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ABSTRACT

Cultural Crossing and Diversity Ideologies:

Three Essays on the Identity Politics of Cultural Accommodation and Integration

Jae Cho

My dissertation explores people’s responses to cultural crossing, exploring when and why it is admired or admonished. One form of crossing is cultural accommodation, which occurs when a recently arrived foreign visitor behaves like a local, adhering to host-country norms of behavior rather than those of his/her heritage country. The second is cultural borrowing, which occurs when ideas from multiple cultural traditions are integrated into a product, performance or activity. I propose that people’s background beliefs about cultural differences (i.e., diversity ideologies) influence their evaluations of the actions of other people who cross cultures, as well as their own decisions to cross cultures.

My studies consider two well-studied diversity ideologies—colorblindness and multiculturalism. In addition, I also consider polyculturalism, a more novel ideology that, like multiculturalism, celebrates cultural differences. However, polyculturalism differs in that it embraces cultural change. I develop novel methods for empirically distinguishing consequences of the mindset of polyculturalism as opposed to classical multiculturalism.

In Chapter 1, I explore how diversity ideologies affect people’s acceptance of foreign visitors’ accommodation to the local culture. Multiculturalism, which holds cultural traditions to be separate legacies that should be preserved, was associated with negative evaluations of high accommodation. When polyculturalism (vs. multiculturalism) was experimentally primed, high accommodation was evaluated more positively. Further, I examine the underlying effects of
diversity ideology on evaluations by focusing on trust judgments and find that multiculturalists’
distrust of high accommodators involves judgments of low ability and of identity contamination. In Chapter 2, I develop the argument that diversity ideologies guide people’s first-person
decisions about whether to accommodate when entering a new cultural context. Polyculturalism facilitated cultural accommodation and longer-term cultural adjustment by reducing concerns about contamination of heritage identity, whereas colorblindness and multiculturalism had no consistent effects.

In Chapter 3, I theorize and demonstrate that diversity ideologies also affect how people
draw upon knowledge from foreign cultures in their problem-solving. Polyculturalism encouraged participants’ inclusion of foreign ideas when solving problems, which enhanced their creativity. However, colorblindness, which views ethnicity/culture as a mirage that is best ignored, inhibited participants’ incorporation of foreign ideas, thereby reducing creativity. No effect was found for multiculturalism.

Taken together, the chapters of my dissertation contribute to a more nuanced understanding of cultural crossing: when people do it, and when people admire or admonish others for doing so. Also, these empirical findings advance research on polyculturalism and spark future research questions.
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CHAPTER 1

EVALUATING AN OUTSIDER’S ACCOMMODATION

Introduction

The old maxim to travelers—“when in Rome, do as the Romans do”—is a common refrain in this era of global business. But is it always good advice? Much recent research has explored what strengths visitors need to enact ‘Roman’ behaviors (Earley & Peterson, 2004; Yamazaki & Kayes, 2004) and the toll it takes on visitors to do so (Molinsky, 2007, 2013). But less research has probed the thoughts and feelings on the other side—how do the Romans feel about visitors who ‘do as Romans do’? The current research\(^1\) investigates how locals’ evaluation of a visitor’s cultural accommodation depends on their background beliefs about cultural differences, or “diversity ideologies” (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Thomas, Plaut, & Tran, 2014).

“Cultural accommodation” refers to a visitor’s deliberate enactment of local behavioral norms (e.g., Francis, 1991; Thomas & Ravlin, 1995), not to immigrants’ or expatriates more gradual acculturation (e.g., Morris, Savani, Mor, & Cho, 2014; Sam & Berry, 2010; Searle & Ward, 1990). Starting in the 1990s, management researchers used experiments to explore locals’ responses to different degrees of cultural accommodation. Results consistently showed that moderate accommodation was preferred to low accommodation (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999; Thomas & Ravlin, 1995); however, findings about more extreme accommodation were inconsistent. Some studies found high accommodation was liked more than moderate accommodation (e.g., Pornpitakpan, 1999) and other studies found it was liked the same amount or less (e.g., Francis, 1991). The principle that similarity breeds attraction

