
The Development of a U.S. and Generalized Ethnocentrism Scale

James W. Neuliep
St. Norbert College

James C. McCroskey
West Virginia University

The two studies reported here deal with the development and validation of a generalized ethnocentrism scale. In Study 1 two scales, including USE, which was designed to assess ethnocentrism in the United States, and GENE, which was designed to measure generalized ethnocentrism, were administered to 396 participants. Their responses were subjected to exploratory factor analysis. In Study 2, the USE and a modified version of GENE along with seven predictor variables were administered to 369 participants. Their responses were also factor analyzed and interim versions of the USE and GENE were generated for possible use. The results indicate that the GENE is more predictive of the seven predictor variables and that the USE may be measuring a somewhat different construct (e.g., patriotism).

One of the central concepts in understanding outgroup attitudes and intergroup relations is ethnocentrism. Sumner (1906) defined ethnocentrism as "the technical name for this view of things in which one's own group is the center of everything, and all others are scaled and rated with reference to it" (p. 13). Sumner (1906) argued that ethnocentrism nourished a group's pride and vanity while looking on outsiders, or outgroups, with contempt. Ethnocentrism is now recognized as a universal phenomenon experienced in all cultures (Segall, 1979). Moreover, Lewis (1985) and others (Lynn, 1976; Rushton, 1989) maintain that ethnocentricity is a natural condition. Specifically, Lewis (1985) contends that most peoples of the world do not like foreigners and openly display feelings of hostility and fear towards them. At the core of ethnocentrism is the tendency for any people to put

James W. Neuliep (Ph.D., University of Oklahoma, 1985) is an Associate Professor in the Department of Communication, St. Norbert College, DePere, WI 54115-2099.

James C. McCroskey (Ed.D., Pennsylvania State University, 1966) is a Professor in the Department of Communication Studies, West Virginia University, Morgantown, WV 26505.

COMMUNICATION RESEARCH REPORTS, Volume 14, Number 4, pages 385-398

their own group in a position of centrality and worth while creating and reinforcing negative attitudes and behaviors toward outgroups (Segall, 1979). As Hofstede (1991) argues, ethnocentrism is to a people what egocentrism is to an individual.

The facets of ethnocentrism are exemplified by attitudes and behaviors toward ingroups versus attitudes and behaviors toward outgroups. Attributions made about the attitudes and behavior of the ingroup and outgroup are biased in favor of the ingroup at the expense of the outgroup (Hewstone & Ward, 1985; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Weber, 1994). Attitudinally, ethnocentric groups see themselves as virtuous and superior, see their own standards of value as universal and intrinsically true, and their customs as original and centrally human. On the contrary, outgroups are seen as contemptible, immoral, inferior, and weak. Behaviorally, ethnocentric groups foster cooperative relations and obedience with ingroup members while maintaining a willingness to remain an ingroup member. Simultaneously, ethnocentric groups compete with and are not obedient to outgroup members and are unwilling to convert to their group. In many cases outgroups are blamed for ingroup troubles and serve as bad examples in the training of ingroup children (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). Sharma, Shimp, and Shin (1995) argue that ethnocentrism functions by helping to secure the survival of the ingroup by increasing its solidarity, conformity, cooperation, loyalty, and effectiveness.

In 1950 a series of studies were published representing the first systemic social scientific treatment of ethnocentrism. That book, *The Authoritarian Personality*, published by Adorno, Frenkel-Brunswik, Levinson, and Sanford (1950), dealt with the psychology of fascism, anti-Semitism, and what they called the "antidemocratic" personality. Adorno et al. (1950) analyzed data from more than 2000 questionnaires and more than 80 clinical interviews. They argued that nationalism is a species of ethnocentrism, that ethnocentrism is an expression of authoritarianism, and that authoritarianism is a personality defect (Forbes, 1985). Adorno et al. (1950) stimulated a substantial amount of research. For example, between 1966 and 1984 *The Authoritarian Personality* was cited in over 1,800 publications (Sanford, 1986). From 1950 to 1989 *Psychological Abstracts* listed 2,341 publications on authoritarianism and dogmatism (Meloan, 1993; Rubinstein, 1996). In *The Authoritarian Personality* Levinson (1950) argued that ethnocentrism is "based on a pervasive and rigid ingroup-outgroup distinction; it involves stereotyped, negative imagery and hostile attitudes regarding outgroups, stereotyped positive imagery and submissive attitudes regarding ingroups, and a hierarchical, authoritarian view of group interaction in which ingroups are rightly dominant, outgroups subordinate" (p. 150).

