

2010

Language exclusionary behavior and attitudes toward immigrants

Christine L. Bennett
University of Northern Iowa

Copyright ©2010 Christine L. Bennett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Multicultural Psychology Commons](#), and the [Social Psychology Commons](#)

Let us know how access to this document benefits you

Recommended Citation

Bennett, Christine L., "Language exclusionary behavior and attitudes toward immigrants" (2010). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. 355.
<https://scholarworks.uni.edu/etd/355>

This Open Access Thesis is brought to you for free and open access by the Graduate College at UNI ScholarWorks. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of UNI ScholarWorks. For more information, please contact scholarworks@uni.edu.

LANGUAGE EXCLUSIONARY BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD IMMIGRANTS

An Abstract of a Thesis
Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Christine L. Bennett
University of Northern Iowa
December, 2010

LIBRARY
UNIVERSITY OF NORTHERN IOWA
CEDAR FALLS, IOWA

ABSTRACT

Immigrants often speak languages that natives do not understand, leading to intentional or inadvertent ostracism, which in turn may increase perceptions of threat. For example, English language participants excluded from a conversation in Spanish report more negative reactions than participants excluded in English (Hitlan, Kelly, & Zárate, 2010). Integrated threat theory (ITT) suggests that there are four threats that lead to prejudice toward outgroups such as immigrants: realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes (Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999). The current study expanded upon prior research by ostracizing participants in English, Spanish, or Arabic and then measuring participants' attitudes toward immigrants using measures of these four ITT concepts.

Further, the personality trait of social dominance orientation (SDO) correlates with unfavorable attitudes toward immigrants (Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998). People high in SDO want their social group to dominate and subordinate groups they consider inferior, so they may be particularly bothered by language-based ostracism. In this study, I also examined whether SDO moderated the effects of ostracism in situations where participants were ostracized. Eighty-five college students participated in a computer-based chat with a confederate posing as two other participants. Each participant was randomly assigned to one of four conditions: Spanish-language exclusion, Arabic-language exclusion, English-language exclusion, or English-language inclusion (control group). Excluded participants reported feeling less accepted than included participants. Furthermore, participants in the Spanish and Arabic exclusion conditions reported feeling

less accepted than the participants in the English exclusion condition. Unexpectedly, language-based exclusion did not affect attitudes toward immigrants and the effects were not moderated by SDO. However, participants who were higher in SDO reported greater realistic threat, symbolic threat, and negative stereotypes. Although language-based exclusion decreases feelings of acceptance, it may not change or create negative attitudes toward immigrant populations.

LANGUAGE EXCLUSIONARY BEHAVIOR AND ATTITUDES
TOWARD IMMIGRANTS

A Thesis
Submitted
in Partial Fulfillment
of the Requirements for the Degree
Master of Arts

Christine L. Bennett
University of Northern Iowa
December, 2010

This study by: Christine L. Bennett

Entitled: Language Exclusionary Behavior and Attitudes Toward Immigrants

has been approved as meeting the thesis requirement for the

Degree of Master of Arts

9-7-10

Date

~~Dr. Helen C. Horton, Chair, Thesis Committee~~

6-14-10

Date

Dr. Robert Hitlan, Thesis Committee Member

6/15/10

Date

Dr. M. Kimberly MacLin, Thesis Committee Member

12/21/15

Date

Dr. Sue A. Joseph, Interim Dean, Graduate College

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This research project would not have been possible without the support of many people. I wish to express my gratitude to my thesis chair, Dr. Helen Harton, who offered encouragement, guidance, and support. Her high standards and dedication to teaching were invaluable to my learning and growth throughout graduate school.

Gratitude is also due to the members of my thesis committee, Dr. M. Kimberly MacLin and Dr. Robert Hitlan, without whose knowledge and assistance this study would not have been possible. I would also like to convey appreciation to the Harton Research Lab for their invaluable assistance in conducting this research study.

I wish to express my love and gratitude to my family and friends for their support, understanding, and patience throughout the duration of my studies.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF TABLES	vii
CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION	1
Prejudice	2
Integrated Threat Theory	5
Social Dominance Orientation.....	8
Ostracism	9
Language-based Exclusion	10
Methodology	12
Research Purpose	15
CHAPTER 2. METHOD	19
Participants.....	19
Design	20
Measures	20
Perceived Threat	20
Intergroup Anxiety.....	21
Stereotyping.....	21
Social Dominance Orientation.....	22
Social Desirability Scale	22
Manipulation Checks	23
Additional Measures	23

Procedure	24
Topics and Script Development.....	26
Confederates	27
Debriefing	28
CHAPTER 3. RESULTS	29
Foreign Language Fluency	29
Manipulation Check.....	29
Acceptance	29
Expressions of Prejudice.....	30
Correlations and Regression Analyses.....	31
Participant Reactions	34
CHAPTER 4. DISCUSSION.....	37
Limitations and Future Research	42
Implications.....	45
REFERENCES	48
APPENDIX A: PROTOCOL SCRIPT	55
APPENDIX B: CONFEDERATE CHAT SCRIPTS	57
APPENDIX C: DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION.....	73
APPENDIX D: MANIPULATION CHECK.....	74
APPENDIX E: SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE	75
APPENDIX F: REALISTIC THREAT SCALE.....	77
APPENDIX G: SYMBOLIC THREAT SCALE.....	79

APPENDIX H: INTERGROUP ANXIETY SCALE.....	81
APPENDIX I: NEGATIVE STEREOTYPE INDEX.....	83
APPENDIX J: SOCIAL DOMINANCE ORIENTATION SCALE	84
APPENDIX K: ADDITIONAL MEASURES.....	86
APPENDIX L: DEBRIEFING SCRIPT	88
APPENDIX M: CONFEDERATE INSTRUCTIONS	90

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE	PAGE
1 Means and Standard Deviations of Acceptance.....	30
2 Means and Standard Deviations of Each Scale by Condition.....	31
3 Within-Cell Correlations.....	33
4 Regression Analysis with Social Dominance Orientation Interactions	35

CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

The 1965 Immigration and Nationality Act lifted the ban on race as a criterion for immigration in the United States. This act relaxed immigration policies, resulting in a shift away from European immigrants, with 80 percent of the current foreign-born population from Latin America or Asia (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b). With a fertility decline in the United States, immigration is now the primary factor contributing to population growth (Kurien, 2005). Foreign-born residents comprise 38.1 million or 12.6 percent of the population (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b), and one in five births in the United States now occur to foreign-born women (Bean & Stevens, 2003). The shift in countries of origin of immigrants and increase in births of Hispanic residents has resulted in increased racial and ethnic diversity, with a decrease in the proportion of the total U.S. population of non-Hispanic Whites (U.S. Census Bureau, 2010b).

Immigration often benefits both the immigrant group and the host country yet it is a source of economic and social concern of many in the host country (Stephan, Ybarra, Martinez, Schwarzwald, & Tur-Kaspa, 1998). For example, this concern has led to a recent bill in the state of Arizona (which borders Mexico) to enact stricter measures to identify, prosecute, and deport undocumented immigrants. The reaction to the Arizona immigration bill has resulted in nationwide demonstrations both supporting and condemning the bill, heavy media coverage, and reignited debates on immigration reform in the United States (Archibold, 2010).

In the state of Iowa where this study was conducted, immigrants and refugees come to the state for jobs in meatpacking and agriculture and are attracted to the low cost of living. Between 1990 and 2005, two-thirds of the state's population growth was due to immigration (Grey, 2006). Latinos are the state's fastest growing population (Grey, 2006). In addition, raids at Iowa meat-packing plants by federal immigration agents in 2006 and 2008 put Iowa and illegal immigration issues in the national media (Hsu, 2008; Perkins, 2006).

With the current influx of immigrants and bi-lingual speakers in the community and workplace, scientific research on attitudes toward immigrant populations is needed. As communities merge, the different languages spoken can create miscommunication and misperceptions. When someone is excluded in a language he or she does not speak, this exclusion can lead to negative feelings. In this study, I will examine whether these negative feelings can lead to prejudice and feelings of threat toward immigrant populations. In this literature review, I first cover prejudice and integrated threat theory, then I discuss ostracism and language-based exclusion, concluding with the personality measure of social dominance orientation and the research purpose.

Prejudice

A negative social effect of immigration is prejudice toward immigrants from citizens from the host country (Stephan et al., 1998). Prejudice is a negative feeling toward a person based on his/her group membership. The negative feelings can be created by emotional association, from the need to justify behavior, or from negative beliefs (Bushman & Baumeister, 1998). People classify themselves within various ingroups

based on age, race, sex, and other affiliations. Ingroups are evaluated more positively than outgroups and outgroups are seen as a form of social competition (Stets & Burke, 2000). Native residents of a host country see immigrants as an outgroup and those negative feelings (threats) can create feelings of prejudice.

There are many theories on the causes of prejudice. Duckitt (1992) offers a four level model of factors: genetic and evolutionary predispositions; societal, organizational, and intergroup patterns; social influence; and personal differences in susceptibility. The genetic factors suggest that feelings of prejudice are inborn in our personalities.

According to evolutionary theory, people who were choosy about the groups that they affiliated with were more likely to survive and procreate than individuals who were indiscriminate (Kurzban & Leary, 2001). Thus, a genetic predisposition evolved into prejudice. Societal, organizational, and intergroup patterns of contact and norms, such as laws, regulations, and norms of segregation, maintain the power of dominant groups over subordinate ones (Clark, 1991; Duckitt, 1992; Yinger, 1976). Social influence creates feelings of prejudice through group and interpersonal interactions from the mass media, the education system, and work organizations (Esmail & Everington, 1993; Duckitt, 1992). Personality and societal factors make an individual susceptible to prejudiced messages and attitudes. Sources of prejudice toward outgroups can also be rooted in people's emotional needs and inner conflicts (Duckitt, 1992; Sniderman, Peri, de Figueiredo, Jr., & Piazza, 2002).

Prejudice toward immigrants in particular can be explained by societal, organizational, and intergroup patterns. An individual's self-concept is derived from

perceived membership in social groups (Hogg & Vaughan, 2002). Social identity theory explains that group membership creates self-categorization in ways that favor the ingroup at the expense of the outgroup (Tajfel & Turner, 1986.) One way that people categorize themselves is by their national identity. Because immigrants often have a different national identity than the host country, they are considered an outgroup (Mummendey, Klink, & Brown, 2001). This societal pattern creates segregation and maintains the power of dominant groups over subordinate ones (Clark, 1991; Duckitt, 1992; Yinger, 1976).

Prejudice can vary based on the target and can include disrespecting groups for perceived incompetence and disliking groups for perceived lack of warmth (Fiske, 2010). The stereotype content model (SCM) uses the dimensions of competence and warmth to show how outgroups are differentiated (Fiske, Cuddy, Glick, & Xu, 2002). Competence measures success and respect. Warmth measures niceness and likeability. For ingroups, competence and warmth are both rated high; whereas for outgroups, competence and warmth are either rated low on both or are negatively correlated. For example, a group high in competence, but low in warmth is respected and envied, but disliked. A group high in warmth and low in competence is liked, but not respected (Fiske, 2010).

Immigrants are often seen as being one outgroup and are rated low in competence and low in warmth (not respected or liked). However, when immigrant populations are specified by an originating country, ratings of competence and warmth differ (Lee & Fiske, 2006). The categories Latino and Mexican are rated as low on competence and low on warmth (Fiske et al., 2002; Lee & Fiske, 2006). The Middle Eastern category is ranked as low in warmth. Middle Easterners overall were average in competence, but

there was a great deal of variability with participants tending to rate them either very high or very low in competence (Fiske et al., 2002; Lee & Fiske, 2006).

Outgroups that adhere to different views threaten the ingroup's world and, as a consequence, create negative attitudes and feelings toward the outgroup. The more an ingroup's values, customs, or traditions are blocked by an outgroup, the more negative the ingroup's attitudes toward the outgroup will be (Esses, Haddock, & Zanna, 1993). Because immigrants are seen as an outgroup, these perceptions of threat play an important role in prejudice.

Integrated Threat Theory

The integrated threat theory (ITT) combines perceived threats to an ingroup into one comprehensive model of prejudice (Stephan, Ybarra, & Bachman, 1999; Stephan et al., 1998) and has been used to examine attitudes toward immigrants as well as other groups (Stephan, Diaz-Loving, & Duran, 2000; Stephan, Renfro, Esses, Stephan, & Martin, 2005; Zárate, Garcia, Garza, & Hitlan, 2004). ITT theorizes that there are four fundamental threats that lead to prejudice toward outgroups: realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes (Stephan et al., 1998; Stephan et al., 1999).

Realistic threat refers to the threats immigrants pose to the welfare of the citizens of the host country. These include threats to the political and economic power of the host country and to the competition for physical and material resources. These resources can include land, jobs, health care, and education (Stephan et al., 1998). Realistic threats are

measured as perceived threats because the perception of threat can lead to prejudice, whether the perception is true or not (Stephan et al., 1999).

Symbolic threat is the perception that the culture of the host country will be changed in undesirable ways by the arrival of immigrants. Symbolic threats relate to differences in morals, values, norms, standards, beliefs, and attitudes (Stephan et al., 1999). The immigrant outgroup adheres to different views, which can be seen as a threat to the ingroup host country. When an ingroup's values, customs, or traditions are thought to be blocked by an outgroup, attitudes toward that outgroup are more negative (Esses et al., 1993).

Intergroup anxiety is when individuals feel threatened by outgroup members. Ingroup members worry about being rejected, ridiculed, or exploited. The anxiety from these feelings can lead to dislike of and prejudice toward outgroup members (Stephan & Stephan, 1985).