\(^1\) The first chapter was submitted to and will appear in Academy of Management Discoveries. Here is the citation for this research: Cho, J., Morris, M. W., & Dow, B. (in press). How do the Romans feel when visitors‘ do as the Romans do’? Diversity ideologies and trust in evaluations of cultural accommodation. Academy of Management Discoveries, amd-2016.
accounted for the greater appreciation of moderate than low accommodation (e.g., Pornpitakpan, 1999, 2003), but could not explain the variable responses to high accommodation. This lively stream of research withered away in part because of this failure to uncover why high accommodation is appreciated in some contexts and not others. The current research elucidates this mystery by introducing new constructs to explain variation in evaluations of high accommodation.

We propose that people’s background beliefs about cultural differences are a prism through which they evaluate cultural accommodation. Diversity ideologies provide a general perspective on how to accept other cultural groups and view intercultural interactions, but they differ in their explanations of intergroup conflict and their remedies for it (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Intergroup research has found that different attitudes about ingroups, outgroups, and intergroup interactions trace to different ideologies (e.g., Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004; Rosenthal & Levy, 2012; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009). Then, do the ideologies influence evaluations of cultural accommodation? While past research shows that some kinds of cultural adaptation are fostered by cultural intelligence (Earley & Ang, 2003) and amount of international experience (Townsend & Wan, 2007), this is different from evaluation of others’ accommodation. Differences in cultural capabilities and experiences may generally foster positive evaluations of foreign visitors (Cao, Galinsky, & Maddux, 2013; Leung, Ang, & Tan, 2014), but they don't imply differential liking of particular magnitudes of accommodation. The present riddle—why reservations about high accommodation appear for some groups and under some conditions—seems better explained by differences in ideologies, which include prescriptive beliefs about how much people should adhere to their heritage culture.
Another, more practical reason for focusing on diversity ideologies is that they can be primed (e.g., Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). While cultural intelligence and international experience grow over time through concerted efforts, diversity ideologies can be induced situationally through organizational policies and communications (Ely & Thomas, 2001).

We focus on the ideology most central to this literature—multiculturalism—and a more recently articulated variant—polyculturalism. Unlike the colorblind ideology of the civil rights era, both of these current ideologies acknowledge the importance of culture to identity and the need for policies to recognize cultural groups rather than ignore them (see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Multiculturalism emphasizes the need to preserve minority traditions against assimilative pressures (e.g., Berry & Kalin, 1995) and implies a notion of cultural authenticity rooted in fidelity to traditional ways. Polyculturalism emphasizes that cultures have always (and should always) interact and evolve (see Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015) and implies notions of authenticity based on hybridity and historical uniqueness. We argue that multiculturalism implies concerns about a high accommodator who drops the mannerisms of his or her heritage completely, while polyculturalism implies appreciation for the ability and flexibility to learn and perform the ways of another culture.

We further explore the process involved by examining trust judgments, measuring the traditional three components of trustworthiness factors (ability, benevolence, integrity; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995) along with a novel aspect: perceived cultural identity betrayal. Much research finds that trust-related judgments affect overall evaluations (e.g., Naquin & Paulson, 2003; Ferrin, Bligh, & Kohles, 2008; Marques, Yzerbyt, & Leyens, 1988). We will test the proposal that diversity ideologies influence trust in, and evaluations of, high accommodators.
This research has theoretical and empirical implications for understanding cultural accommodation and responses to it. First, it addresses why high cultural accommodation sometimes makes a bad impression, a question that remained unresolved by prior research. Second, it explains the influence of context in people’s evaluations of high accommodation by investigating the role of diversity ideologies. Third, it provides a practical method for organizations to increase trust of foreign visitors by making particular diversity ideologies salient. For instance, diversity policy statements (Ely & Thomas, 2001) influence employees’ everyday judgments by providing a defined framework of company values. Lastly, our research may fulfill a deeper need to understand the nuances of cultural accommodation. In today’s global business environment, employees often find themselves in the role of the visitor to a foreign environment or the local interacting with foreign visitors.