A central thesis of Adorno et al. (1950) was that prejudices against minorities and ethnic groups constitute a generalized personality profile and that prejudices should be not be studied in isolation. The theoretical explanation for an individual's prejudice towards Jews, for example, is representative of an entire set of negative attitudes about Blacks, Mexicans, or homosexuals, for example. In his critical analysis of *The Authoritarian Personality*, Forbes (1985) asserts: "No satisfactory explanation could be framed on the assumption that attitudes towards Jews are somehow a reaction to the distinctive characteristic of the Jewish group, whatever these characteristics may be. The explanation would have to be framed in terms of the common characteristics of Jews, Negroes, Mexicans, Filipinos, zootsuiters, and Oklahomans" (p. 27-28). This generalized attitude profile was called ethnocentrism. Although Adorno et al. (1950) have been sharply criticized for a variety of reasons by a number of researchers, a general consensus has been

reached that prejudices against minority and ethnic groups constitute a general attitudinal profile (cf. Bierly, 1985; Murphy & Likert, 1983; Ray & Lovejoy, 1986; Rubinstein, 1996).

Since the publication of *The Authoritarian Personality* far more attention has been paid to the authoritarian concept than to ethnocentrism. One focus of this attention is on the operational definition of authoritarianism; that is, the Fascist scale, more readily known as the F scale. In its various forms, the F scale is a series of Likert like items pertaining to such topics as sex (e.g., "No matter how they act on the surface, men are interested in women for only one reason"), war (e.g., "After we finish off the Germans and Japs, we ought to concentrate on other enemies of the human race such as rats, snakes, and germs"), and ideal society ("America is getting so far from the true American way of life that force may be necessary to restore it"). The ethnocentrism scale, also known as the E scale, is also a series of Likert like items. In its suggested final form, the E scale consists of three subscales, pertaining to Jews, Negroes, and other minority groups and patriotism. Representative items from the subscales include "To end prejudice against Jews, the first step is for Jews to try sincerely to get rid of their harmful and irritating faults," "Negroes have their rights, but it is best to keep them in their own districts and schools and to prevent too much contact with whites," and "Filipinos are all right in their place, but they carry it too far when they dress lavishly and go around with white girls" (p. 142).

The general idea of Adorno et al. (1950) was to combine the scores from the three subscales and treat it as a global measure ethnocentrism. Adorno et al. (1950) argued that significant intercorrelations between the three subscales would indicate that a single underlying dimension of variation was being measured. To be sure, the intercorrelations between the subscales were high, ranging from .69 to .83. Adorno et al. (1950) concluded that an overall ethnocentric ideology, as opposed to some single prejudice against a particular racial or minority group, did indeed exist. Critics have argued that while the three subscales constituting the E scale may be fairly clearly defined, they may not be a valid measure of the theoretical definition of ethnocentrism (Forbes, 1985). Because the E scale was designed for white populations in the United States during the 1950s, it is outdated and ironically ethnocentric. The E scale certainly could not be used today to assess ethnocentrism in Black, Jewish, or Filipino groups among others.

A review of relevant literature in psychology journals uncovered only two studies that have used the E scale, or portions of it, in the past 15 years. In their study of attitude change through the simulation game "BaFa BaFa," Bredemeier, Bernstein, and Oxman (1982) used portions of the E scale that they argued "were not dated by historical specificity" (p. 418). In their study of student ethnocentrism, dogmatism, and motivation, Bruschke, Gartner, and Seiter (1993) used a modified version of the Bredemeier et al. (1982) ethnocentrism scale. Both studies reported psychometric problems in using the E scale.

Since the publication of the E scale, ethnocentrism has been measured in a variety of ways. In their study of Whites' ethnocentrism and attributions of African-Americans, Greenberg and Rosenfield (1979) had participants rate slides of White and African-American faces on several personality traits, such as lazy, industrious, intelligence, etc. The actual measure of ethnocentrism was a score consisting of each participant's total rating for the African-American slides summed over all of the traits, subtracted from the participant's total rating for the White slides.