Finally, negative stereotypes are included in ITT because negative outgroup stereotypes can create perceptions of threat (Hamilton, Sherman, & Ruvolo, 1990). While realistic threats, symbolic threats, and intergroup anxiety are affective measures of outgroup members, negative stereotypes are cognitive aspects of prejudice (Corenblum & Stephan, 2001). For example, in one study, participants read information about a fictitious immigrant group, indicating that the immigrant group possessed negative traits, positive traits, or a combination of positive and negative traits. The creation of a negative stereotype led to negative attitudes toward the immigrant group. On the other hand, attributing positive stereotypes to the immigrant group did not have an impact on the

attitudes toward this group (Stephan et al., 2005). These results suggest that negative stereotypes can function as threats that cause prejudice.

Realistic threats, symbolic threats, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes combine for a comprehensive model of prejudice. The effectiveness of this model for immigrant groups has been demonstrated in studies measuring attitudes toward immigrants in many countries, including the United States (Stephan et al., 1999; Stephan et al., 2000; Zárate et al., 2004), Germany (Rohmann, Florack, & Piontkowski, 2006), Israel, and Spain (Stephan et al., 1998). Intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes are the strongest and most consistent predictors of attitudes and prejudice (Stephan et al., 1998; Stephan et al., 2000), although all four threat variables typically explain unique variance (Stephan et al., 2000; Stephan et al., 2005).

The ITT model demonstrates that prejudices can change when perceived threat changes. Research conducted before and after the terrorist attacks in the United States of September 11, 2001 showed greater levels of symbolic threat and prejudice toward Arab immigrants compared to Mexican immigrants after 2001. In addition, there were greater levels of realistic threat toward Mexican immigrants and immigration (Hitlan, Carrillo, Zárate, & Aikman, 2007). A study conducted in 2001 immediately after the terrorist attacks and repeated in 2004 showed that levels of symbolic threat, realistic threat, and intergroup anxiety toward Arab immigrants were higher in the later study (Harton & Schwab, 2004). Although the terrorist attacks on the United States were almost 10 years ago, the threat felt is still salient due to the United States' continuing role in the wars against the Muslim countries of Iraq and Afghanistan.

Social Dominance Orientation

Feelings of threat toward outgroups can especially be seen in people high in social dominance orientation (SDO). SDO is a personality variable which predicts social and political attitudes. SDO measures an individual's preference for hierarchy within any social system (Pratto, Sidanius, Stallworth, & Malle, 1994). Those high in SDO want their social groups to dominate and subordinate other groups that are considered inferior. Those higher in SDO are more conservative, are more favorable toward the military, and are more patriotic (Pratto et al., 1994). Those lower in SDO tend to be more favorable toward women's rights, gay rights, and social programs in general (Pratto et al., 1994).

SDO correlates with negative attitudes toward outgroups (SDO; Pratto et al., 1994; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999) and is one of the primary predictors of prejudice (e.g., Altmeyer, 1998; Esses, Jackson, & Armstrong, 1998; Guimond, Dambrun, Michinov, & Duarte, 2003) Thus, higher SDO also relates to more negative attitudes toward immigrants (Danso, Sedlovskaya, & Suanda, 2007; Esses et al., 1998; Esses, Dovidio, Jackson, & Armstrong, 2001; Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003; Jackson & Esses, 2000). Persons high in SDO are more likely to indicate that gains for immigrants result in losses for non-immigrants (Esses et al., 1998). They may see immigrants as competition for resources that they believe should benefit their ingroup (Esses et al., 2001). As ingroup salience increases or is threatened, SDO becomes more strongly related to prejudice, and participants become less likely to allocate resources to an immigrant outgroup (Heaven & St. Quinton, 2003). SDO also negatively correlates with attitudes toward immigrants and willingness to empower immigrants, but not with willingness to provide direct assistance.

This finding suggests an attempt to reduce immigrants' competitiveness and to maintain dominance (Esses et al., 2001). People high in SDO value group power, dominance, and superiority and are motivated by competitiveness. They tend to justify their higher status by disliking and devaluing groups that are low in status and power (Duckitt, 2006). Thus, when a member of a lower status outgroup is acting negatively toward or ostracizing them, the negative behavior may prompt competitiveness and produce even greater feelings of threat in a person high in SDO.

Ostracism

Ostracism or social exclusion involves one or more people (source) withdrawing verbal and/or nonverbal contact from another person (target; Dotan-Eliaz, Sommer, & Rubin, 2007). Although there are differences, the terms ostracism and social exclusion are used interchangeably because the distinctions are usually not accounted for by investigators (Williams, 2007). Ostracism includes ignoring, excluding, and rejecting another person (Gruter & Masters, 1986). Ostracism can vary in quantity (from partial to complete) and causal clarity (reasons clear versus unclear to the target). The reasons behind social exclusion include to punish the target, to defend against anticipated rejection, and to gain control over anger. Sometimes the source is unaware his/her behavior is perceived as exclusionary (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009).

Immediate reactions to ostracism can include a bad mood, hurt feelings, and physiological arousal, whereas long-term reactions can include isolation, learned helplessness, and despondency (Williams, 1997). Ostracism also leads to lower levels of belongingness, self-esteem, control, and meaningful existence (Williams, Goven, Croker,

Tynan, Cruickshank, & Lam, 2002; Williams, Shore, & Grahe, 1998; Zadro, Williams, & Richardson, 2004).

The physical environment of the ostracism can be real or implied, such as in internet chat rooms (Hitlan, Kelly, & Zárate, 2010; Otto, Kelly, & Hanninen, 2007) or a computer game (Williams, Cheung, & Choi, 2000). Cyberball is a virtual representation of a face-to-face ball toss game used in ostracism research (Williams & Sommer, 1997). The participant is either included or ostracized depending by the number of times the ball is thrown to them. Participants who received the ball infrequently quit the game sooner and have more negative moods than those who receive the disc more frequently (Williams et al., 2000). This effect occurs even when the perceived source is from a disliked group (Gonsalkorale & Williams, 2007).

Language-based Exclusion

The increase in immigrants and bi-lingual speakers in the U.S. creates potential for a different form of exclusion. The increase in bi-lingual residents increases the likelihood of being ostracized using language. Language-based exclusion or linguistic ostracism (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009) occurs when people converse in a language that those who can hear the interaction cannot understand. Because excluded people cannot participate in the conversations, they may feel rejected, angry, or anxious over the possibility of being secretly criticized or excluded from activities. Sources of language-based exclusion may use a language not understood by another to make the other person feel rejected, because it is their native language and easier to use, or because they do not understand the impact of their behavior on others (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009).

The perception of being excluded in another language is increasingly relevant as an increased number of bi-lingual and non-English speakers enter the workplace (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009) and is the basis of much of the research in this area. In 2007, over 54 million residents born in or outside of the United States reported speaking a language other than English at home (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 2010a). In a study examining the effects of ostracism in the workplace, participants who imagined being excluded from a social conversation in Spanish reported lower work group commitment and higher levels of symbolic threat compared with included participants and those who imagined being excluded in English. Participants in the Spanish ostracism group also reported higher levels of prejudice compared to included participants (Hitlan, Kelly, Schepman, Schneider, & Zárate, 2006). This phenomenon has also been studied with languages not as common as Spanish in the United States. Imagined exclusion in the workplace in Russian or Swedish also leads to greater reported rejection, anger, and anticipated dislike of co-workers (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009).

Language-based exclusion has been demonstrated using internet-based chat rooms as well. In a study by Hitlan et al. (2010), participants were either excluded in English or Spanish or included in the conversation. The topic of discussion in the Spanish exclusion conditions was either immigration or a neutral topic. Participants in Spanish exclusion conditions felt angrier than included participants and less accepted than included participants and those excluded in English. In addition, participants in the Spanish exclusion condition discussing a neutral topic expressed greater prejudice than included participants (Hitlan et al., 2010). In another computer chat room study, participants were

excluded from the conversation in Spanish, German, French, Czech, or English.

Participants excluded in a non-English language disparaged the outgroup members and withdrew from the group more than those excluded in English (Otto et al., 2007).

Exclusion via language produces the same negative feelings as other forms of social exclusion. This effect occurs in person, in imagined scenarios, and in computer-based environments where the language is not even heard. In the current study, a different immigrant group and a personality variable were added. Because people of Muslim faith who speak Arabic have become a source of controversy and disliked for the actions of a few, Arabic language was added to this study. The personality factor of social dominance orientation has been shown to correlate with negative attitudes toward immigrants previously (Danso et al., 2007; Esses et al., 1998, 2001; Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003; Jackson & Esses, 2000), but was added to the current study to see if the effects intensified in a language exclusion environment.

Methodology

Many of the previous studies on both ostracism (Williams, 2007) and language-based exclusion (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2006) were conducted using a computer. In numerous studies using the cyberball computer program, participants reported how they felt. Participants ostracized during the game reported lower levels of belonging, self-esteem, control, and mood levels than those who were not (Eisenberger, Lieberman, & Williams, 2003; Gonsalkorale & Williams, 2007; Williams et al., 2000; Zadro et al., 2004). The negative feelings reported during the cyberball game matched the feelings reported during face-to-face ostracism research (Williams, 1997). Both face-to-face and

computer-based research have demonstrated similar effects of ostracism (Williams, 2007).

The benefit of face-to-face research is that participants can be ostracized through language, facial expressions, and body language. Hearing an accent or seeing a different skin color could make language-based exclusion more salient. A disadvantage of using confederates to exclude participants in face-to-face research is the need to use the same confederates for consistency across sessions. In addition, the sex and attractiveness of the confederates can influence the participant positively or negatively (Adams, Ryan, Hoffman, Dobson, & Nielsen, 1984; Sroufe, Chaikin, Cook, & Freeman, 1977). Because so many factors can affect a participant in a face-to-face research study, even well-trained confederates can show inconsistencies. The advantage of computer-based research is that different confederates using prepared statements and protocols are more likely to be consistent across sessions. The computer environment also eliminates the need to find and train two tri-lingual confederates needed for exclusion. The disadvantage of using a computer is that saliency may be reduced if the participant can not hear an accent or see a confederate of a different nationality. Due to the confederate resources needed to conduct face-to-face ostracism research and the consistency of using the computer, a computer-based ostracism paradigm was chosen for this study.

Deception of the participant is necessary in most ostracism research. While the use of vignettes and imagined responses to ostracism have been used to assess perceived ostracism (Hitlan et al., 2006), other ostracism studies conducted on the computer or face-to-face have used deception in order to measure actual responses to ostracism

(Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Eisenberger et al., 2003; Gonsalkorale & Williams, 2007; Otto et al., 2007; Williams & Sommer, 1997; Williams et al., 2000; Zadro et al., 2004).

Because people do not always react in a manner they would expect from themselves, imagined responses may not be equal to genuine, actual responses and the use of deception is warranted (Hughes & Huby, 2002).

University participants are aware of the use of deception in psychological research through word-of-mouth and classroom learning on research design methods and can become suspicious (Epley & Huff, 1998). A plausible cover story can be used to setup a research study and decrease levels of suspiciousness in order to get accurate results. In this study, participants were told they were participating in two unrelated studies with the measures administered separately. The first part was titled “person perception” and included the computer chat and ostracism. The second part was titled “social attitudes” and included the prejudice measures. Suspiciousness was decreased because participants did not believe the computer chat and prejudice measures were part of the same study.

After reviewing previous research, the computer chat environment with the deception of language exclusion was chosen as the best design for this study. Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: English-language inclusion, Spanish-language exclusion, Arabic-language exclusion, or English-language exclusion. During a 16-minute computer chat, the participant talked about four topics for 4 minutes each with a confederate posing as two participants. In the exclusion conditions, participants were excluded from the conversation during the third and fourth topics.

Research Purpose

The current research on language-based exclusion shows how language can produce unintended effects. When encountering people from other cultures, individuals can be advertently or inadvertently ostracized via language. This exclusion can affect attitudes toward immigrant populations and create inaccurate perceptions. Those excluded via language experience the same feelings of rejection, anger, and dislike that are seen in other forms of exclusion (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009). Language-based exclusion can impede group performance (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009) and impact the workplace by decreasing work group commitment and increasing symbolic threat and prejudice (Hitlan et al., 2006). Language-based exclusion also impacts the social environment (Hitlan et al., 2006; Otto et al., 2007).

This study expands upon prior research by ostracizing participants in a computer-based chat room in both Spanish and Arabic. Because Spanish-speaking immigrants are the largest growing segment of the immigrant population in the U.S. (Potocky-Tripodi, 2002), prior research has mainly focused on this group. Mexican immigrants in particular are the largest and most visible immigrant group in the United States. However, Arab immigrants have become a more visible group in the United States due to fears following the September 11 terrorist attacks and the current wars in the Middle East. Although perceived as a higher status and higher competence immigrant group than Mexican immigrants (Fiske et al., 2002), perceptions of Arab immigrants have varied based on recent events and media coverage (Weston, 2003). Arab immigrants are associated with fear and the threat of terrorism, whereas Mexican immigrants are considered lower status

and not associated with a physically harmful threat. Although outgroups are considered lower status than ingroups, the type of perceived threat is dependent on the group status. A higher status group like Arabic immigrants are considered more competent, but pose a threat based on their abilities and increased competition. A perceived lower status group like Mexican immigrants are seen as a threat to basic resources, but are not seen as competent or warm and are considered harmless. Because Arab immigrants are perceived to be dangerous, participants excluded in Arabic were expected to have higher levels of prejudice and a lower sense of belongingness. Measures used in language-based exclusion research have included measures of rejection, dislike, anger, work group commitment, individual commitment, prosocial behavior, antisocial behavior, perceived threat, symbolic threat, stereotyping, prejudice, and attitudes toward co-workers and immigrants (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2006; Hitlan et al., 2010; Otto et al., 2007). In this study, the ITT measures of realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety and negative stereotypes were used because they have been shown to be good predictors of prejudice toward immigrants (Hitlan et al., 2010; Rohmann et al., 2006). Prejudice is being measured because of the consequences associated with negative affect. Prejudice can decrease self-esteem, inhibit performance, and lead to discrimination of individuals in a perceived outgroup.

