

EVIDENCE FOR A *SIMPATICO* SELF-SCHEMA IN STUDIES
COMPARING HISPANICS AND WHITES

by

RENEE AILEEN HOLLOWAY

Presented to the Faculty of the Graduate School of
The University of Texas at Arlington in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements
for the Degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

THE UNIVERSITY OF TEXAS AT ARLINGTON

August 2006

Copyright © by Renee Aileen Holloway 2006

All Rights Reserved

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I'd like to thank Dr. William Ickes and the 2003-2006 Social Interaction Lab. I'd also like to thank my Mother, sisters Alyson and Brittany, and my Grandfather as well. Special acknowledgements to Carrie Lane, Katy Rollings, Tony Coker, Allison and Helena Mc Cowan, and Judy Flury for their significant contributions to this project

July 10, 2006

ABSTRACT

EVIDENCE FOR A *SIMPATICO* SELF-SCHEMA IN STUDIES
COMPARING HISPANICS AND WHITES

Publication No. _____

Renee Aileen Holloway, Ph.D.

The University of Texas at Arlington, 2006

Supervising Professor: William Ickes

Considerable evidence exists that many Latin American cultures emphasize concept of *simpatia* or *simpatico* (Triandis, Martin, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984). The purpose of this research project was to test for evidence that Mexican-Americans use a *simpatico* self-schema more than White Americans do. Study 1 assessed the participants' reported self-schemas using the "Who am I?" paradigm (Gordon, 1968). As predicted, the Hispanic participants reported significantly more *simpatico*-related terms in their self-descriptions than the White participants. Study 2 also assessed the self-schema of the participants, using a traditional cognitive paradigm (Markus, 1977). However, none of the predicted hypotheses for that study were supported, and possible explanations for these null results are discussed. Study 3 was developed based on the logic that the extent to which people have been socialized in the use of the *simpatia* cultural script is represented not only in their self-concepts but also in the extent to which *simpatia* becomes cognitively available as a guide to their behavior in social

interaction settings. A reanalysis of data from a previous dyadic interaction study (Holloway, Waldrip, & Ickes, 2006) was conducted to determine if the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores could predict three groups of variables: behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and positive partner directed positive affect. All three hypotheses were supported, demonstrating the role of *simpatia* in guiding social interaction behavior. Practical applications of these findings are discussed in reference to clinical psychology and organizational and industrial psychology. Recommendations for future research are also made.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

| | |
|---|------|
| ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS..... | vii |
| ABSTRACT | viii |
| Chapter | |
| 1. INTRODUCTION..... | 1 |
| 1.1 The Simpatico Cultural Value Conceptualized as a Self-Schema | 7 |
| 1.2 An early methodological model for schema research..... | 10 |
| 1.3 Other methodological precedents in self-schema research..... | 13 |
| 1.4 The Present Investigation: Overview of the Current Studies..... | 16 |
| 1.5 The Current Studies | 17 |
| 2. PILOT STUDY..... | 20 |
| 2.1 Participants..... | 20 |
| 2.2 Materials..... | 21 |
| 2.3 Procedure..... | 21 |
| 2.4 Data coding | 22 |
| 2.5 Results | 22 |
| 3. STUDY 1..... | 24 |
| 3.1 Participants..... | 25 |
| 3.2 Materials..... | 25 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 3.2.1 Big Five Personality Measure | 26 |
| 3.2.2 Social Desirability Scale (10-item) | 27 |
| 3.2.3 Acculturation Scale | 28 |
| 3.3 Procedure | 29 |
| 3.4 Data Coding | 30 |
| 3.5 Results | 30 |
| 3.6 Discussion | 31 |
| 4. STUDY 2..... | 33 |
| 4.1 Participants..... | 34 |
| 4.2 Materials..... | 35 |
| 4.2.1 Big Five Personality Measure | 35 |
| 4.2.2 Social Desirability Scale (10-item) | 35 |
| 4.2.3 Acculturation Scale | 36 |
| 4.3 Procedure | 37 |
| 4.4 Data Coding | 41 |
| 4.5 Results | 41 |
| 4.6 Discussion | 44 |
| 5. STUDY 3..... | 50 |
| 5.1 Participants..... | 51 |
| 5.2 Materials..... | 51 |
| 5.3 Procedure..... | 52 |
| 5.3.1 Obtaining the thought feeling data..... | 52 |

| | |
|---|----|
| 5.4 Data Coding | 53 |
| 5.4.1 Coding the thought/feeling data | 53 |
| 5.4.2 Coding the behavioral data..... | 54 |
| 5.4.3 Coding the attribution data..... | 54 |
| 5.5 Results | 55 |
| 5.6 Discussion | 60 |
| 6. DISCUSSION..... | 64 |
| 6.1 Future Studies..... | 67 |
| 6.2 Acculturation..... | 69 |
| 6.3 Practical applications..... | 70 |
| 6.4 Strengths and Limitations | 74 |
| 6.5 Conclusions | 75 |

Appendix

| | |
|--|----|
| A. “WHO AM I?” QUESTIONNAIRE | 78 |
| B. SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE | 80 |
| C. EXCERPT FROM TRIANDIS, ET AL, (1984)..... | 82 |
| D. GOLDBERG’S BIG FIVE (IPIP) | 85 |
| E. SHORT ACCULTURATION SCALE..... | 89 |
| F. DISTRACTOR TASK FOR STUDY 2 | 92 |
| G. TABLES 1 & 2 FOR STUDY 2 | 97 |
| H. POSTINTERACTION QUESTIONNAIRE | 99 |

| | |
|--|-----|
| I. ITEM-BY-ITEM ANALYSIS FOR STUDY 3 | 106 |
| J. QUESTION USED TO ASSESS ETHNICITY | 108 |
| REFERENCES | 110 |
| BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION..... | 119 |

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Considerable evidence exists that many Latin American cultures emphasize harmony, social acceptance, and social support as cultural ideals. Indeed, cross-cultural psychologists have argued that these ideals are central to the concept of *simpatia* or *simpatico* (Triandis, Martin, Lisansky, & Betancourt, 1984). *Simpatico* is defined as a highly valued relational style that is based on a search for social harmony. It emphasizes expressive displays of personal charm, graciousness, and hospitality (Albert, 1996; Gabrielidis, Stephan, Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal, 1997; Markus & Lin, 1999; Roll, Millen, & Martinez, 1980). Individuals who are *simpatico* proactively attempt to create a highly personable atmosphere as an end in itself (Triandis et al., 1984). This distinctive socio-emotional emphasis has been observed in a variety of different contexts, i.e., in studies of helping behavior (Levine, Norenzayan, & Philbrick, 2001) as well as in occupational, educational, and clinical settings (Roll et al., 1980; Zea, Quezada, & Belgrave, 1994).

Other associated constructs found in Hispanic culture include *personalismo* and *familismo* (Fuentes, Baron, & Vasquez, 2003). *Personalismo* refers to a highly personalized communication style that is characterized by interdependence and cooperation (Comas-Diaz, 1989). The values underlying *personalismo* are self-worth,

the dignity of self and others, and *respeto* (respect shown to others) (Garcia, 1996). The concept of *personalismo* stresses the importance of a personal (as opposed to a more formal) relationship, whereas the concept of *simpatico* emphasizes the maintenance and promotion of harmonious and smooth interactions. By applying these cultural values in their everyday interactions, Hispanic individuals promote positive social behaviors while often avoiding the negative behaviors that might engender conflicts (Triandis et al., 1984).

The related concept of *familismo* refers to the reliance on family members for emotional support; it emphasizes the values of loyalty, commitment, and cohesion in Hispanic families. Indeed, we assume, as previous writers have, that the interrelated cultural values of *simpatico*, *personalismo*, and *familismo* are acquired through a socialization process that begins in the family and is further elaborated and reinforced by teachers, peers, and other socializing agents, including the media. By enacting the cultural scripts that are associated with these values, Hispanic individuals should be more likely to enjoy pleasant, mutually rewarding interactions and to have positive perceptions of their interaction partners (Gloria, 1999; Triandis et al., 1984). By the time they are young adults, these effects should be evident even in their earliest interaction with a stranger (Holloway, Waldrip, & Ickes, 2006)

Basing their predictions on the existence of this distinctive cultural orientation, Triandis et al. (1984) hypothesized that Hispanic individuals would be more likely than non-Hispanic individuals to stress harmony and the kinds of behaviors that encourage good social relationships. This hypothesis was tested over several studies in which the

Hispanic participants were Navy recruits (Studies 1, 2 and 3), bilingual college students (Study 1), or Spanish-speaking high school students in Puerto Rico (Study 1).

In the first of the Triandis et al., (1984) studies, each participant was presented with different scenarios via a series of written vignettes. The ethnicity of the actors and targets (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) varied across the presented items, and the participant's task was to report the likelihood of the target engaging in a certain behavior. In the remaining studies, the participants were asked to report the likelihood of certain behaviors occurring in certain roles (mother, son, etc.).

If the cultural script of *simpatico* were affecting the likelihood ratings of the Hispanic participants, we would expect them to predict lower frequencies of socially negative behaviors and higher frequencies of socially positive behaviors compared to the non-Hispanic participants. This pattern of results is exactly what the authors found, providing at least indirect evidence for the operation of the presumed *simpatico* script in the Hispanic participants. The authors argued that they could make this inference with some confidence because they used different instruments and different samples when establishing this overall pattern of results. They also took the degree of acculturation into account in this study and found a weaker effect of the hypothesized *simpatico* value among participants who were more acculturated (Triandis et al., 1984).

Even more compelling evidence for the influence of the *simpatico* cultural value on people's social behavior was found in a recent study reported by Holloway et al. (2006). In this study, 126 strangers were systematically paired into 63 same-sex (male-male or female-female) dyads. In half of the dyads, the partners were of the same

ethnicity (Black-Black, Hispanic-Hispanic, White-White), whereas in the remaining dyads the partners were of different ethnicities (Black-Hispanic, Black-White, Hispanic-White). The initial interaction of each of these dyads was unobtrusively video- and audio-taped during a 6-min observation period using the unstructured dyadic interaction paradigm developed by Ickes and his colleagues (Ickes, 1982, 1983; Ickes, Bissonnette, Garcia, & Stinson, 1990).

Prior to their interactions, the participants independently completed Goldberg's (1999) Big Five questionnaire. Then, after the dyad members' 6-minute interaction had been videotaped, their actual thoughts and feelings and their inferences about their partner's thoughts and feelings were assessed using procedures described by Ickes (2001). Finally, the dyad members individually reported their perceptions of the interaction and of their interaction partner on a post-interaction questionnaire. The resulting data (videotaped behavior, reported thoughts and feelings, and post-interaction ratings) were subsequently coded and analyzed for evidence of the hypothesized Hispanic social advantage (Holloway et al., 2006).

The results of several Actor-Partner Interdependence Model (APIM) analyses (Campbell & Kashy, 2002) revealed that the actors' ethnicity was significantly related to three factors that were defined (in an oblique rotation) by different groups of dependent variables. These three broad factors indexed the dyad members' (1) overall level of *interactional involvement*, (2) their overall assessment of *perceived interaction quality*, (3) *partner-directed positive affect*.

The specific variables that defined the first factor, *interactional involvement*, included measures of how much the individual dyad members talked to each other during the interaction and directed gazes toward each other. As predicted, there was significantly more talking and partner-directed gazing in dyads with Hispanic members, and follow-up tests revealed that the presence of just one Hispanic member within the dyad was sufficient to produce these actor effects. In other words, Hispanic actors both talked and looked at their partners more than Black or White actors did, and there was no significant difference between the Black and White actors on any of the variables related to the behavioral involvement of the dyad members (Holloway et al., 2006).

In addition to these actor effects, there was a significant partner effect showing that individuals who interacted with a Hispanic partner spoke to their partner more frequently and for longer durations compared to those participants who interacted with a non-Hispanic partner. Individuals also gazed more frequently and longer at their partner when their partner was Hispanic than when their partner was Black or White (Holloway et al., 2006).

The specific variables that defined the second broad factor, which was the participants' overall perception of *interaction quality*, included the participants' responses to several items on questionnaire that they completed immediately after their interaction. Analyses of these variables revealed that Hispanic dyad members perceived their interactions to be significantly better than did the Black and White dyad members (who did not differ from each other) Specifically, the Hispanic dyad members reported their interactions to be more smooth, natural, and relaxed (and significantly less forced,

awkward, and strained). They also reported their interactions to be more involving and indicated that they felt more accepted and respected by their interaction partner. In addition, the Hispanic participants reported a greater level of liking for their interaction partners and felt that their interaction partners liked them more when compared to the Black and White participants (who again did not differ from each other) (Holloway et al., 2006).

Complementing this pattern of actor effects, a significant partner effect revealed that individuals who interacted with Hispanic partners also reported a greater desire to spend more time with their interaction partner in the future and reported their interactions to be especially enjoyable and involving. These differences were significant in relation to individuals who interacted with Black or White partners (who did not differ from each other in their ratings of perceived interaction quality) (Holloway et al., 2006).

The specific variables that defined the third broad factor, *partner-directed positive affect*, included measures of the percentage of positive attributions that the individual dyad members made about their interaction partner and the frequency and duration of the individual's smiling and laughing with their partner during the interaction. Univariate analyses of the specific variables that defined this factor revealed both a significant actor effect and a significant partner effect for the percentage of positive partner attributions. Specifically, Hispanic participants reported a greater percentage of positive attributions about their partner than Black or White participants did (the actor effect). Moreover, individuals who interacted with a Hispanic participant

reported a greater percentage of positive partner attributions than those who interacted with a Black or a White participant. No other differences were evident in the data for this variable or for the other variables that defined the partner-directed positive affect factor (Holloway et al., 2006).

Finally, the Hispanic dyad members also displayed a higher frequency of positive affect (i.e., smiling and laughing) during their interaction than the Black or White dyad members (who did not differ from each other in this regard). The data analyses also revealed significant effects for the partners' ethnicity, such that those interacting with Hispanic participants smiled and laughed more during their interaction, than those who interacted with either a White or Black participant. As before, there were significant differences in these behaviors when the participants' partners were Black versus White.

In addition to conducting the above-mentioned analyses, the authors investigated whether the Hispanic social advantage might also be evident in the form of corresponding personality differences on the agreeableness and/or extraversion dimensions of the Big Five. The results of their analyses revealed a significant ethnicity effect for extraversion (but not for agreeableness), indicating that the Hispanic participants scored significantly higher than White and Black participants in their self-reported extraversion (Holloway et al., 2006). This finding raised an important question: Given the significant actor ethnicity effect for extraversion, was this personality difference in itself sufficient to account for the various ethnicity effects that were reported above?

To find out, the authors re-ran all of the APIM analyses and the more specific planned comparisons that were used to test the various hypotheses, in each case controlling for the participants' extraversion scores before testing the effects of the remaining predictors. The results of these analyses revealed that, although extraversion was itself significantly related to the actor's ethnicity, controlling for its influence did not render any of the earlier-tested effects nonsignificant. In other words, every one of the significant effects previously reported remained significant after controlling for actor and partner differences in the participants' extraversion scores. This pattern of results suggests that the Hispanic social advantage is more than a personality-based difference. Instead of being a personality-based difference, this pattern appears to be a culturally acquired difference just as various authors (Abraido-Lanza, Dohrenwend, & Ng-Mak, 1999; Gabrielidis et al., 1997; Roll et al., 1980; Triandis et al., 1984) have argued (Holloway et al., 2006).

1.1 The Simpatico Cultural Value Conceptualized as a Self-Schema

The present investigation seeks to determine whether the cultural value of *simpatico* might operate as a cognitive self-schema. To the extent that evidence for the existence of such a self-schema can be amassed, we may be an important step closer toward understanding how the cultural value of *simpatia* might influence the self-concepts, the thoughts and feelings, and the interaction behavior of those individuals who have acquired this self-schema.

It is reasonable to hypothesize that when the cultural value of *simpatico* is internalized, such "internalization" takes the form of a cognitive self-schema.

Self-schemas are defined as cognitive representations about the self that organize and guide the processing of self-relevant information. Markus (1977) proposed that self-schemas can be thought of as the cognitive mechanisms that are responsible for many of the invariances that we observe in people's behavior. These schemas are assumed to develop as a result of the evaluation, classification, and generalization of information collected about the self during social experience (Markus, 1977, 1982). If the cultural value of *simpatia* is central to Hispanics' socialization experience, as the research evidence suggests it is reasonable to hypothesize that it would result in a self-schema.

Markus (1982) proposed four areas of the self where schemas are likely to develop: (1) domains of the self that are exceptionally salient (i.e., gender), (2) domains that are constantly presented for social evaluation and comment, (3) domains that emerge as prominent early in the life span, and (4) domains that are significant in one's social interactions. Because one's primary cultural values are emphasized during the early and formative years of socialization, it is reasonable to expect that these values will be integrated into the self-concepts of most, if not all, of the members of a given culture.