Another line of research deals with a phenomenon called ethnocentric attributional bias. This effect was introduced by Taylor and Jaggi (1974) who developed the idea from

Kelley's (1973) articulation of egocentric attribution bias. Taylor and Jaggi (1974) argue that ingroup members have a tendency to make internal attributions for the positive behavior of other ingroup members while making external attributions for their negative behavior. The reverse is true for attributions of outgroup members. That is, external attributions are made for the positive behavior of outgroup members while internal attributions are made for their negative behavior. In the typical experiment, ethnocentrism is assessed by having participants read descriptions or view video-tapes of ingroups and outgroups engaged in some kind of behavior. Participants are then asked to make judgements about the social desirability and internal or external locus of the described behavior. Decisions wherein the described behaviors are rated as socially undesirable with an external locus are considered ethnocentric. Considerable debate exists as to whether ethnocentric attributional bias functions to protect group-esteem or to enhance it (Weber, 1994).

In some research, ethnocentrism is treated as a dependent measure. For example, in his work on ethnocentrism and threat to social identity Grant (1992; 1993) and Grant & Brown, (1995) argue that threat to social identity fosters ethnocentrism. In these studies, ethnocentrism is measured on a series of seven-point bipolar semantic differential scales assessing ingroup-outgroup differentiation along stereotype and attitude dimensions. The results show that threatened groups respond ethnocentricly by differentiating the outgroup from their ingroup along stereotyped and attitude dimensions. The strength of group identification is significantly related to differentiation for these groups.

In their work on intergroup perceptions Judd, Park, Ryan, Brauer, & Kraus (1995) employed five different dependent measures of ethnocentrism, including "thermometer ratings" where participants are asked to report their "warmth" toward outgroups, two percentage estimation tasks between positively and negatively valenced attributes about outgroups, open-ended responses, and a response latency measure where ethnocentrism is indicated by relatively faster responses to positive attribute probes for the ingroup than for the outgroup.

Another body of research has emerged focusing on consumer ethnocentrism. Shimp and Sharma (1987) use the term consumer ethnocentrism to represent the beliefs held by American consumers about the appropriateness and morality of purchasing foreign products. Consumer ethnocentrism may partially explain why consumers evaluate domestic products more favorably than foreign goods (Netemeyer, Durvasula, & Lichtenstein, 1991). Consumer ethnocentrism is operationalized via the CETSCALE, a 17 item Likert-type scale with such items as "A real American should always buy American made products," and "Purchasing foreign-made products is un-American." (Shimp & Sharma, 1987; p. 282). The CETSCALE is considered reliable and valid (Netemeyer, et al., 1991)

ETHNOCENTRISM AND COMMUNICATION

Although few, if any, empirical studies involving ethnocentrism and communication have been published, communication researchers, especially intercultural communication researchers, are interested in ethnocentrism and its impact on communication. Samovar and Porter (1997) note that ethnocentrism is universal and the perceptual window through which all cultures interpret and judge other cultures. Lustig and Koester (1996) concur that all cultures have an ethnocentric tendency in that cultures tend to teach

their members to use the categories of their own cultural experiences when they judge the experiences of persons from different cultures. They argue that it is natural (hence, an inborn, genetically based trait) for humans to prefer what is typically experienced but that ethnocentrism is learned. While arguments may be made for either or both of these orientations to be inborn or learned, the important concern here is that both are seen as stable traits of the individual that impact the way the individual responds to the environment—whether the traits are inborn or learned.

Klopf (1995) notes that ethnocentrism is a composition of two words of Greek origin; that is "ethnos" which refers to nation and "kentron" which refers to center. Literally, then, this term refers to the view that one's country is the center of the universe. In actual usage, however, the focus of the term may also be applied to an ethnic group within a country (e.g., Native Americans) or a trans-national group (Africans). The key is that the group must see themselves as a unique grouping and one to which they have strong emotional ties. Essentially ethnocentrism refers to the central position that is granted by the individual to the group with which they most strongly identify. One can be ethnocentric with regard to his/her country, and/or with regard to her/his ethnic group. Further similar views can be held based on religion ("Catholicism is the only true religion") or a region of origin (e.g., "westerners are the only real Americans"). It is important, then, that in any measure of ethnocentrism the basis for such a trait is clearly identified.

The concept of ethnocentrism is essentially descriptive and not necessarily pejorative. Ethnocentrism may serve a very valuable function when one's central group (e.g., national, ethnic, religious, regional, etc.) is under actual or the threat of attack. Ethnocentrism forms the basis for patriotism and the willingness to sacrifice for one's central group. Nevertheless, ethnocentrism presents challenges. Varner and Beamer (1995) stress the importance of understanding ethnocentrism in the world of business. They indicate that the tendency for people to see their own way as the only right way can be dangerous and may lead to complacency. In not looking past their own culture, people see little importance in understanding other cultures. Varner and Beamer (1995) note that business organizations that succeed in their own culture often adopt an ethnocentric stance when they take their business to other cultures (e.g., "we know how to make it work for us as home, so we can make it work for us anywhere").