An obstacle to accurately measuring attitudes is the tendency to respond in a socially acceptable manner and hide any attitudes that are socially unacceptable. Even though participants were informed that their responses were anonymous, a social desirability scale (Crowne & Marlow, 1960) was included in the study to determine the

extent to which participants were providing their true attitudes versus what they perceived to be socially acceptable responses (Randall & Fernandes, 1991).

Research on language-based exclusion has generally not investigated how individual differences may affect reactions. This study used a social dominance orientation (SDO) measure because it is highly correlated with unfavorable attitudes toward immigrants (Esses et al., 1998, 2001; Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003; Jackson & Esses, 2000; Pratto & Lemieux, 2001). Those high in SDO want their social group to dominate and subordinate groups they consider inferior (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Immigrants as a whole are considered lower status with perceptions of being low in competence and low in warmth (Fiske et al., 2002). Thus, immigrant groups in particular may be seen as inferior to those high in SDO. Because of previous findings linking SDO to negative attitudes toward immigrants, individual differences in SDO were used to predict reactions to language-based exclusion. It was predicted that participants higher in SDO would feel the effects of language exclusion more strongly and thus report more prejudice than those low in SDO. Specifically, I predicted that:

1. Perceived ostracism from language exclusionary behavior will lead to higher levels of symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes toward immigrant populations.
2. Levels for all integrated threat theory measures will be higher when the participant is excluded in Arabic compared to Spanish.
3. Both the Arabic and Spanish language-based exclusion conditions will have higher integrated threat theory measure levels than English-based exclusion

extent to which participants were providing their true attitudes versus what they perceived to be socially acceptable responses (Randall & Fernandes, 1991).

Research on language-based exclusion has generally not investigated how individual differences may affect reactions. This study used a social dominance orientation (SDO) measure because it is highly correlated with unfavorable attitudes toward immigrants (Esses et al., 1998, 2001; Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003; Jackson & Esses, 2000; Pratto & Lemieux, 2001). Those high in SDO want their social group to dominate and subordinate groups they consider inferior (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Immigrants as a whole are considered lower status with perceptions of being low in competence and low in warmth (Fiske et al., 2002). Thus, immigrant groups in particular may be seen as inferior to those high in SDO. Because of previous findings linking SDO to negative attitudes toward immigrants, individual differences in SDO were used to predict reactions to language-based exclusion. It was predicted that participants higher in SDO would feel the effects of language exclusion more strongly and thus report more prejudice than those low in SDO. Specifically, I predicted that:

1. Perceived ostracism from language exclusionary behavior will lead to higher levels of symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes toward immigrant populations.
2. Levels for all integrated threat theory measures will be higher when the participant is excluded in Arabic compared to Spanish.
3. Both the Arabic and Spanish language-based exclusion conditions will have higher integrated threat theory measure levels than English-based exclusion

and all exclusion conditions will have higher integrated threat theory measure levels than the inclusion condition.

4. Levels of prejudice will be higher for those who are high in SDO.
5. Language exclusion effects will be stronger for participants high in SDO versus those low in SDO.

CHAPTER 2

METHOD

Participants

Participants were 102 university students (65 female, 36 male, 1 did not report sex) from a mid-sized Midwestern university, ranging in age from 18 to 28 years old ($M = 18.82$, $SD = 1.32$). The majority of participants categorized themselves as Caucasian/White (97%), followed by Asian (2%) and Hispanic/Latino (1%). Most participants were freshmen (76%), followed by sophomores (16%), juniors (5%), and seniors (4%). Participants listed their political orientation as moderate (41%), conservative (30%), liberal (26%), or unknown (3%). Participants received partial course credit for taking part in the experiment.

Because the demographics of the area limited the ethnic diversity of the sample, only the results from the Caucasian participants were used in the analyses. Based on participant answers to post-experimental debriefing, 7 participants indicated being suspicious about the nature of the study and were subsequently excluded from further analysis. An additional 4 participants were not born in the United States. Because most of the measures focused on immigrant populations, these participants were excluded from further analysis. An additional 5 participants in the Spanish language condition reported above average Spanish language ability (3.5 or greater average on a 5-point scale; .88 standard deviations above the mean). Because language ability was an integral part of the current research design, these participants were excluded from further analysis.

After removing these participants, the final sample included 85 participants. Participants used in the data analyses were university students (57 female, 28 male), ranging in age from 18 to 22 years old ($M = 18.76$, $SD = 1.00$). All of the participants used in the analyses categorized themselves as Caucasian/White. Most participants were freshmen (79%), followed by sophomores (12%), juniors (6%), and seniors (4%). Participants listed their political orientation as moderate (41%), conservative (32%), liberal (25%), or unknown (2%).

Design

Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: English-language inclusion, Spanish-language exclusion, Arabic-language exclusion, or English-language exclusion. Dependent variables measured prejudice (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotypes) toward immigrants. In addition, social dominance orientation and social desirability scales were included as dependent or control variables. Acceptance was used both as a manipulation check and a dependent variable.

Measures

Perceived Threat

Two scales based on ITT assessed feelings of realistic and symbolic threat in relation to immigrants (Stephan et al., 1999). Eleven items from the realistic threat scale assessed feelings of threat immigrant groups pose to the welfare of the citizens of the host country (i.e., “How much do you agree or disagree that immigrants take jobs away from other Americans?”; see Appendix F; $\alpha = .84$). Each of the ITT scales typically contains

12 items; however, a smaller number of the realistic and symbolic threat items were provided in the Appendix of Stephan et al. (1999), and those items are the only ones used in this study. Participant responses were obtained on a 10-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). Nine items from the symbolic threat scale assessed the perception that the culture of the host society would be changed in undesirable ways by the arrival of immigrants (i.e., “How much do you agree or disagree that immigration tends to threaten United States culture?”; see Appendix G; $\alpha = .69$). Participant responses were obtained on a 10-point scale ranging from 1 (*strongly disagree*) to 10 (*strongly agree*). When necessary, items were reverse coded. Total scale scores were developed by averaging responses. Higher scores denote higher levels of threat.

Intergroup Anxiety

Intergroup anxiety was measured through the intergroup anxiety scale (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix H; $\alpha = .93$). Participants rated how they feel when interacting with immigrants on a 10-point scale ranging from 1 (*not at all*) to 10 (*extremely*). The 12 anxiety items included: apprehensive, uncertain, worried, awkward, anxious, threatened, comfortable, trusting, friendly, confident, safe, and at ease. Items were recoded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of intergroup anxiety. Total scale scores were developed by averaging responses.

Stereotyping

Stereotyping was measured using the negative stereotype index (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix I; $\alpha = .81$). Participants indicated the percentage of immigrants who

had 12 descriptive traits. The traits included: dishonest, ignorance, undisciplined, aggressive, hard-working, reliable, proud, respectful, unintelligent, clean, clannish, and friendly. Participant responses were obtained on a 10-point scale (0% to 100% in 10% intervals). Items were recoded so that higher scores indicated more negative stereotypes. Total scale scores were developed by averaging responses.

Social Dominance Orientation

To assess the role of social dominance on attitudes and prejudice toward immigrants, participants completed a scale consisting of 14 items (Pratto et al., 1994; see Appendix J; $\alpha = .78$). Half of the items were worded in the pro-trait direction (i.e., “Superior groups should dominate inferior groups”), and half were worded in the con-trait direction (i.e., “No one group should dominate in society”). Participants’ responses were obtained on a 7-point Likert-type scale ranging from 1 (*very negative*) to 7 (*very positive*). When necessary, items were reverse coded. Total scale scores were developed by averaging responses. Items were recoded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of SDO.

Social Desirability Scale

To measure the tendency of individuals to project favorable images of themselves, participants completed the 33-item Crowne-Marlowe (CM) Social Desirability Scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; see Appendix E; $\alpha = .69$). Half of the true-false items included acceptable, but improbable behaviors (i.e., “I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.”) as well as those deemed unacceptable, but probable (i.e., “I can remember ‘playing sick’ to get out of something.”). Items were recoded so that

higher scores indicated higher levels of social desirability. Total scale scores were developed by averaging responses.

Manipulation Checks

To determine whether participants felt exclusion, they were asked questions to determine the degree they felt accepted by the other chat room participants (i.e., “How accepted did you feel by the other students in the discussion?” (Hitlan et al., 2010). Additional author-generated questions also assessed acceptance (see Appendix D; $\alpha = .91$).

Additional Measures

Demographic information was collected as part of the first measure (see Appendix C). Participants indicated gender, age, education level, ethnicity/race, marital status, political orientation, and zip code of hometown.

The last measure collected information on citizenship, language fluency, and familiarity with other cultures (see Appendix K). Citizenship was established with questions on their place of birth, Iowa residency, and United States citizenship. Language fluency was indicated on a chart rating fluency of reading, writing, speaking, and understanding in Spanish, Chinese, French, Arabic, and German. Participants’ fluency was indicated on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 (*no fluency*) to 5 (*fluent*). Familiarity with other cultures was determined through an open-ended question (“Have you visited any countries outside of the United States within the last five years?”). In addition, participants were asked which immigrant group(s) they were thinking about when filling out the questionnaires.

Procedure

The experiment took place in a small research room with a computer on a table and chairs for the participant and researcher. Participants individually read and signed the informed consent form. The female researcher explained that the study assessed person perception and social attitudes. As part of the cover story, the participants were told that they would be participating in two different studies. They were told that in the first study they would interact with two other students via a computer-based chat program to discuss four social issues, and, at the end of the discussion, they would fill out a questionnaire on their perceptions of the conversation and the other participants. Then they were told that as part of the second study, they would be asked to complete social attitudes questionnaires (see Appendix A for protocol script). In reality, the participants interacted with one confederate in a nearby room who used prepared statements in the chat discussion to simulate two other participants and all the measures were components of the computer chat study. After explaining the procedures, the researcher left the participant alone in the room and shut the door.

Each participant was randomly assigned to one of four conditions. Over the 16 minute conversation, four topics were presented on screen one at a time and the participant talked about each topic with the confederate for 4 minutes each. The confederate (in another room) appeared to be two participants and typed in prepared responses or cut and pasted the responses into the chat program. The topics included on-campus versus off-campus housing, whether celebrities influence young people, the use

of cell phones in public places, and preventing spam e-mails (see Appendix B for confederate scripts).

In all of the conditions, the confederate included the participant during the first two topics of the discussion (8 minutes). In the three exclusion conditions, the confederate began the exclusion with the other two “participants” realizing in English that they had the same nationality. In the Spanish and Arabic-language exclusion conditions, the confederate participants continued the remainder of the discussion in Spanish or Arabic. Thus, the participant was ostracized during the last two topics of the discussion (7 to 8 minutes). In the English-language exclusion condition, the confederate began the exclusion with the two “participants” realizing they had the same nationality, but they continued to speak in English. The participant was excluded in the remainder of the discussion with the confederate not responding to him/her.

When the discussion ended, the confederate noted any suspicious or unusual behavior by the participant on a log sheet. The researcher then returned to the participant with the measures, including a demographic form (see Appendix C), a manipulation check for perceived ostracism (Hitlan et al., 2010; see Appendix D), and a social desirability scale (Crowne & Marlowe, 1960; see Appendix E). These first measures were always presented in the same order. The researcher left the room and asked the participant to open the door when finished; another researcher would be in shortly to explain the second study.

After the first measures were completed, the confederate (now posing as a second researcher) brought in the second set of measures, explaining that these were part of the

second study. The measures included the realistic threat scale (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix F), the symbolic threat scale (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix G), the intergroup anxiety scale (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix H), the negative stereotype index (Stephan et al., 1998; see Appendix I), and the social dominance orientation scale (Pratto et al., 1994; see Appendix J). In addition, questions gauging the participant's familiarity with other languages and cultures were asked (see Appendix K). The scales in the second group of measures were presented in a random order with the questions on language ability always last. The confederate left the room and asked the participant to open the door when finished.

After the participant completed the second set of measures, the researcher came back in the room and verbally asked the participant questions to assess the level of ostracism and determine any suspicions about the nature of the study. All responses were recorded by hand on the debriefing script. The participant was debriefed about the nature of the study (see Appendix L), and asked not to discuss the experiment for six months. Before leaving, the participant was offered candy to help alleviate any negative feelings from the ostracism (Macht & Mueller, 2007).

Topics and Script Development

Topics were chosen so that they would create a natural conversation among college-aged participants. Participants would be able to state an opinion on the issue, but the topics would not incite strong feelings. The topics chosen included on-campus versus off-campus housing, whether celebrities influence young people, the use of cell phones in public places, and preventing spam e-mails.

Scripts were developed in English. Undergraduate and graduate psychology students read through the scripts and provided feedback on the topics and phrasing. Then revised scripts were tested in the computer chat program by undergraduate and graduate psychology students. Feedback on the flow of the conversation and whether or not the students noticed the inclusion or exclusion was provided. The scripts were finalized in English. For the language-based exclusion conditions, the last two topics of the scripts were translated into Spanish and Arabic by native speakers (see Appendix B for scripts). Because language accuracy was not important (i.e., the participants by design would not understand the foreign scripts, but just recognize them as another language), back translation was not required.

Confederates

Confederates in the study were psychology graduate and undergraduate students familiar with research practices and confidentiality. A few days before research began, confederates were given verbal instructions on the procedures and received written instructions (see Appendix M). The training included general information about arrival times, etiquette, responsibilities, and step-by-step instructions on the procedure for each participant. The researcher also trained the confederates on the chat program and provided written instructions and scripts. The chat instructions explained the different conditions, the personalities of the two participants they were to represent, and how to create the perception of inclusion and exclusion. Confederates performed practice trials for the English inclusion, English exclusion, and language-based exclusion conditions. During the study, each confederate took on the role of two participants and typed or cut

and pasted scripted responses into the chat program. On the inclusion topics, they were instructed to address the participant's comments based on the scripts. On the exclusion topics, they followed the script directly and did not respond to the participant.