Again, this predication was made because Hispanic-American participants should be more likely than White-American participants to have internalized the cultural value of being *simpatico* through their socialization experience. How and why does the cultural value of *simpatico* become part of the self-concept of people who grow up in a Mexican-American culture? Freeman and Martin (2004) explain that our early interactions with important others establish and reinforce our schemas. These schemas

begin to develop in infancy, and as children age they begin to incorporate culture values within their self-schema. People within the culture help to form other peoples' schemas, and also help to preserve and sustain them. In fact, when people attempt to change their cultural schemas, it is not uncommon for family members to close ranks around the person and use normative influence and other forms of social pressure to try to keep the individual's thoughts, feelings, and behavior consistent with the schema (Freeman & Martin, 2004).

Schemas also influence our behaviors (evidence for this assertion will be reported in Study 3); in addition to helping us make sense of our world (Freeman & Martin, 2004). Schemas embody basic rules about situationally appropriate behaviors and about culturally appropriate beliefs, values, and preferences. D'Andrade (1992) states theoretically that schemas define reality for the self. So if a cultural script is evident for Hispanic individuals, it dictates behaviors, values and how one should think about them self and others. It theoretically follows then that the script, through repeated experience, could translate into a self-schema as well. Just as a new mother must learn the "Mom" script of care-giving behaviors, she eventual through repeated experience with her child, will incorporate motherhood into her self-schema.

Holland and Quinn (1987) have confirmed that people can both describe cultural schemas and agree about what sort of events are acceptable within the cultural schema. Further, Holland and Quinn (1987) state that people know that behavior that is inconsistent with the cultural schema will be sanctioned, because these schemas have the regulative force of social norms (Holland & Quinn, 1987). According to Spiro

(1987b), people internalize cultural systems as personal belief systems that engage the person's mind as well as his or her emotions.

Recently, Oyserman and Markus (1983) stated "that the psychological study of the self has far too long ignored how sociocultural contexts such as gender, ethnicity, and social class govern and shape the content and processes of the self / describe how sociocultural variables can shape the self and present an agenda for future research." The studies proposed here were designed to address how ethnicity influences the self, and is an answer to the call for such research.

1.2 An early methodological model for schema research.

Hazel Markus published a study in 1977 that provided a methodological model for much of the subsequent research on self-schemas. The purpose of her two-part study was to examine the influence of cognitive structures on the selective processing of significant social information, specifically information about important aspects of one's self. Participants first completed an adjective trait checklist that was used to categorize them as Independent, Dependent, or Aschematic (i.e., lacking a well-defined schema for the Independent-Dependent dimension). The performance of the participants on different tasks (self-rating, self-description, and behavior prediction) was then assessed.

In the self-rating task, the participants viewed a succession of different words that were projected on a screen by a slide projector. Following the presentation of each word, they responded by pressing either a ME button if the word was self-descriptive, or a NOT ME button if the word was not self-descriptive. Response latencies were recorded for each judgment as well as the content of the selected self-descriptors.

Participants were also asked to select trait adjectives from a word list that they considered to be self-descriptive. Then the participants were asked to cite instances from their own past behavior to support their endorsement of a particular adjective as self-descriptive. The instructions asked participants to provide evidence from their own past behavior to indicate why they felt a particular trait were self-descriptive.

Finally, the participants were given a series of descriptions of independent and dependent behaviors and they were asked to judge how likely it would be for them to behave in these ways. Examples of these behaviors include, “You hesitate before commenting, only to hear someone else make the point you had in mind” (dependent) and “You speak up as soon you have some comments on the issue being discussed (independent). If participants responded with a zero to a behavior, it indicated they felt it was extremely unlikely they would act or feel that way; in contrast, a response close to 100 indicated the participants were very likely to act that way.

The results showed that the individuals who thought of themselves as “Independent” endorsed significantly more words associated with the concept of independence than the other participants. These same participants also had shorter processing times when making “me” judgments when the word was associated with the concept of independence. When asked to report specific instances of independent behavior, participants classified as independent were able to produce significantly more examples than the other participants. Participants classified as dependent showed a parallel pattern of results with the dependent stimuli.

Overall, the Independent and Dependent participants responded very differently from the Aschematic participants. The Independent and Dependent participants were more certain about the likelihood of them self engaging in different behaviors and were more certain about the types of behaviors that would be characteristic of them in certain settings. These participants who had an established self-schema evidenced greater correspondence between their self-concepts (self-descriptions) and their schema-relevant behavior and also reported greater cross-situational consistency in such behavior. Recall that Aschematics are those who do not have an integrated schema of themselves on the Independent/Dependent dimension, and we can speculate that this is the reason that they did not respond differently to the independent and dependent stimuli on any of the tasks

The second part of Markus's (1977) investigation was concerned with the influences that self-schemas have on the interpretation of inconsistent information. Self-schemas act as cognitive structures that direct attention to self-relevant information. Accordingly, information unrelated to self-schemas is likely to be ignored (Markus, Hamil & Sentis, 1987) and ambiguous information is likely to be framed in ways that are consistent with the self-schema (Catrambone & Markus, 1987). In addition, people are assumed to become resistant to information that contradicts their self-schema once it has developed (Oyserman, Kimmelmeier, Fryberg, Broth, & Hart-Johnson, 2003). This last prediction was the focus of Markus's (1977) second study in which she hypothesized that a well-developed self-schema would make individuals resistant to

counter-schematic information about their behavior, so we should expect to find differences in how people interpret new information about the self.

To test this hypothesis, Markus (1977) asked participants to complete the QPAT Suggestibility Tests, a fictitious test designed so that the experimenter could provide the participants with bogus feedback that was incongruent with their existing self-schema. Specifically, Independents were given feedback stating they were not independent at all, but were instead very susceptible to social influence, whereas Dependents were described as being very independent and not likely to be influenced by the ideas of others. In order to create an appropriate control condition, Aschematics randomly received either the independent feedback or dependent feedback.

After reading the description provided to them, the participants were asked to report how accurately they felt the test had described them. Participants who had a well-developed schema for the Independent/Dependent dimension were more likely to report that they disagreed with or disbelieved the schema-inconsistent feedback provided to them. In contrast, aschematic individuals (who presumably had no well-developed schema) were more willing to accept the bogus feedback as accurate and self-diagnostic.

1.3 Other methodological precedents in self-schema research.

In her 1977 studies, Markus established that having a schema for a particular trait dimension facilitates the processing of schema-relevant information. In a related study that was published the same year, Rogers, Kuiper, and Kirker (1977) hypothesized that schemas should also provide a cognitive mechanism for organizing

and storing information relevant to the self. To test this hypothesis, the researchers used a depth of processing (DOP) paradigm. The DOP paradigm enables the researcher to compare differences in response latencies produced by various encoding tasks that are presumed to differ in the depth or extensiveness of processing.

The participants in the Rogers et al. (1977) study were instructed to respond as quickly as possible to 40 questions presented on a video screen by pressing a YES or NO button. Thirty of the questions were designed such that the participants wouldn't have to use their self-schemas to process the information. These questions were intended to force varying types of encoding: *structural* (Is the word presented in big letters?), *phonemic* (Does this word rhyme with another word?), and *semantic* (Does this word mean the same thing as that word?). The remaining 10 questions asked the participant to determine if the word described them to ensure that the participants processed the information through their self-schemas.

Although the participants weren't expecting a free recall memory test of the experimental stimuli, they were later asked to recall as many as possible of the 40 stimulus words they had previously seen. The results revealed that when the participants were forced to answer questions about *themselves*, they were more likely to remember the associated stimulus words. Significantly more stimulus words were recalled from the "Does this word describe you?" condition than from the control conditions in which the questions were designed to encourage structural, phonemic, or semantic processing. This result demonstrates the facilitative influence that self-schemas can have in the processing, interpretation, and recall of information.

The results of the Markus (1977) study, the Rogers et al. (1977) study, and others using similar methodologies spawned a great deal of research on the self-reference effect (SRE) over the next 20 years. Many subsequent investigators have also found superior recall for information processed through self-structures (Kuiper & Rogers, 1979; Maki & McCaul, 1985). However, some investigators have found that other types of information processing promote memory just as well as information processed in reference to the self.

The inconsistencies in findings across studies inspired Symons and Johnson (1997) to conduct a meta-analytic investigation with the intent of examining the effects associated with certain methodological features of the various studies or, more specifically, to document the different methodologies used across various self-reference effect studies in order to determine the optimal conditions for this type of research. Their review of the literature revealed that there are instances when the SRE is reduced or even reversed. This moderation of the SRE tends to occur when imagery tasks are used (Lord, 1980) and when the semantic task takes the form of a desirability rating (Ferguson, Rule, Carlson, 1983). However, in general the SRE appears more often than it does not. After reviewing the various studies included in their meta-analysis, the authors concluded that self-reference promotes better recall than other types of encoding (semantic, other reference); however, the magnitude of the effect sizes are inconsistent across studies because of the different types of manipulations used.

Following this analysis, the authors use characteristics identified in their review to fit models that would best explain the inconsistencies in results and variations in

effect sizes across studies. The results of their model fitting indicated that the SRE is more robust as the time between stimulus presentation and memory tasks increased, but decreases as the length of the stimulus presentation is increased. The authors also determined that studies using free and cued recall tasks promote greater SRE than studies using recognition tasks. Moreover, studies using self-descriptive tasks produce larger mean SRE than studies using nouns or other types of stimulus materials. Studies using a distractor task between the encoding tasks and memory tests generated larger mean SRE than studies that did not use a distractor task. Further, when participants did not expect a memory test of the experimental stimuli, researchers obtained larger SRE than studies where participants expected a memory test. Last a model test for mode of presentation revealed that researchers who used a projector to present their stimuli obtained significantly smaller mean SRE than researchers who used computer monitors or presented their stimuli orally.

1.4 The Present Investigation: Overview of the Current Studies

Unlike Symon and Johnson's (1997) review, the current research did not seek to determine the optimal methodology for measuring the self-reference effect. Instead, the goal was to establish converging lines of evidence that Hispanic-Americans (more specifically, Mexican-Americans) use a *simpatico* self-schema more than White-Americans do. Supporting evidence was amassed over a series of related studies that investigated the way that Hispanic- and White-Americans (1) think about themselves (self-concept), (2) react to and remember *simpatico*-relevant words (memory and

retrieval), and (3) differ in terms of *simpatico*-relevant thoughts, feelings, and behavior during ongoing social interactions.

Self-schemas influence memory and recall, presumably by acting as a source of cues that facilitate the retrieval of schema-consistent information. The self-schema integrates self-relevant experiences along with situations and events that are relevant to an individual's self-definition. This information is uniquely compelling and interesting, heightening the individual's sensitivity to stimuli relevant to the self-schema. Because of this heightened sensitivity, schema-consistent information tends to be the focus of attention, is better remembered, and is more efficiently processed (Rogers et al., 1977; Kuiper & Rogers, 1979). Recall that the superior processing effect was observed in the Markus (1977) study where it was found that, compared to aschematic participants, schematic participants were able to recall significantly more instances when they had behaved in a manner consistent with their Independent/Dependent schema.

1.5 The Current Studies

This series of studies investigated a number of schema-related differences between Hispanic-Americans and White-Americans.

1. As in the pilot study, the goal of the first study of this dissertation was to test for a predicted difference in the way Hispanic- and White-Americans perceive themselves (self-concept). The procedure for this study was the same as that used to collect the archival data for the pilot study. By coding the participants' spontaneous, self-reported answers to the question "Who am I?" differences in the way Hispanic- and White-Americans perceive themselves were assessed.

2. The goal of the second study was to investigate potential differences in the way Hispanic- and White-Americans react to and remember *simpatico*-relevant words (memory and retrieval). Using a traditional cognitive-experimental paradigm (Markus, 1977), I determined whether Hispanic- and White-Americans chose different words to describe themselves, assessed how quickly the participants reacted to schema-relevant versus schema-irrelevant trait terms, and measured the percentage of *simpatico*-related trait terms recalled at the end of the experiment.

3. The goal of the third study was to determine if Hispanic- and White-Americans display different rates of *simpatico*-relevant thoughts and feelings during ongoing social interactions and if this difference can be used to predict important social behaviors. This was based on the reasoning that to the extent people have been highly socialized in the use of the *simpatia* cultural script it is likely to be represented in their self-concepts as well as to become cognitively available as a guide to their behavior in social interaction settings.

To determine this, archival data from a previous dyadic interaction study were used (Holloway et al., 2006). For the purposes of this study, five independent raters content coded the participants' own reported thoughts and feelings for *simpatico*-related terms. These data were then used to determine if Hispanic- and White-Americans display different rates of *simpatico*-relevant thoughts and feelings during an unstructured social interaction with a same-sex stranger. This variable was then used as Actor and Partner predictor variables in a series of APIM analyses in which the

participants' behavioral involvement, self-reported interaction quality, positive partner attributions and affect, and positive self-affect were the dependent measures.

A more detailed preview of each of the proposed studies is provided below. In the following section, the specific methods that were used in each of the studies in this dissertation project are discussed at length.

CHAPTER 2

PILOT STUDY

In an attempt to provide preliminary evidence for a *simpatico* self-schema, a pilot study was conducted using archival data provided by Flury (2004). My hypothesis for the pilot study was that Hispanic-American individuals would use more *simpatico*-related trait adjectives than White-American participants when describing themselves on the “Who Am I?” task, a measure of spontaneous self-concept (See Appendix A: Gordon, 1968).

2.1 Participants

The “Who Am I?” (See Appendix A) responses of 66 participants were selected from a much larger archival data set (Flury, 2004) based on the participants’ ethnicity and social desirability scores. The 33 Hispanic participants were each matched with a White participant who had the same gender and the same score on a 10-item measure of social desirability (described below). This procedure resulted in 33 same-gender matched pairs in which one member was Hispanic, the other member was White, and both members of the pair had identical social desirability scores. Working within the constraints of the available data set, 24 pairs of female participants and eight pairs of male participants were matched according to the predetermined criteria.

2.2 Materials

In the original study (Flury, 2004) a 10-item short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale (See Appendix B) was administered to all participants during a departmental pretest (Strahan & Gerbasi, 1972). The reliability of this measure was less than optimal in Flury's total sample of 337 respondents ($\alpha = .55$); however, data reported by Ioannon, Mogg, & Bradley (2004) and Fischer and Fick (1993) support the validity of this measure. Sample items include "I always try to practice what I preach" and "I never resent being asked to return a favor." The participants in Flury's study were also asked to report their gender and ethnicity on the department pretest. This information as well as the social desirability scores was used to create the matched pairs that were used in the pilot study.

2.3 Procedure

In the original study (Flury, 2004), participants met in a classroom style setting and completed a series of questionnaires. The first of their tasks was to provide up to 15 free-response answers to the simple question, "Who am I?" (Gordon, 1968). They were encouraged not to worry about the importance or logic of their responses. Participants wrote down their responses in the form of 15 items on a numbered list, their answers in nearly all cases took the form of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence that completed the sentence stem, "I am." Some sample responses are "I am a student," and "I am occasionally arrogant," and "I am in love."

2.4 Data Coding

For the purpose of the present study, five independent raters later coded the “Who Am I?” data for the 33 matched pairs. Each rater was instructed to indicate whether or not each self-description contained one or more of the following words or used words that expressed essentially the same social orientation (i.e., the social orientation that is representative of *simpatico*). The word list the raters were given is as follows: *likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous*.

Raters were given a short excerpt from the introduction section of an article by Triandis et al. (1984) an excerpt that provided a cogent definition of the term *simpatico* (See Appendix C), in order to help them make these judgments. Because the interrater reliability for the *simpatico* ratings of the “Who Am I?” responses proved to be acceptably high ($\alpha = .81$), the percentages of *simpatico* self-descriptions identified by each of the raters were averaged for each participant in the study, and the mean percentage was used as the dependent variable in the analyses reported below.

2.5 Results

As predicted, the results of a dependent (i.e., matched pairs) *t*-test revealed that the percentage of *simpatico*-related self-descriptions reported by the Hispanic-American participants, 12.93% ($SD = 8.27\%$), was significantly greater than the percentage of *simpatico* related self-descriptions reported by the White-American participants, 8.08%

($SD = 6.69\%$), $t(31) = 2.35$, $p < .05$, estimated standard error = 2.06, effect size = 2.35 (large).

To ensure that this finding wasn't attributable to (or qualified by) a gender difference, a mixed-model ANOVA was subsequently conducted in which gender was treated as the between-pairs variable and ethnicity was treated as the within-pairs variable. The main effect for ethnicity was again significant in this analysis, $F(1,62) = 6.74$, $p < .05$; however, neither the main effect for gender nor the interaction between gender and ethnicity was significant, $F_s = 0.81$ and 0.04 , respectively, $p_s > .25$.