Ethnocentrism is also an obstacle to intercultural communication competence. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) contend that high levels of ethnocentrism are dysfunctional with respect to intercultural communication in that it influences the way people communicate with others. Gudykunst and Kim (1997) expand upon Lukens' (1978) concept of ethnocentric speech and Peng's (1974) concept of communicative distance. Peng (1974) asserts that ethnocentric attitudes are reflected in linguistic diversity and create communicative distance between interactants. This distance is not something measurable but manifests itself in the expressions and words of the speakers. Lukens (1978) calls such linguistic devices ethnocentric speech which result in three types of communicative distance, including indifference, avoidance, and disparagement. The distance of indifference communicates to others that the speaker sees his/her own culture at the center of everything. It is communicated in speech patterns, such as talking loudly and slowly to a non-native speaker of the language, including exaggerated pronunciation and simplification. The communicative distance of indifference is also communicated in such expressions as "Jew them down," "top of the totem pole," and "the blind leading the blind."

The distance of avoidance communicates that the speaker prefers to minimize or avoid contact with persons from other cultures though the use of ingroup jargon or slang that members of other cultures or outgroup do not understand. Finally, the distance of disparagement is communicated to openly express contempt for persons of different cultures and is communicated through ethnophaulisms, such as "nigger," "nip," "chink," etc (Gudykunst & Kim, 1997; Lukens, 1978; Peng, 1974).

Thus while ethnocentrism has potential positive as well as negative consequences, it is an orientation which is presumed to have an important impact on an individual's communication behavior, particularly when the context of that communication involves people with diverse cultural, ethnic, religious, or regional backgrounds. The focus of this particular study was on the individual's country of origin. The underlying assumption was that if a satisfactory measure could be developed employing this base, that instrument could be modified to reflect other foci (e.g., religion, ethnic groups, etc.). The validity of that assumption, of course, would need to be directly assessed at a later time.

STUDY I: INITIAL SCALE DEVELOPMENT OF THE US AND GENERALIZED ETHNOCENTRISM SCALE

METHOD & PROCEDURES

A United States ethnocentrism scale (USE) composed of sixteen items, half worded positively and half worded negatively, was written according to a conceptualization of ethnocentrism specifically for persons in the United States. These items were developed based on the definitions of ethnocentrism and the discussion of the concept presented earlier (cf. Hewstone & Ward, 1985; Islam & Hewstone, 1993; Segall, 1979; Sumner, 1906). A generalized ethnocentrism scale (GENE) of 21 items, 11 worded positively and 10 worded negatively, was written to reflect a conceptualization of ethnocentrism that may be experienced by anyone, regardless of culture. The initial USE scale appears in Table 1 and the initial GENE appears in Table 2

The initial versions of the USE and GENE were administered to 396 students enrolled at a four year liberal arts college in the Midwestern United States in a metropolitan area of approximately 200,000 people. One hundred and thirty-six of the participants were male and 256 were female. Participants were asked to indicate on a 5 point scale (Strongly Agree - Strongly Disagree) the degree to which the items on the scale applied to them.

A series of exploratory factor analyses were conducted on both USE and GENE. A minimum loading of .40 with a secondary loading being approximately .20 less than the primary loading was used to isolate factors. The number of respondents needed for stable factors is five times the number of items being factor analyzed. In this case, 396 participants should be sufficient for stable factors. The maximum likelihood procedure is a method of obtaining the initial factor solution which seeks to identify population parameters with a maximum likelihood of generating the observed sample distribution. The oblimin rotation method is a general criterion for obtaining an oblique rotation which tries to simplify the pattern matrix by way of reference axis (Kim & Mueller, 1978).

USE RESULTS

The most interpretable factor structure was produced from a forced two factor unrotated maximum likelihood solution with eight items loading on the first factor and

eight on the second factor. Factor One had an eigenvalue of 4.1 and accounted for 26.1 percent of the variance. Factor Two had an eigenvalue of 3.6 and accounted for 22.6 percent of the variance. All eight of the items that loaded on Factor One were positively worded (i.e., "The United States should be the role model of the world") while all eight of the items loading on Factor Two were negatively worded (i.e., "The United States is a poor example of how to run a country"). This type of item-wording bias has been found to create two factors from a single-factor construct in other research. Hence, the presumption of a single dimension was retained. Reliability for the scale, including all sixteen items, as determined by Cronbach's alpha, was .92. The scale items with corresponding factor loadings appear in Table 1.

