2017

Negative Intergroup Contact: Self-Distancing Facilitates Wisdom for First-Generation Immigrants

Hajer Al Homedawy
alxh4110@mylaurier.ca

NEGATIVE INTERGROUP CONTACT: SELF-DISTANCING FACILITATES WISDOM FOR FIRST-GENERATION IMMIGRANTS

By

Hajer Al-Homedawy

Bachelor of Arts (Honours), University of Waterloo, 2015

THESIS

Submitted to the Department of Psychology

in partial fulfillment of the requirements for

Master of Arts in Psychology

Wilfrid Laurier University

Abstract

Negative intergroup interactions can be utilized for the collective good if reasoned through wisely. An effective mechanism for facilitating wise reasoning is the empirically well-established *self-distancing* perspective. First-generation immigrants were recruited because their position in society makes them susceptible to a different set of challenges than second- or third-generation immigrants. Negative intergroup interaction memories were conjured by either the distanced-why or immersed-why perspective. The distanced-why perspective proved ineffective at reducing explicit negative affect but marginally increased wise reasoning (p = .057) when compared to the immersed-why perspective. The effect of condition was significant for the "search for compromise and conflict resolution" theoretically established wise reasoning dimension (p = .008) indicating that distanced-why participants engaged in more conflict resolution reasoning than immersed-why participants. A factor analysis was conducted to investigate empirically driven wise reasoning dimensions. Two dimensions were extracted. The first dimension proved to be relatively more representative of "change–focused" reasoning and the second more representative of "outsider–focused" reasoning. Distanced-why participants engaged in greater outsider-focused reasoning (p = .028) than immersed-why participants. The study was replicated to investigate spontaneous reactions. Spontaneous self-distancing negatively correlated with implicit negative affect (p = .046) and the "Anxiety" LIWC dimension (p = .004) indicating that as spontaneous self-distancing increases, implicit negative affect and anxiety-laden autobiographical writing decreases. Acculturation strategies were examined so that in-group heterogeneity could be captured. Biculturals adopted an observer perspective more so than non-biculturals (p = .001). Theoretical implications and research limitations are described.

Keywords: immigrants, self-distancing, wisdom

Table of Contents

List of Tables

According to the UN Population Division (2015) international migrants doubled in number from 1975 to 2000 and high-income countries saw an annual net migration of 4.1 million from 2000 to 2015. From 1998 to 2013, United States (U.S.) first-generation immigrants, immigrants who are foreign-born and who immigrated to the U.S., increased from 26 million to 40 million, an increase of 53% over the span of 15 years (Trevelyan et al., 2016). The intimate and increasing interconnection of political, economic, ecological, and sociocultural systems influence the movements of people across the globe. Amongst the challenges brought on by an increasingly globalized world is the emergence of distinct ethnicities and cultures in closer proximity to one another. Culture and ethnic mixing in turn tasks governing bodies to learn and adapt innovative methods by which to manage diverse and often conflicting values, beliefs, and ideas. Intergroup interactions, the social interactions between members of different groups, therefore, require national- and international-management to ensure domestic social cohesion and global communal well-being. Parallel and arguably central to this aim is the theory of intergroup contact.

Originally discussed in *The Nature of Prejudice* by Gordon Allport, the "contact hypothesis" according to McKeown and Dixon (2017) is "now widely accepted as one of the important psychological interventions to promote social change." Dovidio, Gaertner, and Kawakami (2003) deem the contact hypothesis as one of the most successful constructs in overcoming challenges for intergroup relations (for a review see Hodson & Hewstone, 2013; Pettigrew, 1998). However, theorists contended that intergroup contact should be positive to be effective. Intergroup interactions perceived as negative experiences increase out-group anxiety, stereotypes, avoidance, and prejudice (Barlow et al., 2012). Intergroup interactions construed as positive experiences improve intergroup relations by fostering cross-group friendships (Bagci,

Rutland, Kumashiro, Smith, & Blumberg, 2014; Welker, Slatcher, Baker, & Aron, 2014), reducing negative out-group generalizations (Brown, Vivian, & Hewstone, 1999), and prejudiced attitudes (Kamberi, Martinovic, & Verkuyten, 2017; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2006; Pettigrew & Tropp, 2008). Subsequently, researchers in the field of intergroup relations recommended fostering positive and limiting negative intergroup contact, especially situations in which members of different groups were in competition or given unequal status.

However, negative intergroup interactions are not inherently detrimental to the collective good. Improving intergroup relations often time necessitates directly challenging oppressive status quos. Antecedents for the emergence and consolidation of progressive benefits for disadvantaged groups may involve inevitable exposure to negative rather than positive intergroup interactions (see Cakal, Hewstone, Schwär, & Heath, 2011; Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2007; Dixon et al., 2010; Grimes, 2002). For the present investigation, an intergroup relations theoretical foundation requires percipience to forgo the existing unidimensional framework of intergroup interactions whereby positively and negatively construed intergroup interactions are deemed subjectively "good" and "bad", respectively (for a critical review of the contact hypothesis see Dixon, Durrheim, & Tredoux, 2005).

Expanding beyond the unidimensional framework allows research attention to shift toward uncovering psychological tools by which negative intergroup interactions may be utilized for the collective good. One significant precursor to transform negative intergroup interactions is *wise reasoning*. Thinking grounded in taking the cognitive perspective of the "Other", acknowledging the limits of one's knowledge, considering alternative solutions, long-term consequences and overarching interpretations, all combine to formulate pragmatic reasoning that is indicative of *wisdom* (Staudinger & Glück, 2011; Sternberg, 1990). Herein lies the potential

for negative intergroup experiences to be utilized for the collective advantage.

The 21st century is inundated with ever increasing challenges. Increases in immigration heralds increases in anti-immigration attitudes (Schneider, 2008). The U.S. "Immigration Ban" executive order, situated within the context of national security and implemented by the Trump Administration (Office of the Press Secretary, 2017), revoked up to 100,000 visas according to Erez Reuveni, attorney to the Justice Department's Office of Immigration Litigation. William Cocks of the State Department Bureau of Consular Affairs, states however, up to 60,000 visas were provisionally revoked (Rachael, 2017). Rises in the incidences of international terrorist activity (Enders & Sandler, 2006) make salient group categories and additionally inflame suspicion of foreign-born peoples (e.g., Ahmed, 2017). Today's age fosters an environment of mistrust, fear, and confusion, ingredients conducive to the creation of negative intergroup interactions (Pelc, 2017; Pettigrew, 1998). Indeed, researching methods to expedite collective wise reasoning are timely.

The Present Research

In discussing immigrant communities, Trevelyan et al. (2016) indicates, "the first generation often must work harder to overcome numerous cultural and economic challenges." First-generation immigrants are more likely to encounter socio-cultural and economic challenges, by virtue of the processes involved in immigration and resettlement (Al-Issa & Tousignant, 1997). First-generation immigrants are also more closely tied to their original ethnic culture, the culture of their country of origin, than second- or third-generation U.S. immigrants (Mezzich, Ruiperez, Yoon, Liu, & Zapata-Vega, 2009).[1] According to Walter, Renfro, Esses,

[1] Mezzich et al. (2009) uncovered that first-generation immigrants are more likely to practice their original ethnic culture by celebrating their ethnic holidays, practicing their cultural values, speaking the language or dialect of their country of origin, dressing in ethnic cultural attire and eating culturally traditional foods than second- or third-generation immigrants.

White, and Martin (2005) immigrants are perceived as symbolically threatening to members of a host culture to the extent that the overall status quo is challenged. Riek, Mania, and Gaertner (2006) uncovered that symbolic threat facilitates bias and conflict. It follows that first-generation immigrants tied to their ethnic culture in turn symbolically represent their culture and may potentially engender symbolic threat. This line of reasoning would suggest that first-generation immigrants are more susceptible to experiencing negative intergroup interactions than second- or third-generation immigrants. One aim of the present research is to maximize potential societal benefits engendered via investigating negative intergroup interactions. Toward this aim, a practical approach is utilized by focusing on persons vulnerable to negative intergroup experiences. According to the previously established line of reasoning first-generation immigrants may be especially susceptible to negative intergroup interactions. The aim of the present research, therefore, is to research *forces* influencing and the *effects* of wise reasoning for negative intergroup interactions among U.S. first-generation immigrants.

The remainder of the paper is structured as follows. Advances in self-reflection research uncovered a psychological tool by which negative experiences are reasoned through more wisely, a tool termed *self-distancing*. The present investigation begins with a thorough theoretical and empirical discussion in which the construct, self-distancing, is situated. This is followed by a theoretical discussion in which wise reasoning via self-distancing is presented as one possible answer toward the aim of transforming negative intergroup interactions for perceivers. Next, two studies are presented investigating the degree to which self-distancing acts as a psychological tool to address the ultimate aim of reframing negative intergroup relations for adaptive societal growth.

Self-Reflection

A common finding within the self-reflection literature highlights thinking through and analyzing negative life situations as an effective strategy for reducing associated negative affect and cognitive distress (Pennebaker, 2003; Wilson & Gilbert, 2008). Thus, one may reasonably conclude that one adaptive self-reflection coping strategy to help overcome negative life situations would be to think and constructively analyze them. In contrast to the preceding finding however, another body of research reveals that thinking through negative events can lead to rumination, which is defined as the tendency to think repeatedly and passively about life situations. Studies on rumination link it to increases, rather than decreases, in physiological markers of stress, cognitive distress, and overall poor emotional and behavioral self-regulation (Nolen-Hoeksema, Wisco, & Lyubomirsky, 2008). In this way, thinking through negative life situations may be a maladaptive self-reflection coping strategy. These contradictory findings on "working through" negative life events were termed "The Self-Reflection Paradox" by Kross and Ayduk (2011). Why does thinking about negative events sometimes lead to positive consequences and at other times negative consequences? Research on self-reflection suggests that two psychological mechanisms contribute an answer to this question; these mechanisms are termed *self-perspective* and *emotional focus*.

Self-perspective refers to how we view and review life experiences. We can adopt one of two perspectives, which are termed the *self-distanced* or *self-immersed* perspective. Self-immersion occurs when the self of the person experiencing the recalled event and the self of the person analyzing that event are experienced as one. The self is immersed in the recalled experience. Self-distancing occurs when the self of the person experiencing the recalled event and the self of the person analyzing that event are experienced as separate; the self of the person

doing the analyzing is viewing the event similarly to how a neutral third-party observer might view it. The analyzing self is psychologically distant from the recalled experience, relative to self-immersion.

Emotional focus refers to how we analyze life experiences. We can adopt either a "what" or "why" emotional focus. The former gets the analyzer to focus on recounting features of a life experience. For example, someone may focus on what they said, felt, and did in a recalled memory. The latter gets the analyzer to focus on the underlying reasons and causes for why they said, felt, and did certain things. Adopting a self-distanced perspective paired with the "why" emotional focus has been observed to be the most effective cognitive coping strategy for recalled negative autobiographical memories when compared to pairing self-distancing with the "what" emotional focus or self-immersion with either types of emotional focus. Thus, one boundary condition for the effectiveness of self-distancing would be the "why" emotional focus standpoint (hereinafter referred to as the distanced-why perspective; for a review see Kross, Ayduk, & Mischel, 2005).

The distanced-why perspective has been demonstrated to reduce implicit anger, explicit anger, global negative affect (Kross et al., 2005) and cardiovascular reactivity (i.e., blood pressure reactivity) associated with anger-eliciting memories when compared to the immersed-why perspective (Ayduk & Kross, 2008). Similarly, in children, the distanced-why perspective, rather than the immersed-why perspective, helped to reduce feelings of anger and attributions of blame brought on by interpersonal conflicts (Kross, Duckworth, Ayduk, Tsukayama, & Mischel, 2011).

In studies of depression, the distanced-why perspective helped to reduce the frequency of intrusive negative thoughts and overall depressed affect in the long term when compared to the

immersed-why perspective and a distraction condition (Kross & Ayduk, 2008). This research thereby demonstrated that an episode of self-distancing can have long-term positive consequences and is more effective than self-distraction. The distanced-why perspective also helped to reduce the depressed affect experienced by people who display higher, rather than moderate, levels of depression (Kross & Ayduk, 2009). Wondering if self-distancing could be used by, and be effective with, clinically diagnosed depressed individuals, Kross, Gard, Deldin, Clifton, and Ayduk (2012) tested this possibility and observed that the effectiveness of the distanced-why perspective in attenuating negative affect generalizes to clinically depressed individuals as well. Studies investigating self-perspective and culture revealed that Russians display more self-distancing, compared to self-immersion, than Americans; this cultural tendency, moreover, correlated with reductions in depressed symptomology (Grossmann & Kross, 2010).

Spontaneous self-distancing also helps to reduce emotional reactivity (i.e., the extent and intensity of an emotion), cardiovascular reactivity, frequency of intrusive negative thoughts, maladaptive behavior strategies in couples, and helps to increase interpersonal problem solving (Ayduk & Kross, 2010b). Spontaneous self-distancing when measured in children yielded similar results, demonstrating decreased emotional reactivity and increased overall adaptive self-reflection (White, Kross, & Duckworth, 2015).

The effects of self-perspective have been largely researched on recalled autobiographical memories. Interested in discovering whether the distanced-why perspective aids in emotionally heightened situations *in vivo* (or "in the heat of the moment" situations), Mischkowski, Kross, and Bushman (2012) experimentally provoked participants and then measured how they felt, thought, and behaved. They observed that provoked participants assigned to the distanced-why

perspective displayed a greater reduction in anger-induced aggressive behavior, affect, and thought than participants assigned to the immersed-why perspective.

The effectiveness of the distanced-why perspective in attenuating emotionality holds regardless of the valence associated with a recalled experience. For example, heightened positive affect, a distinguishing feature of bipolar disorder, was attenuated in a clinical sample when participants adopted an approach similar to the distanced-why perspective when compared to an approach similar to the self-immersed perspective (Gruber, Harvey, & Johnson, 2009). In studies examining the time duration of emotions, the distanced-why perspective was more effective at reducing the overall duration of both negative and positive emotions (Verduyn, Van Mechelen, Kross, Chezzi, & Van Bever, 2012).

What explains the effectiveness of the distanced-why perspective? In several studies of self-distancing (e.g., Kross & Ayduk, 2008) judges blind to condition investigated participants' autobiographical writing to uncover mental *recounting* versus *reconstruing*. The former of the two refers to the extent to which participants recalled the sequence of events, what was said, and generally engaged in more concrete descriptions of the recalled memory. The latter of the two refers to the extent to which underlying abstract reasons and causes are described. Measuring thought essays revealed three significant findings. Firstly, all participants displayed greater recounting than reconstruing. This finding supports the claim that the effects of self-distancing are not due to cognitive avoidance. Secondly, participants adopting the distanced-why perspective displayed relatively more reconstruing and relatively less recounting than those adopting the immersed-why perspective; this finding helps to explain the decreased negative symptomology in participants adopting the distanced-why perspective. Thirdly, research on self-reflection repeatedly uncovered mental construal (or thought-content) as the key mediator

between self-perspective and outcome variables (e.g., emotional reactivity, Kross et al., 2005; Kross & Ayduk, 2009; anxiety, Kross et al., 2014a). Further, emotional processing is an essential ingredient for adaptive growth (Foa & Kozak, 1986) and one that has been addressed by self-reflection researchers. Kross et al. (2005, pg. 714) state that the distanced-why perspective "may provide an alternative route to fulfilling the two criteria, identified in previous literature, for successful emotional processing—(a) activating an affective memory and (b) modifying that memory with new information that decreases the frequency of future negative responses." Indeed, after several experimental manipulations and measurements of self-analysis, the distanced-why perspective yielded results that suggest that it is not a cognitive avoidance mechanism and that it serves to aid in processing negative affect without emotional and cognitive inundation.

Self-analysis has also been investigated outside the realm of emotionality. Kross and Grossmann (2012) investigated if the distanced-why perspective could increase wise reasoning about an intrapersonal problem (i.e., unsuccessfully finding a job after university graduation) and a problem involving differing political viewpoints (i.e., should one's presidential candidate be unsuccessful during the 2008 U.S. presidential election). According to the researchers, wise reasoning involves three components, which are, "recognizing that the world is in flux and the future is likely to change, recognizing that there are limits associated with one's own knowledge, and possessing a prosocial orientation that promotes the 'common good.'" The first component is often referred to as dialecticism and the second as intellectual humility. The researchers uncovered that the distanced-why perspective not only helped to increase overall wise reasoning but also helped to increase problem-related cooperative attitudes and behaviors, when compared to the immersed-why perspective. Further research between self-distancing and wise reasoning

uncovered that the distanced-why perspective also reduces a cognitive reasoning shortcoming referred to as "Solomon's paradox," which is the tendency for individuals to provide wisdom to others without acting upon that same advice themselves (Grossmann & Kross, 2014). At the physiological level, previous literature has uncovered a positive link between higher (vs. lower) heart rate variability (HRV) and cognitive-executive functioning (Hansen, Johnsen, & Thayer, 2003; Thayer, Hansen, Saus-Rose, & Johnsen, 2009). Wondering if HRV additionally relates to wise reasoning, Grossmann, Sahdra and Ciarrochi (2016) experimentally manipulated participants to receive either distanced-why or immersed-why instructions and subsequently measured their HRV and reasoning judgments about a societal problem. They uncovered that participants who ranked high on HRV and who were assigned to adopt a self-distanced perspective reasoned wiser than participants who ranked high on HRV but were assigned to adopt a self-immersed perspective.

Taken together, the distanced-why perspective has been demonstrated to be one of the most effective strategies for facilitating positive cognitive self-regulation and overall adaptive self-reflection. The effects of self-distancing are robust across a variety of contexts, subject domains and outcome variables[2], suggesting that the distanced-why perspective is a potent self-

[2] A number of variables have also been studied as potential covariates, to include because they may be associated with outcomes of interest, or to rule out alternative explanations for the effects of self-perspective. These include: conflict status (i.e., extent to which a recalled problem has been resolved; Ayduk & Kross, 2008; Ayduk & Kross, 2010b; Kross et al., 2005), recency of a memory (i.e., the age of a memory; Ayduk & Kross, 2010b), level of emotional closeness (i.e., towards a person in a recalled interpersonal experience; Kross et al., 2005), recall time (i.e., how long it takes to recall a memory; Ayduk & Kross, 2008), perspective time (i.e., how long one adopts one of the two perspective strategies; Ayduk & Kross, 2008), questionnaire time (i.e., the time it took participants to complete a study questionnaire; Ayduk & Kross, 2008), cognitive engagement (i.e., the extent to which a participant was engaged while completing a study; Kross & Ayduk, 2008) and psychotherapy status (i.e., the extent to which a participant received clinical treatment; Kross & Ayduk, 2008) just to name a few. Additional variables that were controlled for include conflict status (Ayduk & Kross, 2008) and imagery vividness (i.e., the level of visual vividness experienced in a recalled memory; Ayduk & Kross, 2008).

analysis tool (for more detailed reviews see Ayduk & Kross, 2010a; Kross, 2009; Kross & Ayduk, 2011).

Toward a Potential Solution

Individual Differences

In the grand context of negative intergroup interactions, what forces facilitate adaptive intergroup relations for the collective good? Intelligence, often operationalized via analytical reasoning tasks, is often framed by laypeople and social scientists a significant predictor for greater well-being (see Campbell, Converse, & Rogers, 1976, Study 3; Diener & Fujita, 1995). It follows that one may reason that greater intelligence may be a necessary prerequisite toward overcoming problems at the individual and group levels and to better facilitate overall well-being. Despite common lay beliefs about the positive association between intelligence and well-being however, little to no empirical evidence supports this claim (see Grossmann, Na, Varnum, Kitayama, & Nisbett, 2013; Watten, Syversen, & Myhrer, 1995; Wirthwein & Rost, 2011).

In contrast, wise pragmatic reasoning, rather than intellectual reasoning, defined as "reasoning influenced by life experiences and situated in a social context," which is an integral feature of wisdom, has been demonstrated as not only being associated with greater well-being, but also with "less negative affect, better social relationships, less depressive rumination, more positive versus negative words used in speech, and greater longevity" (Grossmann et al., 2013, pg. 944). Additionally, Grossmann et al. (2010) investigated wise reasoning about intergroup and interpersonal conflicts across young and old adults. They uncovered that unlike fluid intelligence, which has been demonstrated to decrease with increasing age (Salthouse, 2004), older participants ranked higher on wise reasoning than younger participants. This finding thereby demonstrated that wise reasoning proves to be robust to cognitive decline unlike the

decreasing qualities of intelligence over time.

Cultural Differences

The social orientation hypothesis, defined as the way in which a culture is more or less independent than interdependent than another culture, has been argued to be a better hypothesis explaining cultural differences in cognition than the genetic and linguistic hypotheses (see Varnum, Grossmann, Kitayama, & Nisbett, 2010). Wondering if cultural differences, such as social orientation, impact wise reasoning about interpersonal and intergroup conflicts, Grossmann et al. (2012) measured wise reasoning among young and middle-aged American and Japanese participants. Similar to the results reported by Grossmann et al. (2010) fluid intelligence was negatively associated with age in both American and Japanese participants. Overall however, younger and middle-aged Japanese participants, who rank higher than Americans on their interdependent social orientation, reasoned more wisely than age-matched American participants about interpersonal and intergroup conflicts. Older Americans however, scored higher on wise reasoning than older Japanese participants on intergroup conflict. The researchers describe that this may be a result of American participants reporting greater intergroup conflict than Japanese participants indicating that American participants had greater opportunities to learn from various intergroup conflict experiences than Japanese participants.[3] Overall, these findings suggest that wise reasoning rather than fluid intelligence proves to be more beneficial to managing negative intra- and interpersonal conflicts, and for our purposes, intergroup interactions.

Overview of Studies

Recalled negative intergroup interactions may be utilized for the collective good if

[3] Lower intergroup conflict experiences for Japanese participants may be a consequence of the way in which Japanese in-group members are culturally socialized to anticipate and avoid intergroup conflict from an early age.

reasoned through wisely. One potential tool toward this aim is the empirically well-established self-distancing perspective. Distancing from one's self facilitates greater self-regulation and wiser reasoning. To this extent, the first study aims to investigate if adopting the distanced-why perspective for recalled negative intergroup interactions is beneficial to first-generation immigrants by mitigating explicit negative affect and increasing wise reasoning. The second investigation builds from the first by investigating the value of spontaneous self-distancing for negative intergroup interactions. Previous research on acculturation, the cultural-integration strategies involved in reconciling ethnic and host cultures, uncovered differences between acculturation strategy groups (i.e., biculturals vs. non-biculturals) on the degree to which situational features are cognitively framed (i.e., "frame switching", see Hong, Morris, Chiu, & Benet-Martinez, 2000). By investigating acculturation strategies among first-generation immigrants, the second investigation expands from the first by examining potential boundary conditions of self-distancing. [4]

Study One

Method

Participants. The final sample is composed of 559 consenting U.S. first-generation immigrants from Amazon Mechanical Turk (MTurk).[5] MTurk, composed of over 500,000 MTurk workers, was utilized because it proves to hold a more reliable and diverse participant pool than other types of participant sampling (e.g., undergraduate sampling; see Paolacci & Chandler, 2014). The sample is composed of more males (65.9%) than females (34.1%) and the average participant is 30 years old (M = 30, Mdn = 28). 265 and 255 participants were randomly assigned to the immersed-why and distanced-why conditions respectively.

[4] Acculturation strategies are described in more detail in section "Study Two".
[5] The 559 participants all passed the information consent form (i.e., all participants consented) and passed both study pre-screeners.

Exclusion Criteria. To partake in the study participants were required to answer questions indicating that they were first-generation immigrants.[6] The following demographic questions were administered to identify inconsistencies in "first-generation immigrant" self-identification: 1) "Where were you born?", 2) "What is your country of birth?", and 3) "What year did you immigrate to the U.S.A.?". Participants who answered "The United States of America" for the first two questions (n = 6 & 3, respectively) and "I didn't immigrate to the U.S.A., I was born there" (n = 2) were removed from the final data set. Further, participants who responded inconsistently to the first two questions were removed from the final data set (n = 8).[7] In total 32 participants were removed.[8] [9]

Procedure. Participants were informed the researchers were investigating the effects of

[6] To identify first-generation immigrants for Study 1 and 2, three pre-study screener items were used: 1) "A first-generation immigrant was born outside the country they immigrated to. Are you a first-generation immigrant?" (Yes/No), 2) "Did you immigrate to the United States from another country?" (Yes/No) and 3) "I was born in the United States" (Yes/No). All participants who responded "Yes" to the first two questions and "No" to the third question proceeded past the first segment of the pre-study screener. Participants involved in controlled laboratory experiments are exposed to fewer distractions than participants involved in online studies. To screen in non-distracted participants five items were used for the last segment of the pre-study screener: 1) "Right now, do you have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey?" (Yes/No), 2) "Do you agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else?" (Yes/No), 3) "Have you turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings?" (Yes/No), 4) "Have you closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer that would otherwise distract you from the survey?" (Yes/No), and 5) "If you have answered "Yes" to all of the questions above, then click "I'm ready to begin" to proceed to the survey," (I'm ready to begin/I'm not ready to begin just yet). All participants who answered, "Yes" and "I'm ready to begin" proceeded past the pre-study screener.

[7] For example, if a participant answers France to "Where were you born?" and Australia to "What is your country of birth?" they are removed from the final data set.

[8] Due to two programming mistakes participants were also removed if they were 1) identified as a duplicate (n = 17) and 2) did not recall a negative intergroup interaction (n = 1; see supplementary material for more information).

[9] Study 1 proved to be longer in length than Study 2. Consequently, there was a fair bit of participant attrition in Study 1 (especially when compared to Study 2) and which is evidenced in the degrees of freedom listed in the result section. A future examination may incorporate analyses involving the replacement of missing values (akin to Kross & Grossmann, 2012).

memories that involved negative intergroup interactions but were not informed they would be randomly assigned to a self-analysis manipulation (i.e., immersed-why vs. distanced-why self-analysis). Once baseline affect was measured, participants were prompted to recall a negative interaction with an out-group member:

> *Recall instructions:* As an immigrant to the United States, you may have moved from one culture to another. Culture reflects specific ways of understanding the world, expectations about how to act or behave, common values, and so on. Culture may include religious beliefs or basic assumptions about how things should be done or how people should be treated. Everyone holds culture-specific understandings that they may not often think about (e.g., driving on the right side of the road). They may become more aware of these understandings, however, when they observe different cultural understandings or norms (e.g., driving on the left side of the road). Sometimes these differences may seem minor but at other times they may seem more significant. We would like you to think of a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person. Once a memory comes to your mind, allow yourself to consider this event, letting your thoughts and feelings about the event run through your mind for a few moments.