**Background**

Past experiments examining evaluations of cultural accommodation yielded inconsistent results. Francis (1991) manipulated whether a visiting Japanese sales team’s accommodation was low, moderate, or high and found that American participants rated their comfort with and liking for the visitors highest in the moderate condition. Thomas and Toyne (1995) similarly found that American participants reacted more positively to moderate than high accommodation by a Japanese manager. Pornpitakpan (1999) studied Japanese and Thai participants’ responses to accommodation by American visitors to their countries. Japanese participants gave equally positive evaluations of the moderate and high accommodation conditions. In contrast, Thai participants gave more positive evaluations when accommodation was high than when it was moderate. These differing results suggest that evaluations are not determined solely by the degree of accommodation.
Diversity Ideologies and Evaluations

We propose that varying evaluations of high accommodation may hinge on diversity ideologies. Most past research contrasted the traditional policy of colorblindness against the more current policy of multiculturalism (e.g., Plaut, Thomas, & Goren, 2009). Colorblindness assumes that prejudice and conflict between different groups results from an overfocus on skin-deep differences (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2000). Hence, colorblindness encourages treating people without regard to cultural backgrounds and focusing on what people from different backgrounds have in common (see review, Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). By contrast, multiculturalism assumes conflict and prejudice stem from a failure to understand and appreciate differences (see review, Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Hence, multiculturalism encourages recognizing distinctive cultural identities and actively preserving minority traditions against assimilative pressures of the majority. Research on multiculturalist policies in organizations finds that they do have the effect of encouraging minorities to express the norms of their heritage cultures (e.g., Purdie-Vaughns, Steele, Davies, & Ditlmann, 2008).

Intergroup research finds that these diversity ideologies channel everyday social judgments. Endorsement of colorblindness is positively associated with racial bias, whereas endorsement of multiculturalism is negatively associated with racial biases (e.g., Verkuyten, 2005). Experiments priming colorblindness versus multiculturalism find parallel effects (e.g., Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004). Also, priming a colorblind mindset, compared to a multicultural mindset, caused people to notice racial discrimination less (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010) and to suppress cultural category information (Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006; Wolsko et al., 2000). In sum, research finds that colorblindness directs attention away from cultural backgrounds, whereas multiculturalism directs attention towards
cultural backgrounds and cultural differences in behavior. Hence, the latter is more relevant to sensitivities about high cultural accommodation and the colorblindness less relevant. In the present research, we decided not to focus on the effect of colorblindness due to its lack of sensitivity to cultural differences and forms of accommodation in interactions.

The word “multiculturalism” is used rather loosely in popular discourse, especially in the USA. It appears as a label for many kinds of diversity or inclusion policies. But the original meaning of multiculturalism was coined during Canada’s 1970s effort to prevent Quebec succession, to refer to policies and laws that preserved minority cultural traditions against assimilatory pressures of the majority. This became a guiding framework for many nations with cultural or religious minorities, from Western Europe to Singapore, as well as for many public and private sector organizations. In recent years, policymakers and researchers distinguish this original concept from an increasingly prominent alternative, called polyculturalism or interculturalism (Kelley, 1999; Meer & Modood, 2012; Modood & Meer, 2012; Prashad, 2001, 2003). Whereas multiculturalism sees cultures as separate, timeless traditions, polyculturalism regards them as interacting, evolving systems that continually borrow from and react to each other (Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001, 2003). Whereas the multicultural ethos prescribes cultural authenticity through preservation, polyculturalism sees authenticity in hybridity and in each generation’s reinvention of traditional themes (Morris et al., 2015). Multiculturalism involves prescriptive beliefs about not losing one’s heritage culture. This preservationist prescription does not proscribe any exploration of other cultures’ ways; rather, it forbids assimilation, abandoning one’s heritage culture—in short, multiculturalist sensitivity is high accommodation.