TABLE 1
Scale Items and Factor Loadings for United States Ethnocentrism (USE) Scale

	Phase I		Phase II	
	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 1	Factor 2
1. Other countries should model themselves after the United States.	.56	-.46	.65	-.21
2. People in the United States have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere else.	.60	-.18	.68	-.10
3. People in the United States could learn a lot from people of other countries.	.03	.64	-.13	.30
4. The United States is a poor example of how to run a country.	-.08	.47	.17	.75
5. Most people would be happier if they lived like people in the United States.	.67	-.31	.73	.06
6. Most other countries are backward in comparison with the United States.	.57	-.29	.64	.09
7. The United States is a poor role model for other countries.	-.16	.46	.14	.86
8. Lifestyles in other countries are just as valid as in the United States.	.23	.77	-.10	.22
9. Countries are smart to look up to the United States.	.87	.00	.66	-.21
10. Life in the United States is much better than most other places.	.73	.11	.57	-.07
11. The United States should be the role model of the world.	.81	-.13	.73	-.18
12. Countries really should not use the United States as a role model.	.04	.62	-.07	.66
13. A lot of other countries are primitive compared to the United States.	.67	.10	.41	.16
14. I enjoy learning about the customs and values of other countries.	.27	.72	-.06	.32
15. Although different, most countries have equally valid value systems.	.30	.64	-.03	.25
16. The United States would be better if it were more like other countries.	.18	.62	.08	.65
Eigenvalue	4.1	3.6	4.1	2.0
Percent of Variance	26.1	22.6	26.0	12.7

GENE RESULTS

The most interpretable factor structure was produced from a forced two factor maximum likelihood solution with oblimin rotation with 16 items loading on the first factor and two items loading on a second factor. Factor One had an eigenvalue of 4.6 and accounted for 22 percent of the variance. Factor Two had an eigenvalue of 2.5 and accounted for 12 percent of the variance. Three items did not load on either factor. The two

items that loaded on Factor Two were negatively worded and were the only two items on the scale to include the word "poor" (i.e., "My country is a poor role model for other countries," and "My country is a poor example of how to run a country."). The scale items and factor loadings appear in Table 2. The existence of a single dimension should be retained and items not loading on the first dimension should be discarded. A new version of the instrument should be developed based on the strongly loaded items in the initial version.

TABLE 2
Scale Items and Factor Loadings for the Generalized Ethnocentrism (GENE) Scale

	Factor One	Factor Two
1. Other countries should model themselves after my country.	.62	-.33
2. People in my country have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere else.	.65	-.31
3. My country should be the role model of the world.	.72	-.34
4. Most other countries are backward in comparison with my country.	.71	-.05
5. Most people would be happier if they lived like people in my country.	.68	-.18
6. My country is a poor example of how to run a country.	-.16	.88
7. My country is a poor role model for other countries.	-.23	.90
8. Lifestyles in other countries are just as valid as in my country.	-.61	.07
9. Countries are smart to look up to my country.	.57	-.37
10. Life in my country is much better than most other places.	.40	-.14
11. People in my country could learn a lot from people of other countries.	-.49	.07
12. Countries really should not use my country as a role model.	-.26	.43
13. A lot of other countries are primitive compared to my country.	.42	-.10
14. I enjoy learning about the customs and values of other countries.	-.42	.08
15. Although different, most countries have equally valid value systems.	-.36	.05
16. I'm not interested in the values and customs of other countries.	.55	-.06
17. Many other countries have really strange and unusual customs as compared to mine.	.42	-.05
18. People from other countries act strange and unusual when they come into my country.	.47	.03
19. People should respect the values of customs of other countries.	-.10	-.07
20. I have little respect for the values and customs of other countries.	.44	-.08
21. Most people from other cultures just don't know what is good for them.	.49	-.08
Eigenvalue	4.6	2.5
Percent of Variance	21.9	12.2

STUDY II: SCALE DEVELOPMENT AND VALIDITY OF USE AND MODIFIED GENE

METHOD

Based on the results of Phase 1, and to assess validity issues, the USE scale and a modified version of the GENE scale were administered to 369 undergraduate students enrolled in communication courses at a large eastern university. One hundred and

seventy-nine participants were male and 174 were female. The USE scale was the same as administered in Phase 1. The GENE was modified by (a) replacing the word "country" with "culture" in the appropriate items, (b) by rewording several items for clarity, (c) by deleting several items from the original scale, and (d) adding new items. The revised GENE scale appears in Table 3.