The aim of the memory recall instructions was to describe negative intergroup interactions such that participants are able to recall memories of this particular nature. Use of the terms

"intergroup", "intercultural", "in-group", and "out-group" were omitted from the recall instructions since such terminology may confuse rather than clarify concepts to first-generation immigrant participants.[10] No time limit was set on how long participants could take recalling a memory. Next, using established procedures (Kross et al., 2005; Kross & Ayduk, 2009; Kross & Grossmann, 2012), participants were randomly assigned to either a self-immersed or a self-distanced perspective before receiving instructions to analyze their emotions for 60 seconds using a "why" emotional focus standpoint:

> *Self-immersed perspective instructions*: We would now like you to think about this disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. Go back to the time and place of the situation you just recalled and picture it in your mind. Now see the experience unfold through your own eyes as if it were happening to you all over again. Replay the event as it unfolds in your imagination through your own eyes. Take a few moments to do this.
>
> *Self-distanced perspective instructions*: We would now like you to think about this disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. Go back to the time and place of the situation you just recalled and picture it in your mind. Now take a few steps back. Move away from the situation to a point where you can now watch the event unfold from a distance and see yourself in the event. As you do this, focus on what has now become the distant you. Now watch the experience unfold as if it were happening to the distant you all over again. Replay the event as it unfolds in your imagination as you observe your distant self. Take a few moments to do this.

[10] "Culture-clashes" classify as both "intercultural" and "intergroup" interactions. The use of the term "intergroup" in the present paper, rather than the term "intercultural", is more appropriate since it encompasses, by definition, the term "intercultural". The use of the term "intergroup" rather than "intercultural" is consistent with "intergroup relations" terminology (see Dovidio et al., 2003).

> *Emotional "Why" Focus instructions:* As you continue to watch the situation unfold through your own eyes (unfold to your distant self), try to understand his or her feelings. Why did you have those feelings? What were the underlying causes and reasons? Now take a few moments to close your eyes and experience the event. We will continue in 60 seconds.

Following the self-reflection task, participants were presented with a package of dependent measures[11], completed mood booster tasks (Velten, 1968), debriefed and remunerated (see Appendix B Study 1 Materials).

Measures

Self-distancing. Participants completed three manipulation check items rating the extent to which they self-distanced during recall (items were adapted from Kross et al., 2012). Participants rated the extent to which they replayed the memory through their own eyes, "To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?" (1 = "I did not see the memory replay through my own eyes", 7 = "I saw the memory replay through my own eyes"; reverse coded). They rated the extent to which they replayed the memory as an observer, "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer, even if the experience involved you directly?" (1 = "I did not see the memory unfold as an observer", 7 = "I did see the memory unfold as an observer"). Lastly, they rated their distance from the situation, "As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?" (1 = "Very close, saw it through my own eyes", 4 = "Neither too close nor too far", 7 = "Very far, saw it as if an observer"). A correlation analysis indicated that the first item correlated negatively with the second item (r = -.37, p < .001). Inclusion of the first item in a reliability analysis yielded a weak

[11] All measures in Study 1 came after the manipulation except baseline negative affect.

and problematic Cronbach's alpha (α = -.001).[12] Removing the first item significantly improved Cronbach's alpha (α = .36), therefore, only the second and third items were used to create a single index of self-distancing (r = .21, p < .001; M = 4.21, SD = 1.29). Although Cronbach's alpha was improved, the alpha value is below the acceptable cut-off value for reliability (see Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). As a result, the self-distancing items were also examined separately.[13]

Imagery vividness. To investigate if and how imagery vividness influences perceptions, participants rated the extent to which they experienced their memory as vivid and clear (i.e., "My memory of this experience was vivid and clear"; 5-point scale; 1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"; Kross et al., 2012; M = 4.05, SD = .90).

Memory age. Recent negative memories may differentially influence current perceptions than older negative memories (Nigro & Neisser, 1983; Robinson & Swanson, 1993). Using a previously constructed measure (Ayduk & Kross, 2010b) participants rated when the situation took place (i.e., "When did the experience you recalled during the study happen?"; 0 = "less than a month ago", 1 = "approximately 6 months ago", 2 = "approximately a year ago", 3 = "2-3 years ago", & 4 = "4 or more years ago"; M = 3.50, SD = 1.19).

Conflict Status. Negative interactions may be impactful if the experience remains unresolved. To investigate the degree to which participants recall resolved versus unresolved negative interactions they were asked to rate the negative interaction on whether or not their experience remains unresolved and an active source of distress (i.e., "this experience remains unresolved

[12] The first self-distancing item was reverse coded correctly yet a negative correlation was uncovered between the first and second self-distancing items. The average correlation between items is used to formulate Cronbach alpha values. Consequently, negative correlations will yield negative Cronbach alpha values.

[13] There are multiple possibilities for why weaknesses exist among the three self-distancing items, and one such possibility may be that the items were poorly worded. A more detailed description regarding this possibility is discussed in the limitations section.

and an active source of distress for me"; 1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"; Kross et al. 2012; $M = 2.71$, $SD = 1.16$).

Conflict severity. Negative intergroup interactions involve a spectrum of negative experiences (i.e., from minor misunderstandings to physical confrontations). To discover the severity of the negative experiences participants responded to three items: 1) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve verbal disagreements between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no verbal disagreement at all", 7 = "significant verbal disagreement"), 2) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve angry outbursts between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no angry outbursts at all", 7 = "significant angry outbursts"), and 3) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve physical confrontation between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no physical confrontation at all", 7 = "significant physical confrontation"). The items correlated strongly with one another ($p < .05$) so they were averaged to create a single conflict severity index ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.24$; Cronbach's $\alpha = .57$).

Social rejection. Since social rejection characterizes many negative intergroup interactions (see Shapiro, Baldwin, Williams, & Trawalter, 2011), participants indicated the degree to which they experienced social exclusion (i.e., "When you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, to what extent did you feel socially excluded?"; 1 = "Not at all socially excluded", 7 = "Very socially excluded"; $M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.99$).

Bystanders. The effect of the presence of others on performance is greater the larger the group (Jackson & Latané, 1981; Knowles, 1983). Groups are also more vulnerable to *deindividuating* the individual (e.g., Festinger, Pepitone, & Newcomb, 1952). Since deindividuation shares a link to out-group discrimination (Wilder, 1978) others' presence may undermine forces toward wiser

reasoning in some circumstances. To investigate if and how the number of people present during negative intergroup interactions influence perceptions participants made responses to the question, "How many people were involved in the incident?". The majority of participants indicated two people present during the incident ("2 people", 41.3%; "3-6 people", 28.1%; "7-10 people", 3.8%; "10+ people", 2.3%).

Reencounter experiences. Since in many settings anonymity fosters hostility (e.g., Douglas & McGarty, 2001) a single negative encounter with an unknown out-group member (e.g., experiencing only one encounter with an out-group member on a side-walk) may require differential wise reasoning than a negative encounter involving a person who one may interact with again (e.g., reencountering an out-group coworker). To investigate reencounter experiences participants indicated the extent to which they would reencounter the person from the negative intergroup interaction (i.e., "Will you likely interact with the person you had the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with again?"; 1 = "no, most unlikely", 7 = "yes, most likely"; M = 3.47, SD = 2.02).

Third-person mediator. Negative intergroup interactions may involve third-person mediators. Mediators may facilitate cooperative discussion (e.g., perspective-taking techniques) to resolve issues that may in turn encourage wise reasoning across conflicting parties (e.g., Gutenbrunner & Wagner, 2016). To examine third-person mediator involvement participants were asked the following question: "Did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve a third-person mediator? That is, someone who tried to help you, the other person, or both of you resolve the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict?" (0 = "no", 1 = "a little bit", 4 = "somewhat", and 7 = "yes, the majority of the time"; M = 3.60, SD = 2.23).

Causal variables. To evaluate perceptions of causal forces participants were presented with the

12-item Revised Causal Dimension Scale (McAuley, Duncan, & Russell, 1992). "Causal descriptions" constitute the first segment of the measure. That is, participants were instructed to write down what they saw as the most significant reason for why the negative interaction occurred (hereinafter referred to as participants' causal descriptions):

> In considering the conflict, disagreement, and/or misunderstanding that you recalled for this study, please write down what you see as the most significant reason why this conflict occurred. Think about the reason or reasons you have written above. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of this cause or causes of your performance.

Next, participants were administered the 12-item 9-point scale. Four dimensions compose the measure, which are: 1) "locus of causality" (e.g., 1 = "reflects an aspect of the situation", 9 = "that reflects an aspect of yourself"; M = 5.06, SD = 1.85), 2) "external control" (e.g., 1 = "over which others have no control", 9 = "over which others have control"; M = 4.09, SD = 1.81), 3) "stability" (e.g., 1 = "temporary", 9 = "permanent"; M = 5.19, SD = 1.71), and 4) "personal control" (e.g., 1 = "not manageable by you", 9 = "manageable by you"; M = 4.85, SD = 2.00; see Appendix A Table 1.1). All items strongly correlated ($p < .001$) with their respective dimensions so they were collapsed to form the four theoretically established causal dimensions (Cronbach's α = .69, .73, .58, .83, respectively).[14]

Linguistic Examination of Participants' Causal Descriptions. The Linguistic Inquiry and Word Count (LIWC, Tausczik & Pennebaker, 2010) is a platform designed to analyze texts based on the degree to which specific words match pre-identified dictionary-parameters. In anxiety inducing social situations, use of non-first person pronouns and one's name ("linguistic" self-distancing) rather than first person pronouns (e.g., "I") increased overall self-distancing (see

[14] In line with McAuley et al. (1992) guidelines each dimension was analyzed separately.

Kross et al., 2014b). Since linguistic self-distancing involves the use of third-person pronouns rather than first-person pronouns participants' causal descriptions were examined via LIWC to identify associations between self-distancing and pronoun use.

Baseline affect. Participants were presented with ten negative emotion items (i.e., distressed, upset, guilty, scared, hostile, irritable, ashamed, nervous, jittery, and afraid) from the negative affect (NA) subscale of the PANAS (Watson, Clark, & Tellegen, 1988). Participants were instructed to focus on how they felt "right now" (ratings were made on a 5-point scale; 1 = "very slightly or not at all", 5 = "extremely"; $M = 1.68$, $SD = .83$; Cronbach's $\alpha = .94$).[15]

Explicit negative affect. Participants indicated how they felt on a second presentation of the negative affect (NA) subscale of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; Watson et al. 1988; 1 = "very slightly or not at all", 5 = "extremely"; $M = 2.01$, $SD = .87$). Items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$) so they were collapsed to form a single explicit negative affect index (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$). However, since negative intergroup interaction memories compared to intra- and interpersonal depressive memories are more likely to engender feelings of anger than feelings of sadness (e.g., Halperin & Gross, 2011) we identified feelings of anger to be more central to our analysis of negative affect. A discrete anger index was computed using responses to the "hostile" and "irritable" emotion items (Cronbach's $\alpha = .78$; consistent with Watson et al. 1988).

Wise reasoning. Participants indicated the degree to which they reasoned wisely about the recalled memory on 13 items extracted and adapted from the 21-item validated wise reasoning scale (Brienza, Kung, Santos, Bobocel, & Grossmann, 2017).[16] Ratings were made on a 6-point

[15] The items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$) so they were collapsed to form a single explicit baseline negative affect index.

[16] Many first-generation immigrants may identify English as their second language. Concerns were raised *a priori* regarding the phrasing and word-use of the 21-item scale (Brienza et al.

scale (1 = "not at all", 6 = "very much"; *M* = 3.85, *SD* = .99). The 13-items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$) so they were collapsed to form a single index of wise reasoning (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92$). Theoretically, the 21-item wise reasoning scale identified five underlying dimensions of wisdom: 1) "others' perspective" (e.g., "considered the perspectives of the people involved in the situation"), 2) "consideration of change and multiple ways the situation may unfold" (e.g., "believed the situation could lead to a number of different outcomes"), 3) "intellectual humility/recognition of limits of knowledge" (e.g., "realized that there might be some reason for others' behaviour that I do not know"), 4) "search for a compromise/conflict resolution" (e.g., "considered first whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved"), and 5) "view the event through the vantage point of an outsider" (e.g., "tried to see the problem from the view of an uninvolved person"). Items from the 13-item wise reasoning scale were categorized into the five pre-identified theoretical dimensions of wise reasoning (see Appendix A Table 1.2; hereinafter referred to as the theoretically driven dimensions). All items correlated strongly with their theoretically established dimensions ($p < .001$) and all dimensions yielded relatively strong Cronbach alpha values ($\alpha = .81, .80, .71, .61, .71$, respectively). To investigate empirically occurring dimensions among the 13 items a factor analysis was conducted (using the same factor analysis procedure of Brienza et al. 2017). Two dimensions were extracted (see Appendix A Table 1.3; hereinafter referred to as the empirically driven dimensions). Both dimensions yielded strong inter-item correlations ($p < .001$) and relatively strong Cronbach alpha values ($\alpha = .90$ & $.79$, respectively). The first component is composed of all items within the second dimension (i.e., "consideration of change and multiple ways the situation may unfold"), the majority of items in the first (i.e., "others' perspectives") and third

2017). The 13-item wise reasoning scale was used over the 21-item scale since the scale was constructed (i.e., in simplified English) for a previous immigrant population.

(i.e., "intellectual humility/recognition of limits of knowledge") dimensions, and one item in the fourth dimension (i.e., "search for a compromise/conflict resolution"). Since the first component includes all items from the second dimension it is termed "changed-focused reasoning". The second empirically-driven component is composed of all items in the fifth dimension (i.e., "view of the event through the vantage point of an outsider") and the following three items: 1) "tried to find a middle ground between different perspectives about the situation" (dimension one), 2) "realized that there might be some reason for others' behaviour that I do not know" (dimension three), and 3) "considered first whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved" (dimension four). Since the second component includes all items from the fifth dimension it is termed outsider-focused reasoning. [17]

Emotional reactivity. Next, participants completed three items assessing the intensity and extent to which they re-experienced the emotions they originally felt when the situation took place (adapted from Kross et al., 2012), 1) "thinking about the event right now made me feel upset (e.g., rejected, angry, hurt, sad)", 2) "as I think about the event now, my emotions and physical reactions to this experience are still intense", and 3) "I re-experienced the emotions I originally felt during the experience when I thought about it now" (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree; M = 2.99, SD = .92). The items correlated strongly ($p < .001$) and were thus collapsed to form a single index of emotional reactivity (Cronbach's $\alpha = .79$).

Mental construal. Following the emotional reactivity measure, participants completed five items assessing the extent to which they engaged in recounting features of the environment (i.e., focusing on concrete and specific situational details) versus reconstruing features of the situation

[17] Theoretical underpinning patterns may be present in the empirically driven dimension. Due to time and resource constraints a theoretical inspection of the empirically driven components of the 13-item wise reasoning scale could not be conducted. A future inspection may reveal patterns not described in the present research.

(i.e., focusing on abstract concepts pertaining to the causes and reasons for one's and/or other's affect, cognitions, and behavior). Using an established construal measure (Kross et al., 2012) ratings were made on a 5-point scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"). Recounting was operationalized with the statement "my thoughts focused on the specific chain of events—sequence of events, what happened, what was said and done—as I thought about the experience in this study" (M = 3.55, SD = .97). The following four items were averaged to operationalize reconstruing: 1) "as I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that caused me to think differently about the experience", 2) "as I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that made me experience a sense of closure," 3) "thinking about my experience during the experiment led me to have a clearer and more coherent understanding of this experience", and "I feel a sense of closure about this experience." (M = 3.01, SD = .94). The reconstruing items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$) and were collapsed to form a single reconstruing index (Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$).

Motivation attributions. 10 items were generated to discover the degree to which participants negatively attributed reasons for the behaviors and attitudes of the interlocutor (hereinafter called the "motivation attribution" measure). Ratings were made on a 5-point scale (1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"). Five items assessed personal motivation attributions (e.g., "the person in the memory I recalled dislikes people from my country of origin"; M = 2.87, SD = 1.18), and five items assessed in-group motivation attributions (e.g., "most people from the U.S. dislike people from my country of origin"; M = 2.55, SD = 1.11). Inter-item correlations were strong ($p < .001$) for both personal and in-group motivations so they were collapsed to form personal and in-group motivation attribution indices (Cronbach's $\alpha = .92, .93$, respectively; see Appendix A Table 1.4).

Self-Concept Coherency. Since self-concepts are impacted by visual viewpoint in mental imagery (Libby & Eibach, 2011) two items were generated to uncover the degree to which self-analysis (i.e., immersed-why vs. distanced-why) impacts perceptions of self-change and self-improvement.[18] First, participants rated the extent to which they perceived self-change, "Do you

[18] Mental images can be conjured via the third- or first-person visual perspective. The former refers to re-experiencing a memory by watching it unfold through the eyes of an observer, seeing oneself in the image. The latter refers to the visual viewpoint where one re-experiences a recalled memory through one's own eyes. Conceptually, *visual perspective* (i.e., first- & third-person) and *self-perspective* (self-immersed & self-distanced) are similar constructs in the sense that both tap into the visual viewpoint of the conjured image. However, there are notable differences between the constructs. Visual perspective instructions (e.g., Libby & Eibach, 2011) have yet to be employed alongside the manipulation of an emotional focus standpoint (i.e., the "what" & "why" emotional focus, see Kross et al. 2005). *Observing* pictured events, rather than *analyzing* them, has historically been the way in which visual perspective has been investigated. Two hypotheses are relevant to an investigation examining negative autobiographical experiences, and both involve visual viewpoint in mental imagery. The first hypothesis suggests that recalling memories using the third-person perspective helps one to disown undesirable memories. "Disowning" or "owning" memories through the use of third- and first-person perspective, respectively, hinges upon the desirability of the pictured event. This hypothesis is based on the assumption that the *pictured self* is separate from the *present self* in third-person perspective and that the present self is incorporated into the pictured self in first-person perspective. Should the pictured event be a desirable one, the motivation to facilitate psychological ownership of the pictured event results in the adoption of the first-person perspective. On the other hand, should the pictured event be undesirable, the motivation to facilitate psychologically disowning the pictured event leads to the adoption of the third-person perspective. Owning desirable and disowning undesirable events is supposedly motivated by a need to view the self-concept favorably. Therefore, this group of theorists would suggest that in the context of negative intergroup interactions, when the ultimate motivation is self-enhancement, viewing the pictured event from third-person perspective helps disown the event and further aids to maintain a relatively favorable intact image of the self (e.g., Kenny & Bryant, 2007; Kenny et al., 2009; McIsaac & Eich, 2004). Libby and Eibach (2011) challenged this hypothesis by suggesting two components of the self must be considered in order to better understand the effects of visual perspective; these component parts are termed *the experiential self* and *the conceptual self*. The former refers to situating the self into immediate psychophysiological experience and makes mentally salient the concrete and idiosyncratic features of the environment. The latter of the two situates the self into broader understandings and makes salient abstract features of the environment. Based on the latter definition, the researchers suggest that *self-concept coherency* is integral to understanding the pictured self conjured by third-person perspective. If there is self-concept consistency between the pictured and present self, the pictured self is *included* in the present self and perceptions of self-change *decrease*. If there is self-concept inconsistency between the pictured and present self, the pictured self is likely to be *excluded* from the present self and perceptions of self-change *increase*. This line of reasoning has been well supported

consider yourself today to be the same person you recalled in the memory or have you changed since that time?" (1 = "I am the same today as I was in the memory", 7 = "I am a very different person today than I was in the memory"; *M* = 4.40, *SD* = 1.97). Second, participants rated their perceptions of self-improvement, "To the extent that you have changed since the experience you recalled, do you consider yourself to be a better person or worse off than you were at the time of the experience? (-3 = "I am worse off today than I was at the time of the experience", 0 = "I am no better or worse today than I was at the time of the experience", and 3 = "I am a better person today than I was at the time of the experience"; *M* = 5.23, *SD* = 1.37). The items correlated strongly (r = .41, p < .001) so they were collapsed to form a single index labeled "self-concept coherency" (Cronbach's α = .56). In addition to an examination of the single index, scale items were examined separately since Cronbach's alpha is below the acceptable value for scale reliability.

Perception of U.S. Nationality. First-generation immigrants were asked, "Was the person you had a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with a citizen of the United States?" ("Yes", 53.3%; "No", 11.3%; "I don't know"; 10.9%).

Results

Overview. The statistical technique involved a 1-way ANOVA with two levels (condition: immersed-why vs. distanced-why). To first investigate the main and interactive effects of age (i.e., age ≥ 30 vs. age < 30)[19] and gender (i.e., male vs. female) separate hierarchical regressions were conducted for each dependent variable. Hierarchical regressions included main effects on Step 1 (e.g., the main effects of gender and condition) and an interaction on Step 2 (gender ×

empirically (see, Libby & Eibach, 2011).

[19] Two age groups were created since wisdom research uncovered differences across young and old age-groups (see Grossmann et al. 2010 & 2012). Further, age groups allow for pairwise comparisons (i.e., uncovering the locus of an interaction).

condition).[20] Wondering about one's emotions (e.g., I feel "extremely" distressed) before wondering about one's and others' cognitive states (e.g., I "very much" considered the perspectives of others involved in the situation) may impact perceptions differently than if emotions were considered last. To prevent order-effects the wise reasoning measure was counterbalanced with the post-recall presentation of the explicit negative affect measure (i.e., the PANAS). To investigate the impact of order-effects, hierarchical regressions involving the main and interactive effects of counterbalance (levels: PANAS presented first vs. wise reasoning measure presented first) were also conducted on each dependent variable.[21]

Main Analysis

Self-distancing. The effect of condition was significant ($F(1, 478) = 13.93$, $p < .001$) indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 4.43$, $SD = 1.26$) self-distanced more during self-analysis than immersed-why participants ($M = 3.99$, $SD = 1.29$).[22] There were no interactive effects of age ($\beta = -.44$, $t(476) = -1.87$, $p = .062$) and counterbalance ($\beta = .09$, $t(476) = .41$, $p = .68$). There was an interactive effect of gender ($\beta = -.703$, $t(474) = -2.88$, $p = .004$). Pairwise comparisons of the omnibus 2 × 2 ANOVA (condition: immersed-why vs. distanced-why × gender: male vs.

[20] In line with standard conventions, main effects on Step 1 were of interest (and examined further) if an interaction on Step 2 was statistically significant. In total two hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. The first regression analysis examined gender (Step 1 uncovers the main effects of gender and condition & Step 2 uncovers the interactive effect of Gender × Condition). The second regression analysis examined age (Step 1 uncovers the main effects of age and condition & Step 2 uncovers the interactive effect of Age × Condition).

[21] The impact of the following statistical examinations is beyond the scope of the present research due to time and resource constraints: 1) outlier analyses, 2) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), 3) skew-adjustment transformations, and 4) replacement of missing values. Future re-analyses may incorporate these statistical examinations to ensure optimum statistical accuracy in data-treatment.

[22] Using all three items as a single index of self-distancing (i.e., including the reverse-coded item, which would be problematic given Cronbach's $\alpha = -.001$) reveals a similar pattern. The effect of condition was significant ($F(1, 478) = 27.50$, $p < .001$; immersed-why participants: $M = 3.59$, $SD = .95$; distanced-why participants: $M = 4.03$, $SD = .86$). Similarly, there were no interactive effects of age ($\beta = -.19$, $t(476) = -1.10$, $p = .27$) and counterbalance ($\beta = .09$, $t(476) = .56$, $p = .58$), and a significant interactive effect of gender ($\beta = -.49$, $t(474) = -2.83$, $p = .005$).

female) were examined to uncover the locus of the interaction. Female distanced-why participants (M = 4.54, SD = 1.20) self-distanced more than female immersed-why participants (M = 3.66, SD = 1.31; F(1, 474) = 20.1, p < .001). Male immersed-why participants (M = 4.19, SD = 1.25) self-distanced more than female immersed-why participants (M = 3.66, SD = 1.31; F(1, 474) = 9.83, p = .002). Next, each self-distancing item was examined separately. The effect of condition was significant for the first item, "To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?" (F(1, 480) = 9.55, p = .002), indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 5.20, SD = 1.50) replayed the memory through their own eyes more than distanced-why participants (M = 4.77, SD = 1.59).[23] The effect of condition was not significant for the second item, "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer, even if the event involved you directly" (F(1, 478) = .53, p = .47), indicating no difference between immersed-why participants (M = 4.51, SD = 1.77) and distanced-why participants (M = 4.63, SD = 1.58). The effect of condition was significant for the third item, "As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?" (F(1, 480) = 28.56, p < .001), indicating that distanced-why participants (M = 4.24, SD = 1.54) reported greater distance from the scene than immersed-why participants (M = 3.46, SD = 1.67).

Baseline affect. No significant difference between groups in baseline affect indicates successful random assignment to condition. Accordingly, the effect of condition was not significant (F(1, 517) = .43, p = .51) indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 1.64, SD = .82) experienced similar levels of baseline negative affect as distanced-why participants (M = 1.69, SD = .84).

[23] The first self-distancing item, "To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?", was not reverse coded unless stated otherwise. Statistical analyses involving reliability and factor assessments require the item to be reverse coded. Uncovering the effect of condition via a 1-way ANOVA however does not require the item to be reverse coded (i.e., not reverse coding the item does not take away from the interpretability of the item).

There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.11, $t(513) = -.68$, $p = .49$), age (β = .05, $t(515) = .36$, $p = .72$), and counterbalance (β = -.13, $t(515) = -.88$, $p = .37$).

Explicit Negative Affect. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 510) = .006$, $p = .94$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 2.01$, $SD = .89$) experienced similar levels of explicit negative affect as distanced-why participants ($M = 2.01$, $SD = .85$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.10, $t(506) = -.62$, $p = .54$), age (β = .25, $t(508) = 1.63$, $p = .10$), and counterbalance (β = -.14, $t(508) = -.87$, $p = .38$). Next, both groups were compared on the discrete anger index. Similarly, the effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 510) = .00$, $p = .99$; immersed-why: $M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.02$; distanced-why: $M = 2.06$, $SD = 1.03$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.03, $t(506) = -.18$, $p = .86$), age (β = .19, $t(508) = 1.08$, $p = .28$), and counterbalance (β = -.32, $t(508) = -1.74$, $p = .08$). A repeated-measures ANOVA was conducted to investigate the degree to which explicit negative affect changed from baseline (i.e., before memory-recall). Change in affect was significant ($F(1, 511) = 127.68$, $p < .001$) indicating that participants post-recall explicit negative affect ($M = 2.01$, $SD = .87$) increased from baseline ($M = 1.67$, $SD = .83$).

Wise reasoning. The effect of condition was marginally significant ($F(1, 507) = 3.64$, $p = .057$) indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 3.93$, $SD = .96$) are trending toward greater wise reasoning than immersed-why participants ($M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.01$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .00, $t(503) = -.002$, $p = .99$), age (β = -.09, $t(505) = -.51$, $p = .61$), and counterbalance (β = -.07, $t(505) = -.42$, $p = .68$). Next, the theoretically-driven dimensions were examined; a similar pattern was uncovered. For dimension one (“others’ perspectives”), two (“consideration of change and multiple ways the situation may unfold”), three (“intellectual humility & the recognition of limits of knowledge”), and five (“view the event through the

vantage point of an outsider"), distanced-why participants descriptively ranked higher than immersed-why participants but the effect of condition was not significant (1) dimension one: $F(1, 510) = 2.83$, $p = .093$; immersed-why: $M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.14$; distanced-why: $M = 3.93$, $SD = 1.11$); 2) dimension two: $F(1, 509) = 1.52$, $p = .21$; immersed-why: $M = 3.81$, $SD = 1.20$; distanced-why: $M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.13$); 3) dimension three: $F(1, 508) = 3.04$, $p = .08$; immersed-why: $M = 3.79$, $SD = 1.09$; distanced-why: $M = 3.96$, $SD = 1.07$; and 4) dimension five: $F(1, 508) = .78$, $p = .37$); immersed-why: $M = 3.71$, $SD = 1.31$; distanced-why: $M = 3.76$, $SD = 1.27$). The effect of condition was significant for the fourth dimension, "search for compromise and conflict resolution" ($F(1, 509) = 7.09$, $p = .008$), indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 3.97$, $SD = 1.87$) thought more about looking for different ways to resolve the negative interaction and whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved than immersed-why participants ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.18$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = .14$, $t(505) = -1.49$, $p = .13$), age ($\beta = -.23$, $t(507) = -.08$, $p = .28$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.06$, $t(507) = -.31$, $p = .75$).