These frameworks are consequential not only because they guide formal policies, but also because they become internalized as ideologies that guide people’s everyday judgments about
people from different cultural backgrounds. Experiments find that multiculturalism-primed participants become less prejudiced toward out-group targets, but are more likely to stereotype these individuals (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2000). Priming multiculturalism increases dislike of counter-stereotypical targets, which was operationalized by a person who deviates from expectations on every stereotype-relevant attribute (e.g., an African-American student whose sport is snowboarding and who’s dance preference is country dancing; Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010). Similarly, products that mixed different traditions linked to cultural identity (e.g., a design combining the US and Chinese flags) are negatively evaluated by people who endorse cultural essentialism (Cheon, Christopoulos, & Hong, 2016) which is conceptually and empirically associated with multiculturalism (Verkuyten, & Brug, 2004). We suggest that multiculturalism discourages high accommodation by perceiving it as the abandonment or contamination of heritage ways.

Negative evaluations of cultural crossing have also been documented outside of the laboratory. In Singapore, a nation traditionally committed to multiculturalist policies, locals don’t appreciate when expatriates try to mimic local speech patterns (e.g., ending sentences with “...la”, Platt & Weber, 1984). In the art world, activists committed to multiculturalism respond to artists who take on cultural styles of other groups with charges of “cultural appropriation” (Matthes, 2016; Young, 2005). These observations in the laboratory and in real-world contexts suggest that when multiculturalism is the guiding ideology, evaluators object to individuals who try to mimic customs of other cultures they haven’t been raised in or don't belong to.

Polyculturalism allows for a more nuanced view of cultural accommodation. Research on polyculturalism has looked at individual differences in endorsement of polyculturalism,
controlling for endorsement of multiculturalism. In this way, Rosenthal and Levy (2012) found that polyculturalism is positively associated with eagerness for intergroup contact, whereas multiculturalism is negatively associated. Bernardo, Salanga, Tjilpto, Hutapea, Yeung, and Khan (2016) found that racial essentialism is correlated with multiculturalism but not with polyculturalism. Rosenthal, Levy, & Moss (2012) found that polyculturalism encourages an openness to criticisms of one’s own culture, which allows for an evolution of cultural traditions. Other research finds an individual’s endorsement of polyculturalism to be associated with interest in having foreign friends (e.g., Bernardo, Rosenthal, & Levy, 2013; Rosenthal & Levy, 2016) and with accepting Muslim-Americans (Rosenthal, Levy, Katser, & Bazile, 2015). This past research suggests that polyculturalism encourages an appreciation of reaching across cultural borders.

**Overview of Current Studies**

Multiculturalism and polyculturalism are different ways of thinking about group differences that are expressed in intergroup contexts (Meer & Modood, 2012; Modood & Meer, 2012). Could it be that evaluations of high cultural accommodation hinge in part on which of these frameworks is guiding people’s inferences? The current research investigates this question.

In Study 1, we examined how individual differences in diversity ideologies correlate with evaluations of accommodation. In Study 2, we experimentally manipulated the salience of multiculturalism and polyculturalism to look for their effects on evaluations. Further, we explored whether trust-related judgments play a role in the effect of diversity ideologies on evaluations and will elaborate our expectations about this in the introduction to that study. All of our studies are set in the context of American participants’ evaluations of work colleague visiting their office from China.
Pilot Study

Given that our puzzle is an empirical pattern from experiments more than a decade ago—that evaluations do not always rise from moderate to high accommodation—we began by replicating the past design of measuring evaluations to low, moderate, and high accommodation.

Method

Participants. A total of 113 European American individuals (males = 61.9%; $M_{age} = 33.34, SD_{age} = 11.57$) from an Mturk online sample participated in the study in return for monetary compensation.

Procedures and measures. Participants were informed that they would be asked about their perception of social interactions. Participants read about a Chinese employee of an international company who had just visited the US office. They were randomly assigned to one of three conditions, each differing in the degree of the visitor’s cultural accommodation (low, moderate, high). Participants then read a one-page description of a Chinese businessman’s behavior during his first weeks in the U.S office and were asked to take the role of an American employee in that office. The description portrayed six interaction situations with his American coworkers: a greeting, a business meeting, dinner, a presentation, a promotion discussion, and completion of some paperwork. To minimize the effects of differing prior knowledge of typical Chinese behaviors, all participants were presented with a brief about typical Chinese business etiquette.