In summary, the results of the pilot study were consistent with the prediction that Hispanic-American individuals would report a significantly higher percentage of *simpatico*-related trait and adjectives than White-American participants when answering the question, "Who am I?" This result conceptually replicates the findings of a previous study by Brown and Ferguson (1967), which also suggests that people's self-schemas are reflected in their answers to the question, "Who am I?" Brown and Ferguson (1967) found that participants' intensity of religious belief (assessed through a religious attitude scale) was significantly related to the religious content of their self-concepts as assessed through the "Who am I?" technique. Specifically, when they compared the most-religious participants to the least-religious participants, Brown and Ferguson (1967) found significantly more religious-related content in the former group's self-descriptions. Similarly, the pilot study has provided preliminary evidence that the cultural value of *simpatico* may underlie a difference in the way Hispanic- and White-Americans perceive themselves (self-concept).

CHAPTER 3

STUDY 1

The purpose of Study 1 was to replicate and complement the results of the pilot study using a new sample. On the basis of their responses to pre-test questionnaires, participants were matched according to their gender and social desirability scores. One member of each pair was a Hispanic-American and the other will be a White-American. The participants met in a classroom setting and completed the “Who am I?” task (Gordon, 1968). This task requires that participants report up to 15 responses to the simple question, “Who Am I?” by completing the sentence stem “I am.” The participants’ responses were then coded by several independent raters for the presence of *simpatico*-related words such as *amiable*, *congenial*, and *likeable*.

Through their early socialization experience, Hispanic-Americans should have internalized a strong cultural value of *simpatico*, whereas White-Americans should, for the most part, have not. For this reason, Hispanic-American participants should have formed self-concepts in which *simpatico*-relevant words and phrases are more likely to be represented. The hypothesis (H1) for this study was that Hispanic-American individuals would report a significantly higher percentage of *simpatico*-related trait and adjectives than White-American participants when answering the question, “Who am I?”

3.1 Participants

Effect size analysis for the pilot data revealed a large effect size (described above) that was subsequently applied in a power analysis to estimate an appropriate sample size for Study 1. Given a large effect size estimate, a predetermined Type I error rate of .05, and a conservatively non-directional research hypothesis, a sample size of at least 18 matched pairs of participants (or 36 individuals) would be required to achieve a power of .90.

Accordingly, 50 undergraduates (20 men and 30 women) who were enrolled in introductory psychology and research design and statistics classes at the University of Texas at Arlington were recruited for participation in this study. Their participation was voluntary and provided one means by which they could fulfill a course requirement. By background, 25 of the participants were White, and 25 were Hispanic/Latino. Of the 25 Hispanic/Latino participants, 17 specified their ethnicity as Mexican-American, six specified Central or South American, and two marked the “other” option. Although all participants were recruited on the basis of their gender, their self-reported ethnicity (See Appendix J), and their social desirability score, they were not informed of these selection criteria until they were debriefed at the end of their experimental session.

3.2 Materials

All participants completed the following three questionnaires during the first of their two experimental sessions. These questionnaires are as follows:

3.2.1 Big Five Personality Measure

Goldberg's (1999) Big Five (IPIP) questionnaire was used to assess the participants' personalities on five broad and relatively independent dimensions (extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, emotional stability, and openness to experience), so that fundamental personality differences that might potentially account for the predicted effects could be explored (See Appendix D). The validity of this measure has been determined in studies by Goldberg (1993) and by Widiger and Trull (1997).

With regard to personality differences, the focus was on the socially relevant dimensions of extraversion and agreeableness. Extraverted individuals are characterized as being more persuasive, confident, friendly, active, energetic, sociable, and expressive than others, and they tend to experience and report more positive affect (Ashton, Paunonen, & Lee, 2002; Watson & Clark, 1997). Agreeableness, which subsumes such traits as cooperation, empathy, selflessness, and identification with others, is a personality dimension that is also closely related to prosocial behavior (Graziano & Eisenberg, 1997). Agreeableness has been identified by Griffin, Joe, Chatham, and Simpson (1998) as one of the three general factors that underlie their self-report measure of *simpatico* (the other two factors are respect and politeness); therefore this factor is especially relevant to the present investigation. The internal consistency of the Extraversion and Agreeableness scales was found to be acceptably high at .89, and .80, respectively.

Because Conscientiousness could be related to knowing and following the “rules” governing socially gracious behavior, Conscientiousness was also considered as a potential covariate in this study. The reliability of the Conscientiousness measure was acceptably high at .76. These reliability estimates obtained for the five factors in this sample are consistent with Roberts, Chernyshenko, Stark and Goldberg’s (2005) report that the big five factors “internal consistency-reliabilities range from .67 to .90, with an average of .80.” The means obtained for the five factors in this sample are consistent with those found in other studies as well (Lim & Ployhart, 2006).

3.2.2 Social Desirability Scale (10 items)

The second questionnaire was the same 10-item short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale ($\alpha = .69$) that was used in the pilot study. This measure was employed to match the Hispanic and White participants on their tendency to respond in a socially desirable way. This matching procedure was implemented to ensure that any effects for ethnicity could not be attributed to potentially confounding differences in socially desirable responding (See Appendix A). To ensure that the reliability estimates obtained in this study are consistent with those found by other researchers, a review of relevant research was conducted. Normative data were found in a study conducted by Reynold’s (1982), where it was reported that the 10-item social desirability scale’s internal consistencies have ranged from .49 - .75. The sample reliability obtained here lies within this range, so the participants in the present sample were responding in a manner similar to participants in other samples.

3.2.3 Acculturation Scale

The third questionnaire was the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics, a 12-item measure of behavioral acculturation, relevant demographic descriptors, and cultural values (See Appendix E: Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987). This scale appears to measure three distinct factors: *language use and ethnicity loyalty* ($\alpha = .88$); *media* ($\alpha = .87$: referring to use of and preference for electronic and printed media); and *ethnic social relations* ($\alpha = .79$: referring to ethnicity of friends for self and for one's children). In the present sample, the total scale had a high internal consistency ($\alpha = .92$). The reliability estimates for the scale are very similar to the ones obtained in the original study where the scale was developed. Marin et al. (1987) obtained an overall scale reliability of .92, the same value observed here. For the subscales they obtained virtually identical values to those that were observed in this study: *ethnicity loyalty* ($\alpha = .90$); *media* ($\alpha = .86$), and *ethnic social relations* ($\alpha = .78$). The means for Hispanic and Non-Hispanic participants in this sample were also similar to those provided by the participants in the study where the scale was developed (Marin et al., 1987). The range of total scores on the Short Acculturation Scale was 30 for the Hispanic participants (28 – 58), and 27 for the White participants (28 – 55).

To help validate the acculturation scale, the authors computed a correlation between the respondents' subjective evaluation of their own acculturation and their combined responses to the actual scale items. Specifically, the participants were asked to indicate how they would describe themselves on a Likert-type scale that ranged from Very Latino/Hispanic to Very American. Their total scale score responses were found

to correlate .76 with their answers to this single item. The results also showed that Hispanics and Non-Hispanics scored differently on the acculturation scale. The authors then performed independent analyses for the Mexican Americans and Central Americans in their sample. Both groups scored similarly on the scale, supporting the notion that this scale may be appropriately used by more than one Hispanic subgroup.

The participants' gender, ethnicity, and preferred language were also assessed. However, these questions were asked at the beginning of the semester as part of the departmental pretest rather than being included in the measures administered during the experimental sessions. As an index of their socioeconomic status (SES), the participants were also asked to report their mother and father's education level as well as their household income at the time of the pretest.

3.3 Procedure

Participants were recruited via telephone and scheduled to report to two experimental sessions. During the first session, the participants simply provided their responses to each of the questionnaires described above. Their second experimental session was scheduled at least two days after the first; the longest delay between the two sessions was a week. At the time of their second experimental session, participants met in a classroom-style setting to complete the "Who am I?" questionnaire. Participants wrote down their responses in the form of 15 items on a numbered list. Their answers in nearly all cases took the form of a single word, a phrase, or a sentence that completed the sentence stem "I am." Some sample responses are as follows: "I am smart," "I am a Christian," and "I am a hard worker."

3.4 Data Coding

After the data collection was completed, 13 independent data coders were recruited to content code the participants' "Who am I?" responses. As in the pilot study, the raters were given the following word list: *likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous*. The instructions asked the research assistants to specify which entries contained one or more of the aforementioned words, or if the participant used a word or phrase that expressed essentially the same social orientation. Consistent with the procedure used in the pilot study, the raters were also given the excerpt from the Triandis et al., (1984) in order to help them better understand the concept of *simpatico* (See Appendix C).

Because the inter-rater reliability was acceptably high ($\alpha = .94$) for this task, the resulting data were averaged across raters to obtain the best estimate of the percentage of *simpatico*-related terms in the self-descriptions that were provided for each participant.

3.5 Results

Because Study 1 served as a replication of the first "Who am I?" study, the data analyses will be the same as those used in the pilot study. A dependent (matched-pairs) *t*-test was again used to determine if Mexican-American participants used more *simpatico*-related terms in their self-descriptions than White-American participants. As predicted, the results of a dependent *t*-test revealed that the percentage of *simpatico*-related self-descriptions reported by the Hispanic-American participants, 31.4%, ($SD =$

14.82%) was significantly greater than the percentage of *simpatico* related self-descriptions reported by the White-American participants, 22.6% ($SD = 10.12\%$), $t(24) = 2.39$, $p < .05$, estimated standard error = 3.38, effect size = .48 (medium).

Potential covariates including the participants' gender ($F(1,46) = .05$, $p > .82$), acculturation score ($F(1, 45) = .52$, $p > .47$), and socio-economic status ($F(1, 44) = 5.16$, $p > .48$), did not affect this relationship. Further investigation revealed that the participants' scores on the Big Five measures of Extraversion ($F(1, 45) = 3.44$, $p > .07$), and Agreeableness ($F(1, 45) = .05$, $p > .83$), and Conscientiousness ($F(1, 46) = .09$, $p > .76$), did not affect this relationship either.

3.6 Discussion

The goal of the first study was to test for evidence of the presumed difference in the availability of the *simpatico* self-schema in the self-conceptions of Hispanic versus White individuals. This test was conducted using the "Who am I?" task, a measure of spontaneous self-concept (Gordon, 1968). The hypothesis for this study was that Hispanics should report a significantly higher percentage of *simpatico*-related words and phrases in their "Who Am I?" responses than the White participants.

The results of the dependent *t*-test comparing the *simpatico*-related content in the responses to the "Who am I?" task across Hispanics and Whites showed the predicted difference: the responses of the Hispanic participants entries contained a significantly higher percent of responses that reflected the cultural value of *simpatico*. This effect remained significant even after I partialled out the effects of several potential covariates (e.g., agreeableness, extraversion, conscientiousness, gender, and

socio-economic status). These findings suggest that the participants' responses to the "Who am I?" measure had a significant cultural component that reflected the greater incorporation of the value of *simpatia* into the self-concepts of the Hispanic participants—a cultural component that cannot be attributed to the aforementioned covariates.

This was not the first study to use the "Who am I?" task to examine the cultural correlates of individual differences in self-concept (see, for example, Eaton and Louw, 2000). However, to my knowledge, this was the first study to use the "Who am I?" task to examine differences in the self-schemas of Hispanic and White participants.

CHAPTER 4

STUDY 2

The purpose of the Study 2 was to provide additional evidence for a *simpatico* self-schema using an experimental paradigm similar to that employed by Markus (1977). On the basis of their responses to pretest questionnaires, participants were matched according to their gender and their social desirability scores. The procedure of Study 2 involved three phases: (1) Participants were asked to indicate if a trait term described them by responding ME or NOT ME; (2) Response times for these decisions were measured; and (3) Participants were asked to recall as many of the trait terms that were presented in the first phase of the study as possible.

If Hispanic-Americans do have an internalized cultural value of being *simpatico*, they should be able to use and process information about themselves in this domain more easily than White-Americans. It was therefore predicted (H2a) that Hispanic-Americans would choose more *simpatico*-related terms as being self-descriptive than the White-American participants would choose. It was further predicted (H2b) that Hispanic-Americans would have faster response times to *simpatico*-related terms than to *simpatico*-unrelated terms, whereas no such difference was proposed for White-Americans. Finally, it was predicted (H2c) that Hispanic-American participant

would recall more of the *simpatico*-related words than White-American participants when presented with the free recall task at the end of the experiment.

4.1 Participants

Symons and Johnson (1997) have reported that self-reference effect (SRE) studies generally result in medium effect sizes, so past research would suggest using a medium effect size in the current sample size estimations. Given a medium effect size estimate, a predetermined Type I error rate of .05, and a conservatively non-directional research hypothesis, a sample size of at least 44 pairs of participants would be required to achieve a power of .90. Working within the constraints of the department subject participant, 62 participants were recruited for this study. Their participation was voluntary and provided one means by which they could fulfill a course requirement.

The same selection criteria used in the previous study were also used in this one, (i.e., all participants were recruited on the basis of their gender, their self-reported ethnicity (See Appendix J), and their social desirability score). These selection criteria were explained to the participants when they were debriefed at the end of the experiment. Of the 62 participants in this study, 31 of the participants were Anglo-American (i.e., White), and 31 were Hispanic/Latino (i.e., Mexican-American). Of those participants who reported having a Hispanic/Latino background, 20 described themselves themselves as Mexican-American, two reported being Puerto Rican, three specified Central/Southern American, and only one participant used the “other” option.

4.2 Materials

All participants completed the following three questionnaires during the first of their two experimental sessions. The questionnaires are as follows:

4.2.1 Big Five Personality Measure

Goldberg's (1999) Big Five (IPIP: Appendix D) questionnaire was used to assess the participants' personalities on five broad and relatively independent dimensions so that personality differences that might potentially account for the predicted effects could be explored. Previous studies by Goldberg (1993) and by Widiger and Trull (1997) have validated the IPIP measure of the Big Five. For the same reasons as discussed in Study 1, the focus was on the socially relevant dimensions of extraversion and agreeableness. The internal consistency of the Extraversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness scales was found to be acceptably high, with alpha coefficients of .90, .70, and .77 respectively. Normative data for this scale were provided in the previous method section (page 29), and the reader is referred to that section in order to see the comparability of the mean and reliability estimates obtained in the present sample and in previous ones.

4.2.2 Social Desirability Scale (10 items)

The second questionnaire administered was the same 10-item short version of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale that was used in both the pilot study and in Study 1 ($\alpha = .45$). This measure was again used to match the Hispanic and White participants in Study 2 on their tendency to respond in a socially desirable way. This matching procedure helped to ensure that any effects for ethnicity could not be

attributed to potentially confounding differences in socially desirable responding (Appendix B). To determine that the responses provided by the participants in this sample were not atypical a literature review was conducted to collect some normative data for this scale. This information is provided on page 29 and the reader is referred to that section in order to compare the reliability estimates and means provided by this sample and others.

4.2.3 Acculturation Scale for Hispanics

The third questionnaire was the Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics, a 12-item measure of behavioral acculturation, relevant demographic descriptors, and cultural values (Marin, Sabogal, Marin, Otero-Sabogal, & Perez-Stable, 1987). This is the questionnaire that was used for the same purposes in Study 1. In the present sample, the total scale showed an acceptably high level of internal consistency ($\alpha = .96$: Appendix E). In order to determine the reliability estimates and means obtained here were comparable to those obtained by other researchers; normative data were provided for this scale in page 30. The reader is referred to that section to see that the responses provided by the participants in this sample are not irregular. The range of scores for the participants in this sample on the acculturation scale was 28 for the Hispanic participants (27 – 58), and was 22 for the White participants (36 – 58).

The participants' gender, ethnicity, and preferred language were also assessed. However, as in Study 1, these questions were asked at the beginning of the semester as part of the departmental pretest. As a measure of socioeconomic status (SES),

participants were also asked to report their mother and father's education level as well as their household income at the time of the pretest.

4.3 Procedure

Participants were recruited via telephone and offered an opportunity to participate in this study as one means of receiving partial course credit. They were asked to report on separate days to two experimental sessions. Their second experimental session was scheduled at least two days after the first; the longest delay being between experimental sessions was a week. During the first session, the participants simply provided their responses to each of the questionnaires described above.

Upon arriving at the second experimental session, each participant was greeted by the experimenter. The participant was then escorted to a cubicle and seated in front of a personal computer. Computerized instructions informed each participant of the requirements of the upcoming task. Instructions were delivered by E-Prime, which is a graphical experiment generator for Windows that consists of a suite of applications to design, generate, run, collect, edit, and analyze data.

The instructions that appeared on each participant's computer screen read as follows: "A series of words will be presented to you via this computer screen. After viewing each word, your task will be to respond by pushing the 'ME' button on your keyboard as fast as you can if you feel the word describes you, or to respond by pushing the 'NOT ME' button as fast as you can if the word is not self-descriptive (please locate these keys now)."