Next, the two empirically driven-dimensions were examined. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 508) = 2.25$, $p = .13$) for the first empirically-driven dimension, indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.01$) did not differ from immersed-why participants ($M = 3.80$, $SD = 1.09$) on the degree to which they engaged in change-focused reasoning. The effect of condition was significant ($F(1, 508) = 4.85$, $p = .028$) for the second empirically-driven dimension, indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 3.94$, $SD = 1.04$) engaged in more outsider-focused reasoning than immersed-why participants ($M = 3.72$, $SD = 1.08$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = .14$, $t(505) = .67$, $p = .50$), age ($\beta = -.23$, $t(507) = -1.08$, $p = .28$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.06$, $t(507) = -.31$, $p = .75$).

Emotional reactivity. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 508) = .010$, $p = .92$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 3.00$, $SD = .94$) were not more emotionally reactive than distanced-why participants ($M = 2.99$, $SD = .89$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.15$, $t(504) = -.86$, $p = .38$), age ($\beta = .16$, $t(506) = .95$, $p = .344$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.17$, $t(506) = -1.05$, $p = .29$).

Mental Construal. *Reconstrual.* The effect of condition was marginally significant ($F(1, 507) = 3.26$, $p = .07$) indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 3.09$, $SD = .93$) are trending toward greater event reconstrual than immersed-why participants ($M = 2.94$, $SD = .93$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.21$, $t(503) = -1.21$, $p = .23$), age ($\beta = -.12$, $t(505) = -.74$, $p = .46$), and counterbalance ($\beta = .00$, $t(505) = -.36$, $p = .72$). *Recounting.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 507) = 1.11$, $p = .29$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 3.50$, $SD = .99$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 3.59$, $SD = .93$) did not recount differentially. There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = .11$, $t(503) = .61$, $p = .54$), age ($\beta = .20$, $t(505) = 1.17$, $p = .24$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.27$, $t(505) = -1.38$, $p = .17$).

Supplementary Analysis

Imagery vividness. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 481) = 1.67$, $p = .19$), indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 4.09$, $SD = .90$) did not imagine their experiences more vividly than distanced-why participants ($M = 3.99$, $SD = .90$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.004$, $t(477) = -.02$, $p = .98$), age ($\beta = -.15$, $t(479) = -.92$, $p = .36$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.17$, $t(479) = -1.00$, $p = .32$).

Memory-age. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 481) = .393$, $p = .53$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.27$) reported memories around the same time frame as distanced-why participants ($M = 3.53$, $SD = 1.11$). There were no interactive effects of

gender (β = -.20, $t(477) = -.87$, $p = .39$), age (β = -.41, $t(479) = -1.88$, $p = .06$), and counterbalance (β = -.24, $t(479) = -1.02$, $p = .31$).

Conflict-Status. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 508) = .029$, $p = 0.87$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 2.72$, $SD = 1.16$) did not report their experiences as more unresolved and an active source of distress than distanced-why participants ($M = 2.70$, $SD = 1.16$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.03, $t(504) = -.16$, $p = .88$), age (β = .21, $t(506) = .99$, $p = .32$), and counterbalance (β = -.19, $t(506) = -.66$, $p = .51$).

Conflict severity. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 420) = .011$, $p = .92$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 3.92$, $SD = 1.26$) experienced negative intergroup interactions of similar severity as distanced-why participants ($M = 3.90$, $SD = 1.21$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.34, $t(416) = -1.34$, $p = .18$), age (β = .04, $t(418) = .17$, $p = .87$), and counterbalance (β = -.03, $t(418) = -.13$, $p = .9$).

Social rejection. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 420) = .746$, $p = .39$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 4.79$, $SD = 2.05$) perceived similar levels of social rejection as distanced-why participants ($M = 4.62$, $SD = 1.91$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .104, $t(416) = .26$, $p = .78$), age (β = .65, $t(418) = 1.66$, $p = .09$), and counterbalance (β = .17, $t(418) = .43$, $p = .67$).

Bystanders. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 420) = .69$, $p = .40$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 1.53$, $SD = .70$) reported a similar number of people present during the interaction as distanced-why participants ($M = 1.59$, $SD = .75$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .25, $t(416) = 1.67$, $p = .095$), age (β = .26, $t(418) = 1.84$, $p = .07$), and counterbalance (β = .07, $t(418) = .48$, $p = .63$).

Reencounter experiences. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 420) = 2.88$, $p = .09$)

indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 3.63, SD = 2.10) and distanced-why participants (M = 3.29, SD = 1.91) were not influenced to differentially perceive the extent to which they will likely interact with the person they had a negative interaction with. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.08, t(416) = -.19, p = .86), age (β = .19, t(418) = .49, p = .62) and counterbalance (β = -.69, t(418) = -1.76, p = .08).

Third-person mediator. The effect of condition was not significant (F(1, 420) = .352, p = .55) indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 3.66, SD = 2.24) did not receive more third-party intervention than distanced-why participants (M = 3.53, SD = 2.21). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.59, t(416) = -1.31, p = .19), age (β = .14, t(418) = .31, p = .76), and counterbalance (β = -.10, t(418) = -.23, p = .82).

Causal variables. *Locus of Causality.* The effect of condition was not significant (F(1, 482) = .65, p = .42) indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 4.98, SD = 1.97) and distanced-why participants (M = 5.12, SD = 1.72) did not differentially perceive the cause of the negative interaction as something that reflects an aspect of themselves, inside of them, and something about them. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .04, t(478) = .12, p = .90), age (β = -.16, t(480) = -.47, p = .64), and counterbalance (β = .13, t(480) = .37, p = .71). *Stability.* The effect of condition was not significant (F(1, 482) = .473, p = .49) indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 5.14, SD = 1.72) and distanced-why participants (M = 5.25, SD = 1.70) did not differentially perceive the cause of the negative interaction as permanent, stable over time, and unchangeable. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .21, t(478) = .66, p = .51), age (β = .40, t(480) = 1.27, p = .20), and counterbalance (β = .49, t(480) = 1.57, p = .19). *Personal Control.* The effect of condition was not significant (F(1, 482) = .39, p = .53) indicating that immersed-why participants (M = 4.78, SD = 2.09) and distanced-why participants (M = 4.91, SD

= 1.90) did not differentially perceive the cause of the negative interaction as manageable by them, something they can regulate, and over which they have power. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .48, $t(478) = 1.26$, $p = .21$), age (β = -.15, $t(480) = -.41$, $p = .68$), and counterbalance (β = .52, $t(480) = 1.42$, $p = .16$). *External Control.* The effect of condition was significant ($F(1, 482) = 4.46$, $p = .03$) indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = 5.08$, $SD = 1.61$) perceived the cause of the negative interaction as something under the power, regulation, and control of other people more so than immersed-why participants ($M = 4.73$, $SD = 1.97$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .03, $t(478) = .10$, $p = .92$), age (β = .24, $t(480) = .71$, $p = .48$), and counterbalance (β = -.24, $t(480) = -.73$, $p = .46$). Next, participants causal descriptions were examined. The effect of condition was only significant for the "interrogative" LIWC category, ($F(1, 518) = 4.10$, $p = .04$), indicating that distanced-why participants ($M = .39$, $SD = 1.58$) were more likely to use words like "how", "when", and "what" than immersed-why participants ($M = .16$, $SD = .95$).

Motivation Attributions. *In-Group Attributions.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 480) = .001$, $p = .97$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.08$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 2.54$, $SD = 1.13$) did not differ in their perceptions of U.S. nationals' negative out-group perceptions. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.17, $t(476) = -.83$, $p = .41$), age (β = .32, $t(478) = 1.56$, $p = .12$), and counterbalance (β = .15, $t(478) = .74$, $p = .46$). *Personal Attributions.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 480) = .20$, $p = .65$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 2.89$, $SD = 1.23$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 2.84$, $SD = 1.11$) did not differ in their perceptions of the interlocutor's negative out-group perceptions. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .032, $t(476) = .14$, $p = .89$), age (β = -.07, $t(478) = -.33$, $p = .74$), and counterbalance (β = -.18, $t(478) = -.85$, p

= .39).

Self-Concept Coherency. *Self-Concept Coherency.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 481) = 1.3$, $p = .25$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 4.74$, $SD = 1.74$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 4.89$, $SD = 1.33$) did not differ on perceived self-concept coherency. There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.25$, $t(477) = -.95$, $p = .33$), age ($\beta = -.29$, $t(479) = -1.11$, $p = .26$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.18$, $t(479) = -.72$, $p = .46$). *Perceptions of Self-Change.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 481) = .323$, $p = .57$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 4.35$, $SD = 2.04$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 4.45$, $SD = 1.88$) did not differ on the extent to which they perceived self-change. There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.26$, $t(477) = -.68$, $p = .49$), age ($\beta = -.17$, $t(479) = -.48$, $p = .63$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.26$, $t(479) = -.71$, $p = .48$). *Perception of Self-Improvement.* The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 481) = 2.35$, $p = 0.13$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 5.14$, $SD = 1.41$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 5.33$, $SD = 1.31$) did not differ on the extent to which they perceived self-improvement. There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.26$, $t(477) = -.99$, $p = .32$), age ($\beta = -.41$, $t(479) = -1.61$, $p = .11$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.12$, $t(479) = -.48$, $p = .64$).

Perception of U.S. Nationality. The effect of condition was not significant ($F(1, 420) = 2.66$, $p = .10$) indicating that immersed-why participants ($M = 1.38$, $SD = .69$) and distanced-why participants ($M = 1.49$, $SD = .76$) did not differentially perceive the interlocutor as a U.S. citizen. There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.16$, $t(416) = -1.06$, $p = .29$), age ($\beta = .02$, $t(418) = .12$, $p = .90$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.025$, $t(418) = -.17$, $p = .86$).

Correlations

Main Measures. *Explicit Negative Affect.* Unsurprisingly, explicit negative affect positively

correlated with conflict status (r = .37, p < .001), conflict severity (r = .26, p < .001) and social rejection (r = .22, p < .001). *Wise reasoning.* Curiously, the fourth theoretically driven dimension ("search for compromise and conflict resolution") negatively correlated with the "impersonal pronouns" LIWC dimension (e.g., "it", "it's", "those"; r = -.09, p = .03) of participants' causal descriptions. The negative association indicates that as conflict solution based orientation increased the use of impersonal pronouns (e.g., referring to a group of people as *"those" people*) decreased. Wise reasoning positively correlated with self-distancing index (r = .29, p < .001).[24] Additionally, wise reasoning positively correlated with conflict status (r = .13, p = .002), conflict severity (r = .19, p < .001), and social rejection (r = .17, p = .02), indicating perhaps that as negative intergroup interactions grow more severe the more wisdom one draws for the experience. Wise reasoning and third-party intervention share a positive association (r = .11, p = .02) indicating that as third-party intervention increases so does wise reasoning. Similarly, as the likelihood of reencountering the interlocutor increases so does wise reasoning (r = .19, p < .001). There was no association between the number of people present during the interaction and wise reasoning (r = .07, p = .14). *Emotional Reactivity.* Emotional reactivity positively correlated with imagery vividness (r = .18, p < .001) indicating that as mental images grow more vivid the more emotionally reactive one becomes. Emotional reactivity shares a positive association with conflict status (r = .56, p < .001), conflict severity (r = .35, p < .001), and social rejection (r = .28, p < .001), indicating that as negative intergroup interactions grow more severe the greater

[24] Self-distancing also positively correlated with all wise reasoning dimensions: theoretically-driven: dimension 1, "others' perspectives" (r = .29, p < .001); dimension 2, "consideration of change and multiple ways situations may unfold", (r = .21, p < .001), dimension 3, "intellectual humility & recognition of limits of knowledge", (r = .25, p < .001), dimension 4, "search for a compromise & conflict resolution", (r = .27, p < .001), dimension 5, "view the event through the vantage point of an outsider", (r = .27, p < .001), empirically-driven: dimension 1, "change-focused reasoning", (r = .26, p < .001), and dimension 2, "outsider-focused reasoning", (r = .31, p < .001).

emotional reactivity experienced. Memory age and emotional reactivity share a negative association (r = -.12, p = .01) indicating that the older a memory becomes the less emotional reactivity it arouses. *Mental Construal.* Recounting and reconstrual positively correlated with the self-distancing index (r = .15, p < .001; r = .30, p < .001, respectively) indicating as mental recounting (i.e., focusing on "what" features of the situation) and reconstruing (i.e., focusing on "why" features of the situation) increase so does self-distancing.

Secondary Measures. *Causal descriptions.* Since the self-distancing index yielded a weak Cronbach alpha (α = .36) each self-distancing item was examined separately. A correlation analysis revealed a positive correlation between the observer self-distancing item, "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer, even if the experience involved you directly?" and the "second person pronoun" LIWC dimension (e.g., "you", "your", "thou"; r = .10, p = .02). This finding indicates that greater use of an observer perspective is associated with greater use of second person pronouns. *Self-Concept Coherency.* Perceptions of self-change and self-improvement positively correlated with self-distancing (r = .18, p < .001; r = .17, p < .001, respectively) indicating that as self-distancing increases so does perceptions of self-change and self-improvement. Similarly, memory age positively correlates with perceptions of self-change and self-improvement (r = .35, p < .001; r = .29, p < .001, respectively) indicating that the older the memory the greater perceived self-change and self-improvement (for a more comprehensive review of Study 1 correlations see Tables 1.1 and 1.2).

Summary

Two major findings emerged from the first investigation. Firstly, the effect of condition proved effective in the predicted direction for the self-distancing index. Distanced-why participants self-distanced more during recall than immersed-why participants. Curiously

however, immersed-why participants did not mentally conjure more vivid images than distanced-why participants. Secondly, distanced-why participants did not experience a reduction in explicit negative affect when compared to immersed-why participants, but did experience marginal increases in wise reasoning and reconstruing. Distanced-why participants descriptively ranked higher on all wise reasoning dimensions. The effect of condition, however, was only significant for the "search for compromise and conflict resolution" dimension indicating that distanced-why participants engaged in greater conflict resolution reasoning than immersed-why participants. Similarly, distanced-why participants ranked higher on the empirically driven outsider-focused wise reasoning dimension than immersed-why participants. The effect of condition was additionally significant for external control indicating that distanced-why participants perceived the cause of the negative interaction as something under the control of external forces more so than immersed-why participants. To some extent, the two major findings are not attributable to distanced-why and immersed-why participants experiencing qualitatively different negative intergroup interactions. Specifically, both groups did not differ on perceived conflict status, conflict severity, perceived social rejection, the likelihood of reencountering the interlocutor, the extent to which third-party mediators were involved and on their perceptions of the interlocutor as a U.S. citizen. Both groups also did not differ on memory-age, indicating that recalled memories were within a similar time frame. Further, both groups did not differ in their perceived motivation attributions suggesting that self-analysis did not influence negative personal and in-group attitudes held by the interlocutor and mainstream Americans. The groups also did not differ on perceived self-change and self-improvement. Overall, the first investigation provided empirical evidence to support self-distancing as a useful tool in managing negative intergroup interactions to the degree that the perspective facilitates *solution based* and *outsider-focused* wise

reasoning.

Study Two

The second investigation replicates the first but without a manipulation of self-distancing and aims to expand from the first investigation in several ways. First, to investigate the degree to which *spontaneous* self-distancing engenders adaptive self-regulation participants' spontaneous responses to the same recall instructions from the first study are measured. Curiously, the distanced-why perspective proved ineffective at reducing explicit negative affect and emotional reactivity when compared to the immersed-why perspective. Three possibilities might explain why there was no effect of condition on explicit negative affect. One possibility is that the distanced-why perspective is not potent enough as a psychological tool to effectively attenuate explicit negative affect for negative intergroup contact among U.S. first-generation immigrants. Another possibility is that the PANAS measure may not be suited for capturing explicit negative affect among first-generation immigrants (e.g., the emotion item "ashamed" may be interpreted differently across cultures; see Ersoy, Born, Derous, & Van der Molen, 2011). Lastly, cultures differ on the degree to which negative emotions ought to be expressed and disclosed to others (especially strangers) and this may have consequently impacted participant disclosure (see Soto, Perez, Kim, Lee & Minnick, 2011; Su, Wei & Tsai, 2014). Some participants may not have felt comfortable disclosing their explicit negative emotions or else behaved within the social norms of their culture. The latter two possibilities suggest that an explicit affect measure may prove inadequate for uncovering if and how affect relates to self-distancing. To address these possibilities the second investigation expands from the first by additionally administering an implicit affect measure (i.e., a Word Stem Task adapted from DeWall et al., 2011). Further, in-group heterogeneity is investigated to the extent that first-generation immigrants differ on

acculturation strategies.

Redfield, Linton, and Herskovits (1936, pg. 149) define acculturation as "those phenomena which result when groups of individuals having different cultures come into continuous first-hand contact with subsequent changes in the original culture patterns of either or both groups." According to Berry (1997) two points are relevant to a discussion of acculturation. The first point pertains to the personal value one places on their ethnic identity and the second point pertains to the personal value placed towards maintaining and managing a relationship with the new dominant society. If one reasons that maintaining one's ethnic identity is necessary but still believes that maintaining a relationship with the new society is important, then one voluntarily engages in an acculturation process termed *integration*.[25] The second type of acculturation strategy is *assimilation*. This strategy is similar to the integration strategy in that the acculturating group attempts to maintain a relationship with the larger society. However, the non-dominant acculturating group devalues preserving and maintaining their original ethnic culture and identity. The third type of acculturation strategy is *separation*. In this case, the acculturating group believes that their original ethnic identity is to be valued and maintained. Managing their relationship with the larger dominant society is deemed unimportant and is not pursued. The fourth type of acculturation strategy is *marginalization*. In the case of marginalization, one does not value their ethnic identity and their relationship with the larger society.[26] Berry's (1997) description of the dominant acculturation strategies parallel the

[25] A prerequisite to the integration acculturation strategy requires the dominant society to be willing to appreciate the difficulties of the acculturating group and choose to engage in positive contact with its members at the individual and institutional levels.

[26] It is important to evaluate points pertaining to *personal agency* in the acculturation process. According to Berry (1997, pg. 8), "Some groups have entered into the acculturation process voluntarily (e.g. immigrants) while others experience acculturation without having sought it out (e.g. refugees and indigenous peoples)." Different concepts must be used when an acculturating group is provided (by the new dominant cultural environment to a large extent) with little

strategies described by Mezzich et al. (2009) in their discussion on biculturalism and cultural identity. The integration, assimilation, separation, and marginalization acculturation strategies correspond to the acculturation strategies identified by Mezzich et al. (2009), which are, *bicultural*, *acculturated* (dominant monocultural), *culturally traditional* (original monocultural), and *culturally marginalized*, respectively. For consistency purposes, the terms identified by Mezzich et al. (2009) are used for the remainder of the paper. In discussing biculturals and wisdom within the theoretical context of acculturation, West, Zhang, Yampolsky, and Sasaki (2017, pg. 35) state:

> Cognitively, the integrating process involves biculturals forming links between often conflicting perspectives in order to reconcile differences and unite their two cultures into a greater whole within themselves. These abilities (i.e., adopting alternative perspectives, searching for reconciliation, thinking in terms of the "big picture") dovetail with several of the essential facets of wisdom, or wise reasoning (Grossmann et al., 2012; Kross & Grossmann, 2011). Therefore, integrating cultures may foster biculturals' propensity for wisdom more generally, particularly when reasoning about conflict. Recent research on wise reasoning

---

personal agency in selecting their acculturation strategy. This may occur when the acculturating group experiences *acculturative stress* resulting from a dominant group's institutional policies (e.g. policies enforcing a ban against the acculturating group's symbols and clothing) and the dominant social structure. This in turn, forces the acculturating group into pre-selected acculturative strategies. For example, when members of the acculturating group are forced to separate from maintaining a relationship with the larger society such a forced strategy is referred to as *segregation*. Likewise, when *assimilation* is forced by the dominant society, the idea of a "Pressure Cooker" (vs. a "Melting Pot") may be the more appropriate concept to use. In the case of *marginalization*, it is rarely enacted upon voluntarily, according to Berry (1997, pg. 10) people, "usually become marginalised as a result of attempts at forced assimilation (Pressure Cooker) combined with forced exclusion (Segregation); thus, no other term seems to be required beyond the single notion of Marginalisation." Unlike the other acculturative strategies, the integration strategy by definition can only be enacted upon voluntarily and requires the dominant society, to some degree, to be welcoming and accepting of the acculturating group.

> demonstrates that one route to wisdom hinges on the ability to "transcend egocentric viewpoints," which people can achieve by adopting a self-distanced perspective in order to boost their abstract thinking (Grossmann & Kross, 2012; Kross & Grossmann, 2011). These findings tie directly to the process of integrating cultures and to our previous prediction regarding integrating and abstract motivation: *integrating cultures is an inherently abstract process that requires biculturals' awareness and active reconciliation of multiple perspectives, and may rely on the same self-distancing or third-person perspective as wise reasoning*. Biculturals who are successful at integrating their cultures may therefore apply these underlying skills to resolving conflicts in their everyday lives, thereby demonstrating more wisdom in their reasoning.

For the present investigation, West et al. (2017) would theorize that bicultural first-generation immigrants might engage in greater perspective taking than non-biculturals (via ranking higher on the self-distancing measure). Such a finding would suggest that a potential boundary condition to the self-regulation benefits of self-distancing for first-generation immigrants might be one's acculturation strategy.

Method

Participants. A study advertisement (i.e., MTurk HIT) targeted first-generation immigrants and the same pre-study screener items from Study 1 determined participant eligibility.[27] The final

[27] *Repeated for accessibility:* To identify first-generation immigrants for Study 1 and 2, three pre-study screener items were used: 1) "A first-generation immigrant was born outside the country they immigrated to. Are you a first-generation immigrant?" (Yes/No), 2) "Did you immigrate to the United States from another country?" (Yes/No) and 3) "I was born in the United States" (Yes/No). All participants who responded "Yes" to the first two questions and "No" to the third question proceeded past the first segment of the pre-study screener. Participants involved in controlled laboratory experiments are exposed to fewer distractions than participants involved in online studies. To screen in non-distracted participants five items were used for the

sample is composed of 511 consenting U.S. first-generation immigrants from MTurk.[28] Like Study 1, the sample is composed of more males (61.8%) than females (37.2%), and the average participant is 30 years old (M = 30, Mdn = 28).

Exclusion Criteria. The same demographic questions from the first investigation were administered to identify inconsistencies in "first-generation immigrant" self-identification: 1) "Where were you born?", 2) "What is your country of birth?", and 3) "What year did you immigrate to the U.S.A.?". Participants who answered "The United States of America" for the first two questions (n = 0 & 2, respectively) and "I didn't immigrate to the U.S.A., I was born there" (n = 9) were removed from the final data set. Once again, participants who responded inconsistently to the first two questions were removed from the final data set (n = 16). In total 61 participants were removed.[29]

Procedure. The procedure for Study 2 replicates the procedure for Study 1 but without a self-perspective manipulation. Participants were instructed to recall a negative intergroup interaction using the same recall instructions from Study 1. Recall instructions are followed by a package of measures. The following dependent measures were administered again: the negative affect (NA) subscale of the PANAS (Watson et al., 1988), self-distancing (Kross et al., 2012), mental

---

last segment of the pre-study screener: 1) "Right now, do you have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey?" (Yes/No), 2) "Do you agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else?" (Yes/No), 3) "Have you turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings?" (Yes/No), 4) "Have you closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer that would otherwise distract you from the survey?" (Yes/No), and 5) "If you have answered "Yes" to all of the questions above, then click "I'm ready to begin" to proceed to the survey," (I'm ready to begin/I'm not ready to begin just yet). All participants who answered, "Yes" and "I'm ready to begin" proceeded past the pre-study screener.

[28] The 511 participants all passed the information consent form (i.e., all participants consented) and passed both study pre-screeners.

[29] Due to a programming mistake 38 baseline affect responses were identified within the explicit negative affect response dataset. A statistical assessment of explicit negative affect meant removing the 38 responses (see supplementary material for more information).

construal (Kross et al., 2012), imagery vividness (Kross et al., 2012), third-person mediator, reencounter experience, perceptions of conflict severity and perceptions of social rejection. Participants were administered an acculturation measure so that cross-group comparisons could be made (Mezzich et al., 2009) and to qualitatively examine autobiographical writing participants were instructed to describe in writing the negative intergroup interaction. The package of measures was followed by a demographic questionnaire and the same mood booster tasks from Study 1. Participants were lastly debriefed and remunerated (see Appendix B Study 2 Materials).

Measures

Memory Descriptions. Autobiographical writing uncovers and engenders explicit and implicit emotions and cognitions not always captured by Likert-scale measures (e.g., Park, Ayduk, & Kross, 2016; Richeson & Thorson, 2002). To investigate if and how spontaneous self-distancing relates to linguistic self-distancing (e.g., the use of third-person pronouns vs. first-person pronouns, see Kross et al., 2014) and emotionally laden autobiographical writing (e.g., the use of words such as "worried" and "fearful") we tasked participants to describe their memories in writing.

> Now, please describe to us in detail what happened when you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. What happened exactly? Who was there? What were you specifically thinking and feeling? Did your emotions and thoughts change as the situation unfolded? Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" responses and your responses will remain confidential. Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

Self-distancing. The same three self-distancing items from Study 1 were administered again but

were slightly re-worded for Study 2 (items were adapted from Kross et al., 2012): 1) "To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?" (1 = "I replayed the memory entirely through my own eyes", 7 = "I did not replay the memory at all through my own eyes"), 2) "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer?" (1 = "I did not replay the memory at all as an observer", 7 = "I replayed the memory entirely as an observer") and 3) "As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?" (1 = "Very close, saw it through my own eyes", 4 = "Neither too close nor too far", 7 = "Very far, saw it as if an observer"). The second item did not correlate with the first (r = -.007, p = .89) and correlated weakly with the third item (r = .17, p < .001). A factor analysis was conducted to uncover underlying components. The first and third items represented one dimension while the second item was identified as a second independent component. Since the first and third items correlated relatively strongly with one another (r = .57, p < .001), they were averaged to create a single index of self-distancing (M = 3.40, SD = 1.54; Cronbach's α = .72). The second item was examined separately of the created self-distancing index.

Imagery vividness. To investigate spontaneous imagery vividness participants rated the extent to which they experienced their memory as vivid and clear (i.e., "My memory of this experience was vivid and clear"; 5-point scale; 1 = "strongly disagree", 5 = "strongly agree"; Kross et al., 2012; M = 4.02, SD = .92).

Memory age. Like Study 1 participants rated when the situation took place (i.e., "When did the experience you recalled during the study happen?"; 0 = "less than a month ago", 1 = "approximately 6 months ago", 2 = "approximately a year ago", 3 = "2-3 years ago", & 4 = "4 or more years ago"; Ayduk & Kross, 2010; M = 3.6, SD = 1.31).