Degree of accommodation. Participants were randomly assigned to one of three degrees of cultural accommodation (low, moderate, or high) adapted from the design of Francis (1991).

In the low condition, the Chinese visitor behaved in line with Chinese business etiquette—

---

2 One hundred and forty-five participants completed the online survey before it expired. We excluded participants who failed to answer the reading check question correctly ($n = 15$), reported they were distracted ($n = 2$), or did not spend sufficient time to answer the questions reliably ($n = 15$).
introducing himself with a bow and a Chinese family name (“I am Mr. Li”), starting a meeting with relationship-building small talk before launching into the business issues, and avoiding confrontation by indirectly pointing out a colleague’s mistake after a meeting, etc. Although the visitor is accommodating in some ways such as speaking English rather than Chinese, he is not deliberately taking on American business etiquette. In the high accommodation condition, the Chinese visitor behaved like an American businessperson, starting with a handshake and introducing himself by an English first name (“Please call me Charlie”), getting down to business immediately, and correcting a colleague’s mistake during a meeting, etc. In the moderate condition, the visitor exhibited a blend of Chinese and American etiquette.

Dependent variables. After reading about the visitor’s first week in the US, participants rated the visitor on a series of dimensions used in past research (Francis, 1991) to produce an index of positive evaluation: liking of the visitor, visitor’s effectiveness, comfort with the visitor, and visitor’s appropriateness. Each was measured using a single item on a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much). By averaging four items (α = .92), we created an index of positive evaluation, which was used for analyses.

Manipulation Check. We asked participants to rate how much they felt the Chinese visitor tried to accommodate to American culture (1 = not at all, 7 = very much; adapted from Francis, 1991). In addition, participants were asked to rate, using a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much), how similar they felt the visitor’s behavior was to American culture according to past studies (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999).

Results and Discussion

Manipulation check. We performed a one-way between-subjects ANOVA and found significant differences among all three conditions on perceived attempt to accommodate, $F[2,
Post hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that a high accommodator ($M = 6.42, SD = 0.79$) was rated higher than a moderate accommodator ($M = 5.05, SD = 1.48; p < .001$), and a moderate accommodator, higher than a low accommodator ($M = 3.00, SD = 1.41; p < .001$). We performed the same analysis on perceived similarity of visitor’s behavior to American cultural norms ($F[2, 110] = 38.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .412$). Post hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that the high accommodator ($M = 6.00, SD = 1.23$) was more similar than the moderate accommodator ($M = 4.29, SD = 1.29; p < .001$), who in turn was more similar than the low accommodator ($M = 3.32, SD = 1.36; p = .001$). Thus, the manipulation was effective in simulating three degrees of accommodation.

**Evaluations.** We performed a one-way ANOVA between subjects and found a significant effect of degree of accommodation on positive evaluation, $F[1, 110] = 9.51, p < .001, \eta^2 = .147$. Post hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that the low accommodator ($M = 5.24, SD = 1.22$) was evaluated less positively than the moderate accommodator ($M = 6.27, SD = .64, p < .001$). However, as in many past studies, evaluations were less positive with the high accommodator ($M = 5.75, SD = 1.28; p = .036$) than the moderate accommodator, although still more favorable than with the low accommodator ($M = 5.24, SD = 1.22; p = .045$; see Figure 1).

**Discussion.** Evaluations rose from low to moderate accommodation but not thereafter, replicating the pattern observed in many (but not all) tests of this pattern in the 1990s (e.g. Francis, 1991, Study 1). Once again, high accommodation made a less positive impression than moderate accommodation. We explored this riddle by examining whether diversity ideologies and trust-related judgments play a role. In Study 1, we compared measured dispositional
endorsement of multiculturalism and polyculturalism. In Study 2, we developed a novel manipulation of the salience of multiculturalism versus polyculturalism.