To help ensure that the participants were associating similar types of behaviors with the trait adjectives, a particular context was specified for the judgments (Markus, 1977). The instructions that specify this context were as follows and appeared immediately after the previous instructions: “When you are making these decisions about yourself, try to imagine yourself in a typical group setting: one that might occur in the classroom, a dormitory setting, or at a friend’s house. Imagine that the group has gotten together to socialize. Some of the people there are familiar to you, but there are others whom you don’t yet know.” As a final instruction, participants were reminded that if they felt uncomfortable at any time, they had the option to terminate their participation in the study whenever they liked with no loss of research credit.

Following the computer’s presentation of these instructions, each of the 76 trait adjectives (below) was successively presented on the screen for a 2-second interval. These words were selected to match the *simpatico*-related stimulus words on the basis of their relative standing on a range of values (e.g., concreteness, familiarity, frequency of usage, and imageability), as these are important dimensions that affect memory. Six undergraduate research assistants who coded the words on an 11-point Likert scale that ranged from emotionally negative to emotionally positive determined the emotional valence of all words.

As an additional check on their appropriateness as stimuli, the same trait terms were presented in list form to several lower-level undergraduate classes to determine if the people in this sample understood the meaning of all of the words. Any word that more than 10% of the sample reported not knowing the meaning of was dropped from

the list of potential trait terms to be used in the experiment. Five such words were removed from the list for this reason: stoic, candid, amiable, meek, and neurotic.

The remaining words, which were presented in a random order, served as the critical schema-related stimuli. The inter-rater reliability estimates and mean emotional valence ratings for the set of stimulus words are presented after each word list. The *simpatico*-related stimulus words were as follows: likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous ($\alpha = .82$, $M = 6.99$, $SD = .87$). The non-*simpatico* related control stimulus words were classified as belonging to one of three emotional categories: positive, negative, and neutral. The positively valenced control words were as follows: confident, wise, adventurous, ambitious, determined, sincere, sensible, reliable, imaginative, confident, cheerful, attentive, obedient, responsive, eager, calm, genuine, brave, energetic, and dependable ($\alpha = .80$, $M = 7.40$, $SD = .91$).

The neutrally valenced words were as follows: sarcastic, timid, talkative, serious, proud, persistent, impulsive, immature, forgetful, dignified, critical, blunt, bold, absent-minded, tense, outspoken, idealistic, deliberate, and congenial ($M = 4.56$, $SD = 1.14$). The negatively valenced words were as follows: sympathetic, suspicious, stubborn, selfish, reckless, possessive, incompetent, lazy, cruel, cowardly, clumsy, careless, annoying, anti-social, argumentative, indifferent, rude, pessimistic, irritable, insecure, greedy, extravagant, emotional ($M = 2.69$, $SD = 1.39$).

After the participant had responded to the last trait adjective by pushing either the ME or NOT ME button as quickly as possible, the participant was presented with

another set of instructions. These instructions read as follows: “Now that you have completed the first part of the experimental procedure, it is time for you to begin the next phase of the experiment. In this phase, your task will be to proofread the draft of a manuscript and change any inappropriately capitalized letters to lower-case (uncapitalized) letters and mark through any duplicated words. Please read the text carefully, slowly and closely as you might read a textbook when studying for an exam.” The manuscript used for this task appears in Appendix F.

The next phase of the experiment served as a filler or distraction task of the type that produces significantly larger mean SREs according to the results of Symons and Johnson’s (1997) meta-analysis. Consistent with the task instructions specified above, the participants were asked to proofread a manuscript and change the inappropriately capitalized letters to lower-case (uncapitalized) letters and mark through any duplicated words that appear in the text. When the participant had completed this portion of the procedure, the last phase of the experiment began.

The final part of the experimental procedure involved a free-recall memory test, though the participants were not informed of this at the beginning of the study. After the last screen of the manuscript had been reviewed, the E-prime program asked the participants to recall as many of the words they saw during the first phase of the experimental session as they possibly could.

From the data collected by means of these procedures, three dependent variable measures were derived: (1) the percentage of *simpatico*-related words the participants responded to by pressing the ME key, (2) their mean reaction times to the *simpatico*-

relevant stimulus words, and (3) the number of *simpatico*-related words they remembered during the free recall period. Each of these three dependent variables was used in the subsequent data analyses.

4.4 Data Coding

Four independent raters ($\alpha = .99$) coded the participants' free recall lists. Each rater was instructed to identify and record the total number words recalled by each participant and the number of words recalled from the following list. The strictest coding criteria were adopted, such that only exact matches were to be coded. The list of *simpatico* words the raters were given was as follows: *likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous*. The raters were given the short excerpt from the introduction of the article by Triandis et al. (1984) that presents them with a coherent definition of the term *simpatico*, just as before. The coded data were used to determine the total number of *simpatico*-relevant terms recalled as well as the percentage of *simpatico*-relevant terms recalled.

4.5 Results

A series of dependent (matched-pairs) *t*-tests were used to determine if there was a significant difference between the Hispanic participants and the White participants on the three dependent measures that were collected in this study.

Hypothesis H2a would be supported if the Hispanic participants chose more *simpatico*-related terms than to the non-*simpatico*-related stimulus when making ME (i.e., YES) judgments than the White participants did. However, the results of the

dependent *t*-test did not reveal this predicted difference, $t(28) = -.83, p < .81$. Hispanics participants chose an average of 14.15 *simpatico*- related terms ($SD = 1.04$) and an average of 13.42 non-*simpatico* –related terms ($SD = 2.62$). White participants chose an average of 14.03 *simpatico* related terms, ($SD = 1.55$), and an average of 12.91 non-*simpatico* related terms.

Hypothesis H2b would be supported if the Hispanic participants had faster response times to the *simpatico*-related words than to the non-*simpatico*-related stimulus words whereas the White participants did not. The results of the dependent *t*-test did not support the hypothesis, $t(28) = -.30, p < .77$. Hispanic participants had an average reaction time of 1430.53 milliseconds ($SD = 555.71$) to the *simpatico*-related trait terms, and an average response time of 1598.15 milliseconds ($SD = 578.64$) to the non-*simpatico* related terms $t(30) = 13.32, p < .01$. White participants had an average reaction time of 1298.37 milliseconds ($SD = 371.51$) to the *simpatico* related terms and an average reaction time of 1481.53 ($SD = 381.05$) to the non-*simpatico* related terms $t(30) = 19.56, p < .01$. The results revealed no significant difference in the average reaction times for the two ethnic groups when they say “Yes, this word describes me,” in reference to the *simpatico*-relevant terms.

Clearly, both Hispanics and Whites responded significantly faster to the *simpatico* related terms than to the non-*simpatico* related terms. However, because this effect was actually stronger for the White participants than for the Hispanic participants, there was no support for the Hypothesis H2b prediction that an effect in this direction would be stronger for Hispanics than for White.

For these two dependent measures, the amount of variance is low in both groups, and the reason it is low in both groups is because the scores in both groups lie within a narrow range at or near the “ceiling” (upper limit). The reader is directed to Tables 1 and 2, located in Appendix H. The presence of these ceiling effects means that we cannot detect any differences between the reaction times for the ME responses of the Hispanic and White participants because the stimuli used in the study failed to establish a “range of response” in which such effects might be observed. In other words, the null results obtained in this study cannot be taken as strong evidence that there isn’t a *simpatico* self-schema; instead, they suggest that Study 2 failed to establish a response range in which such effects might occur. Empirical evidence for this ceiling effect was evidenced by the fact that participants, regardless of ethnicity, responded significantly faster to the control words than to the neutral, or negative control words ($t_{S(30)} = -6.49$, and -4.60 , both $ps < .01$)

Hypothesis H2c would be supported if the Hispanic participants recalled more of the *simpatico*-related words than the White participants did. The results of the analysis did not support the hypothesis either, $t(29) = 1.75$, $p < .09$. Hispanic participants recalled a total average of 1.93 *simpatico*-related terms ($SD = 1.37$) in the free recall task, whereas White participants recalled a total average of 1.47 *simpatico*-related terms ($SD = 1.04$) in the free recall task. The mean for the total number of non-*simpatico* terms recalled by the Hispanic partners was 13.18 ($SD = 1.03$), and was 13.46 ($SD = 1.14$) for the White participants.

Given the general lack of support for the Study 2 hypotheses, it was decided to see if a potential “*simpatico* schematicity factor” in the data could be identified, for which an ethnicity difference might be found. After standardizing all three dependent variables (the recall data, the reaction times, and proportion of ME responses), the standard scores on these measures were combined to create a single “*simpatico* schematicity factor.” The three variables that formed this factor yielded an alpha coefficient of .57, suggesting that it was acceptable to combine these individual variables into one factor. However, when the participants’ ethnicity was tested to determine if it would predict this “*simpatico* schematicity factor” (gender effects ($F(1, 52) = 1.12, p > .29$), and the possible gender by ethnicity effect ($F(1, 52) = .20, p > .65$ were also tested), the results were again non-significant, $F(1, 52) = .37, p > .54$. Thus, although there was some evidence of a *simpatico* schematicity factor in the data, the participants’ scores on this factor were not predicted by their ethnicity.

4.6 Discussion

Study 2 was based on the premise that a *simpatico* self-schema exists, and that evidence of this schema would manifest itself in differences in the processing of *simpatico*-relevant information. Study 2 used a cognitive paradigm designed to study self-schemas (Markus, 1977), and a meta-analysis of previous studies of this type informed Study 2’s procedures and test stimuli (Symons & Johnson, 1977). Instead of being asked to describe themselves as in Study 1, the participants in Study 2 were asked to judge whether or not each of the 76 trait terms they viewed (*simpatico*-relevant or control) described them, by making a ME versus NOT ME decision in each case.

The *simpatico*-relevant trait terms that were used in Study 2 were selected from an article that outlined the important aspects of the Hispanic cultural script of *simpatico* (Triandis, et. al, (1987). These trait terms were as follows: likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous. Control trait terms were also presented to the participants that were matched with the stimulus words not only in their valence but also in other ways that are known to affect memory processes (e.g., frequency of usage, imageability). The three dependent measures of interest in this study were 1) the percentage of times the participant reported that a *simpatico*-related terms was descriptive of him- or herself, 2) the average time it took the participant to make this decision for *simpatico*-relevant items (i.e., reaction time), and 3) the percentage of *simpatico*-related terms the participant recalled at the end of the experimental procedure.

Dependent *t*-tests were conducted to test these hypotheses, and the results of the analyses failed to support any of them. Recall that all of the participants responded just as quickly to the positively valenced control words as to the *simpatico* trait terms (refer to page 43 to see these reaction time data). However, I predicted that the Hispanic participants should respond faster than the White participants to the (positively valenced) *simpatico* words, and this effect was not found. Instead, Hispanics and Whites had similar average response times to the *simpatico* words. The second hypothesis was also not supported, because Hispanics and Whites showed a similar high level of endorsement of the *simpatico* words as self-descriptive (see the self-

endorsement data on page 48). Finally, the third hypothesis was also not supported, because there was no difference between Hispanics and Whites in their recall of the *simpatico*-related terms during the free recall portion of the experiment.

In short, none of the predicted effects were significant in Study 2. However, before one can conclude that the *simpatico* self-schema does not manifest itself in differences in the cognitive processing of *simpatico*-relevant information (the premise underlying the hypotheses of Study 2, it is important to consider some alternative explanations for these null results. First, because all of the *simpatico*-related terms were positively valenced, people of both ethnic groups responded to them similarly and affirmatively. When presented with a positive term, whether *simpatico* or control, White and Hispanics alike, said, “Yes, this word describes me,” and they did so fairly similarly (the data supporting these claims can be found on page 48 and 49).

In retrospect, this outcome makes sense in terms of what we know about the “better-than-average” effect, which refers to the phenomenon that most people “view themselves as above *average* on positive characteristics” (Silvera, & Seger, 2004; Sedikides, Gaertner, & Vevea, 2005). In a representative study of this type, Kenkyu (1999) asked participants to rate themselves on several attributes. His results showed that more than half of the participants thought that they were above average on several positively valenced personality attributes. In general, people like to think they are above average when it comes to positive attributes, but below average on negative attributes (Silvera, & Seger (2004).

The same need to see oneself (or at least to present oneself) in a positive; socially desirable way may have similarly worked against the confirmation of my second hypothesis. By examining the data presented in Appendix F, the reader can see that the proportion of the ME responses for the control and *simpatico* trait terms are practically at the upper limit for that variable (i.e. one). Hispanics and Whites may have endorsed the *simpatico*-related trait terms at the same high rates because these attributes are viewed as positive and desirable in *both* cultures, even if Hispanic culture places a higher emphasis on their importance. Thus, the lack of the predicted ethnicity difference in the percentage endorsement of ME responses, does not mean that there is not a *simpatico* self-schema. Rather, we may be seeing additional evidence of the “better-than-average” effect.

When researchers collect data, and the mean response level for all experimental groups approaches the maximum, they call the statistical constraint that results a “ceiling effect.” Ceiling effects prevent making any meaningful inferences about group effects from the statistical test performed. However, as noted above, the existence of a ceiling effect in the present case does not mean that a *simpatico* self-schema does not exist. Different trait terms should be selected to prevent from potential ceiling effects in order to investigate for evidence of a *simpatico* self-schema using this paradigm. The trait terms selected for future studies would have to somehow reflect the cultural value of *simpatico*, but somehow not all be positively valenced. This would be a difficult task as all of the words (so far) are associated with the cultural value of *simpatico* are

positive (e.g., loyalty, friendliness, affection, politeness, dignity, and respect.) (Triandis et al. (1984).

CHAPTER 5

STUDY 3

Study 3, the final study in this series, explored differences in the spontaneous, self-reported thoughts and feelings of White- and Hispanic-American participants as they were assessed in a previous dyadic interaction study (Holloway et al., 2006). In that previous study, pairs of same- and mixed-ethnicity strangers were unobtrusively videotaped during an unstructured 6-minute interaction. Afterwards, the participants watched the tape of their interaction and reported any specific thoughts and feelings they had during the interaction using the procedures developed by Ickes and his colleagues (Ickes & Tooke, 1988; Ickes et al, 1990).

In Study 3, independent raters were used to determine the percentage of *simpatico*-related terms in each participant's coded thought/feeling entries. If Hispanic-Americans do have an internalized cultural value of being *simpatico* that developed during their socialization experience, the Hispanic-American participants should have formed schemas for interacting with a stranger in which *simpatico*-relevant words and phrases are more likely to be represented in their thoughts and feelings during such interactions. Further, the percentage of *simpatico*-relevant thoughts and feelings can be used as an actor and partner predictor variable in a series of APIM analyses.

The hypotheses for Study 3 are based on the reasoning that to the extent people have been highly socialized in the use of the *simpatico* cultural script it is likely to be represented in their self-concepts. It follows that it should also become cognitively available as a guide to their behavior in social interaction settings. To test these hypotheses a series of APIM analyses were conducted, with the prediction that after the variance attributable the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores is partialled out, the previously found relationship (in the aforementioned Hispanic Advantage study) between the actor's and partner's ethnicity and the dependent variables will become non-significant. The three dependent variables were as follows: Behavioral involvement, Interaction quality, and Partner-directed positive affect

5.1 Participants

In the previous study by Holloway et al. (2006), 126 strangers were systematically paired into 63 same-sex (male-male or female-female) dyads. In half of the dyads, the partners were of the same ethnicity (Black-Black, Hispanic-Hispanic, White-White), whereas in the remaining dyads the partners were of different ethnicities (Black-Hispanic, Black-White, Hispanic-White). By background, 38 of the participants were Black, 40 were Hispanic/Latino, and 48 were White. For the purposes of Study 3, only the 12 dyads in which one member was Hispanic and one dyad member was White were selected for further analysis.

5.2 Materials

The following description of the setting and equipment used in the study is adapted from earlier descriptions by Ickes et al. (1990) and Holloway et al. (2006).

5.3 Procedure

Prior to their interactions, the participants in each dyad independently completed Goldberg's (1999) Big Five (IPIP) questionnaire (Appendix D. The validity of this measure has been determined in studies by Goldberg (1993), and Widiger and Trull (1997). The subscales of interest for this study were Extraversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness, and their reliabilities were all acceptably high at .88, .73, .83, respectively.

Using the unstructured dyadic interaction paradigm (Ickes, 1982, 1983; Ickes et al., 1990), same-sex strangers were scheduled to meet and interact as members of either same- or mixed-ethnicity dyads. After the dyad members' 6-minute interaction had been videotaped, their actual thoughts and feelings and their inferences about their partner's thoughts and feelings were assessed using procedures described by Ickes et al. (1990). See Appendix G for the post-interaction questionnaire used in this study.