Conflict severity. To discover the severity of the negative interactions participants responded to

the same three items from Study 1: 1) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve verbal disagreements between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no verbal disagreement at all", 7 = "significant verbal disagreement"), 2) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve angry outbursts between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no angry outbursts at all", 7 = "significant angry outbursts"), and 3) "To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve physical confrontation between yourself and the other person?" (1 = "no physical confrontation at all", 7 = "significant physical confrontation"). Since the items correlated strongly with one another ($p < .001$), they were averaged to create a single conflict-severity index ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.47$; Cronbach's $\alpha = .67$).

Social rejection. Participants indicated the extent to which they experienced social exclusion (i.e., "When you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, to what extent did you feel socially excluded?"; 1 = "Not at all socially excluded", 7 = "Very socially excluded"; $M = 4.71$, $SD = 1.99$).

Bystanders. To investigate the number of people present during the negative intergroup interactions the same "bystander" measure from Study 1 was administered. A large numerical scale allows for greater response variability so responses were made on a numerical scale that ranged from 1 to 100+. The majority of participants indicated two people present during the incident (i.e., "How many people were involved in the incident?"; the top three percentages are as follows: "1 person", 10.6%; "2", 33.1%; "3", 11.2%).

Reencounter experiences. Participants indicated the extent to which they would reencounter the person from the negative interaction using the same single item from Study 1 (i.e., "Will you likely interact with the person you had the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with

again?"; 1 = "no, most unlikely", 7 = "yes, most likely"; *M* = 3.95, *SD* = 2.25).

Third-person mediator. Participants were measured on the extent to which a third-person mediator intervened in the negative interaction (i.e., "Did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve a third-person mediator? That is, someone who tried to help you, the other person, or both of you resolve the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict?"; 0 = "no", 1 = "a little bit", 7 = "yes, the majority of the time"; *M* = 3.79, *SD* = 2.36).

Explicit negative affect. To investigate spontaneous explicit negative affect, participants were administered the negative affect (NA) subscale of the Positive and Negative Affect Schedule (PANAS; 5-point scale; 1 = "very slightly or not at all", 5 = "extremely"; *M* = 1.77, *SD* = .89; Watson et al., 1988). The items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$) so they were collapsed to form a single negative affect index (Cronbach's $\alpha = .93$).

Implicit Affect. To investigate implicit affect, a 45-fragment Word Stem Task (DeWall et al., 2011) was administered. The task consists of four components: seven filler stems (e.g., "e[at]"), nineteen positive mood stems (e.g., "gre[at]"), fourteen negative mood stems (e.g., "up[set]"), three implicit belonging stems (e.g., "acc[ept]") and four implicit rejection stems (e.g., "lon[e]"). The frequency of completed stems within each category determined the extent to which participants tuned toward implicit positivity, negativity, belongingness, and rejection (see Appendix A Table 2.1).

Bicultural Measure. To investigate bicultural identity the Modified Cortes, Rogler, and Malgady's Bicultural Scale Generic-Version was administered (Mezzich et al., 2009). The scale consists of 20 questions assessing the extent with which one adopts one's original ethnic culture and the mainstream American culture. For example, participants were asked, "How much are the values common in your country of origin (are mainstream American values) a part of your life?"

and "How comfortable would you be in a group of people from your country of origin (of mainstream Americans)?" (0 = "Not at all", 3 = "Very much"; see Appendix A Table 2.2). In line with previous research, all items correlated strongly ($p < .01$) with their respective dimensions (i.e., the original ethnic vs. mainstream American culture), so they were averaged to create two indices labeled "ethnic" and "American" culture (Cronbach's $\alpha = .86$ and .88, respectively). The measure identifies four acculturation strategies, 1) "culturally marginalized" (summed ratings, X_i, are < 15 on both cultures), 2) "culturally traditional" (original monocultural; $X_i \geq 15$ on the original ethnic culture and $X_i < 15$ on the American "host" culture), 3) "acculturated" (dominant monocultural; $X_i < 15$ on the original ethnic culture and $X_i \geq 15$ on the American "host" culture), and 4) "bicultural" ($X_i \geq 15$ on both cultures).[30] Group sample values were drastically uneven ($n = 15, 42, 35, \& 262$, respectively), so all non-bicultural categories were grouped together ($n = 92$) to allow for comparisons between non-biculturals and biculturals (hereinafter referred to as the "bicultural identity" groups).[31] *Additional Ethnic and American Culture Indices.* In addition to the bicultural measure, 17 additional items were generated for the ethnic (i.e., culture of the country of origin) and American host culture (34 items in total) to further examine the degree to which biculturalism correlates with spontaneous reactions to negative intergroup interactions (see Appendix A Table 2.3; Cronbach's $\alpha = .92, .91$, respectively).

Cultural Similarities. Western cultures (e.g., the British culture) share more cultural similarities with the American host culture (e.g., the English language) than Eastern cultures (e.g., the Japanese culture). To investigate perceived similarity between the ethnic and American host

[30] The listed cut off values for the acculturation strategies are in line with Mezzich et al. (2009).
[31] Grouping all non-bicultural categories improved the overall non-bicultural *n* value, but the difference between the two bicultural-identity groups remains large ($n = 170$) enough to prove problematic for analyses of variance assumptions. A more detailed discussion follows in the limitations section of the present paper.

culture participants were asked, "How similar is mainstream American culture to the culture in your country of origin?" (1 = "Extremely different", 7 = "Extremely similar"; *M* = 3.99, *SD* = 1.60).

Mental construal. Participants completed five items examining mental construals: for recounting, 1) "my thoughts focused on the specific chain of events—sequence of events, what happened, what was said and done—as I thought about the experience in this study" (*M* = 3.81, *SD* = .93), and for reconstruing, 1) "as I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that caused me to think differently about the experience", 2) "as I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that made me experience a sense of closure," 3) "thinking about my experience during the experiment led me to have a clearer and more coherent understanding of this experience", and 4) "I feel a sense of closure about this experience." Since the reconstruing items were strongly correlated ($p < .001$), they were collapsed to form a single reconstruing index (*M* = 3.36, *SD* = .99; Cronbach's $\alpha = .83$).

Perception of U.S. Nationality. To investigate perceptions of U.S. nationality participants were asked, "Was the person you had a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with a citizen of the United States?" ("Yes", 59.3%; "No", 13.3%; "I don't know"; 8.8%).

Ethnic Identity of the Interlocutor. To uncover the ethnic identity of the interlocutor participants were asked, "What was the ethnicity of the other person?". The most frequent ethnic identity was White (39.5%) followed by Asian (16.2%) and African American (10.2%).[32]

Results

Overview. The second investigation did not involve a psychological manipulation. Correlations

[32] Ethic Identity of the Interlocutor: White (39.5%), Asian (16.2%), African-American (10.2%), Aboriginal or Native American (5.9%), Latino (3.3%), Middle Eastern (2.3%), East Indian (2.0%), and Other (1.8%).

across all measures were examined first.[33] A secondary analysis involved uncovering group differences across the acculturation strategies (i.e., "culturally marginalized", "culturally traditional" (original monocultural), "acculturated" (dominant monocultural), & "bicultural"). For the secondary analysis, main and interactive effects of age and gender were examined via separate hierarchical regressions for each dependent variable.[34] Completing an explicit negative measure (via the PANAS) before an implicit affect measure (via the 45-item Word Stem Task) may impact perceptions differently than if explicit negative emotions were analyzed last. Once again, the investigation sought to prevent order-effects. To that extent, the explicit and implicit negative affect measures were counterbalanced. The impact of order-effects on each dependent variable was examined via hierarchical regressions involving the main and interactive effects of counterbalance (PANAS presented first vs. Word Stem Task presented first).[35]

Correlations - Main Analysis

Main Measures. *Self-distancing.* The self-distancing index correlated negatively with imagery vividness (r = -.31, p < .001) indicating that as self-distancing increases the mental image is less vivid. *Explicit Negative Affect.* Explicit negative affect shares a significant positive correlation with the "Negative Emotion" LIWC dimension (e.g., "hurt", "ugly", "nasty"; r = .11, p = .01) indicating that as explicit negative affect increases so does the use of negative emotion words in autobiographical writing. Similarly, explicit negative affect negatively correlated with implicit

[33] Since Study 2 serves as the correlational counterpart to Study 1 correlation matrices were conducted first.

[34] In line with the first investigation, hierarchical regressions included main effects on Step 1 (e.g., the main effects of 'bicultural identity group' and gender) and an interaction on Step 2 ('bicultural identity group' × gender). Main effects on Step 1 were of interest if an interaction on Step 2 was statistically significant.

[35] *Repeated for accessibility:* the impact of the following statistical examinations is beyond the scope of the present research due to time and resource constraints: 1) outlier analyses, 2) analysis of covariance (ANCOVA), 3) skew-adjustment transformations, and 4) replacement of missing values. Future re-analyses may incorporate these statistical examinations to ensure optimum statistical accuracy in data-treatment.

positive affect (r = -.12, p = .007) indicating that as explicit negative affect increases implicit positive affect decreases. A similar pattern was uncovered for implicit negative affect (r = -.09, p = .048). Curiously, and unlike Study 1, explicit negative affect positively correlated with self-distancing (r = 31, p < .001). *Implicit Negative Affect.* There was a significant negative correlation between self-distancing and implicit negative affect (r = -.094, p = .046) indicating that as spontaneous self-distancing increases implicit negative affect decreases. To uncover the robustness of this finding, correlations between self-distancing and the affective LIWC dimensions were examined. A significant negative correlation between the "Anxiety" LIWC dimension (e.g., "worried", "fearful") and spontaneous self-distancing was uncovered (r = -.14, p = .004) indicating that as spontaneous self-distancing increases anxiety-laden autobiographical writing decreases. *Implicit Positive Affect.* Curiously, implicit negative and positive affect are positively correlated (r = .54, p < .001). *Mental Construal.* Unlike Study 1, recounting negative correlated with self-distancing (r = -.26, p < .001), indicating that as recounting increases self-distancing decreases. There was no correlation between reconstrual and self-distancing (r = -.03, p = .43).

Secondary Measures. Next, correlations between secondary measures were examined. *Conflict Severity.* Imagery vividness and conflict severity shared a positive association (r = .18, p < .001) indicating that as conflict severity increases the clarity and vividness of images in mental imagery also increase. Memory age negatively correlated with conflict severity (r = -.24, p < .001) indicating that the older the memory the less perceived conflict severity. *Additional Cultural Indices.* Next, correlations were examined between the generated ethnic and host culture indices and dependent variables of interest. The ethnic and host culture indices negatively correlated with the self-distancing index (r = -.14, p = .009 and r = -.11, p = .03, respectively)

indicating that greater association with either one of the two cultures the less one ranks on self-distancing. The ethnic culture index positively correlated with social rejection (r = .16, p = .003) indicating that as association with one's ethnic culture increases so does perceived social rejection. Interestingly, the American host culture index shared no association with social rejection (r = -.06, p = .21) and a negative association with explicit negative affect (r = -.12, p = .01) indicating that as association with the American host culture increases the less explicit negative affect one expresses for negative intergroup interactions (for a more comprehensive review of Study 1 correlations see Tables 2.1 and 2.2).

Supplementary Analysis

Memory Descriptions. The autobiographical descriptions were examined first to uncover if differences exist between the bicultural identity groups in their English-writing capabilities.[36] Perhaps unsurprisingly, the difference between bicultural identity groups was significant for the "dictionary" LIWC dimension (F(1, 352) = 5.06, p = .02) indicating that biculturals (M = 92.69, SD = 4.96) used greater dictionary words than non-biculturals (90.71, SD = 11.71). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.76, t(350) = -.39, p = .69), age (β = -1.97, t(348) = -1.12, p = .26), and counterbalance (β = -1.14, t(350) = -.65, p = .52). Next, personal and impersonal

[36] Next, all LIWC dimensions were examined. The difference between bicultural identity groups was marginally significant for the following LIWC dimensions: 1) *"Comparisons"* (e.g., "greater", "best", "after"; F(1, 352) = 3.85, p = .05; bicultural: M = 1.99, SD = 2.64; non-bicultural: M = 2.60, SD = 2.24), 2) *"Number"* (e.g., "second", thousand"; F(1, 352) = 2.73, p = .09; bicultural: M = .84, SD = 1.23; non-bicultural: M = 1.92, SD = 10.39); 3) *"Risk"* (e.g., "danger", "doubt"; F(1, 352) = 3.29, p = .070; bicultural: M = .79, SD = 1.60; non-bicultural: M = .46, SD = 1.08), 4) *"Relativity"* (e.g., "area", "bend", "exit"; F(1, 352) = 3.21, p = .07; bicultural: M = 13.37, SD = 8.06; non-bicultural: M = 11.71, SD = 6.22), 5) *"Quotation marks"* (F(1, 352) = 3.08, p = .08; bicultural: M = .21, SD = .71; non-bicultural: M = .39, SD = 1.16), and 6) *"Total function words"* (e.g., "it", "to", "no"; F(1, 352) = 2.77, p = .09; bicultural: M = 57.20, SD = 8.38; non-bicultural: M = 58.89, SD = 8.41). The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant for the following LIWC dimensions: 1) *"Time"* LIWC dimensions (e.g., "end", "until", "season"; F(1, 352) = 6.33, p = .012; bicultural: M = 5.04, SD = 3.76; non-bicultural: M = 3.96, SD = 2.80) and 2) *"Auxiliary Verbs"* (e.g., "am", "will", "have"; F(1, 352) = 3.89, p = .049; bicultural: M = 8.12, SD = 4.37; non-bicultural: M = 9.11, SD = 3.38).

pronouns were examined. The difference between bicultural identity groups was only significant for the "third-person plural" LIWC dimension (e.g., "they", "their", "they'd"; $F(1, 352) = 6.87$, $p = .009$), indicating that biculturals ($M = .88$, $SD = 1.56$) wrote their experiences using less third-person plural words (e.g., *"they"* did this…) than non-biculturals ($M = 1.40$, $SD = 1.91$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = .34$, $t(350) = .78$, $p = .43$) and counterbalance ($\beta = .31$, $t(350) = .76$, $p = .45$). There was an interactive effect of age ($\beta = -.83$, $t(348) = -2.1$, $p = .04$). Pairwise comparisons of the omnibus 2 × 2 ANOVA (bicultural identity: bicultural vs. non-bicultural × age: age ≥ 30 vs. age < 30) were examined to uncover the locus of the interaction. The effect of condition was significant for participants less than 30 years old ($F(1, 348) = 10.70$, $p = .001$) indicating that non-bicultural participants ($M = 1.66$, $SD = 2.20$) wrote their experiences more using third-person plural words than bicultural participants ($M = .76$, $SD = 1.51$).

Self-distancing. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant for the self-distancing index ($F(1, 351) = .033$, $p = .86$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.29$, $SD = 1.61$) and non-biculturals ($M = 3.32$, $SD = 1.37$) did not differ on the constructed index.[37] There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.61$, $t(349) = -1.5$, $p = .13$), age ($\beta = .43$, $t(347) = 1.15$, $p = .25$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.11$, $t(349) = -.30$, $p = .76$). Next, each self-distancing item was examined separately. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant for the first item, "To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?" ($F(1, 351) = .09$, $p = .77$), indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.15$, $SD = 1.80$) did not differ from non-biculturals ($M = 3.20$, $SD = 1.63$). Similarly, The difference between

[37] When all three items are used as an index of self-distancing (which would be problematic given Cronbach's $\alpha = .49$), the difference between bicultural identity groups is still not significant ($F(1, 350) = 2.10$, $p = .15$; bicultural: $M = 3.67$, $SD = 1.27$; non-bicultural: $M = 3.45$, $SD = 1.22$).

bicultural identity groups was not significant for the third item, "As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?", ($F(1, 351) = .00$, $p = .98$), indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.80$) did not differ from non-biculturals ($M = 3.44$, $SD = 1.56$). The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant for the second item, "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer?", ($F(1, 350) = 11.38$, $p = .001$), indicating that biculturals ($M = 4.44$, $SD = 1.82$) replayed the memory more as an observer than non-biculturals ($M = 3.69$, $SD = 1.80$).

Imagery Vividness. The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant ($F(1, 352) = 7.95$, $p = .002$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 4.14$, $SD = .81$) imaged their experience more vividly than non-biculturals ($M = 3.85$, $SD = 1.01$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.11$, $t(350) = -.46$, $p = .64$), age ($\beta = -.19$, $t(348) = -.94$, $p = .35$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.14$, $t(350) = -.64$, $p = .53$).

Memory Age. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant ($F(1, 352) = 3.59$, $p = .06$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.59$, $SD = 1.30$) reported memories around the same time frame as non-biculturals ($M = 3.89$, $SD = 1.30$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = -.16$, $t(350) = -.48$, $p = .63$), age ($\beta = .05$, $t(348) = .15$, $p = .88$), and counterbalance ($\beta = -.39$, $t(350) = -1.24$, $p = .21$).

Conflict Severity. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant ($F(1, 351) = 3.14$, $p = .08$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.88$, $SD = 1.55$) experienced interactions of similar severity as non-biculturals ($M = 3.57$, $SD = 1.40$). There were no interactive effects of gender ($\beta = .53$, $t(349) = 1.40$, $p = .16$), age ($\beta = .12$, $t(347) = .34$, $p = .73$), and counterbalance ($\beta = .09$, $t(349) = .26$, $p = .79$).

Social Rejection. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant ($F(1,$

352) = .26, p = .61) indicating that biculturals (M = 4.73, SD = 1.80) perceived similar levels of social rejection as non-biculturals (M = 4.65, SD = 1.83). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .07, t(350) = .14, p = .88), age (β = .31, t(348) = .72, p = .47), and counterbalance (β = .16, t(350) = .36, p = .72).

Bystanders. The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant (F(1, 343) = 6.35, p = .01) indicating that biculturals (M = 3.52, SD = 6.32) reported less people present during the negative intergroup interaction than non-biculturals (M = 6.42, SD = 15.09). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -1.51, t(341) = .91, p = .36), age (β = 4.66, t(339) = 2.01, p = .05), and counterbalance (β = 2.16, t(341) = .93, p = .35).

Reencounter Experiences. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (F(1, 352) = .09, p = .77) indicating that biculturals (M = 3.97, SD = 2.27) and non-biculturals (M = 3.89, SD = 2.35) reported the same likelihood of reencountering the interlocutor from their negative interactions. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.16, t(350) = .82, p = .41), age (β = .65, t(348) = 1.17, p = .24), and counterbalance (β = -.40, t(350) = -.72, p = .47).

Third-person Mediator. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (F(1, 352) = 3.45, p = .06) indicating that biculturals (M = 3.86, SD = 2.38) and non-biculturals (M = 3.32, SD = 2.31) did not receive differential third-party intervention. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.38, t(350) = -.62, p = .53), age (β = -.29, t(348) = -.52, p = .60), and counterbalance (β = .35, t(350) = .61, p = .54).

Explicit Negative Affect. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (F(1, 351) = .07, p = .79) indicating that biculturals (M = 1.73, SD = .91) and non-biculturals (M = 1.71, SD = .85) did not differ on explicit negative affect. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .23, t(349) = .97, p = .33), age (β = .22, t(347) = 1.06, p = .29), and counterbalance

(β = .29, *t*(349) = 1.36, *p* = .17).

Implicit Affect. *Implicit Belonging.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (*F*(1, 352) = .08, *p* = .78) indicating that biculturals (*M* = .77, *SD* = .61) and non-biculturals (*M* = .75, *SD* = .62) experienced similar levels of implicit belonging. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .17, *t*(350) = 1.05, *p* = .29), age (β = .11, *t*(348) = .76, *p* = .45), and counterbalance (β = .06, *t*(350) = .39, *p* = .69). *Implicit Rejection.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (*F*(1, 352) = .81, *p* = .37) indicating that biculturals (*M* = 2.01, *SD* = .94) and non-biculturals (*M* = 1.91, *SD* = 1.04) experienced similar levels of implicit rejection. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = -.17, *t*(350) = -.66, *p* = .51), age (β = .23, *t*(348) = .98, *p* = .33), and counterbalance (β = -.07, *t*(350) = -.28, *p* = .78). *Implicit Negative Affect.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant (*F*(1, 352) = 4.17, *p* = .04) indicating that biculturals (*M* = 4.69, *SD* = 2.10) experienced greater implicit negative affect than non-biculturals (*M* = 4.16, *SD* = 2.25). There were no interactive effects of age (β = -.59, *t*(348) = -1.14, *p* = .27) and counterbalance (β = .35, *t*(350) = .67, *p* = .50). There was an interactive effect of gender (β = 1.58, *t*(350) = 2.83, *p* = .005). Pairwise comparisons of the omnibus 2 × 2 ANOVA (bicultural identity: bicultural vs. non-bicultural × gender: male vs. female) were examined to uncover the locus of the interaction. Male bicultural participants (*M* = 4.97, *SD* = 2.16) experienced more implicit negative affect than male non-bicultural participants (*M* = 3.89, *SD* = 2.27; *F*(1, 350) = 11.73, *p* = .001) and female bicultural participants (*M* = 4.33, *SD* = 1.99; *F*(1, 350) = 5.73, *p* = .01). *Implicit Positive Affect.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant (*F*(1, 352) = .75, *p* = .39), indicating that biculturals (*M* = 4.64, *SD* = 2.10) and non-biculturals (*M* = 4.42, *SD* = 2.11) experienced similar levels of implicit positive affect. There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .18, *t*(350) = .33, *p* = .74), age (β

= .79, $t(348) = 1.53$, $p = .13$), and counterbalance (β = -.28, $t(350) = -.540$, $p = .59$).

Similarity and Additional Cultural Indices. *Similarity*. The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant ($F(1, 349) = 13.03$, $p < .001$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 4.16$, $SD = 1.58$) perceived greater similarity between their ethnic and the American host culture than non-biculturals ($M = 3.47$, $SD = 1.55$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .16, $t(347) = .39$, $p = .69$) and counterbalance (β = -.17, $t(347) = -.45$, $p = .65$). There was an interactive effect of age (β = 1.01, $t(345) = 2.67$, $p = .008$). Pairwise comparisons of the omnibus 2 × 2 ANOVA (bicultural identity: bicultural vs. non-bicultural × age: age ≥ 30 vs. age < 30) were examined to uncover the locus of the interaction. The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant for participants less than 30 years old ($F(1, 345) = 19.61$, $p < .001$) indicating that bicultural participants ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.46$) perceived greater similarity between their ethnic and the host culture than non-bicultural participants ($M = 3.23$, $SD = 1.63$). The difference between age groups was significant for biculturals ($F(1, 345) = 6.79$, $p = .01$) indicating that bicultural participants less than 30 years old ($M = 4.37$, $SD = 1.46$) perceived greater similarity between their ethnic and the American host culture than bicultural participants more than 30 years old ($M = 3.86$, $SD = 1.67$).

Mental Construal. *Recounting.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant ($F(1, 351) = 13.17$, $p < .001$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 4.00$, $SD = .81$) recounted more than non-biculturals ($M = 3.63$, $SD = .97$). There were no interactive effects of gender (β = .08, $t(349) = .37$, $p = .71$), age (β = -.08, $t(347) = -.40$, $p = .69$), and counterbalance (β = .03, $t(349) = .14$, $p = .89$). *Reconstruing.* The difference between bicultural identity groups was significant ($F(1, 350) = 13.67$, $p < .001$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 3.46$, $SD = 1.0$) reconstrued more than and non-biculturals ($M = 3.02$, $SD = .94$). There were no interactive

effects of gender (β = -.007, $t(348) = -.026$, $p = .98$), age (β = .005, $t(346) = .02$, $p = .98$), and counterbalance (β = .22, $t(348) = .93$, $p = .35$).

Perception of U.S. Nationality. The difference between bicultural identity groups was not significant ($F(1, 352) = .3$, $p = .58$) indicating that biculturals ($M = 1.33$, $SD = .65$) and non-biculturals ($M = 1.29$, $SD = .58$) did not differ in their perceptions of the interlocutor as a U.S national. There were no interactive effects of age (β = .05, $t(348) = .36$, $p = .71$) and counterbalance (β = -.03, $t(350) = -.20$, $p = .84$). There was an interactive effect of gender (β = .33, $t(350) = 2.02$, $p = .04$). Pairwise comparisons of the omnibus 2 × 2 ANOVA (bicultural identity: bicultural vs. non-bicultural × gender: male vs. female) were examined to uncover the locus of the interaction. All pairwise comparisons were non-significant ($.10 < p > .19$).

Summary

The second investigation expanded from the first investigation in two major ways. First, by administering an implicit affect measure the association between self-distancing and affect could be more thoroughly examined. In line with previous findings (e.g., Kross et al. 2005), a negative association between spontaneous self-distancing and implicit negative affect was uncovered. This finding indicates that as spontaneous self-distancing increases implicit negative affect decreases. The associations between self-distancing and the affective LIWC dimensions were additionally examined to uncover the robustness of spontaneous self-distancing in attenuating negative emotions. A similar pattern was uncovered. Specifically, self-distancing was negatively associated with the "Anxiety" LIWC dimension indicating that as spontaneous self-distancing increases anxiety-laden autobiographical writing decreases. Curiously, a positive association between self-distancing and explicit negative affect was uncovered ($r = 31$, $p < .001$) indicating that as spontaneous self-distancing increases so does explicit negative affect. Explicit

negative affect and self-distancing did not significantly correlate in Study 1 however (r = .061, p = .18). Visual perspective in mental imagery (i.e., first- vs. third-person visual perspective) may shed light on one possible explanation for the positive association between explicit negative affect and self-distancing. Stepping back from a negative interaction involves viewing *the pictured self* (i.e., the self in the environmental context) in the conjured image. In doing so, facial expressions (i.e., personal and others' expressions) and emotionally-laden body language may become salient contextual features. Seeing an event through one's own eyes immerses the pictured self into *the present self* (i.e., the self of the person recalling the event). Consequently, the facial expressions and non-verbal cues of the interlocutor are made more salient than those of the perceiver. In a first-person vantage point, the perceiver is made more immersed in the felt experience. Perceivers may be less self-aware of personal emotional expressions than perceivers adopting a third-person vantage point. Overall, adopting a third-person vantage point may make salient explicit emotions and in turn aid in participant self-disclosure (e.g., "yes I felt distressed – my arms were crossed") when compared to the first-person vantage point. This line of reasoning, however, is pegged on the possibility that at least some participants did not follow the PANAS instructions fully. That is, the PANAS instructed participants to report what they felt "right now". It may be possible that participants reported past explicit negative emotion (which is made salient to them via the self-distanced perspective). Unlike the PANAS (which is susceptible to demand characteristics), the implicit negative affect measure may better indicator of current "right now" emotion (i.e., it has been demonstrated to tap into emotion outside of participants' awareness, see Dewall et al., 2011). This possibility may explain why self-distancing positively correlated with explicit negative affect but negatively correlated with implicit negative affect. Finally, the second investigation expanded from the first investigation by measuring

acculturation strategies. Biculturals were uncovered to adopt an observer perspective more so than non-biculturals. To some degree, this finding is an indication that acculturation strategies may serve as potential boundary conditions to the benefits of spontaneous self-distancing for first-generation immigrants.