**Study 1: Individual Differences in Diversity Ideologies**

In Study 1, we measured participants’ diversity ideologies using scales validated in prior research and manipulated whether they were exposed to low, moderate, or high accommodation. Following standard practice in this literature we also measured and controlled for colorblindness (Levin et al., 2012).

We expected that diversity ideologies would affect sensitivities to high levels of accommodation. Past studies (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999; Thomas & Toyne, 1995) consistently found more positive evaluation of moderate than low accommodation. What varied across studies (and was never explained) is that evaluations of high accommodation were sometimes less positive than moderate accommodation and sometimes not. We propose that multiculturalism may bring to focus negative aspects of high accommodation, such as that the visitor is dropping his or her cultural heritage, whereas polyculturalism may bring to focus more positive aspects, such as that the visitor is well equipped to perform jobs in a host culture.

**Method**

**Participants.** A total of 164 students (59.1% male; \(M_{age} = 27.32; \ SD_{age} = 2.12\)) who are US citizens in an MBA program at an East Coast American university participated in an online survey about their attitudes toward diversity and preferences regarding social interaction with a newcomer.

**Procedure and Measures.** First, participants were asked to complete scales measuring their diversity ideologies. Next, they read about a social interaction featuring low, moderate, or high accommodation.
**Diversity ideologies.** Participants completed Wolsko, Park, and Judd’s (2006) 5-item multiculturalism scale (e.g., “If we want to help create a harmonious society, we must recognize that each ethnic group has the right to maintain its own unique traditions.”; 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree) and Rosenthal and Levy’s (2012) 5-item colorblindness scale (e.g., “Ethnic and cultural group categories are not very important for understanding or making decisions about people”; 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). They also completed a 5-item polyculturalism scale (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012), which included statements such as, “Different cultures and ethnic groups probably share some traditions and perspectives because these groups have impacted each other to some extent over the years.” (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree). Ratings for the five items for each scale cohered (multiculturalism $\alpha = .78$, colorblindness $\alpha = .74$, polyculturalism $\alpha = .69$) so we averaged them to create indices for each ideology.

**Dependent variables.** After observing the Chinese visitor’s behaviors, participants were asked to rate liking, effectiveness, comfort, and appropriateness, as in Pilot Study. By averaging the four items ($\alpha = .89$), we created a composite variable representing positive evaluation.

As a manipulation check of the degree of accommodation condition, we asked participants to rate how much the Chinese visitor tried to accommodate to American culture (1= not at all, 7= very much; adapted from Francis, 1991) and how similar the visitor’s behavior was to American cultural norms (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999), using a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much).

**Results**

**Manipulation Check.** Results showed that significant differences among all three conditions on perceived attempt to accommodate, $F [2, 161] = 58.48, p < .001, \eta^2 = .421$. A high
accommodator \((M = 5.50, SD = 1.23)\) was seen as making more of an effort than a moderate accommodator \((M = 4.49, SD = 1.18; p < .001)\), who was seen as making more of an effort than a low accommodator \((M = 3.00, SD = 1.37; p < .001)\). Likewise for perceived similarity \((F[2, 161] = 57.63, p < .001, \eta^2 = .417)\): The high accommodator’s behavior \((M = 5.57, SD = 1.25)\) was perceived as more similar than the moderate accommodator’s behavior \((M = 4.51, SD = 1.25; p < .001)\), which was more similar than the low accommodator’s behavior \((M = 3.12, SD = 1.23; p < .001)\).