5.3.1 Obtaining the thought/feeling data.

In this phase of the study, the participants individually viewed the videotape of their interaction twice, first to record their own thoughts and feelings and then to record their inferences about their interaction partner's thoughts and feelings. Once seated in their respective test cubicles, the participants watched an instructional videotape. It explained that the participants were going to view the tape of the 6-minute interaction they had just engaged in. During this time, they would use their pause/start button to pause the tape every time they remembered having a specific thought or feeling during the interaction. Then, with the tape paused, the participant would use the

thought/feeling coding forms provided in the cubicle to record the following: (1) the specific time of the thought/feeling (as indicated on a timer overlay on the videotape); (2) whether the entry was a thought or a feeling (checked as “I was thinking” or “I was feeling” on the coding form); and (3) the specific content of the thought or feeling, written to complete the sentence stem “I was thinking” or “I was feeling.”

The participants were explicitly encouraged to report, as accurately and honestly as possible, all of the specific thoughts and feelings they had during the interaction. At the same time, they were cautioned not to report any thoughts and feelings that occurred to them for the very first time while viewing the videotape. To help ensure their candor and cooperation in this regard, the participants were assured that their interaction partner would never see their responses.

5.4 Data Coding

5.4.1 Coding the thought/feeling data.

For the purposes of the present Study 3, each participant’s own reported thoughts and feelings was coded for the presence (1) or absence (0) of any *simpatico*-relevant references. Each of the six independent raters who completed the coding was instructed to indicate whether or not each reported thought or feeling contains one or more of the following words or uses words that express essentially the same social orientation ($\alpha = .90$). The word list the raters were given is as follows: *likeable, sympathetic, polite, pleasant, amiable, congenial, agreeable, easy-going, understanding, gracious, tolerant, respectful, considerate, friendly, and courteous.*

The same excerpt from the introduction to the study by Triandis et al. (1984) that was given to the coders in the previous studies was again provided to these raters. The coded responses were used to determine the percentage of *simpatico*-related terms in the set of thoughts and feelings reported by each participant during the initial interaction with the same-sex partner.

5.4.2 Coding the behavioral data.

Trained raters coded the relevant behavioral measures from the videotapes of the interactions using a portable event recorder that had been specially designed for this purpose. Different sets of raters (varying in number from two to six) were assigned to code the frequency and duration of all participants' *verbalizations* ($\alpha = .91; 98$), *directed gazes* ($\alpha = .96; 98$), and *expressions of positive affect* ($\alpha = .93; 93$) (smiles and/or laughter). The interrater reliabilities for these behaviors were all acceptably high so the data were aggregated (i.e., averaged) across the relevant set of raters prior to analysis.

5.4.3 Coding attribution data.

Copies of all of the participants' reported thoughts and feelings were given to three independent raters. The raters' task was to code for instances in which the participant's thought or feeling expressed a positive attribution about his or her interaction partner. Examples of each type of attribution were provided (e.g., "She's a good listener," "He's a movie buff"), and the raters were trained both individually and as a group to help them develop common strategies for resolving ambiguous cases. Because of the constrained interdependence in these data, we computed alpha

coefficients for only the percentages of positive attributions, which evidenced comparably high levels of reliability ($\alpha = .81$).

5.5 Results

The data set for this study contained 16 different dependent variables. A factor analyses was conducted to determine if this larger set of variables could be reduced into a smaller set of factor scores. The results of the principle factor extraction (with varimax rotation) showed that these 16 dependent measures could be represented by three factors (i.e., three factors had an eigenvalue greater than one). Because the three factors were highly intercorrelated, the same data were re-analyzed using an oblique rotation instead (the promax rotation). Therefore, instead of presenting the results of 16 separate APIM analyses, the results will be reported for the three factors as the hypotheses apply to each of them. See Appendix I for the APIM results for each individual variable, as well which variables correspond to which factor.

The first hypothesis (H3a) for this study stated that there would be significant effects of both the actor's and the partner's *simpatico*-index scores on the behavioral involvement factor. The behavioral involvement factor was composed of variables relating to the actor and partner's verbalization and gazing frequency and duration. It was further hypothesized that the relationship between the actor and partner's ethnicity and the dependent variable of behavioral involvement would become non-significant after the variance attributable to the *simpatico*-index scores was partialled out.

The results of the APIM analysis supported these predictions. For the behavioral involvement factor, there was a significant effect of both the actor's ($F(1, 57.8) = 16.02$,

$p < .01$: beta weight = 502.55), and the partner's ($F(1, 57.8) = 15.64, p < .01$: beta weight 505.69) *simpatico*-index scores. Also, the previously-found significant relationships between the actor's and partner's ethnicity and this dependent variable became non-significant when the variance that could be attributed to the *simpatico*-index scores had been partialled out, ($F(2, 64) = .39, p > .67$ and $F(2, 64) = .67, p > .51$ respectively).

The second hypothesis (H3b) for this study stated that there would be significant effects of both the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index score on the *perceived interaction quality* factor. The interaction quality factor was composed of items on the post-interaction questionnaire (see Appendix G). Some of these items include: "How involving did you find the interaction?" and, "How much did you enjoy your interaction with the other person?" I further hypothesized that the relationships between the actor's and partner's ethnicity and the dependent variable of interaction quality would become non-significant after the variance attributable to the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores was partialled out.

These predictions were also supported by the results of the APIM analysis. For the perceived interaction quality factor, there were significant actor ($F(1, 95.5) = 24.72, p < .01$: beta weight = 116.52) and partner ($F(1, 95.5) = 12.76, p < .01$: beta weight = 73.45) effects of the *simpatico*-index scores. In addition, the previously found significant effect between the participant's ethnicity and this dependent variable became non-significant for both the actor and the partner ($F(2, 107) = 2.57, p > .08$, and $F(2,$

107) = .96, $p > .38$, respectively) after the variance attributable to the *simpatico*-index scores had been partialled out.

The third hypothesis (H3c) for this study stated that there would be significant effects for both the actor's and partner's *simpatico*- index scores for the *partner-directed positive affect* factor. The variables that constitute this factor included the percentage of positive attribution that the participants made about their partner and the amount of smiling and laughing the participants displayed while interacting with their partner. The researchers further hypothesized that the relationships between the actor's and the partner's ethnicity and the partner-directed positive affect factor would become non-significant after the variance attributable to the *simpatico*-index scores was partialled out.

This expected pattern of results was supported by the relevant APIM analysis. There were significant effects of both the actor's ($F(1, 67.6) = 13.37, p < .01$: beta weight = 346.54), and the partner's ($F(1, 21.76) = 21.76, p < .01$: beta weight = 392.20) *simpatico*-index scores partner-directed positive affect. Further, after partialling out the variance associated with the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores, the previously found significant effects of the actor's and partner's ethnicity on this dependent variable became non-significant ($F(2, 78.2) = .41, p > .66$, and $F(2, 78.2) = .61, p > .44$, respectively).

Potential covariates for this study included the gender composition of the dyad and their scores on the Big Five measures of Extraversion, Agreeableness and Conscientiousness. The participant's gender was entered as a covariate into three

separate models predicting the participants behavioral involvement, $F(1, 47) = 1.21, p > .28$, perceived interaction quality, $F(1, 55) = .59, p > .45$, and partner-directed positive affect, $F(1, 47) = 1.45, p > .23$. As you can see, the participant's gender did not act as a significant covariate, or affect the previously obtained pattern of results.

Neither the actor's, $F(1, 58) = .42, p > .52$, nor the partner's, $F(1, 58) = .15, p > .70$) agreeableness score were significant covariates where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added in this APIM model predicting behavioral involvement. One main effect was found when the actor's agreeableness score was entered as a predictor for perceived interaction quality, $F(1, 83.1) = 6.32, p < .05$. However, after the variance attributable to this variable was partialled out of the previously described model, the predicted pattern of events that were obtained, remained significant.

The partner's agreeableness score was also entered into a APIM model where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added into the model; however it was a non-significant effect, $F(1, 83.1) = .298, p > .09$). Lastly, the actor's, $F(1, 69.1) = .63, p > .43$, and partner's, $F(1, 69.1) = .09, p > .77$, agreeableness scores were entered into the model predicted partner directed positive affect, and they did not significantly affect the previously found results.

The same pattern of results emerged when the actor's, $F(1, 67.6) = .06, p > .37$, and partner's, $F(1, 68.3) = 1.17, p > .28$) extraversion scores were entered as covariates where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and

then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added in this APIM model predicting the perceived behavioral involvement factor as well, but neither effect was significant. The same was true when the actor's and partner's extraversion scores were entered as covariates in the model where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added in this APIM model predicting perceived interaction quality ($F(1, 91.1) = .06, p < .61$, and $F(1, 91.1) = 2.57, p < .11$, respectively), and partner directed positive affect ($F(1, 66.8) = .93, p < .93$, and $F(1, 91.1) = .75, p < .39$, respectively).

When the actor and partner conscientiousness scores were used as covariates, the same results were obtained as those presented in the previous paragraph. The actor's, $F(1, 56.3) = .91, p > .34$, and partner's, $F(1, 56.3) = .81, p > .36$ conscientiousness scores were entered as covariates where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added in this APIM model predicting behavioral involvement, but neither effect was significant. The same was true when the actor's and partner's extraversion scores were entered as covariates in the model where the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-indexes were first added as predictors, and then the actor's and partner's ethnicities were also added in this APIM model predicting perceived interaction quality ($F(1, 96) = .15, p < .69$, and $F(1, 96) = .24, p < .62$, respectively), and partner directed positive affect ($F(1, 64.9) = .01, p < .91$, and $F(1, 64.9) = 1.31, p < .25$, respectively).

Lastly, a series of analyses was conducted to determine if the actor and partner effects had approximately equal influences on each of the three outcome measures (i.e., the three factor scores). The procedure for this test is outlined in Kenny, Kashy & Cook, (2006), and those methods were used here. Three multilevel models were created in which there were two predictor variables for each of the three dependent measure factor scores. The first predictor was the participants' average *simpatico* score, which was simply created by adding the actor and partner *simpatico* scores and dividing by two. The second predictor was the difference between the actor's and partner's *simpatico* scores, which was created by subtracting the partner *simpatico* score from the actor *simpatico* score. Kenny, Kashy & Cook (2006) state "that if the average has an effect, but the difference does not" you can conclude that the actor and partner effects are equally influential on the dependent measure. This outcome was found in each case: the average effect was significant, but the difference was not. The statistics are as follows: behavioral involvement average effect $F(1, 50) = 26.36, p < .01$, difference effect $F(1, 50) = .01, p > .91$, interactional involvement average effect $F(1, 58) = 39.68, p < .01$, difference effect $F(1, 59) = 1.89, p > .17$, and partner directed positive affect (1, 50) = 31.44, $p < .01$, difference effect $F(1, 50) = 31.44, p < .01$, and difference effect $F(1, 51) = 1.44, p > .23$.

5.6 Discussion

In a previous unstructured dyadic interaction study (Holloway et al., 2006), the spontaneous getting-acquainted conversations of 63 same-sex dyads of varying ethnic compositions (Black-Black, Black-Hispanic, Black-White, Hispanic-Hispanic,

Hispanic-White, White-White) were video and audio-recorded. The two members of each dyad viewed their videotaped interaction immediately after it was completed. While they were viewing their interaction, they were asked to report the specific thoughts and feelings they had during the interaction (for the details of this methodology, see Ickes, 1982, 1983; Ickes, Bissonnette, Garcia, & Stinson, 1990).

To test the hypotheses of the present Study 3, these reported thoughts and feelings were recoded for the presence of *simpatico*-related terms. The percentage of *simpatico* related terms was then used to create a *simpatico* thought and feeling index for both partners in the dyad to be used as the predictor variables in a series of APIM analyses. By including index scores for both partners as predictors, I was able to test both the actor effect and the partner effect for this index when predicting behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and, partner-directed positive affect.

In the original dyadic interaction study, Holloway et al. (2006) had sets of independent raters code the videotapes interaction to measure the frequency and duration of each member's talking, gazing, smiling, and laughing). Holloway et al. also analyzed the dyad members' responses to a post-interaction questionnaire which assessed their perceptions of interaction quality, enjoyment, liking, how much time they wanted to spent with their interaction partner in the future, and their felt need to communicate. The 16 resulting dependent variables were subject to a factor analysis that revealed the presence of three higher-order factors. These factors were labeled *behavioral involvement*, *perceived interaction quality*, and *partner-directed positive affect*.

The first hypothesis tested in the present Study 3 was that the aforementioned *simpatico*-index scores (as coded from the participant's thought/feeling data in the Holloway et al. (2006) study) would predict the participants' scores on the three higher-order factors of behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and partner-directed positive affect. To this end, a series of APIM analyses were conducted in which the first predictors entered were the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores, followed by the actor's and partner's as class variable predictors. The goal of this analysis was to see if the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores accounted for unique variance in the dyad members' behavior, with no significant residual variance to be attributed to the actor's and partner's ethnicity.

Recall that the actor's and partner's ethnicity were significant predictors of behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and partner-directed positive affect in the original study presented by Holloway et al. (2006) that investigated the Hispanic Social Advantage. To the extent people have been highly socialized with the use of the *simpatia* cultural script, it is likely to become cognitively available as a guide to their behavior in social interaction settings.

The results supported all three hypotheses for Study 3 of this dissertation, in that the actor's and partner's *simpatico* index scores were significant predictors of all three factor scores (i.e. behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and partner-directed positive affect.), whereas the actor's and partner's ethnicity were not. In other words, the originally significant actor and partner ethnicity effects from the Holloway et

al. (2006) study were no longer significant when the actor and partner effects for the *simpatico* index score variable were statistically controlled.

To ensure that the aforementioned effects could not be attributed to personality differences (e.g., agreeableness and extraversion), or to the gender composition of the dyad, the data for these variables were used as covariates in subsequent analyses. There was only one instance in which any of these effects was significant, and it was when the participants' agreeableness scores were entered into the model predicting perceived interaction quality (along with the other four predictors: actor's and partner's *simpatico* index scores and actor's and partner's ethnicity). However, the participant's agreeableness score did not render any of the other significant predicted effects non-significant, and it does make sense for agreeableness to exert an independent influence on one's perception of an initial social interaction.

In summary, the results from the re-analyses of the Holloway et al. (2006) dyadic interaction study concur with what we know about schema research and theory (D' Andrade, 1992). Schemas provide goals for behaviors and therefore have the potential to instigate action (D' Andrade, 1992). Attaining the goal (here a warm interpersonal interaction) is followed by the emotional consequence related to the success or failure of reaching the goal (here, positive perceived interaction quality) (D' Andrade, 1992). Therefore, the hypothesized *simpatico* self-schema would provide the motivation to make one's interactions warm, harmonious, and enjoyable (consistent with the behavioral interaction data reported on page 51), and would result in the good

feelings that sustain this motivation to the extent that these interaction goals were met (consistent with the perceived interaction quality data reported on page 52).

CHAPTER 6

GENERAL DISCUSSION

The present set of studies explored the implications of a hypothesized *simpatico* self-schema that (1) was assumed to be more characteristic of Hispanic participants than of White participants, and that (2) might account for the ethnicity differences found in the previously described dyadic interaction study by Holloway et al. (2006).

Recall that the results of that study revealed that Hispanic participants had a unique interaction style, compared to White and Black participants in the same study. The Hispanic participants were generally more involved in their interaction with a same-sex stranger, in that they looked at their partner more, talked with their person more, and expressed more positive affect (e.g., laughing, smiling). In addition, the Hispanic participants reported liking their partner more and that they enjoyed the interaction more than the White and Black participants. In general, the *partners* of Hispanic participants evidenced similar behaviors and perceptions. All of these behaviors are consistent with the cultural values of being *simpatico*, in that one of the goals of that cultural script is to create warm interpersonal interactions that elicit reciprocal responses in one's interaction partner.

The notion of a *simpatico* self-schema derives from the empirical evidence of a cultural script of *simpatia* that promotes an interaction style, which is characterized by sympathetic, understanding, pleasing, friendly, well-behaved, and trustworthy. (Triandis et al. (1984). My assumption that there is a corresponding *simpatico* self-schema was based on the fact that *simpatia* is generally regarded as a fundamental value in Mexican-American culture that plays an important role in the socialization of the members of this culture (Freeman & Martin, 2004). Given the evidence of the greater use of *simpatia* as a cultural script by Mexican Americans than by White Americans (Triandis et al. (1984), it is reasonable to assume that *simpatia* is also reflected to a greater extent in the self-concepts and interaction behaviors of Mexican Americans than of White Americans.