TABLE 3
Scale Items and Factor Loading for the Revised GENE Scale

	Factor One	Factor Two
1. Most other cultures are backward compared to my culture.	.07	.61
2. People in other cultures have a better lifestyle than we do in my culture.	.23	.32
3. Most people would be happier if they didn't live like people do in my culture.	.20	.35
4. My culture should be the role model for other cultures.	.13	.76
5. Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my culture.	.23	-.01
6. Other cultures should try to be more like my culture.	.11	.81
7. I'm not interested in the values and customs of other cultures.	.15	.57
8. It is not wise for other cultures to look up to my culture.	.25	.28
9. People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures.	.31	.05
10. Most people from other cultures just don't know what's good for them.	.18	.71
11. People from my culture act strange and unusual when they go into other cultures.	.27	.37
12. I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures.	.33	.64
13. Most people would be happier if they lived like people in my culture.	.28	.75
14. People in my culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere.	.16	.62
15. My culture is backward compared to most other cultures.	.82	.40
16. My culture is a poor role mode for other cultures.	.84	.33
17. Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture.	.76	.53
18. My culture should try to be more like other cultures.	.83	.38
19. I'm very interested in the values and customs of other cultures.	.69	.03
20. Most people in my culture just don't know what is good for them.	.79	.34
21. People in other cultures could learn a lot from people in my culture.	.69	.38
22. Other cultures are smart to look up to my culture.	.71	.57
23. I respect the values and customs of other cultures.	.70	.09
24. People from other cultures act strange and unusual when they come into my culture.	.64	.42
Eigenvalue	7.7	3.0
Percent of Variance	32.0	12.7

In order to address validity issues, participants were asked several questions pertaining to (a) the size of their home town/city, (b) the frequency of travel outside their home state, (c) the number of people in their home town of the same race, (d) their frequency of contact with people from other countries, and (e) their frequency of contact with people from different races. Participants also completed the Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension (PRICA) and the Personal Report of

Interethnic Communication Apprehension (PRECA) (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). The latter instruments have documented reliabilities (PRICA = .94; PRECA = .97) and were expected to be correlated with ethnocentrism. Presumably, higher ethnocentrism experience discomfort when confronting the possibility of communication with someone from another ethnic or cultural group. The frequency of contact measures were exploratory of a possible relationship between ethnocentrism and contact with other cultures.

USE RESULTS

The factor analysis that yielded the most interpretable factor structure was a forced two factor oblimin rotated solution. Seven items, all positively worded, loaded on the first factor. Four items, each negatively worded, loaded on the second factor. The remaining items loaded on the same factor as they did in Study 1, but at a lower level. Factor One had an eigenvalue of 4.1 and accounted for 26 percent of the variance. Factor Two had an eigenvalue of 2.0 and accounted for 12.7 percent of the variance. Since the factors once again were a function of item wording, the assumption of unidimensionality was retained. The reliability for the 11 highest loading items, as determined by Cronbach's alpha, was .88. The 11 items that loaded in both phases of this study were employed to compute the total score on the USE scale to generated correlations with the criterion variables (see below). The factor loadings appear in Table 1.

GENE RESULTS

The factor analysis yielding the most interpretable factor structure was a forced two factor oblimin rotated solution. Ten items, a mix of positively and negatively worded items, loaded on Factor One. Eight items, all worded positively, loaded on Factor Two. Six items did not meet the factor loading criteria. Many of the items on the first factor had substantial loadings on the second factor. Factor One had an eigenvalue of 7.7 and accounted for 32 percent of the variance. Factor Two had an eigenvalue of 3.0 and accounted for 12.7 percent of the variance. Evidence of an artifactual solution was observed because all of the items which loaded on Factor One appeared on page three of the questionnaire while all of the items which loaded on Factor Two appeared on page four of the questionnaire. Page four was the final page of the questionnaire and subjects may have been experiencing fatigue. Scores based on the 18 items with high loadings on either of the factors were computed and used for computing correlations with the criterion variables. Reliability for the revised 18 item GENE scale, as determined by Cronbach's alpha was .92. The scale items and factor loadings appear in Table 3.