Debriefing

The researcher verbally asked the participants open-ended questions to assess suspiciousness of the true nature of the study and feelings of social exclusion (see Appendix L). All participants were asked general questions about the discussion (i.e., "How did the discussion go? Did you enjoy the discussion?"). To assess suspiciousness, participants were asked "Did you think anything was odd about the discussion?" and "What do you think we were studying in this research?"

All exclusion participants were asked: "Did you feel uncomfortable when the other students did not include you in the discussion?" and "Why do you think this happened?" Participants in the Spanish and Arabic-language exclusion conditions were asked questions specific to the language-based ostracism: "Did you feel uncomfortable when the other students spoke in a different language?" and "What do you feel the others students were talking about?" The researcher recorded the answers to the questions.

CHAPTER 3

RESULTS

Foreign Language Fluency

The mean score for Spanish fluency in participants in the Spanish language condition was 2.28 (Median = 2.38; Mode = 2.00; $SD = .66$). Because language ability represented a prevalent variable in the current research, participants above average (3.5 or greater) Spanish ability were excluded from the analyses. None of the participants in the Arabic language condition had any fluency in Arabic.

Manipulation Check

To assess the effectiveness of the exclusion manipulation, a t -test was conducted using acceptance as the dependent variable and inclusion/exclusion as the independent variable. There was a significant difference between the inclusion condition ($M = 7.08$, $SD = 1.30$) and the exclusion conditions ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.83$) on acceptance, $t(83) = 7.21$, $p < .01$.

Acceptance

Because acceptance has also been used as a dependent variable in previous research on ostracism (Gonsalkorale & Williams, 2007; Williams & Jarvis, 2006) and to further explore differences by condition, an one-way ANOVA was conducted using acceptance as the dependent variable and the inclusion/exclusion condition as the independent variable, $F(3, 81) = 34.74$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .75$. Tukey post-hoc tests revealed that excluded participants reported feeling significantly less accepted than included participants. Furthermore, participants in the Arabic and Spanish exclusion conditions

reported feeling significantly less accepted than the participants in the English exclusion condition. There was no significant difference between the Arabic and Spanish exclusion conditions (see Table 1).

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviation of Acceptance

	English Inclusion	English Exclusion	Arabic Exclusion	Spanish Exclusion
Acceptance	7.08 _a (1.30)	5.30 _b (1.30)	2.82 _c (1.71)	3.54 _c (1.50)

Note: Means with different subscripts differ at $p < .05$.

Expressions of Prejudice

It was predicted that language exclusionary behavior would lead to higher levels of realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes toward immigrant populations. To test the effects of the ostracism, five ANOVAs were conducted using the ITT scales (symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes) and SDO as dependent variables and the exclusion condition as the independent variable (see Table 2). Results yielded no significant differences on any of the scales, $ps > .40$, $\eta^2s < .20$.

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Each Scale by Condition

	Realistic Threat	Symbolic Threat	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotypes	Social Dominance Orientation
English Inclusion	5.16 (1.70)	5.51 (1.18)	4.45 (1.57)	36.57 (12.54)	2.32 (1.04)
English Exclusion	5.43 (1.12)	5.61 (.98)	4.91 (1.27)	36.35 (8.54)	2.45 (.87)
Arabic Exclusion	5.06 (1.21)	5.52 (1.27)	4.40 (1.52)	32.34 (10.58)	2.42 (.71)
Spanish Exclusion	5.48 (1.49)	5.46 (1.46)	4.67 (1.58)	38.25 (13.93)	2.60 (.86)
η^2	.13	.04	.14	.19	.12
p	.72	.98	.66	.41	.78

Note: Realistic threat, symbolic threat, and intergroup anxiety were measured on scales from 1-10. Negative stereotypes were measured on a scale from 0%-100%. SDO was measured on a scale from 1-7.

Correlations and Regression Analyses

Average within-condition correlations were calculated using Fisher z transformations to determine the relationship between the dependent measures prior to the regression analyses. Within-condition correlations were used to control for any effects that condition had on the interrelationships. The four ITT scales (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes), the SDO scale, and the social desirability scale were correlated within each condition, transformed to Fisher z s, averaged, and converted back to r s.

Each ITT scale was significantly correlated with the other three ITT scales and SDO. Participants higher in either realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, or

negative stereotypes were also significantly higher in the other three ITT scales.

Participants who were higher in SDO reported more realistic threat, symbolic threat, prejudice, negative stereotypes, and social desirability. Social desirability had a significant negative correlation with SDO, but did not correlate with any of the ITT scales (see Table 3). There were no significant differences in the correlations between conditions.

Five hierarchical regression analyses were conducted using the four ITT measures (realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes) and acceptance as dependent variables. The inclusion/exclusion condition, SDO, social desirability, and the interactions of condition and SDO were independent variables. Condition was dummy coded as Inclusion/Not (1, 0), Spanish/Not (1, 0), and Arabic/Not (1, 0). For example, the English language exclusion condition would be coded 0, 0, 0. Main effects were entered in the first step. In the second step, interaction effects were entered. The interaction was created by multiplying the *z* scores for SDO with the *z* scores for the dummy coded condition variables.

It was predicted that the levels of prejudice would be higher and language exclusion effects would be stronger for participants who were higher in SDO. The regression analysis did not demonstrate any main effects of condition on any of the threat variables, as would be expected from the analyses of variance. Controlling for condition, participants who were higher in SDO reported greater realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes. The overall variance explained was

Table 3

Within-Cell Correlations

	English Inclusion	English Exclusion	Arabic Exclusion	Spanish Exclusion	Average Within Cell <i>r</i>
Realistic Threat–Symbolic Threat	.87**	.58**	.48*	.73**	.70**
Realistic Threat–Intergroup Anxiety	.47*	.52*	.59**	.69**	.57**
Realistic Threat–Negative Stereotypes	.29	.72**	.43	.80**	.60**
Realistic Threat–Social Dominance	.27	.25	.30	.56**	.35**
Realistic Threat–Social Desirability	.00	-.11	.04	.00	-.02
Symbolic Threat–Intergroup Anxiety	.47*	.64**	.55**	.66**	.58**
Symbolic Threat–Negative Stereotypes	.48*	.47*	.41	.81**	.57**
Symbolic Threat–Social Dominance	-.06	.27	.52*	.49*	.32**
Symbolic Threat–Social Desirability	.07	-.28	-.10	-.19	-.13
Intergroup Anxiety–Negative Stereotypes	.72**	.37	.47*	.69**	.58**
Intergroup Anxiety–Social Dominance	.33	.15	.09	.40	.25*
Intergroup Anxiety–Social Desirability	-.18	-.22	.11	-.10	-.10
Negative Stereotypes–Social Dominance	.19	.46*	.40	.36	.36**
Negative Stereotypes–Social Desirability	-.28	-.01	.14	-.20	-.09
Social Dominance–Social Desirability	-.48*	.04	-.11	-.30	-.22*

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

significant for realistic threat, but not for the other three ITT scales. SDO did not moderate the effects of ostracism for any of the scales (see Table 4).

On the acceptance variable, the regression analysis demonstrated main effects of the condition and the overall variance was significant. SDO did not moderate the effects of exclusion on acceptance (see Table 4).

Participant Reactions

As expected, participants had different reactions when excluded in a language they did not know. Some participants stopped chatting, while others continued chatting on the subject in English and did not acknowledge that the others had switched languages. Other participants expressed feelings of exclusion (e.g., “i dont know what u guys r saying” and “Its awsome in all that you know arabic... but it would really help me out if you type in english.” [*sic*]) or became angry (e.g., “Can we speak in english please??” and “stop it” [*sic*]). A few participants tried to get the attention of the others by making negative remarks (“Ur both idiots” [*sic*] and “Hey, we are in the u.s. here.” [*sic*]). Others displayed a sense of humor and replied to Spanish or Arabic discussions with “I agree” and “Yeah, what he said, lol.” [*sic*]. In the Spanish exclusion condition, some participants attempted to join in the chat by typing replies in basic Spanish.

During the debriefing, there were also a variety of reactions to the language-based exclusion. A few hesitantly mentioned that they were not able to participate during the entire chat because the other participants switched to a different language. Some did not mention the change of language at all even after several leading questions. Others thought “it was cool to see them talking in Arabic.” A few were angry and wanted to report that

Table 4

Regression Analysis with Social Dominance Orientation Interactions

	Realistic Threat	Symbolic Threat	Intergroup Anxiety	Negative Stereotypes	Acceptance
Inclusion	.00	.04	-.07	.04	.33**
Arabic	-.11	-.01	-.11	-.12	-.53**
Spanish	.01	-.09	-.11	.02	-.30**
Social Dominance Orientation	.36**	.29*	.24*	.32**	.01
Social Desirability	.05	-.07	-.07	-.05	.15
R^2	.14*	.10	.08	.14	.58**
Inclusion x SDO	.03	-.15	.06	-.10	-.07
Arabic x SDO	.05	.17	-.02	.03	-.11
Spanish x SDO	.20	.16	.13	.03	-.01
ΔR^2	.03	.09	.02	.02	.01

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

the other participants “weren’t doing what they were supposed to and messed up the chat.”

The seven participants who were excluded from analyses expressed suspiciousness immediately in the debriefing (“I know exactly how this study is setup.”) or within the first two questions (“I think they might have been speaking that way as part of the study.” and “I don’t think those were real people on the chat.”). The remainder of the participants did not show signs of suspiciousness and it took several leading questions before they figured out that the language-based exclusion was part of the study.

CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION

The current study provides empirical support in the areas of language-based exclusion, integrated threat theory (ITT) model, and social dominance orientation (SDO). Participants who were excluded reported feeling less accepted than those who were included and participants who were excluded in a language they did not know reported feeling less accepted than those who were excluded in English. The ITT model of prejudice toward outgroups was supported as realistic threat, symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes were significantly correlated with each other. In addition, participants who were higher in SDO reported greater realistic threat, symbolic threat, and negative stereotypes toward immigrant populations.

Language-based exclusion is a form of social exclusion that occurs when people exclude others from a conversation by speaking a language others cannot understand (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009). In the current study, participants in the three exclusion conditions (i.e., English, Arabic, Spanish) reported feeling less accepted than in the inclusion condition. The differences between the exclusion conditions indicated that the participants felt significantly less accepted in the Arabic and Spanish exclusion conditions than when they were excluded in English. The participants may have felt less accepted because exclusion in another language is more likely to seem intentional than exclusion in English. If one is excluded in English, the person may not actually feel excluded because he/she can still comprehend the conversation even though he/she is not a part of it. When excluded in another language, the exclusion is obvious. The target may

assume that the conversation he/she is being excluded from is about him/her. In addition, language-based exclusion differentiates the source as a member of an outgroup that is likely a different ethnic group. When excluded in one's own language, people may still feel they are the same ingroup. Thus, the current study supports previous findings (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2010) that feelings of acceptance are lower in language-based exclusion in comparison to exclusion in one's own language.

As in previous studies, the ITT scales were significantly correlated with each of the other three ITT scales. All of scales have been found to be effective measures of attitudes toward outgroups and prejudice, particularly with immigrant populations, combining to form a comprehensive model of prejudice (Stephan et al., 1998; Stephan et al., 1999; Stephan et al., 2000; Stephan et al., 2005; Zárate et al., 2004). The correlations found in this study support the consistency of the four individual ITT scales and the combined ITT model of prejudice (Stephan & Stephan, 2000).

The SDO personality trait was used in this study because of its correlation with negative attitudes toward immigrant groups (Esses et al., 1998, 2001; Heaven & St. Quintin, 2003; Jackson & Esses, 2000; Pratto & Lemieux, 2001). People high in SDO want their social group to dominate and consider other groups inferior (Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Although there were no language exclusion effects, the research supported the hypothesis that levels of prejudice would be higher for those who are high in SDO. Controlling for exclusion condition, participants who were higher in SDO reported greater realistic threat, symbolic threat, and negative stereotypes. The negative attitudes toward immigrants indicate the desire of those with higher SDO to maintain their group

dominance. Contrary to other studies, intergroup anxiety did not significantly correlate with SDO. Intergroup anxiety addresses how comfortable a person is interacting with the outgroup, and those high in SDO may feel comfortable around immigrants because they believe their own group is superior.

In the hypothesis, it was predicted that the perceived ostracism from language exclusionary behavior would lead to higher levels of symbolic threat, realistic threat, intergroup anxiety, and negative stereotypes toward immigrant populations. The results did not show significant differences in attitudes toward immigrants between those excluded by language and those excluded in English or not excluded at all. The effects of language-based exclusion on attitudes has been demonstrated in the past by using employment scenarios (Dotan-Eliasz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2006) and computer-based chat rooms (Hitlan et al., 2010; Otto et al., 2007). In the study most similar to the current one, participants were excluded in a chat room in English or Spanish. The participants ostracized in Spanish reported more feelings of anger, leading to increased prejudice and perceived symbolic threat toward immigrants (Hitlan et al., 2010).

One reason for the lack of effects of language-based exclusion in the current study as compared to previous studies could be that language-excluded participants categorized the confederates as “students” rather than as “immigrants,” as it was not revealed that the confederate was from another country until halfway through the conversation. The participants may have seen the confederates as part of their ingroup before the exclusion began. In Hitlan et al. (2010), the confederates were positioned as students from a different university whereas in the current study, the confederates were positioned as

students from the same university in a different room. In Hitlan et al. (2010), the participants could have categorized the confederate both as an ingroup (student) and an outgroup (different university), making it easier to categorize them as part of an immigrant outgroup later in the chat.

