F Change | .0000 |

Analysis of Variance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regression</th>
<th>DF</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>163.48117</td>
<td>163.48117</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>181.28230</td>
<td>1.83113</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

F = 89.27863  Signif F = .0000

Durbin-Watson Test = 1.66820
FIGURE 41
Means of Attraction by Perceived Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utmost</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture n.s., Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 42
Means of Outcomes by Perceived Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture n.s., Main Perceived Adaptation .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 43
Means of Perceived Compliment to the Native Culture by Perceived Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture n.s., Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 44
Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity by Perceived Cultural Adaptation
for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Utmost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Japanese</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture < .001, Main Perceived Adaptation < .01, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 45
Means of Disconfirmation of the Adaptor's Stereotypes by Perceived Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Japanese</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utmost</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Culture n.s., Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 46
Means of Situational Attribution by Perceived Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Thai  | Mean Value  
--- | ---  
2.7  | 5.4  | 6.7  | 7.8  

Japanese  | 3  | 5.2  | 6.4  | 7.7  

Perceived Cultural Adaptation: Low, Moderate, High

Main Culture n.s., Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 47
Means of Perceived Trustworthiness by Perceived Cultural Adaptation for Thai and Japanese Subjects

Main Culture < .001, Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Interaction < .05
FIGURE 48
Means of Perceived Threat to Social Identity
by Perceived Cultural Adaptation and Strength of Identification with One's Own Culture
for the Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Low Identification</th>
<th>Moderate Identification</th>
<th>High Identification</th>
<th>Utmost Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod.</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Perceived Adaptation < .05, Main Identification < .05, Interaction n.s.
FIGURE 49
Means of Attraction
by Perceived Cultural Adaptation and Strength of Identification with One's Own Culture
for the Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perceived Cultural Adaptation</th>
<th>Low Identification</th>
<th>Moderate Identification</th>
<th>High Identification</th>
<th>Utmost Identification</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low Identification</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mod. Identification</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Identification</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Main Identification n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 50
Means of Perceived Trustworthiness by Perceived Cultural Adaptation and Strength of Identification with One's Own Culture for the Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

Main Perceived Adaptation < .001, Main Identification n.s., Interaction < .01
FIGURE 51
Observed Means of Perceived Trustworthiness by Cultural Adaptation and Status Differential (Cultural Heritage) for the Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native &gt; American</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native = American</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native &lt; American</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .05, Main Perceived Heritage n.s., Interaction < .05
FIGURE 52
Observed Means of Perceived Compliment by Cultural Adaptation and Status Differential (Cultural Heritage) for the Pooled Thai and Japanese Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>NoAdap</th>
<th>ModAdap</th>
<th>SubAdapEng</th>
<th>SubAdapNve</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Native &gt; American</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native = American</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Native &lt; American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>4.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Main Adaptation < .001, Main Perceived Heritage n.s., Interaction < .01