PREDICTOR VARIABLE RESULTS

USE was significantly correlated with GENE, $r(369) = .50, p < .01$, PRICA, $r(369) = .19, p < .01$, and PRECA, $r(369) = .17, p < .01$. USE was also significantly correlated with the frequency of travel outside of home state, $r(369) = .14, p < .01$, and the number of people in home town of the same race, $r(369) = .13, p < .05$. GENE was significantly correlated with PRICA, $r(369) = .27, p < .01$, and PRECA, $r(369) = .25, p < .01$. GENE also was significantly correlated with the size of home town, $r(369) = .56, p < .01$, frequency of travel outside of home state, $r(369) = .63, p < .01$, the number of people in home town of same race, $r(369) = .66, p < .01$, frequency of contact with a person from a different country, $r(369) = .57, p$

$< .01$, and the frequency of contact with a person from a different culture, $r(369) = .54$, $p < .01$. The correlation coefficients between the USE and GENE scales and the various predictor variables appear in Table 4.

TABLE 4
Correlations Coefficients between USE and GENE Scales with Predictor Variables.

	USE	GENE
USE	1.0	.50**
GENE	.50**	1.0
PRICA ¹	.19**	.27**
PRECA ²	.17**	.25**
Size of home town.	.06	.56**
Frequency of travel outside of home state.	.14**	.63**
Number of same race people in home town	.13*	.66**
Frequency of contact with people from different country.	.03	.57**
Frequency of contact with people from different culture	.03	.54**

¹ Personal Report of Intercultural Communication Apprehension

² Personal Report of Interethnic Communication Apprehension

** $p < .01$ (2 tailed)

* $p < .05$ (2 tailed)

DISCUSSION

In Sumner's (1906) earliest conceptualizations, ethnocentrism connoted two ideas, (a) that groups naturally dislike each other, and (b) that this animosity manifests as ingroup loyalty and patriotism. Forty years later, in their attempts to operationalize ethnocentrism, Adorno et al. (1950) developed the psychometrically sound E scale which today is hopelessly outdated and ethnocentric in that it assesses "white" group perceptions of "other" groups (viz., Negroes, Jews, and Filipinos). The purpose of the present research was to develop a reliable and valid scale to standardize the operationalization of ethnocentrism. In the two studies reported here, two scales, the USE and GENE appear to be reliable and valid measures of the concept. Both scales have high reliability and demonstrate predictive validity. However, the GENE scale is more predictive than USE scale on each of the seven predictor variables. While the USE and GENE scales are correlated, they do not seem to be measuring the same concept. The USE scale is not predictive of two important validity variables' cross-cultural and cross-country contact. The GENE scale, however, is substantially related to both, accounting for over 30 percent of the variance with cross-country contact and over 40 percent of the variance with cross-cultural contact. The USE is probably tapping into both ethnocentrism and US patriotism while the GENE mainly taps into ethnocentrism. This would explain both the significant correlation between USE and GENE scales and the substantial difference in correlations with cross-country and cross-cultural contact. Hence, GENE is the recommended scale to use in research dealing with ethnocentrism.

The substantial correlations between GENE and the frequency of contact with people from different cultures and countries suggests that as interaction between persons who are

culturally and nationally diverse increases, so does ethnocentrism. Unfortunately, history tells an ugly story of what happens when peoples of diverse cultural, ethnic, religious, or linguistic backgrounds converge. The hostility of group of people against another, different group of people, is among the most instinctive of human drives (Schlesinger, 1993). Consequently, these correlations are disturbing. If ethnocentrism leads to negative behaviors toward other people, and increased contact with different people increases trait ethnocentrism, finding a method to break this cycle is an urgent need. The implications of these relationships include integration producing more ethnocentrism and prejudicial behavior and more international travel and contact leading to more ethnocentrism and poorer relations among countries.

At this point we are unwilling to accept these results without substantial replication in future studies. Follow-up research designed to strengthen the current measures and provide additional tests of criterion validity must be conducted before firm conclusions are advanced.

Such follow-up research should include samples with more racial and ethnic diversity than those employed in this research. The overwhelming percentage of participants in the two studies reported here were white. Moreover, additional and revised criterion variables should be created to further test the validity of the scales. The ethnocentrism construct may be more appropriately measured along approach-avoidance dimensions of behavior and attitudes than along the criterion measures used here.