In previous studies on language-based exclusion, withdrawal (Otto et al., 2007) and mood (Hitlan et al., 2010) were used to measure the effects of language-based exclusion on attitudes. Participants who withdrew more or were angrier reported more negative attitudes. In addition to measuring feelings of acceptance, measures of withdrawal and mood may have assessed the participants' feelings of exclusion more accurately. These negative feelings may have correlated to negative attitudes toward immigrants in this study.

A noteworthy difference between the current and previous studies on language-based exclusion (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2010) was that they were conducted in different geographic regions of the United States, which may account for the differences in results. There are regional differences in attitudes, behavior, and personality. People influence those closest to them and they become more similar than those further away (Harton & Bullock, 2007; Plaut, Markus, & Lachman, 2002). Using the same computer chat methodology as previous studies (Dotan-Eliaz et al., 2009; Hitlan et al., 2010), this was the first known language exclusion study conducted in Iowa. Anecdotally, Iowans are known to be nice and are hesitant to express negative attitudes about others. In other psychological research in Iowa, it has been difficult to get participants to report negative feelings toward others, even when such negativity is

shown by indirect measures (Harton, personal communication, June 15, 2010). Given the similar methodology to Hitlan et al. (2010), a likely reason for the different results are the regional differences in the locations of the studies. This finding strongly suggests that the results may not generalize to all populations.

It was also predicted that the levels for all ITT measures would be higher when the participant was excluded in Arabic compared to Spanish. In a chat room environment where the participant cannot see the confederate, the participant may not have considered the confederate's ethnicity during the language-based exclusion. Although the confederate's ethnicity was mentioned and the chat was in Spanish or Arabic, it may not have been salient because they could not see the person or hear an accent. In addition, the chat program could not support Arabic characters and a transliteration was used instead, which may not even have been recognized as Arabic.

Another component to ethnic perception is the sex of the person. The sex of the confederates was implied in the style of conversation, but never revealed. The emotions felt toward male and female immigrants differ depending on the country of origin. Male immigrants are associated with bigger threats than female immigrants, with Arab men particularly being associated with fear. Female immigrants in general are associated with threats to reciprocity relationships, and Arab and Mexican immigrant women are likely to be associated with feelings of pity (Joshi, 2009). If the confederates were perceived to be women, they may have been pitied instead of being seen as a threat.

The final hypothesis predicted that the language exclusion effects would be stronger for participants high in SDO versus those low in SDO. However, SDO did not interact

with exclusion effects on symbolic threat, intergroup anxiety, negative stereotypes, or levels of acceptance. This lack of interaction could also be attributed to regional differences. Even if the participant believes his/her own group to be superior to others, there still could be a desire to be “nice” or “politically correct” toward outgroups even in anonymous situations.

Limitations and Future Research

There are several limitations in the research. One limitation was that the attitudes of the participant sample ($M = 18.82$) may not generalize to the attitudes of the larger regional population. Because most were college freshmen and likely living on their own for the first time, many of the participants may not have had strong feelings for or against immigrants because of lack of exposure to the population or lack of interest in current events surrounding immigration. The effects of language-based exclusion might be larger in a community sample that has had more contact with immigrants and who may believe that they are in more competition for resources with immigrants. However, the results could indicate that the participants are indeed “middle of the road” about immigrants, regardless of whether they were excluded in another language or not. In a few years, this subpopulation will be a considerable part of the larger community, and these attitudes could continue as they have more contact with immigrants and become more aware of the issues surrounding immigration.

Immigration has a different effect on different geographic areas. This research study is the only one known to have been conducted in the predominantly rural state of Iowa where immigration may not be as salient as in other areas of the country. Other languages

should be used based on the geographic location of the study, and immigrant groups residing there. A comprehensive study using multiple languages and locations could indicate differences in attitudes about different immigrant groups and provide data to make regional comparisons. This study can contribute to a future meta-analysis on geographic effects on language-based exclusion and attitudes toward immigrants.

Another limitation was the computer chat room environment. Although participants did report lowered acceptance in the exclusion conditions, and the computer environment has been successfully used in previous studies of ostracism (Williams et al., 1998; Williams et al., 2000; Williams et al., 2002; Zadro et al., 2004) and language-based exclusion (Hitlan et al., 2010; Otto et al., 2007), the effects of exclusion may have been brief and not as salient because they could not see the other participants. The set up of a computer chat room could not take into account physical differences or different accents, which may have further differentiated the confederates as outgroup members. A face-to-face language-based exclusion research study has not been conducted to my knowledge in the past, but should be conducted and be compared to the computer-based studies to determine if saliency increases.

Another factor to consider in the research design is that there were multiple confederates. Although the confederates conducted the chat according to protocol, they sometimes had to deviate from the script when the participant asked a question. Each confederate also timed the responses differently based on their computer and typing proficiency. Some of the confederates felt uncomfortable excluding the participant from the conversation. Although there were no confederate effects in the analysis, these factors

may have changed the dynamics of the conversation and affected the participants' interest level.

The research in the area of language-based exclusion is limited, but is expanding due to changes in the workplace and community. Compared to other forms of ostracism, research in language-based exclusion is minimal. A larger body of work needs to be collected to demonstrate consistency. As the immigrant population continues to grow and immigration continues to headline news stories, it is beneficial to understand the existing perceptions of immigrants. Due to the proximity to the United States and economic factors, Spanish-speaking Mexican immigrants are the largest and most visible immigrant group in the United States (Camarota, 2002). Because of this, most prior research has focused on exclusion in Spanish, particularly research focused on the effects in the workplace (Hitlan et al., 2006). This study included exclusion in Arabic for comparison purposes. Although Spanish should still be a primary focus, future research should include Arabic because of the stigma surrounding people of Arabic descent since the September 11, 2001 terrorist attacks and the U.S. involvement in two wars in Muslim countries.

The stigmas associated with Spanish and Arabic speakers also have an affective component. Affect has been found to be a common basis for prejudice and attitudes (Dovidio & Gaertner, 1986). The ITT model measures affect through realistic threat, symbolic threat, and intergroup anxiety, but does not take into account the specific emotional reactions tied to threat beliefs. The evolutionary perspective suggests that different outgroups are associated with different types of threats, such as threats to

physical safety, health, and freedoms. Emotions help to resolve these threats posed in intergroup contexts, with specific threats being associated with specific emotions (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). For example, threats to resources, social coordination, physical safety, freedoms and rights, and reciprocity relations have been found to be associated with feelings of anger and fear (Joshi, 2009).

The ITT model is also limited by focusing on only two types of threats. According to image theory, perceptions of outgroups are based on group conflicts between interests and goals (Alexander, Brewer, & Hermann, 1999). When goals are incompatible, the outgroup will be perceived as the enemy (Alexander et al., 1999), and anger is expressed when outgroups pose obstacles to ingroup goals (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Other threats that have been identified include threats to rights and freedoms, threats to social functioning and order, threats to reciprocity relations by not returning outgroup favors, and threats to property (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Immigrants may also follow different hygiene customs that may indicate threats to health (Schaller, Park, & Faulkner, 2003) and result in obstacles to group functioning (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005). Different immigrant groups elicit different emotional reactions (Cottrell & Neuberg, 2005; Joshi, 2009), different levels of warmth and competence (Fiske, 2010), and different forms of threat (Joshi, 2009). Further research should examine the effects of language-based exclusion on more specific types of threats.

Implications

As populations of non-English and bi-lingual speakers continue to grow in the United States, languages other than English are becoming more prominent. This increases

the likelihood that people will be excluded in another language, purposefully or inadvertently. While language-based exclusion leads to lower feelings of acceptance, these findings indicate that these feelings may not manifest themselves as prejudice toward the immigrant population as a whole. By personalizing negative behavior to the individual, the negative attitudes are not being generalized across the entire outgroup (Brewer & Miller, 1984). For example, to improve attitudes toward Arab immigrants, a message should convey that terrorists are individuals, not representative of the group. The perpetuation of stereotypes and feelings of prejudice can be minimized by creating environments where the focus is on the individual and not the outgroup (Miller, Kenworthy, Canales, & Stenstrom, 2006).

People high in SDO see a greater threat from outgroups such as immigrants: threats to healthcare, economic resources, morals, values, and lifestyle. When aware of a common identity with immigrants, those high in SDO have shown more favorable attitudes toward immigrants (Esses et al., 2001). Thus, threat perceptions can be modified by emphasizing similarities with the immigrant outgroup. To minimize threat, the similarity of value systems can be emphasized in educational programs.

Another approach to minimizing threat is through contact. Contact helps facilitate personalization and minimize generalization (Allport, 1954). More contact between the ingroup and outgroup can also bring out these similarities and help reduce threat (Sherif, 1966). Contact between members of the host country and immigrants can be increased through events targeted to all members of the community, through the educational

system, by encouraging diversity in neighborhoods, and by including members of all groups in community planning.

Language-based exclusion leads to lower feelings of acceptance and makes the outgroup status of the individual salient to the person being excluded. Despite the salience of the outgroup status, this study demonstrated that when excluded in a language one does not understand, personalization toward the individual can occur instead of generalization to the outgroup. By focusing on personalization, emphasizing similarities over differences, and increased contact between groups, feelings of threat and prejudice toward immigrant populations can decrease.

REFERENCES

- Adams, G. R., Ryan, R. H., Hoffman, J. J., Dobson, W. R., & Nielsen, E. C. (1984). Ego identity status, conformity behavior, and personality in late adolescence. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 47(5), 1091-1104.
- Alexander, M. G., Brewer, M. B., & Hermann, R. K. (1999). Images and affect: A functional analysis of out-group stereotypes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77, 78-93.
- Allport, G. W. (1954). *The Nature of Prejudice*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Altemeyer, B. (1998). The other "authoritarian personality." *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 47-91.
- Archibold, R. C. (2010, April 23). Arizona enacts stringent law on immigration. *New York Times*, p. A1.
- Bean, F. D., & Stevens, G. (2003). *America's newcomers and the dynamics of diversity*. New York: Russell Sage Publications.
- Brewer, M. B., & Miller, N. (1984). Beyond the contact hypothesis: Theoretical perspectives on desegregation. In N. Miller & M. Brewer (Eds.), *Groups in contact: The psychology of desegregation* (pp. 281-300). New York: Academic Press.
- Bushman, B. J., & Baumeister, R. F. (1998). Threatened egotism, narcissism, self-esteem, and direct and displaced aggression: Does self-love or self-hate lead to violence? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 219-229.
- Camarota, S. A. (2002). *Immigrants in the United States, 2002: A snapshot of America's foreign-born population*. Washington, DC: Center for Immigration Studies.
- Clark, W. A. V. (1991). Residential preferences and neighborhood racial segregation: A testing of the Schelling segregation model. *Demography*, 28, 1-19.
- Corenblum, B., & Stephan, W. G. (2001). White fears and native apprehensions: An integrated threat theory approach to intergroup attitudes. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 33, 251-268.
- Cottrell, C. A., & Neuberg, S. L. (2005). Different emotional reactions to different groups: A sociofunctional threat based approach to "prejudice." *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 88, 770-789.

- Crowne, D. P., & Marlowe, D. (1960). A new scale of social desirability independent of psychopathology. *Journal of Consulting Psychology, 24*, 349-354.
- Danso, H. A., Sedlovskaya, A., & Suanda, S. H. (2007). Perceptions of immigrants: Modifying the attitudes of individuals higher in social dominance orientation. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 33*, 1113-1123.
- Dotan-Eliaz, O., Sommer, K. L., & Rubin, Y. S. (2009). Multilingual groups: Effects of linguistic ostracism on felt rejection and anger, coworker attraction, perceived team potency, and creative performance. *Basic and Applied Social Psychology, 31*, 363-375.
- Dovidio, J. F., & Gaertner, S. L. (1986). *Prejudice, discrimination, and racism*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Duckitt, J. (1992). *The Social Psychology of Prejudice*. New York: Praeger.
- Duckitt, J. (2006). Differential effects of right wing authoritarianism and social dominance orientation on outgroup attitudes and their mediation by threat from and competitiveness to outgroups. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 32*(5), 684-696.
- Eisenberger, N. I., Lieberman, M. D., & Williams, K. D. (2003). Does rejection hurt? An fMRI study of social exclusion. *Science, 302*(5643), 290-292.
- Epley, N., & Huff, C. (1998). Suspicion, affective response, and educational benefit as a result of deception in psychology research. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 24*(7), 759-768.
- Esmail, A., & Everington, S. (1993). Racial discrimination against doctors from ethnic minorities. *British Medical Journal, 306*(6879), 691-692.
- Esses, V. M., Dovidio, J. F., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (2001). The immigration dilemma: The role of perceived group competition, ethnic prejudice, and national identity. *Journal of Social Issues, 57*, 389-412.
- Esses, V. M., Haddock, G., & Zanna, M. P. (1993). Values, stereotypes, and emotions as determinants of intergroup attitudes. In D. L. Hamilton & D. Mackie (Eds.), *Affect, cognition, and stereotyping: Interactive processes in group perception* (pp. 137-166). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Esses, V. M., Jackson, L. M., & Armstrong, T. L. (1998). Intergroup competition and attitudes toward immigrants and immigration: An instrumental model of group conflict. *Journal of Social Issues, 54*, 699-715.