General Discussion

Negative intergroup experiences can worsen intergroup relations (e.g., Paolini, Harwood, & Rubin, 2010). However, positive intergroup contact experiences may undermine collective action toward bettering the social status of disadvantaged groups (see Cakal et al., 2011). The present investigation aimed to move forward from the unidimensional framework where negative intergroup contact is often viewed as hazardous to intergroup relations. The investigation sought to uncover a tool by which negative intergroup experiences may be applied toward the collective good. Positive features of negative experiences may be uncovered through self-distanced engendered wisdom (Kross & Grossmann, 2012). Reframing situational features via wise reasoning and self-distancing may facilitate the emergence of positive situational features (e.g., reexamining how one will reason about out-groups in the future). In this way, the first investigation sought to uncover if self-distancing may be utilized for negative intergroup contact experiences. Since spontaneous reactions inform the extent to which thoughts and emotions naturally occur, a second investigation was conducted to uncover natural responses to negative intergroup interactions. The second investigation expanded from the first by examining group-heterogeneity via acculturation strategies among first-generation immigrants. Overall, results were mixed.

Theoretical and Practical Implications

Negative Affect and Wise Reasoning. Explicit negative affect increased from baseline but

adopting a distanced-why perspective proved ineffective at mitigating post-recall negative affect when compared to the immersed-why perspective. This finding suggests that distancing from one's self and taking an emotional "why" focus while analyzing one's emotions appear ineffective at reducing explicit negative affect for negative intergroup interactions. In line with previous research, however, distanced-why participants were descriptively higher on all wise reasoning dimensions than immersed-why participants. The effect of condition was only significant for the fourth dimension, referred to as the "search for compromise and conflict resolution" dimension. Since items from the wise reasoning scale could potentially form different dimensions than the theoretical dimensions outlined by Brienza et al. (2017) a factor analysis was conducted to investigate empirically occurring dimensions. A factor analysis revealed two dimensions. Based upon item grouping, the first dimension is relatively more representative of change-focused reasoning whereas the second component is relatively more representative of outsider-focused reasoning. When compared to the immersed-why perspective, the effect of the distanced-why perspective proved to increase only outsider-focused reasoning.

The distanced-why strategy failed to mitigate increases in explicit negative feelings (e.g., feeling angry, upset, distressed, etc.) for negative intergroup interactions, but despite this the distanced-why perspective still proved effective at increasing wise reasoning overall. As such, the distanced-why perspective may still prove useful for negative intergroup interactions. In the context of intergroup relations, explicit negative feelings may remain stable or increase for conflicting intergroup members, especially for interactions involving prejudice, discrimination, and racism. Reconciling explicit negative emotions with and about an interlocutor suspected of holding negative attitudes toward an in-group may prove challenging, since often times, social norms delineate feelings of anger, frustration, and distress to be appropriate emotional responses

to social injustices, especially ones involving features of discrimination. One possibility therefore is that in such circumstances the distanced-why perspective may prove ineffective at reducing explicit negative emotions. Further, it may be less possible to entirely emotionally resolve negative intergroup interactions than negative intra- or interpersonal interactions. One possible explanation may be that for negative intergroup interactions it may be more realistic for a perceiver to *cognitively manage* than to *emotionally reconcile* their experiences. When compared to the immersed-why perspective, wiser reasoning, via the distanced-why perspective, may prove to be one effective tool to manage negative intergroup interactions. Although there was no effect of condition in the predicted direction for explicit negative affect the second investigation uncovered some empirical evidence to suggest that spontaneous self-distancing may still prove to attenuate negative emotions. Overall, the self-distancing index was negatively associated with implicit negative affect and the "Anxiety" LIWC dimension. This finding suggests that self-distancing overall may still prove to be a useful tool for decreasing implicit negative affect and anxiety-laden autobiographical writing.

Autobiographical Writing. The fourth theoretically driven dimension, "search for compromise and conflict resolution", negatively correlated with the "impersonal pronouns" LIWC dimension (e.g., "it", "it's", "those") indicating that as resolution based reasoning increases the use of impersonal pronouns decreases. Similarly, in Study 2, the difference between bicultural identity groups was apparent for the "third-person plural" LIWC dimension (e.g., "they", "their", "they'd") indicating that non-biculturals wrote their experiences using more third-person plural words (e.g., *"they"* did this…) than biculturals. One account for this pattern of findings comes from research indicating that pronouns use may be suggestive of intergroup bias (see Perdue, Dovidio, Gurtman, & Tyler, 1990). A reference to a group of people as "Black" or "White"

people may be an accurate description of the group. A reference to a group of people as *"those" people* however may be suggestive of negative out-group connotations. One of the first steps toward conflict resolution involves recognizing the interlocutor as similar to the perceiver, rather than an objectified target in space. The negative association between impersonal pronouns and resolution based reasoning may be explained therefore by the extent to which one feels a sense of "shared humanity": *How can bring this conflict to an end with 'this' person? When I think deeply about things, I see that in many ways Mark is similar to me.* Since non-biculturals, by definition either immerse themselves in one of two cultures (i.e., the ethnic or the host culture) or in neither of the two cultures, they have less of an invested interest in bridging cultural differences than biculturals. One possibility for the use of third-person plural pronouns in non-biculturals' autobiographical writing may be, to some extent, an indication of non-bicultural perceivers *vilifying* the interlocutor and *victimizing* the self: *"they" did this to 'me' and "they'll" do it again if I'm not careful.* Centered in dichotomous thinking (i.e., the "Other" is bad & "I" am good) is a self-protective motivation (Crocker & Major, 1989). Since self-protective motivations conflict with self-expansion motivations, which require openness to experience and risk-taking, biculturals, whose aim it is to expand the self to integrate various cultural identities (for a review see West et al. 2017), would less likely engage in dichotomous explanations.

Bicultural Identity. Bicultural and non-bicultural first-generation immigrants experienced similar negative intergroup interactions to the extent that both groups did not differ on perceived conflict severity, perceived social rejection, potential reencounter experiences, and third-party interventions. Additionally, both groups did not differ on memory-age, indicating that their recalled memories were within a similar time frame. Biculturals however replayed more vivid mental images, experienced interactions with fewer bystanders, recounted (i.e., thought about the

series of events) and reconstrued (i.e., mentally reframed features of the situation) more so than non-biculturals. When measured on the self-distancing index, there was no difference between biculturals and non-biculturals on their reports of spontaneous self-distancing. Since the self-distancing items proved to be problematic (see the limitations section), all self-distancing items were examined separately. Curiously, and in line with previous research, when measured on the following item "To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer?", biculturals replayed their experiences as observers more so than non-biculturals. When measured on explicit negative affect, both groups did not differ in their self-reports. At the non-conscious level however, biculturals experienced greater implicit negative affect than non-biculturals.

Valuing social cohesion may mean greater negative personal impact when social disorder manifests. Unlike non-biculturals, biculturals, by definition, invest greater effort in both their ethnic and host cultures. Incorporating one's self into both cultures while maintaining harmony between both cultures can serve to be socially rewarding but may also prove to be cognitively taxing. For biculturals, experiencing negative intergroup interactions may be an indication that one is poorly managing both cultures. Alternatively, a negative social interaction may mean that a bicultural's *tried and true* social scripts, facial expressions, and overall behaviors are not effective at managing all types of social situations. Consequently, experiencing a perceived unsuccessful social interaction may be more impactful for a bicultural than a non-bicultural. This line of reasoning accounts for why biculturals cognitively recounted and reconstrued more than non-biculturals. To manage life circumstances, biculturals may have attempted to rationalize, and thereby downplay, their explicit feelings about the negative experience, which explains why biculturals did not differ from non-biculturals in their explicit negative affect. At the non-conscious level however, biculturals' invested interest in managing social interactions was

demonstrated by their tuning toward greater implicit negativity than non-biculturals, an indication they were more negatively impacted by the negative experience than non-biculturals.

Limitations and Future Directions

Self-Distancing. Initial inspection of the self-distancing items prompted discussion that for a first-generation immigrant population the items require revision from their original forms. Reliability assessments of the self-distancing items for both studies however, proved the use of this measure to be problematic, despite revisions. The use of all items in a reliability analysis for the first and second study indicated Cronbach alpha values of -.001 and .49 respectively; values below the acceptable cut off (see Tavakol & Dennick, 2011). Future research should consider piloting revised self-distancing items and including an open-ended question referencing the comprehensibility of the self-distancing items to first-generation immigrants (e.g., How do you interpret "seeing the image in your mind's eye"?). The second investigation did not measure wise reasoning. Consequently, the correlation between spontaneous self-distancing and wise reasoning could not be uncovered. Future research should measure spontaneous wise reasoning to uncover how spontaneous self-distancing relates to wisdom for negative intergroup interactions.

***Online Research*.** To be a participant in the present investigation, all first-generation immigrants had to have an MTurk account. Consequently, the pool of potential first-generation immigrants was limited to people who had access to additional electronic-based resources, such as, Internet, computers, laptops, cell-phones, and registration with Amazon Mechanical Turk. By not restricting participation via electronic-based resources future research may benefit from a wider first-generation immigrant participant pool. Conducting one-on-one controlled laboratory research may also eliminate the uncontrolled aspects of conducting online studies, such as,

preventing participants from viewing other websites, stopping unnecessarily throughout the experiment, removing cell-phone and conversation-related distractions, and perhaps most importantly, ensuring the same physical environmental space and social treatment for all participants.

Power. Since online studies involve less environmental control than laboratory experiments, participants are more vulnerable to distractions. Undistracted participants however, may still choose not to take the study seriously (i.e., participants may not talk, text, and surf online, for example, but may still choose to respond randomly to measures). The present investigation included at least 300 participants per study. However, what proportion of the entire sample followed through with all instructions? The present investigation did not include questions pertaining to the degree to which participants followed all instructions and, to ensure truthfulness in self-reports, timers for each study segment (e.g., 10 seconds spent on recall instructions more accurately indicates seriousness than self-report measures). Consequently, participant-*quality*, the truthful and serious dedication of participants, of the present investigation, may be cause for concern. In conjunction with reducing environmental distractions, future research should consider gathering more participants, especially if the research is conducted online. Simultaneously, future research should screen out poor quality participant (e.g., random responding behavior) to ensure sample-*power*, the correct identification of an existing effect, is not subsequently undermined.

The 2016-2017 U.S. Socio-political Climate. Left-wing U.S. political groups hoping for inclusive and equitable economic, social, and political reforms (e.g., greater ethnic and gender inclusivity in the workforce, improved adjustments to healthcare, and stable economic growth) have been growing progressively more disconcerted with discourses and policies executed by the

on-going Trump administration. Discourse pertaining to gender harassments cases targeting female staff and persons (Benoit, 2017), the ban and airport-mistreatment of immigrants and refugees (e.g., United States District Court, 2017), questionably managed U.S. trade agreements (Stiglitz, 2017), and the rapid increase in the number of Trump-inspired White supremacy groups (Giroux, 2017) are indicative of a drastically changing U.S. sociopolitical climate, especially when compared to the previous Obama Administration. Demonstrations exemplifying national civil unrests engendered by the growingly impactful climate include "The Women's March" on Washington (Childers, 2017), the mass airport anti-immigration-ban demonstrations (Regan, 2017) and the anti-Trump Tower protests (Kellner, 2017). In Virginia, the unsanctioned "Unite the Right" White-nationalists rally resulted in the death of a counter-protester and the injury of many more (Hanna, Hartung, Sayers, & Almasy, 2017). The first study ran during the 2016 U.S. Presidential Election and the second study after Donald Trump was inaugurated as the 45th U.S. president. Since the present investigation involves immigrant-identity and negative intergroup interactions, participants may have responded differentially to our measures depending on the degree to which the changing U.S. sociopolitical environment impacted their mental wellbeing and opinions. Future research should include questions examining the extent to which sociopolitical policies, civil unrests, and social disharmony impact participant-perceptions.

Concluding Comment

The present research sought to expand from the notion that negative intergroup interactions are disadvantageous to societal adaptive growth. The research investigated if wise reasoning and self-distancing may be used toward transforming negative intergroup interactions for perceivers. The research uncovered some empirical support to suggest that for negative intergroup contact self-distancing may facilitate increases in wise reasoning and decreases in

implicit negative affect. Further research is required, however, before conclusions can be made regarding the robust effects of self-distancing for negative intergroup contact.

Tables
Study 1

Table 1.0 – Means and Standard Deviations for the Effect of Condition on Study 1 Measures

		Experimental Conditions	
		Immersed-Analysis	*Distanced-Analysis*
Self-Distancing Index	**	3.99 (1.29)	4.43 (1.26)
Base Negative Affect		1.64 (.82)	1.69 (.84)
Explicit Negative Affect		2.01 (.89)	2.01 (.85)
Wise Reasoning	†	3.76 (1.01)	3.93 (.96)
Emotional Reactivity		3.00 (.94)	2.99 (.89)
Recounting		2.94 (.93)	3.09 (.93)
Reconstruing	†	3.50 (.99)	3.59 (.93)
Imagery Vividness		4.09 (.90)	3.99 (.90)
Memory Age		3.46 (1.27)	3.53 (1.11)
Conflict Status		2.72 (1.16)	2.70 (1.16)
Conflict Severity		3.92 (1.26)	3.90 (1.21)
Social Rejection		4.79 (2.05)	4.62 (1.91)
Bystanders		1.53 (.70)	1.59 (.75)
Reencounter		3.63 (2.10)	3.29 (1.91)
Third Person Mediator		3.66 (2.24)	3.55 (2.21)
Locus of Causality		4.98 (1.97)	5.12 (1.72)
External Control	*	4.73 (1.97)	5.08 (1.61)
Stability		5.14 (1.72)	5.25 (1.70)
Personal Control		4.78 (2.09)	4.91 (1.90)
Personal Attributions		2.89 (1.23)	2.84 (1.11)
In-group Attributions		2.54 (1.08)	2.54 (1.13)
Perceptions of Self-Change		4.35 (2.04)	4.45 (1.88)
Perceptions of Self-Improvement		5.14 (1.41)	5.33 (1.31)

Note. Numbers in parentheses are standard deviations. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ † $p < .10$.

Table 1.1 – Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study 1 Main Measures

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
01. Self-Distancing	4.20	1.29	-	-.155**	.786**	.776**	.057	.061	.299**	.052	.153**	.300**
02. Own Eyes Item‡	3.01	1.56		-	-.344**	.105*	-.016	-.023	-.273**	-.237**	-.302**	-.184**
03. Observer Item	4.57	1.67			-	.219**	-.011	.012	.330**	.091*	.205*	.247**
04. Far-Away Item	3.84	1.65				-	.101*	.082	.134**	-.015	.028	.223**
05. Base Negative Affect	1.67	.83					-	.692**	.034	.308**	.028	.188**
06. Explicit Negative Affect	2.01	.87						-	.070	.460**	.122**	.202**
07. Wise Reasoning	3.84	.98							-	.217**	.406**	.420**
08. Emotional Reactivity	2.99	.91								-	.309**	.282**
09. Recounting	3.54	.96									-	.348**
10. Reconstruing	3.01	.93										-

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ † $p < .10$. ‡ The first self-distancing item, "own-eyes item", is reverse-coded.

Table 1.1 – *N* Values

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
01. Self-Distancing	-	480	480	480	480	480	479	480	480	480
02. Own Eyes Item‡		-	480	482	482	482	481	482	482	482
03. Observer Item			-	480	480	480	479	480	480	479
04. Far-Away Item				-	482	482	481	482	482	482
05. Base Negative Affect					-	512	509	510	509	509
06. Explicit Negative Affect						-	508	510	509	509
07. Wise Reasoning							-	508	507	507
08. Emotional Reactivity								-	509	509
09. Recounting									-	509
10. Reconstruing										-

Note. $479 \leq N \geq 509$. Missing values excluded pairwise.

Table 1.2 – Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study 1 Secondary Measures

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
01. S.D.	4.20	1.29	-	-.155**	.786**	.776**	.178**	.044	-.002	.147**	.037	.089	.104*	.120*	.033	.063	.011	-.125**	.092	.134*	.185**	.174**
02. O.E.‡	3.01	1.56		-	-.344**	.105*	-.470**	-.023	-.046	-.146**	-.205**	-.029	-.076	-.032	-.100*	.019	-.053	-.100*	-.210**	-.095*	-.060	-.122**
03. O.I.	4.57	1.67			-	.219**	.328**	.058	-.017	.099*	.062	.041	.088	.053	.033	.038	-.021	-.127**	.101*	.087	.096*	.194**
04. F.A.I.	3.84	1.65				-	-.057	.014	.014	.133**	.008	.093	.063	.127**	.026	.057	.032	-.059	.046	.116*	.197**	.085
05. I.V.	4.04	.902					-	-.071	.055	.208**	.157**	.021	.050	.046	.037	-.028	-.092*	.000	.187**	.075	.000	.151**
06. M.A.	3.50	1.19						-	-.249**	-.132**	.085	.024	-.255**	-.109*	.054	-.039	.093*	-.043	-.061	-.114*	.359**	.293**
07. C.S.	2.71	1.16							-	.337**	.154**	.128**	.200**	.227**	.005	-.048	-.172**	.130**	.315**	.311**	-.088	-.168**
08. C.Se	3.91	1.23								-	.355**	.130**	.153**	.344**	.035	-.062	-.033	.037	.442**	.401**	.110*	.045
09. S.R.	4.55	1.76									-	.097*	-.057	.096*	.046	-.104*	-.048	.097*	.353**	.233**	.176**	.182**
10. B.	1.56	.729										-	.094	.291**	-.052	-.055	-.025	-.072	.133**	.048	.132**	.019
11. R.	3.46	2.01											-	.220**	-.062	.067	-.043	-.041	-.004	.160**	-.127**	-.168**
12. T.P.	3.60	2.22												-	-.020	-.005	.004	-.103*	.289**	.208**	.105*	.051
13. L.C.	5.05	1.85													-	-.035	.329**	.593**	.128**	-.003	.039	-.045
14. E.C.	4.90	1.81														-	.120**	-.032	.002	.104*	.016	-.025
15. S.	5.19	1.71															-	.097*	-.019	-.015	.169**	.046
16. P.C.	4.85	2.00																-	.229**	.114*	-.128**	-.218**
17. P. A.	2.87	1.17																	-	.465**	.018	.015
18. I. A.	2.54	1.11																		-	.090*	-.032
19. S.C.	4.40	1.96																			-	.412**
20. S.I.	5.23	1.37																				-

Note.
* $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ † $p < .10$. ‡ The first self-distancing item, "own-eyes item", is reverse-coded.

Table 1.2 - *Legend*

Variable	Description	Variable	Description
01. S.D.	Self-Distancing	11. R.	Reencounter
02. O.E.‡	Own Eyes Item	12. T.P.	Third-Person Mediator
03. O.I.	Observer Item	13. L.C.	Locus of Causality
04. F.A.I.	Far-Away Item	14. E.C.	External Control
05. I.V.	Imagery Vividness	15. S.	Stability
06. M.A.	Memory Age	16. P.C.	Personal Control
07. C.S.	Conflict Status	17. P. A.	Personal Attributions
08. C.Se	Conflict Severity	18. I. A.	In-group Attributions
09. S.R.	Social Rejection	19. S.C.	Perceptions of Self-Change
10. B.	Bystanders	20. S.I.	Perceptions of Self-Improvement

Table 1.2 – *N* Values

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15	16	17	18	19	20
01. S.D.	4.20	1.29	-	480	480	480	480	480	480	420	420	420	420	420	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480
02. O.E.‡	3.01	1.56		-	480	482	482	482	482	422	422	422	422	422	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482
03. O.I.	4.57	1.67			-	480	480	480	480	420	420	420	420	420	480	480	480	480	480	480	480	480
04. F.A.I.	3.84	1.65				-	482	482	482	422	422	422	422	422	482	482	482	482	482	482	482	482
05. I.V.	4.04	.902					-	483	482	422	422	422	422	422	482	482	482	482	482	482	483	483
06. M.A.	3.50	1.19						-	482	422	422	422	422	422	482	482	482	482	482	482	483	483
07. C.S.	2.71	1.16							-	422	422	422	422	422	484	484	484	484	482	482	482	482
08. C.Se	3.91	1.23								-	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422
09. S.R.	4.55	1.76									-	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422
10. B.	1.56	.729										-	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422
11. R.	3.46	2.01											-	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422
12. T.P.	3.60	2.22												-	422	422	422	422	422	422	422	422
13. L.C.	5.05	1.85													-	484	484	484	482	482	482	482
14. E.C.	4.90	1.81														-	484	484	482	482	482	482
15. S.	5.19	1.71															-	482	482	482	482	482
16. P.C.	4.85	2.00																-	482	482	482	482
17. P. A.	2.87	1.17																	-	482	482	482
18. I. A.	2.54	1.11																		-	482	482
19. S.C.	4.40	1.96																			-	483
20. S.I.	5.23	1.37																				-

Note. $422 \leq N \geq 484$. Missing values excluded pairwise.

Study 2

Table 2.1 – Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study 2 Main Measures

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
01. Self-Distancing Index	3.40	1.54	-	.888**	.095*	.886**	.318**	-.094*	-.024	-.121*	.052	-.135**	-.011	.033	-.263**	-.037
02. Own Eyes Item	3.22	1.75		-	-.007	.573**	.281**	-.112*	-.016	-.071	.076	-.124**	.020	.012	-.270**	-.078
03. Observer Item	4.22	1.80			-	.176**	.146**	.077	-.048	-.032	.037	-.101*	-.027	.051	.213**	.388**
04. Far-Away Item	3.58	1.73				-	.280*	-.059	-.028	-.146**	.013	-.116*	-.042	.045	-.196**	.013
05. Explicit Negative Affect	1.77	.89					-	-.089*	-.121**	-.055	.115*	-.012	-.022	.087	-.019	.123**
06. Implicit Negative Affect	3.97	2.53						-	.543**	.127**	.115**	.196**	.100*	.024	.131**	.121*
07. Implicit Positive Affect	3.95	2.45							-	.145**	.123**	.108*	.101*	.017	.088	.041
08. Positive Emotion AW	2.29	3.89								-	-.086	-.011	-.093*	-.033	.047	.120*
09. Negative Emotion AW	2.91	3.91									-	.220**	.525**	.629**	.039	.056
10. Anxiety AW	.393	.972										-	-.005	.000	.024	.003
11. Anger AW	.835	1.63											-	.079	.049	-.068
12. Sadness AW	.609	1.91												-	-.006	.041
13. Recounting	3.81	.932													-	.358**
14. Reconstruing	3.35	.998														-

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ † $p < .10$. AW = Autobiographical Writing.

Table 2.1 – *N* Values

Variables	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
01. Self-Distancing Index	-	447	446	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	477	444	443
02. Own Eyes Item		-	446	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	444	443
03. Observer Item			-	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	447	443	442
04. Far-Away Item				-	448	448	448	448	448	448	448	448	444	443
05. Explicit Negative Affect					-	498	498	498	498	498	498	498	444	443
06. Implicit Negative Affect						-	511	511	511	511	511	511	444	443
07. Implicit Positive Affect							-	511	511	511	511	511	444	443
08. Positive Emotion AW								-	511	511	511	511	444	443
09. Negative Emotion AW									-	511	511	511	444	443
10. Anxiety AW										-	511	511	444	443
11. Anger AW											-	511	444	443
12. Sadness AW												-	444	443
13. Recounting													-	443
14. Reconstruing														-

Note. $442 \leq N \geq 511$. Missing values excluded pairwise.

Table 2.2 – Mean, Standard Deviations, and Correlations for Study 2 Secondary Measures

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
01. Self-Distancing Index	3.40	1.54	-	.888*	.095*	.886**	-.315**	.011	.141**	.033	-.020	.035	.165**
02. Own Eyes Item	3.22	1.75		-	-.007	.573**	-.328**	.021	.088	-.025	-.027	-.007	.114*
03. Observer Item	4.22	1.80			-	.176**	.189**	-.109*	.224**	.221**	.062	.057	.179**
04. Far-Away Item	3.58	1.73				-	-.230**	-.001	.161**	.084	-.008	.070	.178**
05. Imagery Vividness	4.02	.91					-	-.108*	.181**	.168**	.082	.090	.075
06. Memory Age	3.60	1.31						-	-.237**	.020	.061	-.095	-.153**
07. Conflict Severity	3.85	1.46							-	.234**	.056	.030	.444**
08. Social Rejection	4.66	1.80								-	-.011	-.085	.155**
09. Bystanders	4.19	8.89									-	-.092	.044
10. Reencounter	3.94	2.24										-	.226**
11. Third-Person Mediator	3.79	2.35											-

Note. * $p \leq .05$. ** $p \leq .01$ † $p < .10$.

Table 2.2 – *N* Values

Variables	*M*	*SD*	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
01. Self-Distancing Index	3.40	1.54	-	447	446	447	444	415	411	412	400	412	412
02. Own Eyes Item	3.22	1.75		-	446	447	444	415	411	412	400	412	412
03. Observer Item	4.22	1.80			-	447	443	414	410	411	399	411	411
04. Far-Away Item	3.58	1.73				-	444	415	411	412	400	412	412
05. Imagery Vividness	4.02	.91					-	416	412	413	401	413	413
06. Memory Age	3.60	1.31						-	412	413	401	413	413
07. Conflict Severity	3.85	1.46							-	412	400	412	412
08. Social Rejection	4.66	1.80								-	401	413	413
09. Bystanders	4.19	8.89									-	401	401
10. Reencounter	3.94	2.24										-	413
11. Third-Person Mediator	3.79	2.35											-

Note. $401 \leq N \geq 447$. Missing values excluded pairwise.

Appendices

Appendix A

Dependent Variable Tables

9-Point Scale	9	1
Locus of Causality	1. That reflects an aspect of yourself	Reflects an aspect of the situation
	2. Inside of you	Outside of you
	3. Something about you	Something about others
External Control	4. Over which others have control	Over which others have no control
	5. Under the power of other people	Not under the power of other people
	6. Other people can regulate	Other people cannot regulate
Stability	7. Permanent	Temporary
	8. Stable over time	Variable over time
	9. Unchangeable	Changeable
Personal Control	10. Manageable by you	Not manageable by you
	11. You can regulate	You cannot regulate
	12. Over which you have power	Over which you have no power

Table 1.1: Revised Causal Dimension Scale (RCD; 12 items; McCauley et al., 1992)

1. Others' Perspectives
    1. Considered the perspectives of the people involved in the situation
    2. Took time to consider what opinions the other involved people might have on the matter
    3. Tried to find a middle ground between different perspectives about the situation.
2. Consideration of Change and Multiple Ways Situations May Unfold
    4. Considered that the situation could change as it unfolded
    5. Believed the situation could lead to a number of different outcomes
    6. Thought the situation could unfold in many different ways.
3. Intellectual Humility & Recognition of Limits of Knowledge
    7. Looked for different reasons that could have led to this situation.
    8. Realized that there might be some reason for others' behaviour that I do not know.
    9. Considered the context of the situation before reacting to it.
4. Search for a Compromise & Conflict Resolution
    10. Looked for different ways the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict could be resolved
    11. Considered first whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved.
5. View the Event Through the Vantage Point of an Outsider
    12. Wondered how somebody else would reflect on this situation.
    13. Tried to see the problem from the view of an uninvolved person.