REFERENCES

- Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, E., Levinson, D. J., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The authoritarian personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Bierly, M. M. (1985). Prejudice toward contemporary outgroups as a generalized attitude. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 15*, 255-260.
- Bredemeier, M. E., Bernstein, G., & Oxman, W. (1982). Ba Fa Ba Fa and dogmatism/ethnocentrism: A study of attitude change through simulation-gaming. *Simulation & Games, 13*, 413-436.
- Bruschke, J. C., Gartner, C., & Seiter, J. S. (1993). Student ethnocentrism, dogmatism, and motivation: A study of BaFa BaFa. *Simulation and Gaming, 24*, 9-20.
- Forbes, H. D. (1985). *Nationalism, ethnocentrism, and personality*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Grant, P. R. (1992). Ethnocentrism between groups of unequal power in response to perceived threat to social identity and valued resources. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science, 24*, 348-370.
- Grant, P. R. (1993). Ethnocentrism in response to a threat to social identity. In J. W. Neuliep (Ed.), Replication research in the social sciences [Special issue] *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8*, 143-154.
- Grant, P. R., & Brown, R. (1995). From ethnocentrism to collective protest: Responses to relative deprivation and threats to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 58*, 195-211.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. (1997). *Communicating with strangers: An approach to intercultural communication*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hewstone, M., & Ward, C. (1985). Ethnocentrism and causal attribution in Southeast Asia. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 48*, 614-623.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Islam, M. R., & Hewstone, M. (1993). Intergroup attributions and affective consequences in majority and minority groups. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 64, 936-950.

Judd, C. M., Park, B., Ryan, C. S., Brauer, M., & Kraus, S. (1995). Stereotypes and ethnocentrism: Diverging interethnic perceptions of African American and White American Youth. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 460-481.

Kim, J.O., Mueller, C. W., (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage

Klopf, D. W. (1995). *Intercultural encounters: The fundamentals of intercultural communication*, (3rd. Ed.). Englewood, CO: Morton.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism: Theories of conflict, ethnic attitudes, and group behavior*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Levinson, D. J. (1950). Politico-economic ideology and group memberships in relation to ethnocentrism. In T. W. Adorno, E. Frenkel-Brunswik, D.J. Levinson, & R. N. Sanford *The authoritarian personality* (pp. 151-221). New York: Harper & Brothers.

Lewis, I. M. (1985). *Social anthropology in perspective*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Lukens, J. (1978). Ethnocentric speech. *Ethnic Groups*, 2, 35-53.

Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (1996). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. New York: HarperCollins.

Lynn, R. (1976). The sociobiology of nationalism. *New Society*, (July), 11-14.

Meloen, J. (1993). The F Scale as a predictor of fascism: An overview of 40 years of authoritarianism research. In W. Stone, G. Lederer, & R. Christie (Eds.), *Strength and weakness: The authoritarian personality today* (pp. 47-69). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Murphy, G., & Likert, R. (1983). *Public opinion and the individual*. New York: Harper & Brother.

Netemeyer, R. G., Durvasula, S., & Lichtenstein, D. R. (1991). A cross-national assessment of the reliability and validity of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 28, 320-328.

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997) The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales. *Communication Research Reports*, 14, 145-156.

Peng, F. (1974). Communicative distance. *Language Science*, 31, 32-38.

Ray, J. J. & Lovejoy, F. A. (1986). The generality of racial prejudice. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 126, 563-564.

Rubinstein, G. (1996). Two peoples in one land: A validation study of Altmeyer's right wing authoritarianism scale in the Palestinian and Jewish societies in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 27, 216-230.

Rushton, J. P. (1984). Genetic similarity, human altruism, and group selection. *Behavioral and brain sciences*, 12, 503-559.

Samovar, L. A., & Porter, R. E., (1997). *Intercultural communication: A Reader*. (8th ed.), Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Sanford, N. (1986). A personal account of the study of authoritarianism: Comment on Samelson. *Journal of Social Issues*, 42, 209-214.

Schlesinger, A. (1993). *The disuniting of America: Reflections of a multicultural society*. New York: Norton.

Segall, M. H. (1979). *Cross-cultural psychology: Human behavior in global perspective*. Monterey, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Sharma, S., Shimp, T.A., & Shin, J. (1995). Consumer ethnocentrism: A test of antecedents and moderators. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*, 23, 26-28.

Shimp, T.A., & Sharma, S. (1987). Consumer ethnocentrism: Construction and validation of the CETSCALE. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 24, 280-289.

Stevens, S. (1986). *Applied multivariate methods for the social sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston: Ginn.

Varner, I. & Beamer, L. (1995). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace*. Chicago, IL.

Weber, J. G. (1994). The nature of ethnocentric attribution bias: Ingroup protection or enhancement? *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, 30, 482-504.