Based on this assumption, three studies were designed to test for the implications of the hypothesized difference between Hispanics and Whites in their use of the cultural *simpatia* script or a corresponding *simpatico* self-schema. Study 1 compared the spontaneously reported self-concepts of Hispanic and White participants who were matched on gender and on their tendency to respond in a socially desirable manner. This study tested the hypothesis that a *simpatico* self-schema would be reflected in the spontaneous self-concepts of the Hispanic participants to a greater degree than in the spontaneous self-concepts of the White participants.

Study 2 used a more traditional cognitive paradigm to explore the presumably greater cognitive availability of the *simpatico* self-schema for Hispanics versus Whites. Specifically, I predicted that, when asked if a *simpatico*-related term described them,

the Hispanic participants would be significantly more likely than the White participants to say yes by making a ME versus a NOT ME response. Ethnic differences were also hypothesized to affect the participants' reaction times in making this decision. Specifically, Hispanic participants were expected to make ME or NOT ME decisions about the *simpatico*-related items more quickly than the White participants. Finally, during the free recall task at the end of the experiment, Hispanic participants were predicted to recall more of the *simpatico*-related terms than the White participants were.

These predicted differences follow from the assumption that the *simpatico* self-schema is more cognitively available (i.e., habitually used) by Hispanic participants than by White participants and that, like other self-schemas, it facilitates recognition of, decisions about, and memory for schema-relevant information (Markus, 1977).

In contrast to the first two studies, which examined the role of a *simpatico* self-schema in Hispanics' and Whites' self-concepts and in their facility in processing *simpatico*-relevant information, Study 3 explored whether the *simpatico* self-schema was differentially represented in the thoughts and feelings of Hispanic versus White and Black participants in a way that might account for the differences in their social interaction behavior. This study involved a secondary analysis of the dyadic interaction data that were previously collected by Holloway et al. (2006). (The findings from this study were briefly summarized at the start of the Introductions section.)

In the present Study 3, I measured the extent to which the participants in Holloway et al. (2006) study had reported thoughts and feelings during their interaction that reflected the cultural script of *simpatia*. According to Triandis et al. (1984) this

index of the extent to which the *simpatia* construct is activated in the mind should be positively correlated with the positive interaction outcomes that presumably follow from the enactment of the corresponding *simpatia* script (i.e., greater interactional involvement, higher ratings of interaction quality, and a greater expression of positive affect).

A second hypothesis tested in Study 3 followed up on Holloway et al.'s (2006) previous findings that both the actor's and partner's ethnicity significantly predicted the same three positive relationship outcomes: degree of behavioral (interactional) involvement, perceived interaction quality, behavioral involvement, and expressions of positive affect. If these outcomes followed from the enactment of the *simpatia* cultural script, and reflected the degree to which this script came to mind during the interaction, an index tapping that process should be just as (if not more) important in directing the participant's behavior as their ethnicity is. Accordingly, after partialling out the variance associated with indices measuring the extent to which the *simpatia* script was represented in the actors' and partners' thoughts and feelings, I expected to see a reduction in the variance of the outcome measures that is uniquely accounted for by the actors' and partners' ethnicity.

6.1 Future Studies

Researchers have also noted that self-schemas influence the non-conscious availability of information, so an alternate means of studying the *simpatico* self-schema, without the difficulty of having to find new stimulus words could involve a different measure of cognitive processing and availability. Using the same E-Prime program that

I used in Study 2, future researchers could randomly present the trait terms, as was done here. The difference between this proposed experiment, and Study 2 of this dissertation would be that trait terms would be presented at extremely brief intervals (i.e. milliseconds), making the words difficult for the person to perceive. After each trial, the participant would be asked to report which trait term appeared on the screen. The correctly guessed words would be removed from the trait list, and the presentation time noted at which the word was adequately recalled. In a second set of trials, the incorrectly guessed words would again be presented randomly on the screen, this time for a slightly longer interval. This process would continue until all of the words had been successfully identified. If the *simpatico*-relevant trait words are more schematic for Hispanics than for Whites, the mean recognition time for these words in comparison to the similarly valenced non-*simpatico* words should be significantly shorter for Hispanics than for Whites.

Another interesting way to investigate the hypotheses proposed in Study 2 while avoiding some of the aforementioned problems with the positive connotations of the stimulus words would be to use a forced choice paradigm. Here, the participants would be presented with a pair of words, rather than the trait terms individually. Although both words within each pair (one *simpatico*-relevant, one not) would be matched in their positive valence, the participants would be forced to choose only one word in each pair as “most self-descriptive.” Theoretically, if Hispanics have internalized a *simpatico* self-schema they should be significantly more likely than the White participants to preferentially choose the *simpatico* terms, whereas the White participants’ tendency to

choose the *simpatico* related terms should be closer to the expected random baseline of 50-50.

6.2 Acculturation

A research question was proposed to the effect that acculturation might either moderate or act as a significant covariate when predicting the participant's behavior in Study 1 and Study 2. However, because there were no significant effects obtained for Study 2, there was no need to further investigate the relationship between those dependent variables, the participant's ethnicity, and his or her acculturation. Also recall that no acculturation data were collected for Study 3. Moderated multiple regression and an analyses of covariance were conducted on the dependent variable for Study 1. Recall the dependent variable for Study 1 the percentage of *simpatico* related terms included in the "Who am I?" data. Acculturation was not a significant moderator between the *simpatico* scores and the proportion of *simpatico*-related terms reported in the "Who am I?" data ($F(1,45) = .03, p > .85$). Moreover, it failed to act as a significant covariate, in that it never accounted for enough variance to render nonsignificant the relationship between the *simpatico* scores and the proportion of *simpatico*-related terms reported in the "Who am I?" responses ($F(1, 45) = .52, p > .47$).

There may be a very simple explanation as to why acculturation did not affect the behavior of the Hispanic participants in these studies. Freeman and Martin (2004) discuss how schema modification occurs almost exclusively when the schema no longer serves to organize and explain experiences adequately. If the Hispanic *simpatico* self-schema continued to serve the participants well in their social interactions, then,

according to Freeman and Martin (2004), there would be no need for them to alter this aspect of their self. Kim (2005) explained that minority group members embrace those cultural elements from the host culture that best serve their own needs, but not necessarily all of the host culture's values and beliefs.

Acculturation occurs when there is conflict between two cultural values (LaFramboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). If there were no conflict between the cultural value of *simpatico* and the day-to-day activities of the participants, there would be no need for them to alter their schemas. A minority group member can become a competent participant of the majority culture, while still retaining his or her identity as a member of the minority culture. Moreover, minority members are *particularly* likely to retain a cultural value like *simpatico*, because it actually facilitates their interaction with members of the majority culture and therefore makes acculturation along other lines easier to achieve (LaFramboise et al, 1993).

6.3 Practical Applications of Present findings

The results of the present studies provide a useful addition to this existing body of literature in at least two specific areas: industrial/organizational psychology, and clinical psychology.

In the field of industrial/organizational psychology, knowledge of the *simpatico* self-schema and script may give researchers and practitioners a tool to help enhance workplace harmony. In their presentation of *simpatia* as a cultural script, Triandis et al. (1984) note that the ignorance of different ethnic groups' expectations' about behavior can bring about discomfort and stress in inter-group relations. The results of a 2002

study comparing ethnic group expectations (Sanchez-Burks et al., 2000) showed that Anglo-Americans preferred task-oriented groups, whereas Mexican-Americans responded more favorably to socioemotional groups. (Anglo-Americans preferred task-oriented groups whether they were watching videotapes of people of their own ethnicity or of the opposite ethnicity). Similarly, Mexican-Americans responded more favorably to socioemotional groups whether they watching videotapes of people of their own ethnicity or of the opposite ethnicity. From these results, we see that the match, or mismatch, of relational schemas can be more important than match, or mismatch, of ethnicity.

Typically, in-group versus out-group differences are cited as the cause of intergroup conflict, but the Sanchez-Burks et al. (2002) study shows that that intergroup conflict may be more likely to be due to culturally-based differences in relational schemas than to membership in a different cultural group *per se*. If the Sanchez-Burks et al. (2002) view is correct, then fostering a better understanding of the different schemas that the members of different ethnic group rely upon to guide their behaviors during social interactions may have the potential to reduce intergroup conflict. If we can teach members of workgroups the expectations of the other members' cultural schemas and scripts, we may be able to increase to workgroup satisfaction.

The importance of understanding different cultural values will become increasingly significant as workplace globalization increases (Oetzel, 2005). The results obtained from the series of studies in this dissertation can perhaps increase our understanding of the way the burgeoning cultural group of Mexican-Americans think

about themselves and how these important cultural differences in self-schemas impact the way Hispanics interact with others.

The results of the present studies are also relevant to the field of clinical psychology (Freeman & Martin, 2004). The intake assessment in most initial therapist/client meetings usually presses patients to discuss unpleasant issues (e.g. suicidal thoughts, problems with drugs and alcohol, and neglect from important family members). Clinical psychologists who see Hispanic clients need to be aware that Hispanic clients may perceive the therapist's behavior toward the client in the initial session as being rude and insensitive in relation to his or her own cultural value of *simpatia* (Dingfelder, 2005). The expectation of Hispanic clients, based on their internalization of the *simpatia* script, might be that the therapist would use the first session to show graciousness and hospitality, or to compliment the client and attempt to make him or her feel at ease (Ridley, Chih, & Olivera, 2000).

Contrary to these expectations, however, the procedure for a first assessment is generally very formulaic. The clinician's formality, line of questioning, or desire to delve into personal issues very early in a relationship may be interpreted as insulting, or at the very least as a violation of a cultural norm that is important to Hispanic clients (Ridley, et al., 2000). Recall that important aspects of the cultural value of *simpatia* are interpersonal harmony, non-confrontation, and graciousness. For that reason, starting from the premise that there is something wrong with a Hispanic client's perceptions

and/or their behavior is a violation of a very important component of the value of being *simpatico*.

Progressing further into the therapist/client relationship, ignorance on the therapist's part of the client's expectation or internalization of the value of *simpatia* may present additional problems (Ridley et al., 2000). For instance, Hispanic individuals often value their families' well-being over their own; as a result, clinical suggestions for self-care (e.g., taking time for the self) may come across as selfish to a Hispanic client. It may be better to frame this type suggestion in terms of the welfare of the client's family, letting the client know that by taking care of themselves, they will be better able to take care of their family (McEachern, & Kenny, 2002; Dingfelder, 2005). As another example, Hispanic individuals place a great value on interpersonal harmony, so suggesting that a Hispanic client directly confront a person they are having interpersonal conflict with might cause more anxiety than the initial problem itself, whereas this might not be the case with a client who has not internalized the *simpatico* self-schema.

This is information that can be used to help clinicians better understand Hispanic clients, thereby improving quality of care and retention of Hispanic clients. It has been reported that 50% of Hispanics who seek psychotherapy never return after their first session (Dingfelder, 2005). Dingfelder (2005) further notes that some of these patients may never return to therapy because they feel as if they were not understood, particularly because they feel as if the values of the therapist are different from their own (Ridley et al., 2000). Although specific therapeutic approaches have been

formulated for female clients and other groups with unique clinical needs (e.g. homosexuals), as of yet no such guidelines exist for the Hispanic population (Dingfelder, 2005).

Recall from the Sanchez-Burks et al. (2002) study that the ethnicity of the target did not predict the Hispanic participant's task satisfaction, but rather the target's general interaction style. Accordingly, it may not be necessary for Hispanic clients to solely seek out Hispanic clinicians; instead, it may simply be necessary for the clinician to be trained to be sensitive to the cultural expectations of this particular ethnic group.

6.4 Strengths and Limitations of the Present Studies

Several strengths of this study are noteworthy. First, the data collection procedures were exceptionally comprehensive for Studies 1 and 3. For Study 1 I was able to collect more participants than the power analysis called for. By using the unstructured interaction paradigm for Study 3, the participants in this study were able to interact freely in initial same-sex interactions. By using this methodology, I was able to capture the spontaneous, natural behavior of the participants. In addition, various self-report measures of the participants' own thoughts, feelings, and perceptions of the interaction were obtained.

Second, many of the self-report and behavioral measures for Study 3 allowed for aggregation of various behaviors over the entire interaction, producing multiple-act criterion measures to use in the data analysis. The measurement error related with multiple-act criterion measures is generally low, and such measures have proved to be more useful than single-act criterion measures in predicting behaviors from traits

(Monson, Hensley & Chernick, 1982). Also, for Studies 1 and 2, the data collected on personality variables, gender, and socioeconomic status permitted ruling out some plausible alternate explanations for the participants' behavior.

Due to the limited Hispanic population in the participant pool, and the strict matching criteria, I was unable to obtain as many dyads as desired for Study 2. Also, the stimulus words chosen for Study 2 were problematic for reasons already discussed (refer to pages 48 and 50). Another limitation of the present study is the obvious restriction of range in the participants' ages. All participants were college students, recruited from a pool of individuals enrolled in introductory psychology classes. Replication of the present findings in a non-college population is needed in order to test the generality of the results.

6.5 Conclusions

Across these interrelated studies, I investigated possible differences in the way that Hispanics and Whites think about themselves (self-concept), react to and remember *simpatico*-relevant words (memory and retrieval), and display *simpatico*-relevant thoughts, feelings, and behaviors during ongoing social interactions. Study 1 assessed the content of the participants spontaneously reported self-schema by using the "Who am I?" paradigm (Gordon, 1968). As predicted, the Hispanic participants reported significantly more *simpatico*-related terms in their self-descriptions than the White participants.

Study 2 was designed to assess the *simpatico* self-schema between Hispanics and Whites this time using a traditional cognitive paradigm (Markus, 1977). However, none of the predicted hypotheses for that study were supported, and possible explanations for that were discussed (refer to pages 48 and 50). Study 3 was developed with a different, but related, emphasis on investigating the implications of the existence of a *simpatico* self-schema. To the extent people have been highly socialized in the use of the *simpatia* cultural script it is likely to be represented in their self-concepts as well as to become cognitively available as a guide to their behavior in social interaction settings.

To test these ideas, a reanalysis of data from a previous dyadic interaction study (Holloway, et al., 2006) was conducted to determine if the actor's and partner's *simpatico*-index scores could predict three groups of variables: behavioral involvement, perceived interaction quality, and positive partner directed positive affect. All three hypotheses were supported, thereby providing evidence of the behavioral implications of the *simpatico* self-schema.

In the present series studies, I began by assuming the existence of a *simpatico* self-schema, and then went on to develop some testable implications of the presumed difference of the use of this schema by Hispanic versus White individuals. Some support for the existence of a *simpatico* self-schema was provided in Study 1, and we saw behavioral evidence for the behavioral implications of a *simpatico* self-schema in Study 3. Ideally, the findings from these studies will contribute to the growing literature

about Hispanics as a cultural group, and will be usefully applied in the kinds of ways I have outline above.

APPENDIX A

“WHO AM I?” QUESTIONNAIRE

Who am I?

There are fifteen numbered blanks in the page below. Please write fifteen different answers to the simple question "Who am I?" in the blanks, answering as if you were giving the answers to yourself, not to somebody else. The answers can be as short or as long as you would like. Write the answers in the order that they occur to you. Don't worry about "logic" or "importance". Please do not take more than six or seven minutes to complete the answers.

1. I am _____.
2. I am _____.
3. I am _____.
4. I am _____.
5. I am _____.
6. I am _____.
7. I am _____.
8. I am _____.
9. I am _____.
10. I am _____.
11. I am _____.
12. I am _____.
13. I am _____.
14. I am _____.
15. I am _____.

APPENDIX B

SHORT VERSION MARLOWE-CROWNE SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

1. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.
2. I always practice what I preach.
3. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
4. I have never been irked when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
5. I have never deliberately said something to hurt someone's feelings.
6. I like to gossip at times.
7. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
8. I sometimes try to get even rather than forgive and forget.
9. At times I have really insisted in having things my own way.
10. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things

APPENDIX C

EXCERPT FROM TRIANDIS, ET AL., (1984)

Simpatia as a Cultural Script of Hispanics (1984). Triandis, H.C., Marin, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, B. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(6) 1383 – 1375. A cultural script is a pattern of social interaction that is characteristic of a particular cultural group. Data from three samples of Hispanic and non-Hispanic recruits as well as samples of Hispanic monolinguals and bilinguals suggest that the Hispanics have a cultural script, which we call *simpatia*. Hispanics are more likely than the non-Hispanics to expect high frequencies of positive social behaviors and low frequencies of negative social behaviors. This suggests different levels of adaptation for social behavior in the two cultures. The inattention among non-Hispanic to the presence of this script among Hispanics is likely to lead to misunderstandings when Hispanics and non-Hispanics interact. Hispanics are likely to be perceived as negative behaviors that are considered neutral by non-Hispanics; also, behaviors that are perceived as positive by non-Hispanics are likely to be perceived as neutral by the Hispanics.