- Fiske, S. T. (2010). *Social beings: Core motives in social psychology*, New York: Wiley.
- Fiske, S. T., Cuddy, A. J. C., Glick, P., & Xu, J. (2002). A model of (often mixed) stereotype content: Competence and warmth respectively follow from perceived status and competition. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology* 82, 878-902.
- Gonsalkorale, K., & Williams, K. D. (2007). The KKK won't let me play: Ostracism even by a despised outgroup hurts. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 37, 1176-1186.
- Guimond, S., Danbrun, M., Michinov, N., & Duarte, S. (2003). Does social dominance generate prejudice? Integrating individual and contextual determinants of intergroup cognitions. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 84, 697-721.
- Grey, M. A. (2006). *New Americans, new Iowans: Welcoming immigrant and refugee newcomers*. Cedar Falls, IA: University of Northern Iowa Center for Immigrant Leadership and Integration.
- Gruter, M., & Masters, R. D. (1986). Ostracism as a social and biological phenomenon: An introduction. *Ethology and Sociobiology*, 7, 149-158.
- Hamilton, D. L., Sherman, S. J., & Ruvolo, C. M. (1990). Stereotype-based expectancies: Effects on information processing and social behavior. *Journal of Social Issues*, 46, 35-60.
- Harton, H. C., & Bullock, M. (2007). Dynamic social impact: A theory of the origins and evolution of culture. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 1, 521-540.
- Harton, H. C., & Schwab, N. (2004). [Attitudes toward immigrants]. Unpublished raw data.
- Heaven, P. C., & St. Quinton, D. (2003). Personality factors predict racial prejudice. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 34, 624-634.
- Hitlan, R. T., Carrillo, K., Zárate, M. A., & Aikman, S. N. (2007). Attitudes toward immigrant groups and the September 11 terrorist attacks. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*, 13(2), 135-152.
- Hitlan, R. T., Kelly, K. M., Schepman, S. M., Schneider, K. T., & Zárate, M. A. (2006). Language exclusion and the consequences of perceived ostracism in the workplace. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, and Practice*, 10, 56-70.
- Hitlan, R. T., Kelly, K. M., & Zárate, M. A. (2010). *The effects of language-based ostracism on mood and expressed prejudice*. Manuscript submitted for publication.

- Hogg, M. A., & Vaughan, G. (2002). *An introduction to social psychology, 3rd edition*. Sydney: Pearson Education.
- Hsu, S. S. (2008, May 18). Immigration raid jars a small town: Critics say employers should be targeted. *The Washington Post*.
- Hughes, R., & Huby, M. (2002). The application of vignettes in social and nursing research. *Journal of Advanced Nursing, 37*(4), 382-386.
- Jackson, L. M., & Esses, V. M. (2000). Effects of perceived economic competition on people's willingness to help empower immigrants. *Group Processes and Intergroup Relations, 3*, 419-435.
- Joshi, P. (2009). *Prejudice as an emotional response to threat: An evolutionary approach* (Unpublished master's thesis). University of Northern Iowa, Cedar Falls, IA.
- Kurien, P. A. (2005). Being young, brown, and Hindu: The identity struggles of second-generation Indian Americans. *Journal of Contemporary Ethnography, 34*(4), 434-469.
- Kurzban, R., & Leary, M. (2001). Evolutionary origins of stigmatization: The function of social exclusion. *Psychological Bulletin, 127*(2), 187-208.
- Lee, T. L., & Fiske, S. T. (2006). Not an outgroup, not yet an ingroup: Immigrants in the stereotype content model. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 30*, 751-768.
- Macht, M., & Mueller, J. (2007). Immediate effects of chocolate on experimentally induced mood states. *Appetite, 49*, 667-674.
- Miller, N., Kenworthy, J., Canales, C., Stenstrom, D. (2006). Explaining the effects of crossed categorization on ethnocentric bias. In R. J. Crisp & M. Hewstone (Eds.) *Multiple social categorization: Processes, models and applications* (pp.160-188). Sussex, U. K.: Taylor and Francis.
- Mummendey, A., Klink, A., & Brown, R. (2001). Nationalism and patriotism: National identification and out-group rejection. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(2), 159-172.
- Otto, K., Kelly, K., & Hanninen, R. (2007). *Being ignored by an in-group vs. an out-group: Group membership affects responses to exclusion*. Poster presented at the annual meeting of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Memphis, TN.

- Perkins, J. (2006, December 12). Feds raid Marshalltown plant; Busloads of workers arrested. *Des Moines Register*.
- Plaut, V. C., Markus, H. R., & Lachman, M. E. (2002). Place matters: Consensual features and regional variation in American well-being and self. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *83*, 160-184.
- Potocky-Tripodi, M. (2002). *Best practices for social work with refugees & immigrants*. New York: Columbia University Press.
- Pratto, F., & Lemieux, A. F. (2001). The psychological ambiguity of immigration and its implications for promoting immigration policy. *Journal of Social Issues*, *57*, 413-431.
- Pratto, F., Sidanius, J., Stallworth, L. M., & Malle, B. F. (1994). Social dominance orientation: A personality variable predicting social and political attitudes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *67*, 741-763.
- Randall, D. M., & Fernandes, M. F. (1991). The social desirability response bias in ethics research. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *10*, 805-817.
- Rohmann, A., Florack, A., & Piontkowski, U. (2006). The role of discordant acculturation attitudes in immigrants perceived threat: An analysis of host and immigrant attitudes in Germany. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *30*, 683-702.
- Schaller, M., Park, J. H., & Faulkner, J. (2003). Prehistoric dangers and contemporary prejudices. *European Review of Social Psychology*, *14*, 105-137.
- Sherif, M., (1966). *In common predicament: Social psychology of intergroup conflict and cooperation*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.
- Sidanius, J., & Pratto, F. (1999). *Social dominance: An intergroup theory of social hierarchy and oppression*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Sniderman, P. M., Peri, P., de Figueiredo, Jr., R. J. P., & Piazza, T. (2002). *The outsider: Prejudice and politics in Italy*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Sroufe, R., Chaikin, A., Cook, R., & Freeman, V. (1977). The effects of physical attractiveness on honesty: A socially desirable response. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, *3*, 59-62.
- Stephan, W. G., Diaz-Loving, R., & Duran, A. (2000). Integrated threat theory and intercultural attitudes: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *31*, 240-249.

- Stephan, W. G., Renfro, C. L., Esses, V. M., Stephan, C. W., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes towards immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 29, 1-19.
- Stephan, W. G., & Stephan, C. W. (1985). Intergroup anxiety. *Journal of Social Issues*, 41, 157-175.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., & Bachman, G. (1999). Prejudice toward immigrants. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 29, 2221-2237.
- Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Martinez, C. M., Schwarzwald, J., & Tur-Kaspa, M. (1998). Prejudice toward immigrants to Spain and Israel: An integrated threat theory analysis. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29, 559-577.
- Stets, J. E., & Burke, P. J. (2000). Identity theory and social identity theory. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, 63(3), 224-237.
- Tajfel, H. & Turner, J. C. (1986). The social identity theory of inter-group behavior. In S. Worchel & L. W. Austin (Eds.), *Psychology of Intergroup Relations*. Chicago: Nelson-Hall.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010a). *Language Use and English Speaking Ability: 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2010b). *Race and Hispanic Origin of Foreign-Born Population in the United States: 2007*. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- Weston, M. A. (2003). Post 9/11 Arab American coverage avoids stereotypes. *Newspaper Research Journal*, 24, 92-106.
- Williams, K. D. (1997). Social ostracism. In R. M. Kowalski (Ed.), *Aversive interpersonal behaviors* (pp. 133-70). New York: Plenum.
- Williams, K. D. (2007). Ostracism. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 58, 425-452.
- Williams, K. D., Cheung, C. K. T., & Choi, W. (2000). Cyberostracism: Effects of being ignored over the Internet. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 79, 748-762.
- Williams, K. D., Goven, C. L., Croker, V., Tynan, D., Cruickshank, M., & Lam, A. (2002). Investigations into differences between social and cyber ostracism. *Group Dynamics: Theory, Research, & Practice*, 6, 65-77.
- Williams, K. D., & Jarvis, B. (2006). Cyberball: A program for use in research on interpersonal ostracism and acceptance. *Behavior Research Methods*, 38, 174-180.

- Williams, K. D., Shore, W. J., & Grahe, J. E. (1998). The silent treatment: Perceptions of its behaviors and associated feelings. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*, 1, 117-41.
- Williams, K. D., & Sommer, K. L. (1997). Social ostracism by one's coworkers: Does rejection lead to loafing or compensation? *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 23, 693-706.
- Yinger, J. (1976). Racial prejudice and racial residential segregation in an urban model. *Journal of Urban Economics*, 3(4), 383-396.
- Zadro, L., Williams, K. D., & Richardson, R. (2004). How low can you go? Ostracism by a computer is sufficient to lower self-reported levels of belonging, control, self-esteem, and meaningful existence. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40(4), 560-567.
- Zárate, M. A., Garcia, B., Garza, A. A., & Hitlan, R. T. (2004). Cultural threat and perceived realistic group conflict as dual predictors of prejudice. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 40, 99-105.

APPENDIX A
 PROTOCOL SCRIPT

Protocol Script

Hi. My name is _____ and this is the person perception and social attitudes research study. Let's head down to the room you will be in for the study.

- Bring participant into individual office with computer setup for the chat.

In this study, we are interested in people's perceptions and viewpoints following a chat about different social issues.

All data you provide will be completely anonymous. There will be no way that we will be able to identify your individual answers. Please be honest and truthful in all your responses.

You are free to withdraw from the study at any time without penalty.

Read over the consent form. If you agree to participate, fill out the bottom of the form. One copy is yours to keep as a receipt for participation. Hang on to it in case there are any questions about whether or not you participated at the end of the semester (you do NOT need to turn this in to your intro professor).

- Participant fills out form, researcher puts in envelope with other consent forms

Note that you are participating in two studies that will take approximately ½ hour each. The first will be on a chat program. After that is complete, you will fill out questionnaires for a second study.

In the first part of this research, you will chat with two other people via a computer chat program. Four different social issues will appear on the computer one at a time. At the end of the discussion, you will fill out a couple questionnaires. Once I see that the chat is over, I will bring the questionnaires to you. We ask that you do not use instant messaging style abbreviations during the chat. So now just watch the computer screen and you will be prompted when to begin.

- Participant chats with the confederate for 16 minutes.
- Researcher returns and moves participant into another room to fill out questionnaires

Here are the questionnaires for you to complete on your perceptions of the other participants and your viewpoints on the chat discussion. Please read each question

carefully and answer truthfully. When you are finished with the questionnaires, please open the door and either me or the person running the second study will exchange your questionnaires for those needed in the second study.

- Researcher returns and takes first questionnaires and gives participant second questionnaires.

Here are the questionnaires for you to complete on your social attitudes and personality traits. Please read each question carefully and answer truthfully. When you are finished, please open the door again and one of us will be there shortly.

- Researcher collects questionnaire and conducts debriefing.
- Questionnaire is marked with exclusion condition.

APPENDIX B

CONFEDERATE CHAT SCRIPTS

Confederate Chat Script - Inclusion Condition

- **Include** participant in all topics. Chatting options below. Can change wording or discussion as needed to include participant.

Topic 1: Discuss the benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing.

BETA (female) Stance: On-campus housing better	OMEGA (male) Stance: Off-campus housing better
This is my second-year living on-campus. I'm rooming with a friend from my floor last year.	I decided to live in Hillcrest this year. The extra space is sweet.
In the dorm, I like being close to everything on campus. I don't think I'd feel as safe in an apartment.	Hillcrest is not too far from to campus. I feel safe there.
I like the idea of having my own place, but it's really nice not to have to worry about cooking and grocery shopping.	We don't cook or grocery shop very much. We end up ordering pizza or Jimmy John's a lot.
I get tired of the noise sometimes in the dorms. It's hard to get studying done. I usually have to go to the library.	I got a computer in my bedroom, so I do my work in there.
Sometimes it'd be nice to have the privacy of an apartment.	I like having my own room. Especially when my girlfriend comes over.
I also think living in the dorms is cheaper. I need to save money wherever I can.	I've managed to get by at about the same costs as the dorms.
I've even heard of people who move back into the dorms after living off-campus to save money.	That can't be very many people. Most people in the dorms are freshman or sophomores. Not too many juniors or seniors there.

Topic 2: Discuss whether celebrities influence young people.

BETA (female) Stance: Celebrities are an influence	OMEGA (male) Stance: Celebrities aren't an influence
I love to watch ET and the Insider! So I'm a celebrity watcher. I admit I like to see what stars are wearing.	Lol. A lot of people do watch those shows, but I don't think they matter much.
I do think younger girls try to be like a lot of the stars. Lindsey, Britney, Paris, etc. That's not good.	I think it's all just for entertainment. The celebs don't have much influence.
People go through magazines and buy clothes so they can look like a star. They starve themselves so they can be ultra skinny too.	Parents and friends are more of an influence than celebrities. They are real.
It's not just the Hollywood types, sports stars are just as influential on boys. Makes them want to buy certain shows and dress a certain way.	I think kids give in to what their friends are doing more than trying to do what some celebrity is doing.
I actually think celebrities can be a good influence too. You see them on TV telling people not to do drugs and stuff like that.	Celebrities just do charity stuff for the camera because their agent tells them to.

Topic 3: Discuss the use of cell phones in public places.

BETA (female) Stance: Cell phones should not be used in public places	OMEGA (male) Stance: Cell phones OK in public places
I think cell phones are convenient, but I don't think people should take a call in places like a restaurant.	I don't see anything wrong with taking a call as long as it doesn't interrupt anyone.
People talk so loud on their cells phones. I don't want to hear their conversation.	I've seen people talking on phones out in public for years. It's so common nowadays, I don't think anything of it.
I think cell phone etiquette has gotten out of hand. People can't do anything without a phone to their ear!	I couldn't imagine not having a cell phone. I like to be able to be in constant contact with my friends. Makes things easier.
Sometimes people even talk on their phones at the video store trying to choose a movie.	Now that everyone has cell phones, talking anywhere is the norm. Times change.
I can't help but listen sometimes. Some conversations I hear are embarrassing. People forget that others can hear them.	I've heard people fighting on the phone. Even heard someone talking about a drug deal. How stupid! You can't be dumb about it either.
I hate it when people wear the headsets and it looks like they are talking to themselves.	Headsets make it easier to walk and talk. Plus driving with headsets is safer.