Table 1.2: Wise Reasoning Dimensions; theoretically-driven dimensions based on Briezna et al. (2017)

1. Change-focused Reasoning
    1. Thought the situation could unfold in many different ways.
    2. Looked for different ways the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict could be resolved
    3. Believed the situation could lead to a number of different outcomes
    4. Considered that the situation could change as it unfolded
    5. Took time to consider what opinions the other involved people might have on the matter
    6. Considered the perspectives of the people involved in the situation
    7. Considered the context of the situation before reacting to it.
    8. Looked for different reasons that could have led to this situation.
2. Outsider-focused Reasoning
    1. Tried to see the problem from the view of an uninvolved person.
    2. Wondered how somebody else would reflect on this situation.
    3. Considered first whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved.
    4. Tried to find a middle ground between different perspectives about the situation.
    5. Realized that there might be some reason for others' behaviour that I do not know.

Table 1.3: Wise Reasoning Dimensions; empirically-driven dimensions based on extraction method used for Brienza et al. (2017) 21-item wise reasoning scale (Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis; Rotation Method: Oblimin with Kaiser Normalization)

1. In-Group Motivation Attributions
    1. Most people from the U.S. dislike people from my country of origin.
    2. Most people from the U.S. have a negative opinion of people from my country of origin.
    3. Most people from the U.S. are not accepting of people from my country of origin.
    4. Most people from the U.S. view people from my country of origin as a threat.
2. Personal Motivation Attributions
    1. The person in the memory I recalled dislikes people from my country of origin.
    2. The person in the memory I recalled has a negative opinion of people from my country of origin.
    3. The person in the memory I recalled is not accepting of people from my country of origin.
    4. The person in the memory I recalled views people from my country of origin as a threat.

Table 1.4: Motivation Attribution Measure

1	2	3	4
Implicit Positive Mood	Implicit Negative Mood	Implicit Rejection	Implicit Belonging
1. Active	18. Afraid	32. Exclude	36. Accept
2. Alert	19. Anger/Angry	33. Hate	37. Include
3. Calm	20. Bad	34. Lone	38. Like
4. Caring	21. Blame	35. Reject	
5. Delight	22. Down		
6. Easy	23. Fear		
7. Excited	24. Guilty		
8. Glad	25. Low		
9. Good	26. Mad		
10. Great	27. Sad		
11. Happy	28. Scared		
12. Joy	29. Stress		
13. Lively	30. Upset		
14. Love	31. Worry		
15. Proud			
16. Secure			
17. Up			

Table 2.1: 45-Fragment Word Stem Task

Blanks: T H E [_/_]; S O [_/_]; N [_/_]; T E [_/_]; E [_/_]; Q U [_/_/_]; B LA [_/_/_]

1. Original Ethnic Culture
    1. How much are the values common in your country of origin a part of your life?
    2. How important is it to you to celebrate holidays in the ways they are celebrated in your country of origin?
    3. How important is it to you to raise your children with the values common in your country of origin?
    4. How comfortable would you be in a group of people from your country of origin?
    5. How proud are you of being from your country of origin?
    6. How much do you enjoy speaking the language or dialect of your country of origin?
    7. How much do you enjoy TV programs from your country of origin?
    8. How much do you like to eat food from your country of origin?
    9. Do you think people from your country of origin are kind and generous?
    10. How important would it be to you for your children to have friends from your country of origin?

2. Mainstream American Culture
    1. How important is it to you to celebrate holidays in the mainstream American way?
    2. How much are mainstream American values a part of your life?
    3. How comfortable would you be in a group of mainstream Americans?
    4. How important is it to you to raise your children with mainstream American values?
    5. How proud are you of a mainstream American identity?
    6. Do you think mainstream Americans are kind and generous?
    7. How much do you enjoy mainstream American TV programs?
    8. How much do you enjoy speaking English?
    9. How much do you like to eat mainstream American food?
    10. How important would it be to you for your children to have mainstream American friends?

Table 2.2: The Modified Cortes, Rogler, and Malgady's Bicultural Scale Generic-Version (Mezzich et al., 2009)

1. To what extent do you understand the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) used by Americans (people from your country of origin)?
2. To what extent do the clothes worn by Americans (people from your country of origin) seem sensible to you?
3. To what extent do you understand American humor (humor from people from your country of origin)?
4. To what extent do you understand American figures of speech (from your country of origin)?
5. To what extent do you understand American standards of beauty (from your country of origin)?
6. To what extent do you adopt American social conventions (from your country of origin)?
7. To what extent do you use the facial expressions that are typical of Americans (of people from your country of origin)?
8. To what extent do you use the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) that are typical of Americans (of people from your country of origin)?
9. To what extent do you wear the clothes typically worn by Americans (people from your country of origin)?
10. To what extent do you use American humor (humor used by people from your country of origin)?
11. To what extent do you use American figures of speech (from your country of origin)?
12. To what extent do you accept standards of American beauty (of beauty from your country of origin)?
13. To what extent do you appreciate American art (from your country of origin)?
14. To what extent do you appreciate American music (from your country of origin)?
15. To what extent do you appreciate American movies (from your country of origin)?
16. To what extent do you appreciate American novels (from your country of origin)?
17. To what extent do you follow American politics (from your country of origin)?

Table 2.3: Additional 17-Items per Culture (Ethnic* and American Culture; *in parenthesis)

Appendix B

Study 1 Materials

START

MTURK Recruitment

Study Description:

This HIT is a study seeking to recruit first-generation immigrants. The study investigates how people respond to recalling experiences of "culture clash" (a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different understandings, values, beliefs or expectations). You will be remunerated 50 cents (USD) for your participation.

Project Title	How different forms of self-analysis affect reactions to memories of culture clashes
Researchers	Hajer Al Homedawy (alxh4110@mylaurier.ca) Dr. Christian Jordan (cjordan@wlu.ca)
Ethics Reference Code	REB #5123
Compensation	$0.50 USD (payable via your online account)
Duration	30 minutes
Number of Participants	300

Description:
This is a study that is being conducted by Hajer Al Homedawy (Graduate Student, Wilfrid Laurier University) and Dr. Christian Jordan (Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University). We are looking for participants who are first-generation immigrants to the United States who have experienced "culture clash."

A "culture clash" is a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different culture-specific understandings, values, beliefs or expectations. Such clashes may be experienced by people who immigrate from one culture to another.

Participants will be asked to identify "a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person."

They will also be asked to provide demographic information (e.g., age, ethnicity, income).

Participants must meet the following criteria to take part in this study:

1. 18+ years of age.
2. Resident of the United States.
3. First-generation immigrant (i.e., born in another country and currently reside in the United States).\
4. Can remember an experience of "culture clash" (a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different understandings, values, beliefs or expectations)

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY (WLU)
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Title: How different forms of self-analysis affect reactions to memories of culture clashes

Principal Investigator: Hajer Al Homedawy
(Affiliation: WLU graduate student; e: alxh4110@mylaurier.ca;)
Supervisor: Dr. Christian Jordan
(Affiliation: faculty advisor; e: cjordan@wlu.ca; Office: N2022; N: 519 884 0710 Ext. 2574)

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate how people respond to memories of "culture clash"; specifically, you will be asked to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. The principal investigator, Hajer Al Homedawy is a WLU psychology graduate student. The faculty advisor, Dr. Christian Jordan, is a WLU psychology faculty member.

Note: To be eligible for this study, participants must be 18+ years of age, a resident of the United States, and a first-generation immigrant (i.e., you were born in another country and currently reside in the United States). You must also be able to identify a time when you experienced "culture clash."

INFORMATION

In this study, participants will be asked about specific memories. Once you have given your consent to participate in this study you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced a "culture clash;" that is, a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person.

Once you have recalled a single specific memory, you will be asked to reflect on it for some time. Next, you will be asked questions about what you experienced while you were reflecting, such as, "Thinking about the event right now made me feel upset (e.g., rejected, angry, hurt, sad)". You will also complete a brief demographic questionnaire. The full purposes of this study cannot be revealed at this time, but at the end of the study a thorough explanation will be provided. Approximately 300 participants recruited via MTurk will complete this study. The study will take no more than 30 minutes of your time. Participation is voluntary.

Risks

In this study you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced culture clash, which might cause you to experience negative feelings. That is, you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person. Recalling this time might make you feel upset or angry; this is normal and we expect the feelings you experience will be temporary and pass with time. Remember that you are free to discontinue your participation at any time and to omit answering any questions that make you uncomfortable. Please note that you will not have to describe what happened during the episode of culture clash at any point before, during, or after the study. Because recalling this memory may make you feel upset or angry, there are potential emotional and psychological risks involved in agreeing to participate in this study. If you experience any lasting negative feelings as a result of participating in this study, please contact the researchers and/or your local mental health care facility. All participants are free to call Mental Health America at 1-800-969-NAMI (6264; for specific mental health service referrals in your area, website: http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/). Please keep in mind that you may skip any question or completely withdraw from the study at any time.

BENEFITS

By partaking in this study you will be exposed to a study in the area of social psychology, and as a result you'll be exposed to learning about what is involved in being a participant. To some, contributing to the scientific progress is a valuable benefit. Furthermore, this study hopes to contribute to the body of literature in psychology about self-reflection.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your data will be confidential. Only the researchers listed at the top of this form will have access to the data. Please note, however, that while in transmission on the internet, confidentiality of data cannot be guaranteed. The researchers acknowledge that the host of the online survey (Qualtrics) may automatically collect participant data without their knowledge (i.e., IP addresses); however, the researchers will not use or save this information. Data will be stored on a password-protected computer in a locked lab at Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU). The anonymous data file will be maintained indefinitely and may be analyzed in the future as part of a separate project (i.e., secondary data analysis). Data will be presented in aggregate (e.g., means) in any study reports or presentations.

COMPENSATION

For your participation, $0.50 USD will be awarded to your Worker account. You may decline to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer and you can withdraw your participation at any time by ceasing to answer questions, without penalty or loss of remuneration. To receive remuneration please proceed to the end of the questionnaire, obtain the unique code for this HIT, and submit it. The amount received is taxable. It is your responsibility to report the amount received for income tax purposes.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study), you may contact the researcher, Hajer Al

Homedawy, at alxh4110@mylaurier.ca or her faculty supervisor at WLU, Dr. Christian Jordan at 519-884-0710 ext. 2574. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB #5123), which is supported by the Research Support Fund. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, WLU Research Ethics Board Chair, 519-884-0710 ext. 4994, rbasso@wlu.ca.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you may skip any question or procedure, or completely withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. If you withdraw from the study, please contact the researcher so that the debriefing can be emailed to you. Your data cannot be withdrawn once data collection is complete because data are stored without identifiers.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Should the research be reviewed and accepted by the research community, the results of the research will be disseminated as a psychological article in a scientific journal and/or presented in conferences and academic courses. The findings may be made available through Open Access resources. Since participants will be completing the present study anonymously and any identifying information will be deleted participants cannot obtain personal feedback information, but can contact the researchers to learn about aggregate research results once they have been finalized. Feedback will be available by September 30, 2017.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information.

- o I consent to participate in this study [clicking here will lead to study]
- o I do not consent to participate in this study [clicking here will return to browser]

Please indicate today's date: _____(DD/MM/YYYY)

We recommend that you print or save a copy of this form for your records.

Welcome and thank you for your interest in this study!
You will first be asked to complete some questions to confirm your eligibility for this study. If you do not meet the study criteria, your responses will be deleted and you will not receive remuneration for this study.

If you are eligible, you may begin the study. Because we are currently studying responses from certain populations, you will first be asked to respond to several background questions to determine eligibility in the study such as age, gender, and ethnicity. This part of the study will

take no more than 1 minute of your time. You will be taken to the study page if you are eligible for the study. There is no remuneration for completing the screening questionnaire.

1. What is your age? _____
2. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female
   - Other: (please specify)
3. What is your ethnicity?
   - 1. Aboriginal or Native American
   - 2. Asian
   - 3. African American
   - 4. East Indian
   - 5. Hispanic
   - 6. Middle Eastern
   - 7. White
   - 8. Other (Please specify)
4. A first-generation immigrant was born outside the country they immigrated to. Are you a first-generation immigrant?
   - Yes
   - No
5. Did you immigrate to the United States from another country?
   - Yes
   - No
6. I was born in the United States:
   - Yes
   - No
7. Where were, you born? (drop down list of countries)

Thank you for your interest in the study! You do not qualify to participate at this time. Please note, your responses will be deleted.

We have a few more questions to ask you before we begin…

1. Right now, do you have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey?
   - Yes
   - No
2. Do you agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else?
   - Yes
   - No
3. Have you turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings?
   - Yes

- No

4. Have you closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer that would otherwise distract you from the survey?
   - Yes
   - No

If you have answered "yes" to all of the questions above, then click 'I'm ready to begin' to proceed to the survey.

- I'm ready to begin
- I'm not ready to begin just yet

Thank you for your interest in the present study. However, you do not qualify to participate at this time due to one or all of the following reasons:

1. You've indicated you do not have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey.
2. You've indicated you do not agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else.
3. You've indicated you have not turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings.
4. You've indicated you have not closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer.

Please note, your responses will be deleted.

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way **right now, that is, at the present moment.**

Distressed				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Upset				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Guilty				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Scared				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely

1	2	3	4	5
Hostile				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Irritable				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Nervous				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Jittery				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Afraid				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

As an immigrant to the United States, you may have moved from one culture to another. Culture reflects specific ways of understanding the world, expectations about how to act or behave, common values, and so on. Culture may include religious beliefs or basic assumptions about how things should be done or how people should be treated. Everyone holds culture-specific understandings that they may not often think about (e.g., driving on the right side of the road). They may become more aware of these understandings, however, when they observe different cultural understandings or norms (e.g., driving on the left side of the road). Sometimes these differences may seem minor but at other times they may seem more significant.

We would like you to think of a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person.

Once a memory comes to your mind, allow yourself to consider this event, letting your thoughts and feelings about the event run through your mind for a few moments.

>>

We would now like you to think about this disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. Go back to the time and place of the situation you just recalled and picture it in your mind.

Now see the experience unfold through your own eyes as if it were happening to you all over again. Replay the event as it unfolds in your imagination through your own eyes.

Do you understand what we mean by the above instructions?

- Yes
- No

[

(If "No", participants are presented with simplified instructions:)

You should picture the event from a first-person visual perspective. With the first-person visual perspective you see the event from the visual perspective you had when the event was originally occurring. In other words, you can see your surroundings in the event looking through your own eyes.

Once again, see the experience unfold through your own eyes as if it were happening to you all over again. That is, re-experience the situation as if it is happening again, but do so through your own eyes.

Do you understand what we mean by the above instructions?

- Yes
- No

]

(If "Yes":)

Take a few moments to do this. When you're ready to continue press ">>".

As you continue to see the situation unfold through your own eyes, try to understand your feelings. Why did you have those feelings? What were the underlying causes and reasons?

Now take a few moments to close your eyes and experience the event.

We will continue in 60 seconds.

[We would now like you to think about this disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. Go back to the time and place of the situation you just recalled and picture it in your mind.

Now take a few steps back. Move away from the situation to a point where you can now watch the event unfold from a distance and see yourself in the event. As you do this, focus on what has now become the distant you. Now watch the experience unfold as if it were happening to the distant you all over again. Replay the event as it unfolds in your imagination as you observe your distant self.

Do you understand what we mean by the above instructions?
o Yes
o No

[

(If "No", participants are presented with simplified instructions:)

You should picture the event from a third-person visual perspective. With the third-person visual perspective you see the event from the visual perspective an observer would have had when the event was originally occurring. In other words, you can see yourself in the event as well as your surroundings.

Once again, watch the experience unfold as if it were happening to the distant you all over again. Replay the event as it unfolds in your imagination as you observe your distant self.

Do you understand what we mean by the above instructions?
o Yes
o No

]

(If "Yes":)

Take a few moments to do this. When you're ready to continue press ">>".

As you continue to watch the situation unfold to your distant self, try to understand his or her feelings. Why did you have those feelings? What were the underlying causes and reasons?

Now take a few moments to close your eyes and experience the event. We will continue in 60 seconds.]

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way **right now, that is, at the present moment.**

Distressed				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Upset				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Guilty				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Scared				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Hostile				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Irritable				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Nervous				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Jittery				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Afraid				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely

1	2	3	4	5

In thinking about the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, please rate the extent to which you...

44.Considered the perspectives of the people involved in the situation

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

45.Took time to consider what opinions the other involved people might have on the matter

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

46.Considered that the situation could change as it unfolded

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

47.Looked for different ways the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict could be resolved

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

48.Believed the situation could lead to a number of different outcomes

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

49.Thought the situation could unfold in many different ways.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

50.Looked for different reasons that could have led to this situation.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

51.Considered the context of the situation before reacting to it.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

52.Realized that there might be some reason for others' behaviour that I do not know.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

53.Tried to find a middle ground between different perspectives about the situation.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

54.Considered first whether it was possible to satisfy most of the people involved.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

55.Wondered how somebody else would reflect on this situation.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

56.Tried to see the problem from the view of an uninvolved person.

Not at all				Very much
1	2	3	4	5

These next questions ask you about your experiences while recalling the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict memory earlier in the study. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided:

Q66; Thinking about the event right now made me feel upset (e.g., rejected, angry, hurt, sad)

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q67; As I think about the event now, my emotions and physical reactions to this experience are still intense.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q68.0; I re-experienced the emotions I originally felt during the experience when I thought about it now.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q69; This experience remains unresolved and an active source of distress for me.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

These next questions ask you about your experiences while recalling the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict memory earlier in the study. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided:

Q60; My thoughts focused on the specific chain of events—sequence of events, what happened, what was said and done—as I thought about the experience in this study.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q61; As I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that caused me to think differently about the experience

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q62; As I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that made me experience a sense of closure.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q63.0; Thinking about my experience during the experiment led me to have a clearer and more coherent understanding of this experience.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Q64; I feel a sense of closure about this experience.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

In considering the

In considering the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that you recalled for this study, please write down what you see as the most significant reason why this conflict occurred. [text box provided]

Think about the reason or reasons you have written. The items below concern your impressions or opinions of this cause or causes of your performance. Circle one number for each of the following questions.

Is this cause(s) something:

That reflects an aspect of yourself	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Reflects an aspect of the situation
Manageable by you	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Not manageable by you
Permanent	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Temporary
You can regulate	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	You cannot regulate
Over which others have control	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Over which others have no

		control
Inside of you	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Outside of you
Stable over time	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Variable over time
Under the power of other people	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Not under the power of other people
Something about you	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Something about others
Over which you have power	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Over which you have no power
Unchangeable	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Changeable
Other people can regulate	9 8 7 6 5 4 3 2 1	Other people cannot regulate

---

These next questions ask you about

These next questions ask you about your thoughts about *why* the person you experienced disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with felt, said, and behaved the way they did.

Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided:

1. The person in the memory I recalled dislikes people from my country of origin.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

2. The person in the memory I recalled has a negative opinion of people from my country of origin.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

3. The person in the memory I recalled is not accepting of people from my country of origin

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

4. The person in the memory I recalled views people from my country of origin as a threat.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

These next questions ask you about your perceptions of people from the U.S. in general. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided:

1. Most people from the U.S. dislike people from my country of origin.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

2. Most people from the U.S. have a negative opinion of people from my country of origin.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

3. Most people from the U.S. are not accepting of people from my country of origin.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

4. Most people from the U.S. view people from my country of origin as a threat.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

These next questions ask you about your experiences while recalling the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict memory earlier in the study. Indicate your response using the scales provided.

To what extent did

To what extent you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?

I did not see the memory replay through my own eyes						I saw the memory replay through my own eyes
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer, even if the experience involved you directly?

I did not see the memory unfold as an observer						I did see the memory unfold as an observer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?

Very close, saw it through my own eyes			Neither too close nor too far			Very far, saw it as if an observer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

My memory of this experience

My memory of this experience was vivid and clear:

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

When did the experience you recalled during the study happen?

Less than a month ago	Approximately 6 months ago	Approximately a year ago	2-3 years ago	4 or more years ago
0	1	2	3	4

When did the experience

As you think about the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, please answer the following two questions:

Q104. Do you consider yourself today to be the same person you recalled in the memory or have you changed since that time?

I am the same today as I was in the memory						I am a very different person today than I was in the memory
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Q105. To the extent that you have changed since the experience you recalled, do you consider yourself to be a better person or worse off than you were at the time of the experience?

I am worse off person today than I was at the time of the experience			I am no better or worse today than I was at the time of the experience			I am a better person today than I was at the time of the experience
-3	-2	-1	0	1	2	3

Were you able to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them?

- Yes
- No

These next questions ask you about the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict you recalled earlier in the study.

1. Was the person you had a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict a citizen of the United States?
   - Yes
   - No
   - I don't know

2. When you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, to what extent did you feel socially excluded?

Not at all socially excluded						Very socially excluded
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

3. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve verbal disagreements between yourself and the other person?

No verbal disagreement at all						Significant verbal disagreement
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

4. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve angry outbursts between yourself and the other person?

No angry outbursts at all						Significant angry outbursts
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

5. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve physical confrontation between yourself and the other person?

No physical confrontation at all						Significant physical confrontation
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

6. How many people were involved in the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict?
   - 2 people
   - 3-6 people
   - 7-10 people
   - 10+ people
7. Will you likely interact with the person you had the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with again?

No, most unlikely						Yes, most likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

8. Did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve a third-person mediator? That is, someone who tried to help you, the other person, or both of you resolve the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict?

0	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
No	A little bit			Somewhat			Yes, the majority of the time

Next, we are going to ask you a few simple questions about your background:

1. What is your country of birth? (drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)

2. What year did you immigrate to the USA (drop down list: "I didn't move to the USA, I was born there", & 1900-2018)

3. Q123; Are you currently employed?
   - 1; Yes
   - 2; No

4. Q126; What is your marital status?
   - 1; Married
   - 2; Single
   - 3; Widowed
   - 4; Divorced
   - 5; Common Law
   - 6; Other (please specify)

5. Q127; What is the highest level of education you've received?
   - 1; Kindergarten or never attended school
   - 2; Grades 1-4, or equivalent
   - 3; Grades 5-8, or equivalent
   - 4; Grades 9-10, or equivalent
   - 5; More than grade 10 without secondary school completion, or equivalent
   - 6; Secondary school diploma or equivalent
   - 7; Some postsecondary education (e.g,. 2 years in a Science degree program)
   - 8; Postsecondary certificate, diploma or degree (e.g., Science, Arts, or English degree)
   - 9; Degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry
   - 12; Degree in law
   - 10; Master's degree (e.g., Masters in Business Administration, MBA)
   - 13; Doctorate (PhD)
   - 11; Other (please specify): _____

Finally, we just have a few questions for you about your experience while completing this online survey. Again we value your honest response, as this will help us to make the best use of the data we collect in this survey.

1. We are interested in the environments in which people complete our online surveys. Where are you completing this survey now?
   - o In my home
   - o At the library
   - o At a public computer lab
   - o In a coffee shop or restaurant
   - o In a public space outside
   - o Some other location (please specify): _____

2. Approximately how many other people are in the room where you are right now (or in your general vicinity if you are outside)? _____

3. Sometimes when people are completing online surveys they experience distractions outside of their control. We're interested in whether you experienced any distractions while you were filling out this online survey today. Please check off as many or as few of the options below to describe what happened while you were filling out this survey.

   I had to answer or make a phone call
   I had to answer or write a text or email message
   I talked to someone else in the room or someone talked to me
   A TV, radio, or other music device was playing
   Other people in the room were talking (although I wasn't participating in the conversation)
   I visited another website or accessed another program on the computer
   I was distracted in some other way (please specify) _____
   I completed the entire survey without a single distraction

4. Approximately how many minutes did it take you to complete this survey? _____

5. Did you have to stop at all partway through completing this survey?
   I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey within minutes
   I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey within an hour or so
   I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey the same day
   I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey the next day
   I completed the entire survey without stopping to do anything else

6. In all honesty, how seriously did you take this experiment? (Please keep in mind that your response is anonymous and you will still receive full credit no matter what your response is.)

Not at all						Extremely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

7. Were there any aspects of the scenario, the questions, or this survey in general that were hard to picture, confusing, or awkward? Or, are there any other comments you had about this survey? Your responses will be extremely useful to us in improving our research so please provide any thoughts or comments that you have. [Text-Box Provided]

Read each of the following statements to yourself.

As you look at each statement focus your attention only on that one.

You should not spend too much time on any one statement.

Your success at coming to experience a positive mood will largely depend on your willingness to accept and respond to the idea in each statement and to allow each statement to act upon you without resistance.

Attempt to respond to the feeling suggested by each statement. Then try to think of yourself as definitely being and moving into that state. If it is natural for you to do so, try to visualize a scene in which you have had such a feeling.

1. Today is neither better nor worse than any other day.

2. I do feel pretty good today, though.

3. If your attitude is good, then things are good, and my attitude is good.

4. On the whole, I have very little difficulty in thinking clearly.

5. My judgement about most things is sound.

6. My judgement is keen and precise today. Just let someone try to put something over on me.

7. If I set my mind to it, I can make things turn out fine.

8. I feel enthusiastic and confident now.

9. I'm able to do things accurately and efficiently.

10. I know good and well that I can achieve the goals I set.

11. I have a sense of power and vigor.

12. In the long run, it's obvious that things have gotten better and better during my life.

13. I know that in the future I won't over-emphasize so-called "problems".

14. I'm optimistic that I can get along very well with most of the people I meet.

15. I feel highly perceptive and refreshed.

16. I can concentrate hard on anything I do.

17. My thinking is clear and rapid.

18. I can make decisions rapidly and correctly, and I can defend them against criticism easily.

19. Life is firmly in my control.

20. I'm really feeling sharp now.

This last task requires that you look very closely at a few pictures…

a) Please select all the photos that have 2 people in them:

b) Now please select all the photos that have babies in them:

c) Now please select all the photos that have people smiling in them:




Well done! You're finished!

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY (WLU)
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
PROJECT SUMMARY

How different forms of self-analysis affect reactions to memories of culture clashes
Investigator: Hajer Al Homedawy, Supervisor: Dr. Christian Jordan (Wilfrid Laurier University)

Thank you for participating in this research! We really appreciate your participation and hope you had an insightful experience. You were informed that the purpose of this study is to investigate how people recall experiences of culture clash. You were asked to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Although we are interested in how people remember experiences of culture clash, we would like to explain the specific purpose of this study to you now.

To begin, self-reflection refers to how we view and review life experiences. We can choose to adopt one of two perspectives, that are termed the "distanced-why" or "immersed-

why" perspective. Self-immersion occurs when the self of the person re-experiencing the recalled event in the memory and the self of the person analyzing that event in the present are experienced as one and the same. In this way, the self is immersed in the recalled experience. Self-distancing occurs when the self of the person re-experiencing the recalled event in the memory and the self of the person analyzing that event now are experienced as separate; the present self views the self in the past memory much like a third-party observer might view them. Our aim is to discover whether reflecting on an experience of culture clash from the distanced-why perspective, compared to the immersed-why perspective, helps reduce promote wise reasoning and reduce any negative feelings associated with the memory. Wise reasoning refers to reasoning that incorporates the realization that one's own perspective may be limited, that other people may hold different perspectives and that there are limits to what one knows in a situation. A significant aspect of wise reasoning is the recognition that people may hold differing viewpoints and understandings of the same situation. Demographic information was collected to better inform our research results. For example, participants with a university education and who reside in Washington may feel and think differently about some aspects of this study than participants who received a graduate-level education and who reside in New York. We are interested in also discovering these differences. Our ultimate goal is to contribute research on healthy self-reflection mechanisms that can better our ability to recall and analyze negative experiences without becoming emotionally and cognitively overwhelmed.