A cultural script is a pattern of social interaction that is characteristic of a particular cultural group. For example, Greeks are more likely to get help from an in-group member than from an out-group member (Feldman, 1968; Triandis & Vassiliou, 1972). This behavioral pattern is associated with the concept of *philotimo*, which is the strongest norms of traditional Greek society: doing what in-group members expect. Another example comes from Japan, where Doi (1973) identified the cultural script of *amae*, which occurs when a person wants to be dependent on another, to be passively loved. High status persons cultivate such dependence on the part of lower status persons, who feel grateful for the opportunity to be dependent and work hard to satisfy the higher status person. Among South African blacks the concept of *ubuntu* prescribes giving sympathy and help to those who need it showing respect and dignity of others – people must not be manipulated; old people must be treated with; a caring, sharing relationship is emphasized. “You must not live for yourself, but for others” (Godsell, 1982).

Among Hispanics and Latin Americans a cultural script that seems to be equally important to the Greek’s *philotimo*, the African *ubuntu*, and the Japanese’s *amae* is that of *simpatia*. This word has no equivalent in English but refers to a permanent personal quality where an individual is perceived as likeable, attractive, fun to be with, and easy-going. An individual who is *simpatico* shows certain levels of conformity and ability share in other’s feelings (Real Academia Espanola, 1980), behaves with dignity and respect towards others, and seems to strive for harmony in interpersonal relations. This latter characteristic implies a general avoidance of interpersonal conflict and tendency for positive behaviors to be emphasized in positive situations and negative behaviors to be de-emphasized in negative situations.

Although there are few studies that empirically test the role of *simpatia* as a cultural script in social relations among Hispanic and Latin Americans, a number of authors have written about it from a sociological and anthropological perspective. Burma (1970) for example, observes that Mexican-Americans stress politeness, agreeableness, keeping one’s temper, and passively enduring stress. Madsen (1972) proposes that Mexican-Americans value the person guarding against offending others, that is, directly questioning another beliefs or actions or attempting direct criticisms that

may be offensive. Murillo (1976), again, writing about the Mexican-Americans, notes there is a great value placed on manners and courtesy in interpersonal relations. The manner of expression is likely to be elaborate and indirect, and there is much concern to make social relations appear at least harmonious. Murillo notes that because direct argument or contradiction is considered rude, a person will tend not to disagree unless this can be done tactfully.

Wagenheim (1972), writing about Puerto Rican culture, states that disrespectful behavior, such as arguments, fights, and direct confrontation, tend to be interpreted as assaults on the essential dignity of others. He notes that a common method of resistance to someone else's views is by means of a *pelea monga* or the relaxed fight. Rather than disagree or confront, the preferred reaction is a form of passive noncooperation. Wagenheim also observes that Puerto Ricans rarely give a direct negative answer if they can avoid it.

Landy (1959), writing earlier about a sugar cane community in Puerto Rico, notes that the cultural traits considered to be desirable for individuals and interpersonal relations are respectfulness, obedience, liking people, pleasantness, being nice to people, all important aspects of being *simpatico*.

The importance of being *simpatico* is further exemplified by Alum and Manteiga's (1977) assertion that the awkwardness in interpersonal relations that results from not being *simpatico* (i.e., being unlikable, unwitty, disagreeable, etc.) is one of the worst "cultural sins" among Cubans.

The value Hispanics and Latin American place on the avoidance of negative behaviors (e.g., criticizing, insulting, fighting, etc.) has also been widely documented (e.g., Diaz-Royo, 1974; Fitzpatrick, 1971; Heller, 1966; Madsen, 1972; Rubel, 1970). This concern for the avoidance of negative behaviors in interpersonal relations has been explained as being based on Hispanic's cultural values of *respecto* (respect) and *dignidad* (worthiness). Behaviors that are interpreted culturally as criticism or insults, for example, are perceived by Hispanics as assaults on the other person's dignity and self-respect (Diaz-Royo, 1974; Tumin & Feldman, 1971). A direct derivation of this cultural value is the preference for avoiding conflict, a fact that has been documented in the past for Hispanic and Latin-Americans (e.g., Kagan, Knight, & Martinez-Romero, 1982; Kagan & Madsen, 1971, 1972). As a matter of fact, in a recent study (Kagan et al., 1982) with Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican children, the authors found when questioned about how they would react to situations that often result in aggression, Anglo-American and Mexican-American children indicated that they would confront the aggressor, whereas Mexican children indicated that they would avoid the confrontation.

APPENDIX D
GOLDBERG'S BIG FIVE (IPIP)

On the following pages, there are phrases describing people's behaviors. Please use the rating scale below to describe how accurately each statement describes you. Describe yourself as you generally are now, not as you wish to be in the future. Describe yourself as you honestly see yourself, in relation to other people you know of the same sex you are, roughly your same age. So that you can describe yourself in an honest manner, your responses will be kept in absolute confidence. Please read each statement carefully, and then fill in the blank with the number on the scale.

Response Options

1 = Very Inaccurate

2 = Moderately Inaccurate

3 = Neither Inaccurate nor Accurate

4 = Moderately Accurate

5 = Very Accurate

_____ Am the life of the party.

_____ Feel little concern for others.

_____ Am always prepared.

_____ Get stressed out easily.

_____ Have a rich vocabulary.

_____ Don't talk a lot.

_____ Am interested in people.

_____ Leave my belongings around.

_____ Am relaxed most of the time.

_____ Have difficulty understanding abstract ideas.

_____ Feel comfortable around people.

- _____ Insult people.
- _____ Pay attention to details.
- _____ Worry about things.
- _____ Have a vivid imagination.
- _____ Keep in the background.
- _____ Sympathize with others' feelings.
- _____ Make a mess of things.
- _____ Seldom feel blue.
- _____ Am not interested in abstract ideas.
- _____ Start conversations.
- _____ Am not interested in other people's problems.
- _____ Get chores done right away.
- _____ Am easily disturbed.
- _____ Have excellent ideas.
- _____ Have little to say.
- _____ Have a soft heart.
- _____ Often forget to put things back in their proper place.
- _____ Get upset easily.
- _____ Do not have a good imagination.
- _____ Talk to a lot of different people at parties.
- _____ Am not really interested in others.

- _____ Like order.
- _____ Change my mood a lot.
- _____ Am quick to understand things.
- _____ Do not like to draw attention to myself.
- _____ Take time out for others.
- _____ Shirk my duties.
- _____ Have frequent mood swings.
- _____ Use difficult words.
- _____ Do not mind being the center of attention.
- _____ Feel others' emotions.
- _____ Follow a schedule.
- _____ Get irritated easily.
- _____ Spend time reflecting on things.
- _____ Am quiet around strangers.
- _____ Make people feel at ease.
- _____ Am exacting in my work.
- _____ Often feel blue.
- _____ Am full of ideas.

APPENDIX E
SHORT ACCULTURATION SCALE

When answering the following question please indicate your answer using the following options:

- A. Only Spanish
- B. More Spanish than English
- C. About half & half
- D. More English than Spanish
- E. Only English

1. In general, what language do you read and speak?
2. What was the language you used as a child?
3. What language do you usually speak at home? In which language(s) do you usually think?
4. What language(s) do you speak with your friends? In what language(s) are the T.V. programs you usually watch?
5. In what language(s) are the radio programs you usually listen to? In general, in what language(s) are the movies, T.V., and radio programs you *prefer* to watch and listen to?

When answering the following question please indicate your answer using the following options:

- A. All Latinos/Hispanics
- B. More Latinos than Americans
- C. About half & half
- D. More Americans than Latinos
- E. All Americans

1. Your close friends are:
2. You prefer going to social gatherings/parties at which people are:
3. The persons you visit or who visit you are:
4. If you could choose your children's friends, you would want them to be:

APPENDIX F
DISTRACTOR TASK FOR STUDY 2

If Belgium's spotlight on the European stage is a little dim, it's only because because its people rarely brag. This Country has more history, art, art, food and architecture packed into its tiny Self than many of its bigger, louder neighboring countries.

Divided by pride first and language Second, the country's combining agents are an all-encompassing sense of family and a strong strong, industrial spirit. Visitors, Lulled by the Locals' friendliness, will probably not even even notice the tensions that spark across the Linguistic Divide.

Squeezed between the Netherlands, Germany, Luxembourg and and France, Belgium is one of Europe's Smaller countries. The north is flat, the south dominated by the pretty Ardennes, and the North Sea coastline taken over over by resorts, bar a Few patches of windswept dunes. Lower Belgium is criss-crossed by a network of canals.

You're unlikely unlikely to encounter extremes in weather during an average Belgian year. April to September is the warmest time, But be prepared for grey skies and soggy streets no matter what what time of year you go. Visitors may be may be forgiven for assuming umbrellas and raincoats are part of the Belgian national dress.

Belgium packs quite a cultural punch punch; World-class art, Picture-perfect castles, Spectacular chocolate everywhere and More varieties of beer than plant and wildlife species combined combined.

It It is a place of the Divine and the Divided. The north and south speak different languages and regard one another as culturally untrustworthy.

Comic strips are another Belgian specialty and while there are are many local favorites, Hergé, the creator of the reporter Tintin, is the most Widely known.

At the Turn of this Century, the winding architecture of Art Nouveau started in Brussels led by by Henri van de Velde and Victor Horta. Horta was famed for his Interiors which avoided straight lines - Ceilings simply simply became curved continuations of walls. Stained glass and wrought iron were much used to emphasize this whiplash of lines lines.

Belgian food is highly regarded throughout Europe - Some say it's second only to French. Combining French and and German styles, meat and seafood are the main raw ingredients. The Belgians swear they invented *frites* (chips, or fries), And judging by availability, It's a claim few would challenge. And though they they didn't actually invent beer or chocolate, They may as well have.

Belgium's big-gun Neighbors France, Germany and England (which faces it across the North Sea) long favored this little Nation as a nice nice spot to kill each other. Conquered by German tribes, Christianized by the 7th century and carved up during the Frankish Empire in 1100, Much of Belgium enjoyed a Golden Age of prosperity and artistry under the French Duke of Burgundy during the 14th century. This was a boom

time time for the cloth-trading Flemish towns of Ypres, Bruges and Ghent. With the demise of Bruges due to British competition and a silted river, Antwerp soon became the greatest port in Europe.

The golden age began to tarnish in the Mid-15th century when the Low Countries (present-day Belgium, the Netherlands and Luxembourg) were inherited by Spain, Igniting a long battle against Catholic Spanish rule. The Catholic Philip II of Spain sent sent in the Inquisition to enforce Catholicism. Thousands were imprisoned or executed before full-scale war erupted in 1568. The Revolt of the Netherlands lasted 80 years and in the end Holland and its Allied Provinces booted out the Spaniards. Belgium and Luxembourg stayed stayed under Spanish rule. Napoleon's defeat at the Battle of Waterloo near Brussels led to the creation, in 1814, of the United Kingdom of the Netherlands, melding Belgium and Luxembourg into the Netherlands. But but the Catholic Belgians revolted, winning independence in 1830.

Stuck between a rock and a hard place (a.k.a., France and Germany), Belgium managed to retain retain its neutrality throughout the century, At the end of which Flemish nationalism flowered. Meanwhile, King Leopold II began to assemble a a fortune for himself (and, Indirectly, for for his subjects) by his genocidal exploitation of his holdings in the African Congo.

Despite Belgium's neutral Policy, the Germans invaded in 1914. Another German attack in 1940 saw saw the entire country taken over within three weeks. King Leopold III's questionably early capitulation to the Germans led to his abdication in 1950 in favor favor of his son, King Baudouin, whose Popular reign ended with his death death in 1993. Childless, Baudouin was succeeded by his his brother, the present King Albert II.

Postwar Belgium was characterized by an Economic Boom, later accentuated by Brussels' appointment as the headquarters of the European Union (EU) and the North Atlantic Treaty Organization (NATO). While while the country's number one city is being busily groomed to suit the rest of Europe, The Belgians themselves remain casual - The true spirit of the country will always stem from its people and its past.

In December 1999, Prince Philippe, 39-year-old heir to the Belgian throne, married a Speech Therapist with Flemish and Walloon roots, Finishing an an eventful century with what many Belgians saw as a promising flourish.

Attractions

Brussels

Get lost in a dense circuit of cobblestone alleys before emerging suddenly into the magnificence of the Grand Place, With its baroque guildhalls, Splendid Gothic town hall and ringside group of pavement cafes and intimate restaurants. Then Then see what else the backstreets of Brussels have to offer.

Antwerp

The richly historic city of Antwerp is Belgium's most underrated tourist destination. Few places tangle the old and the new quite so enchantingly. Here eclectic Art Nouveau mansions stare back at Neo-Renaissance villas, And medieval castles provide a magical backdrop for the city's countless bars and cafes.

Bruges

Home to Europe's best-preserved medieval Buildings, Bruges is Belgium's most visited town. Suspended in time 500 years ago by the silting of its river, this 13th-century City is blessed with two medieval cores, the Markt and the Burg, and some of the country's most compelling Art collections.

In the middle of Summer Bruges teems with tourists; Out of season its beauty is an easier delight to behold. The whole historic centre of Bruges was added to Unesco's World Heritage List in 2000 and, in 2002, Bruges took center stage as the European City of Culture.

The Ardennes

Home to Deep River Valleys and high forests, Belgium's southeast corner is often overlooked by travelers hopping between the old art towns and the capital. But here you'll find tranquil villages nestled into the the grooves of the Meuse, Lesse and Ourthe valleys or sitting atop the verdant hills.

It was in this area that the Battle of the Bulge once raged. There are several Tours available which make the most of the ancient citadels of the region. The town of Namur is the best base for exploration, Offering plenty of transport options to some of the more inaccessible spots.

Ghent

Southwest of Antwerp, Ghent was once a medieval-era Powerhouse due to its 14th-century status as the Largest cloth producer in Europe, And its rebellious nature when it came to tax increases. Now now the capital of the Flanders province of Oost-Vlaanderen, It is home to a significant student population.

The most famous attraction in Ghent is inside the otherwise unremarkable St Baafskathedraal (St Baaf's Cathedral): One of the earliest-known oil paintings, A stunningly overwrought piece of art by 15th-century artist Jan Van Eyck called *De Aanbidding van het Lams God* (Adoration of the Mystic Lamb).

Jeaneke Pis

Gender equality comes to peeing statues! Normally it's a a cherubic Y chromosome-endowed statue, but the girls strike back with Jeaneke-Pis. Sister of Mannekin Pis (the

little boy weeing), she can be found in Brussels' central restaurant strip, Rue des Bouchers (Butcher's Street).

Menin Gate

Within the town of Ypres, this tragic memorial is inscribed with the names of 55,000 British and Commonwealth troops lost forever in the quagmire of the Flanders trenches during WWI. A bugler sounds the last post here every evening at 8pm.

Museum voor Schone Kunsten

This museum is well worth a couple of hours, particularly when combined with a visit to the nearby Stedelijk Museum voor Actuele Kunst (SMAK). The Flemish Primitives are well-represented, as are Reubens, Jordaens, Van Dyk, Ensor and Delvaux.

Tongeren

To the east, Near the city of Liege, Tongeren has the honor (along with Tournai) of being Belgium's oldest town. Settled in 15 BC as a base for Roman troops, The town has an important collection of Gallo-Roman remains, And is surrounded by Roman and medieval walls.

Brussels' most festive months are July and August. On the first Thursday in July there's the Ommegang pageant, A huge parade of nobles dressed in historic costumes. Belgium's colorful National Day is July 21, Which also marks the start of the month-long Brussels Fair. Throughout the year there are jazz festivals, Religious processions, Local fairs, film festivals and classical music Extravaganzas. Carnival is a big do - people shake off the winter blues with outrageous celebrations ranging from balls to masked parades. In Ypres, the Kattenfestival (Festival of the Cats) involves imitation cats being hurled from the town's belfry!

http://aolsvc.travel.aol.com/travel/lonely_planet/europe/belgium/culture.html

APPENDIX G
TABLES FOR STUDY 1 AND 2

Table 1. Means, Standard deviations, and ranges by ethnicity for the proportion of ME responses in Study 2.

| Statistic | Proportion of ME responses to simpatico-related terms | Proportion of ME responses to (positive) control terms | Proportion of ME responses to neutral terms | Proportion of ME responses to negative terms |
|-----------------------------|---|--|---|--|
| Hispanic Mean | .94 | .89 | .63 | .37 |
| White Mean | .94 | .87 | .60 | .28 |
| Hispanic Standard deviation | .08 | .16 | .18 | .23 |
| White Standard deviation | .10 | .17 | .17 | .20 |
| Hispanic Range | .23 | .64 | .71 | .95 |
| White Range | .50 | .64 | .95 | 1.00 |

Table 2. Means, Standard deviations, and ranges by ethnicity for the reaction time data in Study 2.

| Statistic | Reaction times to simpatico-related terms | Reaction times to positive(control) terms | Reaction times to neutral terms | Reaction times to negative terms |
|-----------------------------|---|---|---------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Hispanic Mean | 1347.13 | 1325.33 | 1560.69 | 1651.09 |
| White Mean | 1347.13 | 1325.33 | 1560.69 | 1651.09 |
| Hispanic Standard deviation | 520.54 | 533.68 | 715.75 | 549.81 |
| White Standard deviation | 383.51 | 326.18 | 455.18 | 523.13 |
| Hispanic Range | 2451.43 | 2166.77 | 2777.35 | 1890.95 |
| White Range | 1557 | 1240.68 | 1834.90 | 1745.5 |

APPENDIX H

POST-INTERACTION QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STUDY THREE

PERCEPTIONS OF INTERACTION

In the following questions we are interested in assessing your perceptions of the interaction between you and the other subject over the six-minute period that you waited together. Indicate your answers by circling the point on each scale that best describes your feelings or perceptions. Please reflect on how you felt during the interaction and try to answer each question as accurately and honestly as possible. Your answers will *not* be shown to the other subject and will be used for statistical purposes *only*.