Topic 4: How to avoid spam e-mails.

BETA (female) Stance: Doesn't like all the spam she receives	OMEGA (male) Stance: Thinks spam filters work fine
I get so much spam e-mail. Drives me crazy trying to get through all of it.	The spam filter on my account seems to work fine. Not too often they get through.
Seems like I have more spam than real e-mails.	When you're on a lot of mailing lists, they sell your name.
I thought companies had to your permission to sell your address.	Unless they say they won't, they can sell your address to anyone. You can be asked to be taken off the list.
Some of the topics in the spams are pretty funny though. Do people actually fall for this stuff?	They must if people keep sending them.
I must get one every day for a "pharmacy order" or someone that supposedly left me an inheritance, lol.	Then there are all the "adult" ones.

Confederate Chat Script - Spanish Exclusion Condition

- **Include** participant in first two topics. Chatting options below. Can change wording or discussion as needed to include participant.
- Exclusion begins in topic 3 when indicated. Follow script exactly and do **NOT** respond to participant.

Topic 1: Discuss the benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing.

BETA (female) Stance: On-campus housing better	OMEGA (male) Stance: Off-campus housing better
This is my second-year living on-campus. I'm rooming with a friend from my floor last year.	I decided to live in Hillcrest this year. The extra space is sweet.
In the dorm, I like being close to everything on campus. I don't think I'd feel as safe in an apartment.	Hillcrest is pretty close to campus. Besides, who has to worry about safety in CF.
I like the idea of having my own place, but it's really nice not to have to worry about cooking and grocery shopping.	We don't cook or grocery shop very much. We end up ordering pizza or Jimmy John's a lot.
I get tired of the noise sometimes in the dorms. It's hard to get studying done. I usually have to go to the library.	I got a computer in my bedroom, so I do my work in there.
Sometimes it'd be nice to have the privacy of an apartment.	I like having my own room. Especially when my girlfriend comes over.
I also think living in the dorms is cheaper. I need to save money wherever I can.	I've managed to get by at about the same costs as the dorms.
I've even heard of people who move back into the dorms after living off-campus to save money.	That can't be very many people. Most people in the dorms are freshman or sophomores. Not too many juniors or seniors there.

Topic 2: Discuss whether celebrities influence young people.

BETA (female)	OMEGA (male)
Stance: Celebrities are an influence	Stance: Celebrities aren't an influence
I love to watch ET and the Insider! I'm totally a celebrity watcher. I have to admit I love to see what stars are wearing.	Lol. A lot of people do watch those shows, but I don't really think it means anything about you.
I think younger girls try to be like a lot of the stars. Lindsey, Britney, Paris, etc.	I think it's all just for entertainment. The celebs don't have much influence.
People go through magazines and buy clothes so they can look like a star. They starve themselves so they can be skinny too.	I think parents and friends are more of an influence than celebrities. They're the people who really matter.
It's not just the Hollywood types, sports stars are just as influential on guys. Makes them want to buy expensive shoes and dress like basketball players.	I think kids do what their friends do more than trying to do what some celebrity is doing.
I actually think celebrities can be a good influence too. You see them on TV telling people not to do drugs and stuff like that.	Celebrities just do charity events for the camera because their agent tells them to.

OSTRACISM BEGINS IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 3: Discuss the use of cell phones in public places.

BETA (female) Stance: Cell phones should not be used in public places	OMEGA (male) Stance: Cell phones OK in public places
I think cell phones are convenient, but I don't think people should take a call in places like a restaurant.	I don't see anything wrong with taking a call as long as it doesn't interrupt anyone.
But people talk so loud on their cell phones. It's funny, my cousin lives in Mexico and she feels she has to yell over the phone for me to hear her!	No way! Some of my family are in Mexico City.
Do you speak Spanish?	Si, pero no lo uso mucho aqui.
As ido a visitar a tus familiares aya? Yo fui unas cuantas veces.	Esta area es muy linda.
Quizas debemos regresar al tema.	Probablemente eso es una buena idea. Estoy seguro que nos estan mirando.
Con los telefonos celulares, algunas veces las personas hablan en las tiendas de videos tratando de escojer una pelicula.	Es tan comun estos dias. Yo no pienso nada de eso.
Eres una de esas personas que hablan en el telefono celular en todos los lugares que vas?	Si, a mi me gusta mantener contacto con mis amigos y familiares. Hace cosas mas facil.
No puedo resistir oir algunas veces. Algunas conversaciones son embarazosa. Las gentes se le olvida que otras personas los pueden oir.	He oido personas discutiendo en el telefono celular. He hasta oido alguien hablando de una transaccion de drogas. Que estúpido!
Cuando personas usan auriculares, otras gente piensan que estan hablando con sí mismos.	Yo he tenido alguien contestar una pregunta mia cuando no se dieron cuenta que yo estaba hablando en el telefono!
Eso es demasiado comico.	Me sentia mal por la persona. Ellos arieron avergonzado.

OSTRACISM CONTINUES IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 4: How to avoid spam e-mails.

BETA (female) Stance: Doesn't like all the spam she receives	OMEGA (male) Stance: Thinks spam filters work fine
Recibo tanto "spam" correo electronico. Me hace loco trantando de leer lo todo.	El filtro contra spam en mi cuenta parece que trabaja bien. Esos mensajes no pasan mucho.
Realmente, parece que tengo mas spam que correo electronico verdadero.	Suena que tu alomejor estas en muchas listas de correo que venden tu nombre.
Estoy en bastante listas de correo. Yo pensaba que ellos no estaban supuesto a hacer eso?	A menos que ellos digan que no hacen eso. Ellos le pueden vender su direccion a cualquiera. Jamas usted pide ser quitado de listas?
No realmente. Trabaja eso?	Mi mama lo hace. Pero tambien manda un parrafo de un abogado en el Internet que dice que no la pueden enviar mas spam.
Aunque algunos de los temas en el spam son bastante comico. Hay personas que realmente caen por estas cosas?	Ellos deben si personas mantienen mandardoles cosas.
Debo recibir uno cada dia para una "orden de farmacia" o para alguien que segun cabe suponer me dejo una herencia.	Entonces hay todos los unos de adulto.
Ah, no me empieces en eso.	Bueno, no lo hago.

Confederate Chat Script - *Arabic Exclusion Condition*

- **Include** participant in first two topics. Chatting options below. Can change wording or discussion as needed to include participant.
- Exclusion begins in topic 3 when indicated. Follow script exactly and do **NOT** respond to participant.

Topic 1: Discuss the benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing.

BETA (female) Stance: On-campus housing better	OMEGA (male) Stance: Off-campus housing better
This is my second-year living on-campus. I'm rooming with a friend from my floor last year.	I decided to live in Hillcrest this year. The extra space is sweet.
In the dorm, I like being close to everything on campus. I don't think I'd feel as safe in an apartment.	Hillcrest is pretty close to campus. Besides, who has to worry about safety in CF.
I like the idea of having my own place, but it's really nice not to have to worry about cooking and grocery shopping.	We don't cook or grocery shop very much. We end up ordering pizza or Jimmy John's a lot.
I get tired of the noise sometimes in the dorms. It's hard to get studying done. I usually have to go to the library.	I got a computer in my bedroom, so I do my work in there.
Sometimes it'd be nice to have the privacy of an apartment.	I like having my own room. Especially when my girlfriend comes over.
I also think living in the dorms is cheaper. I need to save money wherever I can.	I've managed to get by at about the same costs as the dorms.
I've even heard of people who move back into the dorms after living off-campus to save money.	That can't be very many people. Most people in the dorms are freshman or sophomores. Not too many juniors or seniors there.

Topic 2: Discuss whether celebrities influence young people.

BETA (female)	OMEGA (male)
Stance: Celebrities are an influence	Stance: Celebrities aren't an influence
I love to watch ET and the Insider! I'm totally a celebrity watcher. I have to admit I love to see what stars are wearing.	Lol. A lot of people do watch those shows, but I don't really think it means anything about you.
I think younger girls try to be like a lot of the stars. Lindsey, Britney, Paris, etc.	I think it's all just for entertainment. The celebs don't have much influence.
People go through magazines and buy clothes so they can look like a star. They starve themselves so they can be skinny too.	I think parents and friends are more of an influence than celebrities. They're the people who really matter.
It's not just the Hollywood types, sports stars are just as influential on guys. Makes them want to buy expensive shoes and dress like basketball players.	I think kids do what their friends do more than trying to do what some celebrity is doing.
I actually think celebrities can be a good influence too. You see them on TV telling people not to do drugs and stuff like that.	Celebrities just do charity events for the camera because their agent tells them to.

OSTRACISM BEGINS IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 3: Discuss the use of cell phones in public places.

BETA (female) Stance: Cell phones should not be used in public places	OMEGA (male) Stance: Cell phones OK in public places
I think cell phones are convenient, but I don't think people should take a call in places like a restaurant.	I don't see anything wrong with taking a call as long as it doesn't interrupt anyone.
But people talk so loud on their cell phones. It's funny, my cousin lives in Saudi Arabia and she feels she needs to yell for me to hear over here!	No way! Some of my family are in Riyadh.
Do you speak Arabic?	Na'am, walaakinenni la Astakhdimuha katheeran huna.
Hel sebaqa lek wa'en zort aqaaribek honaak? Thehebt marraat qaleeleh.	Almantiqah haqqan Jameeleh.
La'allohu min alafdhal en narji' lisob almawdo'	Fikrah Jayyideh. Ana mote'ekkid min annahom yoraaqiboona.
Biwogood alhawaatif annaqaaleh wasala annaas ila darajet al'ittisaal biba'dihim wahom bidaakhil mahal bei' alafllaam li'ikhtiyaar film mo'ayyen.	Haatha amr aadi haathihi al'eyyaam, fahowa la yotheer ihtimaami.
Hel ent min thaalik annaw' min annaas allatheene yetekellemoon fi hawaatifihim annaqaaleh ein maa theheboo?	Na'am fe'anaa Ohib en ekoon alaa ittisaal mostammir bi'ehlee wa'asdiqa'ee. Thaalik yaj'al el'omoor ekthar sohooleh.
Ahyaanen la astatee en akof nafsi en istiraaq essem'. Ba'dh almohaadethaat elleti esma'ohaa mohrijeh.	Sabaqa lee wa'en semi'to onaas yeteshaagaron ala elhaatif. Wabel semi'to ahaden yatakellem aan safqat mokhaddeeraat.

OSTRACISM CONTINUES IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 4: How to avoid spam e-mails.

BETA (female) Stance: Doesn't like all the spam she receives	OMEGA (male) Stance: Thinks spam filters work fine
<p>Atalaqqa alketheer min albareed al'iliktrawnee alghair mohim, wallethee yot'ibonee thihniyyen mohaawilen qiraa'atih kolloh.</p>	<p>Birnaamej tasfiyet albareed al'iliktrawnee ya'mel bisoorah jayyideh. Naadiran ma ajido mithl tilke arrasaa'il.</p>
<p>Haqqan? Amma binnisbah lee fa'inne kammiyet arrasaa'il alghair mohimmah akhthar min almohimmah.</p>	<p>La'allak Odwon fi alkatheer min shabakaat almoraasalah wallatee taqoom bibay' al'asmaa.</p>
<p>Anaa moshtariq bilqaleel min tilke ashabakaat. Walaakin fee itiqaaadi enneho laysa min almoftaradh minhom amal thaalik.</p>	<p>Inne bi'imkaanihim bai' inwaanak li'ei ahad ithaa lem yosarriho mosbaqan bi'adam fi'l thaalik. Hel sabaq lek wa'en talabta minhom izaaletek min qawaa'im ashabakah?</p>
<p>Kellaa haqeeqah. Wahel min thaalik faa'idah?</p>	<p>Ommi ta'mel thaalik. Walaakinnehaa aidhen torsil faqrah min mohaamee ala alintarnet tanos ala enneho laisa bi'imkaanihim alkitaabah lahaa marrah okhrra.</p>
<p>Ma'a thaalik fa'inne ba'dan min almawaadee' fi tilke arrassa'il alghair mohimmah modhik. Hel fi'len honaak min annas men yaqa fareesah limithl haathihi al'ashyaa'?</p>	<p>Labodda wa'enne honaake mithl olaa'ike annas bimaa enne mithl haathihi arrasaa'il motadaawalah.</p>
<p>Kol yawm labodda wa'en ajid risaaleh imam liwasfeh tibbiyen aw enne ahaden tarake lee irthaa.</p>	<p>Wahonaaka aidan thaalika annaw mine arrasaa'il alleeti tatahaddeth an al'ashyaa al'ibaahiyah wal'khalee'ah.</p>
<p>Rajaa'en la tabda' bittahadoth ma'ee an tilke al'ashyaa'.</p>	<p>Hasanen se'akoffo an thaalik.</p>

Confederate Chat Script - English Exclusion Condition

- **Include** participant in first two topics. Chatting options below. Can change wording or discussion as needed to include participant.
- Exclusion begins in topic 3 when indicated. Follow script exactly and do **NOT** respond to participant.

Topic 1: Discuss the benefits of on-campus versus off-campus housing.

BETA (female)	OMEGA (male)
Stance: On-campus housing better	Stance: Off-campus housing better
This is my second-year living on-campus. I'm rooming with a friend from my floor last year.	I decided to live in Hillcrest this year. The extra space is sweet.
In the dorm, I like being close to everything on campus. I don't think I'd feel as safe in an apartment.	Hillcrest is not too far from to campus. I feel safe there.
I like the idea of having my own place, but it's really nice not to have to worry about cooking and grocery shopping.	We don't cook or grocery shop very much. We end up ordering pizza or Jimmy John's a lot.
I get tired of the noise sometimes in the dorms. It's hard to get studying done. I usually have to go to the library.	I got a computer in my bedroom, so I do my work in there.
Sometimes it'd be nice to have the privacy of an apartment.	I like having my own room. Especially when my girlfriend comes over.
I also think living in the dorms is cheaper. I need to save money wherever I can.	I've managed to get by at about the same costs as the dorms.
I've even heard of people who move back into the dorms after living off-campus to save money.	That can't be very many people. Most people in the dorms are freshman or sophomores. Not too many juniors or seniors there.