If you have any questions or comments about the study, please contact the primary researcher, Hajer Al Homedawy, at the psychology department in Wilfrid Laurier University, by email at alxh4110@mylaurier.ca. Alternatively, you can also contact her supervisor, Dr. Christian Jordan, my phone, 519-884-0710, ext. 2574, email, cjordan@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (REB #5123). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, WLU Research Ethics Board, 519-884-0710 ext. 4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca.

Recalling a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict experience may have left you feeling upset or angry. Any negative feelings should be temporary and should go away soon, if they have not already. If you experience any persistent negative feelings as a result of participating in this study, please contact the researchers and/or your local mental health care facility. All participants are free to call the following hotlines should they desire to do so: 1) Mental Health America at 1-800-969-NAMI (6264; for specific mental health service referrals in your area, website: http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/), and 2) Hopeline at 1-800-784-2433 (to speak immediately with a trained volunteer; website: http://hopeline.com/).

If you would like to receive information about the results, please contact the researchers. The results will be available by September 30, 2017.

To conclude, we would like to share a few thoughts on diversity with you. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, a member of the Associative Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

> Major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today's increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. High-ranking retired officers and civilian military leaders assert that a highly qualified, racially diverse

> officer corps is essential to national security. Moreover, because universities, and in particular, law schools, represent the training ground for a large number of the Nation's leaders, . . . the path to leadership must be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity. Thus, the Law School has a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body.
>
> *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003)

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor viewpoint is supported by empirical research. According to James, Dovidio, and Vietze (2014, p. 14), "Among the reasons offered for the value of diversity are that it (a) facilitates adaptability, flexibility, and creativity in thinking and acting; (b) produces better citizenship in a more diverse world; (c) fosters human capital, which are the resources that people bring to enterprises, by engaging participation of marginalized groups; and (d) is morally correct and consistent with the core U.S. values of equity and fairness."

If you are interested in learning more about this area of research, you may be interested in reading:

Kross, E., Ayduk, O., & Mischel, W. (2005). When asking "why" does not hurt: Distinguishing rumination from reflective processing of negative emotions. Psychological Science, 16(9), 709-715. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01600.x

Kross, E., & Grossmann, I. (2012). Boosting wisdom: Distance from the self enhances wise reasoning, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General*, *141*(1), 43-48.

Thank you very much for your time and participation!

We suggest that you save or print this form for your records.

END

Study 2 Materials

START

MTURK Recruitment

Study Description:
This HIT is a study seeking to recruit first-generation immigrants. The study investigates recalling and describing experiences of a "culture clash" (a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different understandings, values, beliefs or expectations). You will be remunerated 50 cents (USD) for your participation.

Project Title	Recalling & describing memories of culture clashes
Researchers	Hajer Al Homedawy (alxh4110@mylaurier.ca) Dr. Christian Jordan (cjordan@wlu.ca)
Ethics Reference Code	REB #5226
Compensation	$0.50 USD (payable via your online account)
Duration	30 minutes
Number of Participants	300

Description:
This is a study that is being conducted by Hajer Al Homedawy (Graduate Student, Wilfrid Laurier University) and Dr. Christian Jordan (Professor, Wilfrid Laurier University). We are looking for participants who are first-generation immigrants to the United States who have experienced "culture clash."

A "culture clash" is a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different culture-specific understandings, values, beliefs or expectations. Such clashes may be experienced by people who immigrate from one culture to another.

Participants will be asked to identify "a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person."

They will also be asked to provide demographic information (e.g., age, ethnicity, income).

Participants must meet the following criteria to take part in this study:

5. 18+ years of age.
6. Resident of the United States.
7. First-generation immigrant (i.e., born in another country and currently reside in the United States).

8. Can remember an experience of a "culture clash" (a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different understandings, values, beliefs or expectations)
9. Can describe their experience of a "culture clash" using full sentences.

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY (WLU)
INFORMED CONSENT STATEMENT

Title: Recalling & describing memories of culture clashes

Principal Investigator: Hajer Al Homedawy
(Affiliation: WLU graduate student; e: alxh4110@mylaurier.ca;)
Supervisor: Dr. Christian Jordan
(Affiliation: faculty advisor; e: cjordan@wlu.ca; Office: N2022; N: 519 884 0710 Ext. 2574)

You are invited to participate in a research study. The purpose of this study is to investigate memories of "culture clash"; specifically, you will be asked to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. You will then be asked to describe this experience in detail. The principal investigator, Hajer Al Homedawy is a WLU psychology graduate student. The faculty advisor, Dr. Christian Jordan, is a WLU psychology faculty member.

Note: To be eligible for this study, participants must be 18+ years of age, a resident of the United States, and a first-generation immigrant (i.e., you were born in another country and currently reside in the United States). You must also be able to identify and describe a time when you experienced "culture clash."

INFORMATION

In this study, participants will be asked about specific memories. Once you have given your consent to participate in this study you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced a "culture clash;" that is, a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person. Once you have recalled a single specific memory, you will be asked to reflect on it for some time. Next, you will be asked to describe the specific memory in detail. You will also complete a brief demographic questionnaire. The full purposes of this study cannot be revealed at this time, but at the end of the study a thorough explanation will be provided. Approximately 300 participants recruited via MTurk will complete this study. The study will take no more than 30 minutes of your time. Participation is voluntary.

Risks

In this study you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced culture clash, which might cause you to experience negative feelings. That is, you will be asked to recall a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds,

you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person. Recalling this time might make you feel upset or angry; this is normal and we expect the feelings you experience will be temporary and pass with time. Remember that you are free to discontinue your participation at any time and to omit answering any questions that make you uncomfortable. Because recalling this memory may make you feel upset or angry, there are potential emotional and psychological risks involved in agreeing to participate in this study. If you experience any lasting negative feelings as a result of participating in this study, please contact the researchers and/or your local mental health care facility. All participants are free to call Mental Health America at 1-800-969-NAMI (6264; for specific mental health service referrals in your area, website: http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/). Please keep in mind that you may skip any question or completely withdraw from the study at any time.

BENEFITS

By partaking in this study you will be exposed to a study in the area of social psychology, and as a result you'll be exposed to learning about what is involved in being a participant. To some, contributing to the scientific progress is a valuable benefit. Furthermore, this study hopes to contribute to the body of literature in psychology about self-reflection.

CONFIDENTIALITY

Your data will be confidential. Only the researchers listed at the top of this form will have access to the data. Please note, however, that while in transmission on the internet, confidentiality of data cannot be guaranteed. The researchers acknowledge that the host of the online survey (Qualtrics) may automatically collect participant data without their knowledge (i.e., IP addresses); however, the researchers will not use or save this information. Data will be stored on a password-protected computer in a locked lab at Wilfrid Laurier University (WLU). The anonymous data file will be maintained indefinitely and may be analyzed in the future as part of a separate project (i.e., secondary data analysis). Data will be presented in aggregate (e.g., means) in any study reports or presentations.

COMPENSATION

For your participation, $0.50 USD will be awarded to your Worker account. You may decline to answer any questions that you do not wish to answer and you can withdraw your participation at any time by ceasing to answer questions, without penalty or loss of remuneration. To receive remuneration please proceed to the end of the questionnaire, obtain the unique code for this HIT, and submit it. The amount received is taxable. It is your responsibility to report the amount received for income tax purposes.

CONTACT

If you have questions at any time about the study or the procedures (or you experience adverse effects as a result of participating in this study), you may contact the researcher, Hajer Al Homedawy, at alxh4110@mylaurier.ca or her faculty supervisor at WLU, Dr. Christian Jordan at 519-884-0710 ext. 2574 or cjordan@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the Wilfrid Laurier University Research Ethics Board (REB #5226), which is supported by the Research Support Fund. If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this

project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, WLU Research Ethics Board Chair, 519-884-0710 ext. 4994, rbasso@wlu.ca.

PARTICIPATION

Your participation in this study is voluntary. If you choose to participate, you may skip any question or procedure, or completely withdraw from the study at any time without penalty and without loss of benefits to which you are otherwise entitled. If you withdraw from the study, every attempt will be made to remove your data from the study, and have it destroyed. If you withdraw from the study, please contact the researcher so that the debriefing can be emailed to you. Your data cannot be withdrawn once data collection is complete because data are stored without identifiers.

FEEDBACK AND PUBLICATION

Should the research be reviewed and accepted by the research community, the results of the research will be disseminated as a psychological article in a scientific journal and/or presented in conferences and academic courses. The findings may be made available through Open Access resources. Since participants will be completing the present study anonymously and any identifying information will be deleted participants cannot obtain personal feedback information, but can contact the researchers to learn about aggregate research results once they have been finalized. Feedback will be available by September 30, 2017.

CONSENT

I have read and understand the above information.

- I consent to participate in this study [clicking here will lead to study]
- I do not consent to participate in this study [clicking here will return to browser]

We recommend that you print or save a copy of this form for your records.

USE OF QUOTATIONS CONSENT FORM

Title: Recalling & describing memories of culture clashes

Principal Investigator: Hajer Al Homedawy
(Affiliation: WLU graduate student; e: alxh4110@mylaurier.ca;)
Supervisor: Dr. Christian Jordan
(Affiliation: faculty advisor; e: cjordan@wlu.ca; Office: N2022; N: 519 884 0710 Ext. 2574)

Researchers involved in this project may present findings from this study at professional conferences or in written publications in psychology journals. From time to time, it is useful to present short excerpts from participants' responses to help explain or illustrate certain concepts. Before using these excerpts, we remove any identifying information such as specific names or locations. For example, to illustrate how people sometimes describe themselves, we could present an example: "I find that I have become much more outgoing and self-confident since I began my new part-time job as hostess *[at the King Street Trio]* – I interact a lot more with

strangers." The information in brackets *[at the King Street Trio]* would be eliminated or replaced with a more general *[at a local restaurant]*.

However, we only use direct quotations from participants who have given their prior consent. Your consent to the use of specific quotations is voluntary; you may decline without penalty. Your responses will still be included in aggregated (group) results even if you don't consent to the use of quotations.

By agreeing to allow us to use excerpts from your responses at this time, you are providing "blanket" consent for any excerpts (you consent at this time to the use of any excerpts drawn from your responses), provided that the researchers omit identifying information.

Please indicate the alternative you choose.

- o NO, please DO NOT use excerpts of my responses for presentation purposes.

- o YES, the researchers may present excerpts of my responses at professional conferences or in publications, provided that identifying information such as names and specific locations are omitted.

We recommend that you print or save a copy of this form for your records.

We thank you for your time spent taking this survey. Your response has been recorded.

Welcome and thank you for your interest in this study!

You will first be asked to complete some questions to confirm your eligibility for this study.

If you do not meet the study criteria, your responses will be deleted and you will not receive remuneration for this study.

If you are eligible, you may begin the study. Because we are currently studying responses from certain populations, you will first be asked to respond to several background questions to determine eligibility in the study such as age, gender, and ethnicity. This part of the study will take no more than 1 minute of your time. You will be taken to the study page if you are eligible for the study.

8. What is your age? _____
9. What is your gender?
   - o Male
   - o Female

- Other: (please specify)

10. What is your ethnicity?
    - Aboriginal or Native American
    - Asian
    - African American
    - East Indian
    - Latino
    - Middle Eastern
    - White
    - Other (Please specify)
11. A first-generation immigrant was born outside the country they immigrated to. Are you a first-generation immigrant?
    - Yes
    - No
12. Did you immigrate to the United States from another country?
    - Yes
    - No
13. I was born in the United States:
    - Yes
    - No
14. Where were you born? (drop down list of countries)

Thank you for your interest in the study! You do not qualify to participate at this time.

Participants must meet the following criteria to take part in this study:

1. 18+ years of age.
2. Resident of the United States.
3. First-generation immigrant (i.e., born in another country and currently reside in the United States).
4. Can remember an experience of a "culture clash" (a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict that can occur between individuals with differing cultural backgrounds because they have different understandings, values, beliefs or expectations)
5. Can describe their experience of a "culture clash" using full sentences.

Please note, your responses will be deleted.

We have a few more questions to ask you before we begin…

5. Right now, do you have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey?
    - Yes
    - No
6. Do you agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else?
    - Yes

- No

7. Have you turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings?
   - Yes
   - No
8. Have you closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer that would otherwise distract you from the survey?
   - Yes
   - No

If you have answered "yes" to all of the questions above, then click 'I'm ready to begin' to proceed to the survey.

- I'm ready to begin
- I'm not ready to begin just yet

Thank you for your interest in the present study. However, you do not qualify to participate at this time due to one or all of the following reasons:

1. You've indicated you do not have at least 30 minutes of uninterrupted time in which you can complete this survey.

2. You've indicated you do not agree to complete this survey in one sitting, without taking any breaks and without talking to anyone else.

3. You've indicated you have not turned off any phones, televisions, music, and other media devices in your immediate surroundings.

4. You've indicated you have not closed all other programs and browser windows on your computer.
Please note, your responses will be deleted.

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way **right now, that is, at the present moment.**

Distressed

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Upset

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Guilty

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Scared

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Hostile

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Irritable

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Ashamed

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Nervous

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Jittery

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

Afraid

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

As an immigrant to the United States, you may have moved from one culture to another. Culture reflects specific ways of understanding the world, expectations about how to act or behave, common values, and so on. Culture may include religious beliefs or basic assumptions about how things should be done or how people should be treated. Everyone holds culture-specific understandings that they may not often think about (e.g., driving on the right side of the road). They may become more aware of these understandings, however, when they observe different cultural understandings or norms (e.g., driving on the left side of the road). Sometimes these differences may seem minor but at other times they may seem more significant.

We would like you to think of a time when you experienced a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural

understandings than them. Because of your differing cultural backgrounds, you may have held different expectations, different viewpoints, approached a situation differently, or felt misunderstood by this person.

Once a memory comes to your mind, allow yourself to consider this event, letting your thoughts and feelings about the event run through your mind for a few moments.

We will continue in 60 seconds.

>>

Now please complete these items to form a word in English (**no proper names**).

Use the empty spaces "_ _" to identify the total number of missing letters.

Please write the first word that comes to mind that fits:

T H E _ _	C A _ _	T E _ _
E A S _		G U I _ _ _
D O _ _	F E _ _	E X C _ _ _ _
I N C L _ _ _	E X C L _ _ _	E _ _
G R E _ _	W O R _ _	
S A _	C H E _ _	P R O _ _
	A N G _ _	B L A _ _
A F _ _ _ _	S E C _ _ _	Q U _ _ _
U _		L O _ _
S O _ _	U P _ _ _	
L I V _ _ _	A C T _ _ _	M A _
L O _	B A _	R E J _ _ _
H A _ _	N _ _	S T R _ _ _
	L O N _	L I _ _
G O _ _	S C A _ _ _	C A R _ _ _
A L _ _ _	G L _ _	B L A _ _
A C C _ _ _		D E L I _ _ _
H A _ _ _	J O _	

This scale consists of a number of words that describe different feelings and emotions. Read each item and then mark the appropriate answer.

Indicate to what extent you feel this way **RIGHT NOW, that is, at the present moment.**

Distressed

Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely

1	2	3	4	5
Upset				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Guilty				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Scared				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Hostile				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Irritable				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Ashamed				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Nervous				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Jittery				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5
Afraid				
Very slightly or not at all	A little	Moderately	Quite a bit	Extremely
1	2	3	4	5

These next questions ask you about your experiences while recalling the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict memory earlier in the study. Indicate your response using the scales provided.

To what extent did you see the memory replay through your own eyes as if you were right there?

I replayed the memory				I did not replay the

entirely through my own eyes						memory at all through my own eyes
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

To what extent did you watch the memory unfold as an observer?

I did not replay the memory at all as an observer						I replayed the memory entirely as an observer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

As you replayed the experience in your memory, how far away from the scene were you?

Very close, saw it through my own eyes			Neither too close nor too far			Very far, saw it as if an observer
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

These next questions ask you about your experiences while recalling the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict memory earlier in the study. Indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement using the scale provided:

My thoughts focused on the specific chain of events—sequence of events, what happened, what was said and done—as I thought about the experience in this study.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

As I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that caused me to think differently about the experience

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

As I thought about my experience during the study I had a realization that made me experience a sense of closure.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Thinking about my experience during the experiment led me to have a clearer and more coherent

understanding of this experience.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

I feel a sense of closure about this experience.

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

My memory of this experience was vivid and clear:

Strongly disagree				Strongly agree
1	2	3	4	5

Now, please describe to us in detail what happened when you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict. What happened exactly? Who was there? What were you specifically thinking and feeling? Did your emotions and thoughts change as the situation unfolded?

Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" responses and your responses will remain confidential.

Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

Were you able to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them?

- Yes
- No

These next questions ask you about the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict you recalled earlier in the study.

9. When did this experience happen?

Less than a month ago	Approximately 6 months ago	Approximately a year ago	2-3 years ago	4 or more years ago
0	1	2	3	4

10. Was the person you had a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict a citizen of the United States?
    - Yes
    - No
    - I don't know
11. What was the ethnicity of the person?
    - Aboriginal or Native American
    - Asian
    - African American
    - East Indian
    - Latino
    - Middle Eastern
    - White
    - Other (Please specify)
12. What was the gender of the other person?
    - Male
    - Female
    - Other (please specify)
13. What day of the week was it?
    - M
    - T
    - W
    - T
    - F
    - S
    - S
    - Don't remember
14. What time of day was it?
    - Morning
    - Afternoon
    - Evening
    - Don't remember
15. Where were you when the situation happened? [text-box provided]
16. What were you doing when it happened? (1-2 sentences) [text-box provided]

17. When you experienced the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict, to what extent did you feel socially excluded?

Not at all socially excluded						Very socially excluded
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

18. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve verbal disagreements between yourself and the other person?

No verbal disagreement at all						Significant verbal disagreement
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

19. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve angry outbursts between yourself and the other person?

No angry outbursts at all						Significant angry outbursts
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

20. To what extent did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve physical confrontation between yourself and the other person?

No physical confrontation at all						Significant physical confrontation
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

21. How many people were involved in the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict? [drop-down list of numbers]

22. Will you likely interact with the person you had the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with again?

No, most unlikely						Yes, most likely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

15. Did the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict involve a third-person mediator? That is, someone who tried to help you, the other person, or both of you resolve the disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict?

No	A little bit		Somewhat				Yes, the majority of the time
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

The questions that follow refer to different ways of experiencing life in your country of origin as well as the United States.

Please, read each question carefully and respond by choosing a rating on each scale.
Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and your responses will remain confidential.
Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

When we refer to "Americans" in the questions below, we mean individuals that you perceive to be members of mainstream American society.

1. How much are the values common in your country of origin a part of your life?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

2. How important is it to you to celebrate holidays in the ways they are celebrated in your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

3. How important is it to you to raise your children with the values common in your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

4. How comfortable would you be in a group of people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

5. How proud are you of being from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

6. How much do you enjoy speaking the language or dialect of your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

7. How much do you enjoy TV programs from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

8. How much do you like to eat food from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

9. Do you think people from your country of origin are kind and generous?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

10. How important would it be to you for your children to have friends from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

11. How important is it to you to celebrate holidays in the mainstream American way?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

12. How much are mainstream American values a part of your life?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

13. How comfortable would you be in a group of mainstream Americans?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

14. How important is it to you to raise your children with mainstream American values?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

15. How proud are you of a mainstream American identity?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

16. Do you think mainstream Americans are kind and generous?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

17. How much do you enjoy mainstream American TV programs?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

18. How much do you enjoy speaking English?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

19. How much do you like to eat mainstream American food?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

20. How important would it be to you for your children to have mainstream American friends?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

The questions that follow refer to different ways of experiencing life the United States.

Please, read each question carefully and respond by choosing a rating on each scale.
Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and your responses will remain confidential.
Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

When we refer to "Americans" in the questions below, we mean individuals that you perceive to be members of mainstream American society.

To what extent do you understand the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) used by Americans?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do the clothes worn by Americans seem sensible to you?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you understand American humor?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you understand American figures of speech?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you understand American standards of beauty?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you adopt American social conventions?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you use the facial expressions that are typical of Americans?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you use the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) that are typical of Americans?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you wear the clothes typically worn by Americans?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much

0	1	2	3

To what extent do you use American humor?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you use American figures of speech?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you accept standards of American beauty?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you appreciate American art?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you appreciate American music?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you appreciate American movies?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you appreciate American novels?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

To what extent do you follow American politics?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

The questions that follow refer to different ways of experiencing life in your country of origin.

Please, read each question carefully and respond by choosing a rating on each scale.
Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and your responses will remain confidential.
Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

When we refer to "people from your country of origin" in the questions below, we mean individuals that you perceive to be members of mainstream society from your country of origin.

1. To what extent do you understand the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) used by people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

2. To what extent do the clothes worn by people from your country of origin seem sensible to you?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

3. To what extent do you understand humor from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

4. To what extent do you understand figures of speech from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

5. To what extent do you understand the standards of beauty from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

6. To what extent do you adopt the social conventions from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

7. To what extent do you use the facial expressions that are typical of people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

8. To what extent do you use the mannerisms (e.g., gestures, body language) that are typical of people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

9. To what extent do you wear the clothes typically worn by people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

10. To what extent do you use humor used by people from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

11. To what extent do use figures of speech from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

12. To what extent do you accept standards of beauty from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

13. To what extent do you appreciate art from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

14. To what extent do you appreciate music from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

15. To what extent do you appreciate movies from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

16. To what extent do you appreciate novels from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

17. To what extent do you follow politics from your country of origin?

Not at all	A little	Quite a bit	Very much
0	1	2	3

The question that follows refers to how the different ways of experiencing life in your country of origin differ from the ways of experiencing life in the United States.

Please, read the question carefully and respond by choosing a rating on the scale.
Remember, there are no "right" or "wrong" answers and your responses will remain confidential.
Do not rush, but work steadily as we are interested in your thoughtful responses.

How similar is mainstream American culture to the culture in your country of origin?

Extremely different						Extremely similar
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Next, we are going to ask you a few simple questions about your background:

1) A second-generation immigrant is a U.S. native (born in the United States or territories) with at least one foreign-born parent (born outside the U.S.). Are you a second-generation immigrant?
    - Yes
    - No
2) A third-generation immigrant is a U.S. native (born in the United States or territories) with both parents native born (both parents are born in the United States). Are you a third-generation immigrant?
    - Yes
    - No
3) What year did you immigrate to the USA (drop down list: "I didn't immigrate to the USA, I was born there", & 1900-2018)
4) What age were you when you immigrated to the United States? (I didn't immigrate to the USA, I was born there", less than 1; 1-100)
5) Is the country you immigrated from a predominately English-speaking country?
    - Yes
    - No
    - I didn't immigrate to the U.S.A, I was born there.
6) How many years in total have you lived in the USA? (drop down list; 0-100)
7) Where was your mother born? (I don't know & drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)
8) Where was your father born? (I don't know & drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)

It is possible for someone to be born outside their country of origin due to changing life circumstances (e.g., political upheaval). Additionally, we may immigrate from a country that is also not our country of origin. These differences interest us and so we appreciate your patience in helping us identify these differences:

9) What is your country of origin? (drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)
10) What country did you immigrate from? (drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)
11) What is your country of birth? (drop down list of countries, Afghanistan-Zimbabwe)

---

1) Are you currently employed?
    - Yes
    - No
2) What is your marital status?
    - Married
    - Single
    - Widowed
    - Divorced
    - Common Law
    - Other (please specify)
3) What is the highest level of education you've received?
    - Kindergarten or never attended school

- Grades 1-4, or equivalent
- Grades 5-8, or equivalent
- Grades 9-10, or equivalent
- More than grade 10 without secondary school completion, or equivalent
- Secondary school diploma or equivalent
- Some postsecondary education (e.g,. 2 years in a Science degree program)
- Postsecondary certificate, diploma or degree (e.g., Science, Arts, or English degree)
- Degree in medicine, dentistry, veterinary medicine or optometry
- Degree in law
- Master's degree (e.g., Masters in Business Administration, MBA)
- Doctorate (PhD)
- Other (please specify): _____

Finally, we just have a few questions for you about your experience while completing this online survey. Again we value your honest response, as this will help us to make the best use of the data we collect in this survey.

8. We are interested in the environments in which people complete our online surveys. Where are you completing this survey now?
   - In my home
   - At the library
   - At a public computer lab
   - In a coffee shop or restaurant
   - In a public space outside
   - Some other location (please specify): _____

9. Approximately how many other people are in the room where you are right now (or in your general vicinity if you are outside)? _____

10. Sometimes when people are completing online surveys they experience distractions outside of their control. We're interested in whether you experienced any distractions while you were filling out this online survey today. Please check off as many or as few of the options below to describe what happened while you were filling out this survey.

    I had to answer or make a phone call
    I had to answer or write a text or email message
    I talked to someone else in the room or someone talked to me
    A TV, radio, or other music device was playing
    Other people in the room were talking (although I wasn't participating in the conversation)
    I visited another website or accessed another program on the computer
    I was distracted in some other way (please specify) _____
    I completed the entire survey without a single distraction

11. Approximately how many minutes did it take you to complete this survey? _____

12. Did you have to stop at all partway through completing this survey?
    I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey within minutes
    I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey within an hour or so
    I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey the same day
    I had to stop partway through but returned to the survey the next day
    I completed the entire survey without stopping to do anything else

13. In all honesty, how seriously did you take this experiment? (Please keep in mind that your response is anonymous and you will still receive full credit no matter what your response is.)

Not at all						Extremely
1	2	3	4	5	6	7

14. Were there any aspects of the scenario, the questions, or this survey in general that were hard to picture, confusing, or awkward? Or, are there any other comments you had about this survey? Your responses will be extremely useful to us in improving our research so please provide any thoughts or comments that you have. [Text-Box Provided]

Read each of the following statements to yourself.

As you look at each statement focus your attention only on that one.

You should not spend too much time on any one statement.

Your success at coming to experience a positive mood will largely depend on your willingness to accept and respond to the idea in each statement and to allow each statement to act upon you without resistance.

Attempt to respond to the feeling suggested by each statement. Then try to think of yourself as definitely being and moving into that state. If it is natural for you to do so, try to visualize a scene in which you have had such a feeling.

1. Today is neither better nor worse than any other day.

2. I do feel pretty good today, though.

3. If your attitude is good, then things are good, and my attitude is good.

4. On the whole, I have very little difficulty in thinking clearly.

5. My judgement about most things is sound.

6. My judgement is keen and precise today. Just let someone try to put something over on me.

7. If I set my mind to it, I can make things turn out fine.

8. I feel enthusiastic and confident now.

9. I'm able to do things accurately and efficiently.

10. I know good and well that I can achieve the goals I set.

11. I have a sense of power and vigor.

12. In the long run, it's obvious that things have gotten better and better during my life.

13. I know that in the future I won't over-emphasize so-called "problems".

14. I'm optimistic that I can get along very well with most of the people I meet.

15. I feel highly perceptive and refreshed.

16. I can concentrate hard on anything I do.

17. My thinking is clear and rapid.

18. I can make decisions rapidly and correctly, and I can defend them against criticism easily.

19. Life is firmly in my control.

20. I'm really feeling sharp now.

This last task requires that you look very closely at a few pictures…

d) Please select all the photos that have 2 people in them:

e) Now please select all the photos that have babies in them:

f) Now please select all the photos that have people smiling in them:






Well done! You're finished!