1. How much did you feel a need to communicate with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

2. How much do you think the other person felt a need to communicate with you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

3. How self-conscious did you feel when you were with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

4. How self-conscious do you think the other person felt when he or she was with you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

5. To what degree did the interaction seem *awkward*, *forced*, and *strained* to you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

6. To what degree do you think the interaction seemed *awkward, forced, and strained* to the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

7. To what degree did the interaction seem *smooth, natural, and relaxed* to you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

8. To what degree do you think the interaction seemed *smooth, natural, and relaxed* to the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

9. How well do you think you understood the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

10. How well do you think the other person understood you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

11. How involving did you find the interaction?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

12. How involving do you think the other person found the interaction?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

13. To what extent did you feel *put down, patronized, or rejected* by the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
much less involving about as involving much more
involving
than I preferred as I preferred than I preferred

14. To what extent do you think the other person felt *put down, patronized, or rejected* by you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
much less involving about as involving much more
involving
than I preferred as I preferred than I preferred

15. To what extent did you feel *accepted and respected* by the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

16. To what extent do you think the other person felt *accepted and respected* by you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

17. To what extent would you like to interact more with the other person in the future?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

18. To what extent do you think the other person would like to interact more with you in the future?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

19. To what extent do you trust the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

20. How much did you enjoy your interaction with the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

21. How much did you use the other person's behavior as a guide for your own behavior?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

22. How much do you think the other person used your behavior as a guide for his/her behavior?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

23. To what degree did you attempt to take the lead in the conversation?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

24. To what degree did the other person attempt to take the lead in the conversation?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

25. To what extent did you try to influence the other person to do what you wanted him/her to do?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

26. To what extent did the other person try to influence you to do what he/she wanted you to do?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10
not at all very
much

27. To what extent did you try to accommodate the other person by adapting your behavior to “fit in” with his/hers?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

28. To what extent did the other person try to accommodate you by adapting his/her behavior to “fit in” with yours?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

29. How much did you like the other person?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

30. How much do *you* think the other person likes you?

1-----2-----3-----4-----5-----6-----7-----8-----9-----10

not at all

very

much

APPENDIX I
ITEM-BY-ITEM RESULTS

| Factor | Variable Name | Actor Effect | Partner Effect |
|----------------------------------|--|------------------------------------|------------------------------------|
| Behavioral involvement | Actor verbalizations - frequency | $F(1, 64) = 16.84,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1, 64) = 13.79,$ $p < .01$ |
| | Actor verbalizations - duration | $F(1, 93.9) = 12.41,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1, 93.9) = 12.78,$ $p < .01$ |
| | Actor gazing - frequency | $F(1, 80.1) = 15.57,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1, 80.1) = 7.27,$ $p < .01$ |
| | Actor gazing - duration | $F(1, 73.8) = 4.78,$ $p < .05$ | $F(1, 73.8) = 6.49,$ $p < .05$ |
| Perceived interaction quality | Index of interaction quality created from post-interaction questionnaire items (1,7, 11, 15, 17, 19, 20, 23, 29) | $F(1, 94) = 19.97,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1, 94) = 11.04,$ $p < .01$ |
| Partner-directed positive affect | Positive partner attributions | $F(1,111) = 87.64,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1,111) = 0.36,$ <i>ns</i> |
| | Actor positive affect - frequency | $F(1, 90.1) = 15.18,$ $p < .01$ | $F(1, 90.1) = 22.79,$ $p < .01$ |
| | Actor positive affect - duration | $F(1, 107) = 2.94,$ <i>ns</i> | $F(1, 107) = 7.86,$ $p < .01$ |

APPENDIX J
QUESTIONS USED TO ASSESS ETHNICITY

1. What is your racial or ethnic background?

a. Asian — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of the Far East, Southeast Asia, or the Indian subcontinent including, for example, Cambodia, China, India, Japan, Korea, Malaysia, Pakistan, the Philippine Islands, Thailand, and Vietnam.

b. Black or African American — A person having origins in any of the Black racial groups of Africa. Terms such as “Haitian” can be used in addition to “Black or African American.”

c. White — A person having origins in any of the original peoples of Europe, North Africa, or the Middle East.

d. Hispanic or Latino — A person of Mexican, Puerto Rican, Cuban, Central or South American, or other Spanish culture or origin.

e. Multi-racial or Other

2. If you indicated ‘Hispanic or Latino’ as your ethnic background, please specify your country of origin, or your ancestor’s country of origin.

A) Mexico

B) Puerto Rico

C) Cuba

D) Central or South America

E) Other.

REFERENCES

- Abraido-Lanza, A.F., Dohrenwend, B.P. & Ng-Mak, D.S. (1999). The Latino Mortality Paradox: A test of the “Salmon Bias” and Healthy Migrant Hypothesis. *American Journal of Public Health, 89(10)*, 1543-1548
- Albert, R.D. (1996). A framework and model for understanding Latin American and Latino/Hispanic cultural patterns. In D. Landis and R.S. Bhagat (Eds.), *Handbook of intercultural training* (2nd ed., pp. 327-348). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Ashton, M.C., Paunonen, S.V. & Lee, K. (2002). What is the central feature of extraversion? Social attention versus reward sensitivity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83(1)*, 242-252.
- Brown, C.M. & Ferguson, L.W. (1967). Self-concept and religious belief. *Psychological Reports, 22(1)*, 266.
- Campbell, L & Kashy, D.A. (2002). Estimating the actor, partner and interaction effects for dyadic data using PROC MIXED and HLM: A user-friendly guide. *Personal Relationships, 9*, 327-342.
- Catrambone, R., Markus, H.R. (1987). The role of self-schemas in going beyond the information given. *Social Cognition, 5*, 349-368.

- Comas-Diaz, L. (1989). Culturally relevant issues and treatment applications for Hispanics. In: D.R. Koslow and E.P. Salett (Eds.), *Crossing cultures in mental health* (pp. 31-48) Washington, DC, US: SIETAR International.
- D'Andrade, R. G. (1992). Schemas and motivation. In Strauss, C. (Ed). *Human motives and cultural models* (pp. 23-44). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Dollinger, S. J. (2001) Religious Identity: An Autophotographic Study. *International Journal for the Psychology of Religion*, 11(2), 71-92.
- Eaton, L & Louw, J (2000). Culture and Self in South Africa: Individualism – Collectivism Predictions. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 140(2), 210-217.
- Ferguson, T.J., Rule, G.R., & Carlson, D. (1983). Memory for personally relevant information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 44, 251-261.
- Fischer, D.G. & Fick, C. (1993). Measuring Social Desirability: Short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 53(2), 417-424.
- Flury, J. (2004). The Sense of Self Scale (SOSS): Development and Validation. Dissertation.
- Freeman, A., & Martin, D. M. A Psychosocial Approach for Conceptualizing Schematic Development. In Freeman, A., Mahoney, M.J., DeVito, P., Martin, D. (Eds.) *Cognition and psychotherapy* (pp. 221-256). New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Fuentes, C., Baron, A., & Vasquez, M.J.T. (2003). Teaching Latino psychology. In P. Bronstein and K. Quina (Eds.), *Teaching gender and multicultural awareness:*

- Resources for the psychology classroom* (pp. 207-220). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Gabrieldis, C., Stephan, W.G., Ybarra, O., Pearson, V.M., & Villareal, L. (1997). Preferred styles of conflict resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology*, 28, 661-667.
- Garcia, W. (1996). Respeto: A Mexican base for interpersonal relationships. In W.B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey et al. (Eds.), *Communication in personal relationships across cultures* (pp. 137-155). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Gloria, A.M. (1999). Apoyando estudiantes Chicanos: Therapeutic factors in Chicana college student support groups. *Journal for Specialists in Group Work*, 24(3), 246-259.
- Goldberg, R.L. (1993). The structure of phenotypic personality traits. *American Psychologist*, 48, 26-34.
- Goldberg, R.L. (1999). The curious experiences survey, a revised version of the Dissociative Experiences Scale: Factor structure, reliability and relation to demographic and personality variables. *Psychological Assessment*, 11(2), 134-145.
- Gordon, C. (1968). Self-conceptions: Configurations of content. In C. Gordon & K. Gergen (Eds.), *The self in social interactions*. (pp. 115-136). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

- Graziano, W.G. & Eisenberg, N. (1997). Personality structure: The return of the Big Five. In Hogan, R., Johnson, J. & Briggs, S. (Eds.). *Handbook of Personality* (pp. 737-765). San Diego: Academic Press.
- Griffin, J.D., Joe, G.W., Chatham, L.R. & Simpson, D.D. (1998) Development and validation of a Simpatia scale for Hispanics entering drug treatment. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 20(4), 468-482.
- Holland, D., & Quinn, N. (1987). Culture and cognition. In Quinn, N., & Holland, D. (Eds), *Cultural models in language and thought* (pp 1-40). New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Holloway, R.A., Waldrip, A.M., Ickes, W.J. (2006). Evidence for the Hispanic Social Advantage in Same- and Mixed-Ethnicity Interactions. Manuscript in preparation.
- Hong, Y., Morris, M.W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martinez, V. (2000) Multicultural Minds A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist*, 55(7), 709-720.
- Ickes, W. (1982). A basic paradigm for the study of personality, roles, and social behavior. In W. Ickes & E.S. Knowles (Eds.), *Personality, Roles, and Social Behavior*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Ickes, W. (1983). A basic paradigm for the study of unstructured dyadic interaction. *New Directions for Methodology of Social & Behavioral Science*, 15, 5-21

- Ickes, W., & Tooke, W. (1988). The observational method: Studying the interaction of minds and bodies. In S. Duck and D. F. Hay (Eds) *Handbook of personal relationships: Theory, research and interventions*. (pp. 79-97) Oxford, England: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ickes, W. (2001). Measuring empathic accuracy. In J. A. Hall and F. J. Bernieri (Eds), *Interpersonal sensitivity: Theory and measurement*. (pp. 219-241) Mahwah, New Jersey: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.
- Ickes, W., Stinson, L., Bissonnette, V. (1990). Naturalistic social cognition: Empathic accuracy in mixed-sex dyads. *Journal of Personality & Social Psychology*, 59(4), 730-742.
- Ioannon, M.C., Mogg, K., & Bradley, B.P. (2004). Vigilance for threat: effects of anxiety and defensiveness. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(8), 1879-1891.
- Lim, B., & Ployhart, R.E. (2006). Assessing the Convergent and Discriminant Validity of Goldberg's International Personality Item Pool: A Multitrait-Multimethod Examination. *Organizational Research Methods*, 9(1), 29 – 54.
- Kenny, D.A., Kashy, D. A., & Cook, W. L. (2006). Analyzing mixed independent variables: The Actor-Partner Interdependence Model. In Kenny, D.A., Kashy, D.A., & Cook, W.L. (Eds.) *Dyadic Data Analysis*. New York: Guilford.
- Klein, S.B., & Kihlstrom, J.F. (1986). Elaboration, organization, and the self-reference effect in memory. *Journal of Experimental Psychology General*, 115, 26-38.

- Kuiper, N.A. & Rogers, T.B. (1979). Encoding of personal information: Self-other differences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 37, 445-450.
- LaFramboise, T., Coleman, H., & Gerton, J. (1993). Psychological impact of biculturalism: Evidence and theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 114, 395 - 412.
- Levine, R.V., Norenzayan, A., & Philbrick, K. (2001). Cross-cultural differences in helping strangers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 32, 543-560.
- Lord, C.G. (1980). Schema and images as memory aids: Two modes of processing social information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 38, 499-514.
- Maki, R.H. & McCaul, K.D. (1985). The effects of self-references versus other references on the recall of traits and nouns. *Bulletin of Psychonomic Society*, 23, 169-172.
- Marin, G., Sabogal, F., Marin, B.V., Otero-Sabogal, R. & Perez-Stable, E. (1987) Development of a Short Acculturation Scale for Hispanics. *Hispanic Journal of Behavioral Sciences*, 9(2), 183-205.
- Markus, H.R. (1977) Self-schemata and processing of information about the self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35 (2), 63-78.
- Markus, H.R., Hamil, R., & Sentis, K.P. (1987). Thinking Fat: Self-schema for body weight and the processing of weight relevant information. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 17, 50-71.
- Markus, H.R., & Lin, L.R.(1999). Conflict ways: Cultural diversity in the meanings and practices of conflict. In D.A. Prentice and D.T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides:*

- Understanding and overcoming group conflict (pp. 302-333). New York: Russell Sage Foundation.
- McEachern, A.G., & Kenny, M.C. (2002). A Comparison of Family Environment Characteristics Among White (Non-Hispanic), Hispanic, and African Caribbean Groups. *Journal of Multicultural Counseling and Development*, 30, 40 – 58.
- Oyserman, D., Kimmelmeier, M., Fryberg, S., Broth, H. & Hart-Johnson, T. (2003). Racial-ethnic self-schemas. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 66(4), 333-347.
- Oyserman, D. & Markus, H.R. (1993). The Sociocultural Self. In Suls, J. (Ed) *The Self in Social Perspective*. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Reynolds, W.M. (1982). Development of reliable and valid short forms of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, Vol 38(1), 119-125.
- Ridley, C.R., Chih, D.W., & Olivera, R.J. (2000). Training in Cultural Schemas an Antidote to Unintentional Racism in Clinical Practice. *American Journal of Orthopsychiatry*, 70(1), 65 – 72.
- Roberts, B.W., Chernyshenko, O.S., Stark, S, & Goldberg, L.R. (2005). The structure of Conscientiousness: An empirical investigation based on seven major personality questionnaires. *Personnel Psychology*, 58(1), 103-139.
- Rogers, T.B., Kuiper, N.A., & Kirker, W.S. (1977). Self-reference and the encoding of personal information. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 35(9), 677-688.

- Roll, S., Millen, L., Martinez, R. (1980). Common errors in psychotherapy with Chicanos: Extrapolations from research and clinical experience. *Psychotherapy: theory, Research and Practice*, 17, 158-168.
- Sanchez-Burks, J., Nisbett, R.E., & Ybarra, O. (2000). Cultural styles, relational schemas, and prejudice against out-groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79(2), 174-189.
- Sedikides, C, Gaertner, L, & Vevea, J. L. (2005). Pancultural Self-Enhancement Reloaded: A Meta-Analytic Reply to Heine. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol 89(4), 539-551.
- Silvera, D. H. & Seger, C. R. (2004). Feeling Good about Ourselves: Unrealistic Self-Evaluations and Their Relation to Self-Esteem in the United States and Norway. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol 35(5), 571-585.
- Strahan, R.U. & Gerbasi, K.C. (1972). Short, homogenous versions of the Marlowe-Crowne Social Desirability Scale. *Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 28(2), 191-193.
- Symons, C.S. & Johnson, B.T. (1997) The self-reference effect in memory: A meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 121(3), 371-394.
- Triandis, H.C., Marin, G., Lisansky, J., & Betancourt, H. (1984). Simpatia as a Cultural Script of Hispanics. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47 (6), 1363-1375.

- Wager, B.M. & Cohen, D. (2003). Culture, memory and the self: An analysis of the personal and collective self in long-term memory. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 39 (5) 468-475.
- Watson, D. & Clark, L.A. (1997). Extraversion and its positive emotional core. In Hogan, R., Johnson, J. & Briggs, S. (Eds.) *Handbook of Personality* (pp. 767-793) San Diego: Academic Press.
- Widiger, T.A. & Trull, T.J. (1997). Assessment of the Five-Factor Model of Personality. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 68, 228-250.
- Zea, M.C., Quezada, T., & Belgrave, F.Z. (1990). Latino cultural values: Their role in adjustment to disability. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality*, 9, 185-2

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Renee Aileen Holloway received a B.A. in Psychology from San Diego State University under the supervision of Dr. Niels Christensen, a M.S. and Ph.D. in Psychology from the University of Texas at Arlington under the supervision of Dr. William Ickes.