Topic 2: Discuss whether celebrities influence young people.

BETA (female) Stance: Celebrities are an influence	OMEGA (male) Stance: Celebrities aren't an influence
I love to watch ET and the Insider! I'm totally a celebrity watcher. I have to admit I love to see what stars are wearing.	Lol. A lot of people do watch those shows, but I don't really think it means anything about you.
I think younger girls try to be like a lot of the stars. Lindsey, Britney, Paris, etc.	I think it's all just for entertainment. The celebs don't have much influence.
People go through magazines and buy clothes so they can look like a star. They starve themselves so they can be skinny too.	I think parents and friends are more of an influence than celebrities. They're the people who really matter.
It's not just the Hollywood types, sports stars are just as influential on guys. Makes them want to buy expensive shoes and dress like basketball players.	I think kids do what their friends do more than trying to do what some celebrity is doing.
I actually think celebrities can be a good influence too. You see them on TV telling people not to do drugs and stuff like that.	Celebrities just do charity events for the camera because their agent tells them to.

OSTRACISM BEGINS IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 3: Discuss the use of cell phones in public places.

BETA (female) Stance: Cell phones should not be used in public places	OMEGA (male) Stance: Cell phones OK in public places
I think cell phones are convenient, but I don't think people should take a call in places like a restaurant.	I don't see anything wrong with taking a call as long as it doesn't interrupt anyone.
OSTRACISM BEGINS HERE	OSTRACISM BEGINS HERE
But people talk so loud on their cell phones. It's funny, my cousin lives in Mexico City and she feels she needs to yell for me to hear over here!	No way! Some of my family is not too far from there.
Omega - Ever gone to visit your relatives there? I've gone a few times.	It is really nice in the area.
Perhaps we should get back to the topic.	Probably a good idea beta. They're probably watching us, lol!
With the cell phones, sometimes people even talk on their phones at the video store trying to choose a movie.	It's so common nowadays, I don't think anything of it.
Are you one of those people that talk on their cell everywhere they go?	Yes beta, I do like to stay connected with my friends and family. Makes things easier.
I can't help but listen sometimes. Some conversations I hear are embarrassing. People forget that others can hear them.	I've heard people fighting on the phone. Even heard someone talking about a drug deal. How stupid!

OSTRACISM CONTINUES IN THIS TOPIC

Topic 4: How to avoid spam e-mails.

BETA (female) Stance: Doesn't like all the spam she receives	OMEGA (male) Stance: Thinks spam filters work fine
I get so much spam e-mail. Drives me crazy trying to get through all of it.	The spam filter on my account seems to work fine. Not too often they get through.
Really omega? Seems like I have more spam than real e-mails.	Beta – It sounds like you may be on too many mailing lists who sell your name.
I am on quite a few mailing lists. I thought they weren't supposed to do that?	Unless they say they won't, they can sell your address to anyone. Beta, do you ever ask to be taken off the list?
Not really. Does that work?	My Mom does it. But then she also sends a paragraph from a lawyer on the internet which says they can't spam her anymore.
Some of the topics in the spams are pretty funny though. Do people actually fall for this stuff?	They must if people keep sending them.
I must get one every day for a "pharmacy order" or someone that supposedly left me an inheritance, lol.	Then there are all the "adult" ones.
Oh omega, don't get me started on that!	OK, I won't!

APPENDIX C
DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION

Demographic Information

Please fill out the following information about yourself by circling the correct answer.

Sex: Male Female

Age: _____

Ethnicity/race:

1. African-American/Black
2. Asian
3. Caucasian/White
4. Hispanic/Latino
5. Pacific Islander
6. Multiracial
7. Other (please indicate: _____)

Marital status: (circle one)

1. Single
2. In a relationship
3. Married
4. Divorced
5. Widowed

Political Orientation

1. Conservative
2. Moderate
3. Liberal

Zip code of hometown: _____

APPENDIX D
MANIPULATION CHECK

Please rate your perceptions of the computer chat and the other students in the study.

1. How similar do you feel to the other students in the discussion?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not similar at all</i>								<i>Very similar</i>	

2. How accepted did you feel by the other students in the discussion?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not accepted at all</i>								<i>Very accepted</i>	

3. How much did you like the other students in the discussion?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Did not like at all</i>								<i>Liked very much</i>	

4. Did you feel everyone was included in the discussion?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not at all included</i>								<i>Very much included</i>	

5. Was the discussion enjoyable for you?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not enjoyable at all</i>								<i>Very enjoyable</i>	

6. Were the other students in the discussion friendly?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
<i>Not friendly at all</i>								<i>Very friendly</i>	

APPENDIX E

SOCIAL DESIRABILITY SCALE

Listed below are a number of statements concerning personal attitudes and traits. Read each item and decide whether it is true or false as it pertains to you. Circle T for true and F for false.

- T F 1. Before voting I thoroughly investigate the qualifications of all the candidates.
- T F 2. I never hesitate to go out of my way to help someone in trouble.
- T F 3. It is sometimes hard for me to go on with my work if I am not encouraged.
- T F 4. I have never intensely disliked anyone.
- T F 5. On occasion I have had doubts about my ability to succeed in life.
- T F 6. I sometimes feel resentful if I don't get my way.
- T F 7. I am always careful about my manner of dress.
- T F 8. My table manners at home are as good as when I eat out in a restaurant.
- T F 9. If I could get into a movie without paying and be sure I was not seen, I would probably do it.
- T F 10. On a few occasions, I have given up doing something because I thought too little of my ability.
- T F 11. I like to gossip at times.
- T F 12. There have been times when I felt like rebelling against people in authority even though I knew they were right.
- T F 13. No matter who I'm talking to, I'm always a good listener.
- T F 14. I can remember "playing sick" to get out of something.
- T F 15. There have been occasions when I took advantage of someone.
- T F 16. I'm always willing to admit it when I make a mistake.

- T F 17. I always try to practice what I preach.
- T F 18. I don't find it particularly difficult to get along with loud-mouthed, obnoxious people.
- T F 19. I sometimes try to get even, rather than forgive and forget.
- T F 20. When I don't know something I don't at all mind admitting it.
- T F 21. I am always courteous, even to people who are disagreeable.
- T F 22. At times I have insisted on having things my own way.
- T F 23. There have been occasions when I felt like smashing things.
- T F 24. I would never think of letting someone else be punished for my wrongdoings.
- T F 25. I never resent being asked to return a favor.
- T F 26. I have never been irritated when people expressed ideas very different from my own.
- T F 27. I never make a long trip without checking the safety of my car.
- T F 28. There have been times when I was quite jealous of the good fortune of others.
- T F 29. I have almost never felt the urge to tell someone off.
- T F 30. I am sometimes irritated by people who ask favors of me.
- T F 31. I have never felt that I was punished without cause.
- T F 32. I sometimes think when people have a misfortune that they only got what they deserved.
- T F 33. I have never deliberately said something that hurt someone's feelings.

APPENDIX H

INTERGROUP ANXIETY SCALE

Indicate how you would feel when interacting with immigrants.

- | | | | | | | | | | | |
|-----------------|-------------------|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|----|------------------|
| 1. Apprehensive | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 2. Uncertain | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 3. Worried | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 4. Awkward | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 5. Anxious | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 6. Threatened | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 7. Comfortable | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 8. Trusting | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |
| 9. Friendly | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 | 8 | 9 | 10 | |
| | <i>Not at all</i> | | | | | | | | | <i>Extremely</i> |

APPENDIX I

NEGATIVE STEREOTYPE INDEX

Indicate the percentage of immigrants that possess each of the below traits

1. Dishonesty	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
2. Ignorance	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
3. Undisciplined	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
4. Aggressive	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
5. Hard-working	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
6. Reliable	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
7. Proud	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
8. Respectful	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
9. Unintelligent	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
10. Clean	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
11. Clannish	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%
12. Friendly	0%	10%	20%	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%	80%	90%	100%

8. Increased economic equality.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

9. Increased social equality.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

10. Group equality should be our ideal.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

11. If people were treated more equally, we would have fewer problems in this country.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

12. In an ideal world, all nations would be equal.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

13. All humans should be treated equally.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

14. It is important that we treat other countries as equals.

1	2	3	4	5	6	7
<i>very negative</i>						<i>very positive</i>

APPENDIX K

ADDITIONAL MEASURES

Please answer the following questions.

What country were you born? _____

Are you an Iowa resident? Yes No

Are you a United States citizen? Yes No

Indicate your fluency with the following languages in the table on a scale from 1 to 5.

1 **2** **3** **4** **5**
No **Moderate** **Fluent**
fluency **ability**

	Reading	Writing	Speaking	Understanding
Spanish				
Chinese				
French				
Arabic				
German				

Have you visited any countries outside of the United States within the last five years?
Indicate which countries.

When answering the questionnaires, what immigrant group(s) were you thinking about?

Have you participated in the following other research studies this semester?

Attractiveness and Perceptions of Others (computer chat) Yes No

Social and Political Attitudes (questionnaire) Yes No

APPENDIX L

DEBRIEFING SCRIPT

I want to tell you a little more about the study and find out if you have any questions about anything before you leave.

Questions

- How did the discussion go? Did you enjoy the discussion?
- Did you feel like everyone participated?
- How did you feel during the discussion?
- Did you think anything was odd about the discussion?
- What do you think we are studying in this research?

Exclusion conditions (English, Spanish, and Arabic)

- Did you feel uncomfortable when the other students did not include you in the discussion?
- Why do you think this happened?

Language exclusion conditions (Spanish and Arabic only)

- Did you feel uncomfortable when the other students spoke in a different language?
- What do you feel the other students were talking about?

Debriefing

This study is in the area of psychology known as social psychology, which deals with how people affect and are affected by others. We are interested in how people's attitudes might be affected by their discussions with other people. In this research, we are interested in how people's attitudes are affected when they are excluded from the conversation. We will look at how attitudes differ whether the person was left out of the conversation or not and whether they were ostracized in English or another language.

Exclusion conditions – Please know that the exclusion you experienced by the other participants did not have anything to do with you personally. Their exclusion of you was part of the study.

By using computers to do the discussions, we are controlling for many factors that may have an effect in face-to-face communications. For example, the attractiveness and gender often affect how persuasive a person is, but these factors are taken away when we do discussions over the computer.

It is very important that you do not share this information with anyone else or talk about the purposes of the study with anyone else. We will continue to collect data this semester and next semester.

If anyone asks you what the study was about, just tell them that you gave your opinions on different kinds of issues and discussed some of them with other people in the study. If a person comes into the study with preconceived notions of what the study is about, it could mess up our results. So, please, do not give the details of the study to your friends.

Do you agree not to talk about this study until after the school year is over?

Do you have any further questions? Thank you for participating.

APPENDIX M

CONFEDERATE INSTRUCTIONS

Person Perception Chat Conversation and Social Attitudes Questionnaires Confederate Procedures

General Information

- Arrive 15 minutes before study start time
- If you can't make it, find a replacement and alert Christine
- Be quiet when talking in rooms, particularly when participant is the room next door.

Overall Procedure

1. Participant fills out informed consent form (PI)
2. Confederate is in room #9
3. Participant brought down to room #10 or #11 and given instructions (PI)
4. 16 minute chat, 4 topics, 4 minutes each (CON)
5. Confederate acts as two people in chatting (CON)
6. Confederate notes participant behavior/comments on log sheet, particularly unusual behavior (CON)
7. Confederate sets up computer in #9 to prepare for next round (CON)
8. PI brings measures to fill out about chat (PI)
9. Participant turns on red light when complete
10. "Second" study begins, confederate picks up first measures (CON)
11. Confederate explains procedure on second study and gives second measures (CON)
12. Participant turns on red light when complete
13. Participant is debriefed (PI)
14. PI sets up computer in participant room for next round (PI)

Note: Responsibilities may change slightly for each participant depending on arrival time and how long it takes for them to fill out the questionnaires.

Timing: First night we'll run one session an hour. Subsequent nights we will either schedule 45 minutes apart or run 30 minutes with planned overlap.

Chat Specific Instructions

4 conditions

- English exclusion
- Spanish exclusion
- Arabic exclusion
- English inclusion (control group)

Confederate Personalities

- Both pleasant personalities. Have opinions on subjects, but not extreme views or strong stances.

<p>Confederate #1 Female</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Pleasant personality, agreeable - Polite, but not afraid to voice opinion - Stances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lives on-campus o Celebrities are an influence o Cell phone use in public is rude o Dislikes receiving spam e-mails 	<p>Confederate #2 Male</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Easy-going, nice - Tries to be funny sometimes - Stances: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> o Lives off-campus o Celebrities aren't an influence o Uses cell phone in public and doesn't care when others do o Has a good spam e-mail filtration system setup
------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------	---------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

Chatting Guidelines

- In inclusion topics, make comments on participants statements "I agree alpha." Ask them a question if they are not talking. Use prepared cut and paste statements as much as possible.
- In exclusion topics, use cut and paste exclusively, do not acknowledge participants comments
- No chat abbreviations, spell everything out.
- Watch clock to judge when to cut and paste, depending on length of sentence
 - o Short sentence/comment – 5 seconds
 - o One sentence – 10 seconds
 - o 2 or more sentences – 20-30 seconds
- Take your time. You are being 2 people. OK if it is a little slow. Regular chat rooms can be slow too.