WILFRID LAURIER UNIVERSITY (WLU)
DEPARTMENT OF PSYCHOLOGY
PROJECT SUMMARY

Recalling & describing memories of culture clashes

Investigator: Hajer Al Homedawy, Supervisor: Dr. Christian Jordan (Wilfrid Laurier University)

Thank you for participating in this research! We really appreciate your participation and hope you had an insightful experience. You were informed that the purpose of this study is to investigate experiences of culture clash. You were asked to recall a memory that involved disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict with another person because you held different cultural understandings than them. Although we are interested in how people remember experiences of culture clash, we would like to explain the specific purpose of this study to you now.

To begin, self-reflection refers to how we view and review life experiences. We can choose to adopt one of two perspectives, that are termed the "distanced-why" or "immersed-why" perspective. Self-immersion occurs when the self of the person re-experiencing the recalled event in the memory and the self of the person analyzing that event in the present are experienced as one and the same. In this way, the self is immersed in the recalled experience. Self-distancing occurs when the self of the person re-experiencing the recalled event in the memory and the self of the person analyzing that event now are experienced as separate; the present self views the self in the past memory much like a third-party observer might view them. Our aim is to discover whether reflecting on an experience of culture clash from the distanced-why perspective, compared to the immersed-why perspective, helps reduce promote wise reasoning and reduce any negative feelings associated with the memory. Wise reasoning refers to reasoning that incorporates the realization that one's own perspective may be limited, that other people may hold different perspectives and that there are limits to what one knows in a situation. A significant aspect of wise reasoning is the recognition that people may hold differing viewpoints and understandings of the same situation. Demographic information was collected to better inform our research results. For example, participants with a university education may feel and think differently about some aspects of this study than participants who received a graduate-level education. We are interested in also discovering these differences. Our ultimate goal is to contribute research on healthy self-reflection mechanisms that can better our ability to recall and analyze negative experiences without becoming emotionally and cognitively overwhelmed.

If you have any questions or comments about the study, please contact the primary researcher, Hajer Al Homedawy, at the psychology department in Wilfrid Laurier University, by email at alxh4110@mylaurier.ca. Alternatively, you can also contact her supervisor, Dr. Christian Jordan, my phone, 519-884-0710, ext. 2574, email, cjordan@wlu.ca. This project has been reviewed and approved by the University Research Ethics Board (REB #5226). If you feel you have not been treated according to the descriptions in this form, or your rights as a participant in research have been violated during the course of this project, you may contact Dr. Robert Basso, Chair, WLU Research Ethics Board, 519-884-0710 ext. 4994 or rbasso@wlu.ca.

Recalling and describing a disagreement, misunderstanding or conflict experience may have left you feeling upset or angry. Any negative feelings should be temporary and should go away soon, if they have not already. At the end of the study you were asked to read statements like this one "Today is neither better nor worse than any other day" and you were asked questions about photos. These tasks were used to help make you feel better to the extent that you were still feeling upset. If you experience any persistent negative feelings as a result of participating in this study, please contact the researchers and/or your local mental health care facility. All participants are free to call the following hotlines should they desire to do so: 1)

Mental Health America at 1-800-969-NAMI (6264; for specific mental health service referrals in your area, website: http://www.mentalhealthamerica.net/), and 2) Hopeline at 1-800-784-2433 (to speak immediately with a trained volunteer; website: http://hopeline.com/).

If you would like to receive information about the results, please contact the researchers. The results will be available by September 30, 2017.

To conclude, we would like to share a few thoughts on diversity with you. Justice Sandra Day O'Connor, a member of the Associative Justice of the Supreme Court of the United States, said:

> Major American businesses have made clear that the skills needed in today's increasingly global marketplace can only be developed through exposure to widely diverse people, cultures, ideas, and viewpoints. High-ranking retired officers and civilian military leaders assert that a highly qualified, racially diverse officer corps is essential to national security. Moreover, because universities, and in particular, law schools, represent the training ground for a large number of the Nation's leaders, . . . the path to leadership must be visibly open to talented and qualified individuals of every race and ethnicity. Thus, the Law School has a compelling interest in attaining a diverse student body.
>
> *Grutter v. Bollinger* (2003)

Justice Sandra Day O'Connor viewpoint is supported by empirical research. According to James, Dovidio, and Vietze (2014, p. 14), "Among the reasons offered for the value of diversity are that it (a) facilitates adaptability, flexibility, and creativity in thinking and acting; (b) produces better citizenship in a more diverse world; (c) fosters human capital, which are the resources that people bring to enterprises, by engaging participation of marginalized groups; and (d) is morally correct and consistent with the core U.S. values of equity and fairness."

If you are interested in learning more about this area of research, you may be interested in reading:

Kross, E., Ayduk, O., & Mischel, W. (2005). When asking "why" does not hurt: Distinguishing rumination from reflective processing of negative emotions. Psychological Science, 16(9), 709-715. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01600.x

Kross, E., & Grossmann, I. (2012). Boosting wisdom: Distance from the self enhances wise reasoning, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*(1), 43-48.

Thank you very much for your time and participation!

We suggest that you save or print this form for your records.

END

References

Ahmed, S. (2017). News media, movies, and anti-muslim prejudice: Investigating the role of social contact. *Asian Journal of Communication, 27*(5), 536-553. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1080/01292986.2017.1339720

Al-Issa, I., & Tousignant, M. (1997). *Ethnicity, immigration, and psychopathology*. New York, NY, US: Plenum Press, New York, NY.

Ayduk, Ö, & Kross, E. (2008). Enhancing the pace of recovery: Self-distanced analysis of negative experiences reduces blood pressure reactivity. *Psychological Science, 19*(3), 229-231. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2008.02073.x

Ayduk, Ö, & Kross, E. (2010a). Analyzing negative experiences without ruminating: The role of self-distancing in enabling adaptive self-reflection. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4*(10), 841-854. doi:10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00301.x

Ayduk, Ö, & Kross, E. (2010b). From a distance: Implications of spontaneous self-distancing for adaptive self-reflection. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 98*(5), 809-829. doi:10.1037/a0019205

Bagci, S. C., Rutland, A., Kumashiro, M., Smith, P. K., & Blumberg, H. (2014). Are minority status children's cross- ethnic friendships beneficial in a multiethnic context? *British Journal of Developmental Psychology, 32*(1), 107-115. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/bjdp.12028

Barlow, F. K., Paolini, S., Pedersen, A., Hornsey, M. J., Radke, H. R. M., Harwood, J., . . . Sibley, C. G. (2012). The contact caveat: Negative contact predicts increased prejudice more than positive contact predicts reduced prejudice. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 38*(12), 1629-1643. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1177/0146167212457953

Benoit, W. (2017). Image repair on the Donald Trump "Access hollywood" video: "Grab them by the p*ssy". *Communication Studies, 68*(3), 243-259. doi:10.1080/10510974.2017.1331250

Berry, J. W. (1997). Immigration, acculturation, and adaptation. *Applied Psychology, 46*(1), 5-34. doi:10.1111/j.1464-0597.1997.tb01087.x

Brienza, J. P., Kung, F., Y., Santos, H. C., Bobocel, D. R., & Grossmann, I. (2017). *Wisdom, bias, and balance: Toward a process-sensitive measurement of wisdom-related cognition.* Unpublished manuscript.

Brown, R., Vivian, J., & Hewstone, M. (1999). Changing attitudes through intergroup contact: The effects of group membership salience. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 29*(5-6), 741-764. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1002/(SICI)1099-0992(199908/09)29:5/63.0.CO;2-8

Campbell, A., Converse, P. E., & Rogers, W. L. (1976). *The quality of American life: Perceptions, evaluations, and satisfactions.* New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Cakal, H., Hewstone, M., Schwär, G., & Heath, A. (2011). An investigation of the social identity model of collective action and the 'sedative' effect of intergroup contact among black and white students in south africa. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 50*(4), 606-627. doi:10.1111/j.2044-8309.2011.02075.x

Childers, S., M. (2017). Commentary on the women's march on Washington: How does one become one million? *Educational Studies, 53*(3), 315-318. doi:10.1080/00131946.2017.1297303

Crocker, J., & Major, B. (1989). Social stigma and self-esteem: The self-protective properties of stigma. *Psychological Review, 96*(4), 608-630. doi:10.1037/0033-295X.96.4.608

DeWall, C. N., Twenge, J. M., Koole, S. L., Baumeister, R. F., Marquez, A., & Reid, M. W. (2011).

Automatic emotion regulation after social exclusion: Tuning to positivity. *Emotion, 11*(3), 623-636. doi:10.1037/a0023534

Diener, E., & Fujita, F. (1995). Resources, personal strivings, and subjective well-being: A nomothetic and idiographic approach. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68,* 926–935. doi:10.1037/0022- 3514.68.5.926

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2005). Beyond the optimal contact strategy: A reality check for the contact hypothesis. *American Psychologist, 60*(7), 697-711. doi:10.1037/0003-066X.60.7.697

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., & Tredoux, C. (2007). Intergroup contact and attitudes toward the principle and practice of racial equality. *Psychological Science, 18*(10), 867-872. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2007.01993.x

Dixon, J., Durrheim, K., Tredoux, C., Tropp, L., Clack, B., & Eaton, L. (2010). A paradox of integration? Interracial contact, prejudice reduction, and perceptions of racial discrimination. *Journal of Social Issues, 66*(2), 401-416. doi:10.1111/j.1540-4560.2010.01652.x

Douglas, K. M., & McGarty, C. (2001). Identifiability and self-presentation: Computer-mediated communication and intergroup interaction. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 40*(3), 399-416. doi:10.1348/014466601164894

Dovidio, J. F., Gaertner, S. L., & Kawakami, K. (2003). Intergroup contact: The past, present, and the future. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 6*(1), 5-20. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1177/1368430203006001009

Enders, W., & Sandler, T. (2006). Distribution of transnational terrorism among countries by income class and geography after 9/11. *International Studies Quarterly, 50*(2), 367-393.

doi:10.1111/j.1468-2478.2006.00406.x

Ersoy, N. C., Born, M. P. H., Derous, E., & van, d. M. (2011). Effects of work- related norm violations and general beliefs about the world on feelings of shame and guilt: A comparison between turkey and the netherlands. *Asian Journal of Social Psychology, 14*(1), 50-62.

Festinger, L., Pepitone, A., & Newcomb, T. (1952). Some consequences of de-individuation in a group. *The Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 47*(2), 382-389. doi:10.1037/h0057906

Foa, E. B., & Kozak, M. J. (1986). Emotional processing of fear: Exposure to corrective information. *Psychological Bulletin, 99*(1), 20-35. doi:10.1037/0033-2909.99.1.20

Giroux, H. A. (2017). White nationalism, armed culture and state violence in the age of Donald Trump. *Philosophy & Social Criticism, ,* 0191453717702800. doi:10.1177/0191453717702800

Grimes, D. S. (2002). Challenging the status quo? *Management Communication Quarterly, 15*(3), 381-409. doi:10.1177/0893318902153003

Grossmann, I., Karasawa, M., Izumi, S., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2012). Aging and wisdom. *Psychological Science, 23*(10), 1059-1066. doi:10.1177/0956797612446025

Grossmann, I., & Kross, E. (2010). The impact of culture on adaptive versus maladaptive self-reflection. *Psychological Science, 21*(8), 1150-1157. doi:10.1177/0956797610376655

Grossmann, I., & Kross, E. (2014). Exploring solomon's paradox. *Psychological Science, 25*(8), 1571-1580. doi:10.1177/0956797614535400

Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2013). A route to well-being: Intelligence versus wise reasoning. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General,*

142(3), 944-953. doi:10.1037/a0029560

Grossmann, I., Na, J., Varnum, M. E. W., Park, D. C., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2010). Reasoning about social conflicts improves into old age. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 107*(16), 7246-7250. doi:10.1073/pnas.1001715107

Grossmann, I., Sahdra, B. K., & Ciarrochi, J. (2016). A heart and A mind: Self-distancing facilitates the association between heart rate variability, and wise reasoning. *Frontiers in Behavioral Neuroscience, 10* doi:10.3389/fnbeh.2016.00068

Gruber, J., Harvey, A. G., & Johnson, S. L. (2009). Reflective and ruminative processing of positive emotional memories in bipolar disorder and healthy controls. *Behavioral Research and Therapy, 47*(8), 697-704. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2009.05.005

Gutenbrunner, L., & Wagner, U. (2016). Perspective-taking techniques in the mediation of intergroup conflict. *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology, 22*(4), 298-305. doi:10.1037/pac0000184

Halperin, E., & Gross, J. J. (2011). Intergroup anger in intractable conflict. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 14*(4), 477-488. doi:10.1177/1368430210377459

Hanna, J., Hartung, K., Sayers, D., M. & Almasy, S. (2017). Virginia Governor to White Nationalists: 'Go home...shame on you'. Retrieved from http://www.cnn.com/2017/08/12/us/charlottesville-white-nationalists-rally/

Hansen, A. L., Johnsen, B. H., & Thayer, J. F. (2003). Vagal influence on working memory and attention. *International Journal of Psychophysiology, 48*(3), 263-274. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0167-8760(03)00073-4

Hodson, G., & Hewstone, M. (2013). Introduction: Advances in Intergroup Contact. In G. Hodson, & M. Hewstone (Eds.), *Advances in intergroup contact* (pp. 3-20, Chapter xiv, 316 Pages). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.

Hong, Y.-Y, Morris, M. W., Chiu, C., & Benet-Martínez, V. (2000). Multicultural minds: A dynamic constructivist approach to culture and cognition. *American Psychologist, 55*, 709–720.

Jackson, J. M., & Latané, B. (1981). All alone in front of all those people: Stage fright as a function of number and type of co-performers and audience. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 40*(1), 73-85. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.40.1.73

Kamberi, E., Martinovic, B., & Verkuyten, M. (2017). Intergroup contact and minority group empowerment: The perspective of roma and non- roma adolescents in macedonia. *Journal of Community & Applied Social Psychology, 27*(5), 424–434. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1002/casp.2320

Kellner, D. (2017). Unforeseen consequences of a trump presidency. *American horror show* (Transgressions: Cultural Studies and Education ed., pp. 57-65) SensePublishers, Rotterdam. doi:https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-6300-974-4_5

Kenny, L. M., & Bryant, R. A. (2007). *Keeping memories at an arm's length: Vantage point of trauma memories. Behaviour Research and Therapy*, *45*(8), 1915-1920. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.brat.2006.09.004

Kenny, L. M., Bryant, R. A., Silove, D., Creamer, M., O'Donnell, M., & McFarlane, A. C. (2009). Distant memories: A prospective study of vantage point of trauma memories.. *Psychological Science, 20*(9), 1049-1052. doi:10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02393.x

Knowles, E. S. (1983). Social physics and the effects of others: Tests of the effects of audience size

and distance on social judgments and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 45*(6), 1263-1279. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.45.6.1263

Kross, E. (2009). When the self becomes other. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences, 1167*(1), 35-40. doi:10.1111/j.1749-6632.2009.04545.x

Kross, E., & Ayduk, O. (2008). Facilitating adaptive emotional analysis: Distinguishing distanced-analysis of depressive experiences from immersed-analysis and distraction. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 34*(7), 924-938. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1177/0146167208315938

Kross, E., & Ayduk, O. (2011). Making meaning out of negative experiences by self-distancing. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 20*(3), 187-191. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1177/0963721411408883

Kross, E., & Ayduk, Ö. (2009). Boundary conditions and buffering effects: Does depressive symptomology moderate the effectiveness of self-distancing for facilitating adaptive emotional analysis? *Journal of Research in Personality, 43*(5), 923-927. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1016/j.jrp.2009.04.004

Kross, E., Ayduk, O., & Mischel, W. (2005). When asking "why" does not hurt: Distinguishing rumination from reflective processing of negative emotions. *Psychological Science, 16*(9), 709-715. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2005.01600.x

Kross, E., Bruehlman-Senecal, E., Park, J., Burson, A., Dougherty, A., Shablack, H., . . . Ayduk, O. (2014a). Self-talk as a regulatory mechanism: How you do it matters. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 106*(2), 304-324. doi:10.1037/a0035173

Kross, E., Duckworth, A., Ayduk, O., Tsukayama, E., & Mischel, W. (2011). The effect of self-distancing on adaptive versus maladaptive self-reflection in children. *Emotion, 11*(5), 1032-

1039. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1037/a0021787

Kross, E., Gard, D., Deldin, P., Clifton, J., & Ayduk, O. (2012). "Asking why" from a distance: Its cognitive and emotional consequences for people with major depressive disorder. *Journal of Abnormal Psychology, 121*(3), 559-569. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1037/a0028808

Kross, E., & Grossmann, I. (2012). Boosting wisdom: Distance from the self enhances wise reasoning, attitudes, and behavior. *Journal of Experimental Psychology: General, 141*(1), 43-48. doi:10.1037/a0024158

Libby, L. K., & Eibach, R. P. (2011). Self-enhancement or self-coherence? why people shift visual perspective in mental images of the personal past and future. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 37*(5), 714-726. doi:10.1177/0146167211400207

McAuley, E., Duncan, T. E., & Russell, D. W. (1992). Measuring causal attributions: The revised causal dimension scale (CDSII). *Pers Soc Psychol Bull, 18*(5), 566-573. doi:10.1177/0146167292185006

McIsaac, H. K., & Eich, E. (2004). Vantage point in traumatic memory. *Psychological Science, 15*(4), 248-253. doi:10.1111/j.0956-7976.2004.00660.x

McKeown, S., & Dixon, J. (2017). The "contact hypothesis": Critical reflections and future directions. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 11*(1). doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/spc3.12295

Mezzich, J., Ruiperez, M., Yoon, G., Liu, J., & Zapata-Vega, M. (2009). Measuring cultural identity: Validation of a modified Cortes, Rogler and Malgady Bicultural Scale in three ethnic groups in New York. *Culture, Medicine, and Psychiatry, 33*(3), 451-472. doi:10.1007/s11013-009-9142-6

Mischkowski, D., Kross, E., & Bushman, B. J. (2012). Flies on the wall are less aggressive: Self-distancing "in the heat of the moment" reduces aggressive thoughts, angry feelings and aggressive behavior. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, *48*(5), 1187-1191. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2012.03.012

Nigro, G., & Neisser, U. (1983). Point of view in personal memories. *Cognitive psychology*, *15*(4), 467-482. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0010-0285(83)90016-6

Nolen-Hoeksema, S., Wisco, B. E., & Lyubomirsky, S. (2008). Rethinking rumination. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(5), 400-424. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00088.x

Office of the Press Secretary. (2017). Executive order: Protecting the nation from foreign terrorist Entry into the United states. Retrieved from https://www.whitehouse.gov/the-press-office/2017/01/27/executive-order-protecting-nation-foreign-terrorist-entry-united-states

Paolacci, G., & Chandler, J. (2014). Inside the Turk: Understanding mechanical Turk as a participant pool. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 23*(3), 184-188. doi:10.1177/0963721414531598

Paolini, S., Harwood, J., & Rubin, M. (2010). Negative intergroup contact makes group memberships salient: Explaining why intergroup conflict endures. *Personality and Social Psychological Bulletin, 36*(12), 1723-1738. doi:10.1177/0146167210388667

Park, J., Ayduk, Ö, & Kross, E. (2016). Stepping back to move forward: Expressive writing promotes self-distancing. *Emotion, 16*(3), 349-364. doi:10.1037/emo0000121 ER

Pelc, N. (2017). *American enough? attitudes toward immigrants, patriotism, and nationalism* (Doctoral dissertation, Texas Woman's University). Available from PsycINFO. (1924848011; 2017-05714-002).

Pennebaker, J. W. (2003). Writing about emotional experiences as a therapeutic process. In P. Salovey, & A. J. Rothman (Eds.), *Social Psychology of Health* (pp. 362-368, Chapter xii, 396 Pages). New York, NY, US: Psychology Press.

Perdue, C. W., Dovidio, J. F., Gurtman, M. B., & Tyler, R. B. (1990). Us and them: Social categorization and the process of intergroup bias. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(3), 475-486. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.59.3.475

Pettigrew, T. F. (1998). Intergroup contact theory. *Annual Review of Psychology, 49*(1), 65-85. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1146/annurev.psych.49.1.65

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2006). A meta-analytic test of intergroup contact theory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 90*(5), 751-783. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1037/0022-3514.90.5.751

Pettigrew, T. F., & Tropp, L. R. (2008). How does intergroup contact reduce prejudice? Meta-analytic tests of three mediators. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 38*(6), 922-934. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1002/ejsp.504

Rachael, R. (2017). Donald Trump immigration ban: 60, 000 visas revoked after travel restrictions imposed on seven Muslim-majority countries. Retrieved from http://www.independent.co.uk/news/world/americas/donald-trump-travel-ban-immigration-visas-revoked-us-president-muslim-countries-a7561986.html

Redfield, R., Linton, R., & Herskovits, M. J. (1936). Memorandum for the study of acculturation. *American Anthropologist, 38*(1), 149-152. doi:10.1525/aa.1936.38.1.02a00330

Regan, T. (2017). Why Trump's anti-Muslim immigration ban is ineffectual. *The Washington Report on Middle East Affairs, 36*(2), 10-11.

Richeson, N., & Thorson, J. A. (2002). The effect of autobiographical writing on the subjective

well-being of older adults. *North American Journal of Psychology, 4*(3), 395-404.

Riek, B. M., Mania, E. W., & Gaertner, S. L. (2006). Intergroup threat and outgroup attitudes: A meta-analytic review. *Personality and Social Psychology Review, 10*(4), 336-353. doi:10.1207/s15327957pspr1004_4

Robinson, J. A., & Swanson, K. L. (1993). Field and observer modes of remembering. *Memory, 1*(3), 169-184. doi:10.1080/09658219308258230

Salthouse, T. A. (2004). What and when of cognitive aging. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 13*(4), 140-144. doi:10.1111/j.0963-7214.2004.00293.x

Schneider, S. L. (2008). Anti-immigrant attitudes in Europe: Outgroup size and perceived ethnic threat. *European Sociological Review, 24*(1), 53-67. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1093/esr/jcm034

Shapiro, J. R., Baldwin, M., Williams, A. M., & Trawalter, S. (2011). The company you keep: Fear of rejection in intergroup interaction. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 47*(1), 221-227. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2010.10.006

Staudinger, U. M., & Glück, J. (2011). Psychological wisdom research: Commonalities and differences in a growing field. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 215-241. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1146/annurev.psych.121208.131659

Sternberg, R. J. (1990). *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development.* Cambridge University Press.

Stiglitz, J., E. (2017). The overselling of globalization. *Business Economics, 52*(3), 129-137.

Soto, J. A., Perez, C. R., Kim, Y., Lee, E. A., & Minnick, M. R. (2011). Is expressive suppression always associated with poorer psychological functioning? A cross-cultural comparison between European Americans and Hong Kong Chinese. *Emotion, 11*(6), 1450-1455. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0023340

Su, J. C., Wei, M., & Tsai, H. (2014). Running away from unwanted feelings: Culture matters. *Cognition and Emotion, 28*(7), 1313-1327. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02699931.2014.881322

Tausczik, Y. R., & Pennebaker, J. W. (2010). The psychological meaning of words: LIWC and computerized text analysis methods. *Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 29*(1), 24-54. doi:10.1177/0261927X09351676

Tavakol, M., & Dennick, R. (2011). Making sense of Cronbach's alpha. *International Journal of Medical Education, 2*, 53-55. doi:10.5116/ijme.4dfb.8dfd

Thayer, J., Hansen, A., Saus-Rose, E., & Johnsen, B. (2009). Heart rate variability, prefrontal neural function, and cognitive performance: The neurovisceral integration perspective on self-regulation, adaptation, and health. *Annals of Behavioral Medicine, 37*(2), 141-153. doi:10.1007/s12160-009-9101-z

Trevelyan, E., Gambino, C., Gryn, T., Larsen, L., Acosta, Y., Grieco, E., . . . Walters, N. (2016). *Characteristics of the U.S. population by generational status: 2013.* (No. P23-214). Washington, DC: U.S. Census Bureau.

United States District Court. (2017). Petition for writ of habeas corpus and complaint for declaratory and injunctive relief. Retrieved from https://www.courthousenews.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/TRO.pdf

Varnum, M. E. W., Grossmann, I., Kitayama, S., & Nisbett, R. E. (2010). The origin of cultural differences in cognition. *Current Directions in Psychological Science, 19*(1), 9-13. doi:10.1177/0963721409359301

Velten, E. (1968). *A laboratory task for induction of mood states. Behaviour research and therapy*, *6*(4), 473-482. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0005-7967(68)90028-4

Verduyn, P., Van Mechelen, I., Kross, E., Chezzi, C., & Van Bever, F. (2012). The relationship between self-distancing and the duration of negative and positive emotional experiences in daily life. *Emotion, 12*(6), 1248-1263. doi:10.1037/a0028289

Walter, S. G., Renfro, L. C., Esses, V. M., White, S. C., & Martin, T. (2005). The effects of feeling threatened on attitudes toward immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29*(1), 1-19. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.04.011

Watson, D., Clark, L. A., & Tellegen, A. (1988). Development and validation of brief measures of positive and negative affect: The PANAS scales. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 54*(6), 1063-1070. doi:10.1037/0022-3514.54.6.1063

Watten, R., Syversen, J., & Myhrer, T. (1995). Quality of life, intelligence and mood. *Social Indicators Research, 36*(3), 287-299. doi:10.1007/BF01078818

Welker, K. M., Slatcher, R. B., Baker, L., & Aron, A. (2014). Creating positive out-group attitudes through intergroup couple friendships and implications for compassionate love. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 31*(5), 706-725. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1177/0265407514522369

West, A. L., Zhang, R., Yampolsky, M., & Sasaki, J. Y. (2017). More than the sum of its parts: A transformative theory of biculturalism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 48*(7), 963-990. doi:10.1177/0022022117709533

White, R. E., Kross, E., & Duckworth, A. L. (2015). Spontaneous self-distancing and adaptive self-reflection across adolescence. *Child Development, 86*(4), 1272-1281. doi:10.1111/cdev.12370

Wilder, D. A. (1978). Reduction of intergroup discrimination through individuation of the out-group. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 36*(12), 1361-1374. doi:10.1037/0022-

3514.36.12.1361

Wilson, T. D., & Gilbert, D. T. (2008). Explaining away: A model of affective adaptation. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(5), 370-386. doi:http://dx.doi.org.libproxy.wlu.ca/10.1111/j.1745-6924.2008.00085.x

Wirthwein, L., & Rost, D. H. (2011). *Focussing on overexcitabilities: Studies with intellectually gifted and academically talented adults.* Personality and Individual Differences, *51*(3), 337-342. doi:http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2011.03.041

World population prospects: The 2015 revision, key findings and advance tables. (2015). (No. ESA/P/WP.241). United Nations, Department of Economic and Social Affairs, Population Division.