**Evaluations.** First, we performed an exploratory factor analysis using a varimax rotation on the items from all three diversity ideology scales. Three factors emerged and every item loaded greater than .60 onto the expected factor (Bernardo et al., 2016; Rosenthal & Levy, 2012). Further, we conducted confirmatory factor analyses (CFA) for a 4-factor model: colorblindness (5 items), multiculturalism (5 items), polyculturalism (5 items), and positive evaluation (4 items). The results showed that a comparative fit index (CFI) is 0.951 and standardized root mean square (SRMR) is 0.062. Given that CFI above 0.90 and the SRMR less than 0.09 are the required criteria for acceptable fit (Bentler, 1990; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2005), our model was considered acceptable.³

To isolate the individual differences of interest, we controlled for demographic variables (age and gender) that were correlated with the independent or dependent variables (see Table 1). We regressed positive evaluation on demographics (model 1), then included the accommodation condition (model 2), and added ideologies (model 3). In model 4, interactions between each ideology and the condition were added (see Table 2).

³ We tested CFA for alternative models. We conducted the CFA for a 2-factor model in which all 15 items of the three ideologies belong to a single construct with positive evaluation as another factor. The results showed that CFI is 0.734 and SRMR is 0.108. Next, we specified a 3-factor model in which the 10 items of multiculturalism and polyculturalism loaded onto a single construct with colorblindness and positive evaluation. The results showed that CFI is 0.865 and SRMR is 0.086. Both alternative models exhibited significant misfit.
Two contrast vectors (D1= low vs. combination of moderate and high accommodation, - .67, .33, .33; D2 = moderate vs. high accommodation, 0, -.50, .50) were created. In model 2, higher accommodation was favored over low (D1; $B = 1.00, SE = .17, t(159) = 5.91, p < .001$), but there was no difference between high and moderate (D2; $B = .18, SE = .20, t(159) = .86, p = .389$).

In model 3, we observed the following main effects: multiculturalism was unassociated with evaluation ($B = -.18, SE = .11, t(156) = -1.60, p = .112$), but polyculturalism was associated with more positive evaluation ($B = .43, SE = .15, t(156) = 2.89, p = .005$). The main effect of D1(low vs. combination of moderate and high accommodation) remained ($B = 1.03, SE = .17, t(156) = 6.08, p < .001$). The effect of D2 (moderate vs. high accommodation) was not significant ($p = .256$).

More importantly, in models 4A and 4B, we tested the interaction effects between each ideology and accommodation condition (D1 and D2). In model 4A, multiculturalism interacted with contrast D2 (moderate vs. high accommodation), $B = -.71, SE = .25, t(154) = -2.89, p = .004$, but not with contrast D1 (low vs. combination of moderate and high accommodation), consistent with our expectation that the influence of ideologies is at the high level of accommodation. As seen in Figure 2, evaluation of the high accommodator was less positive for participants higher in multiculturalism ($B = -.53, t = -3.35, p = .001$), whereas multiculturalism was not associated with evaluations of moderate accommodation ($p = .366$).

In model 4B, polyculturalism interacted with contrast D2 (moderate vs. high accommodation) at a marginal level of significance, $B = -.73, SE = .41, t(154) = -1.81, p = .073$. As seen in Figure 2, the evaluation of moderate accommodation was positively predicted by
polyculturalism ($B = .84, t = 2.86, p = .005$), whereas that of high accommodation was not predicted ($p = .720$).

---

**Discussion**

The results of Study 1 show that diversity ideologies mattered to evaluations of accommodation, particularly on the high end of the accommodation spectrum: Ideologies interacted with only contrast D2 (moderate vs. high accommodation) not with D1 (low vs. the combination of moderate and high accommodation). Multiculturalism sharply reduced liking for high accommodators but not moderate accommodators. Polyculturalism had a robust main effect: Participants higher in polyculturalism felt more positive toward foreign visitors who accommodated at any level. Polyculturalism did not significantly interact with D2, although a directional pattern suggested that high polyculturalism was associated with positive evaluations of both moderate and high accommodators. Low polyculturalism was less positive, particularly for the moderate accommodator. Overall, results were in line with the expectation that ideologies matter at the higher end of the accommodation spectrum.

As predicted, moderate accommodation was favored more than low accommodation regardless of effects of diversity ideologies, which was consistent with past findings (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999). To corroborate this, when the analysis is run with a contrast, specifically between the low and moderate conditions, there is no interaction with multiculturalism ($p = .524$) or polyculturalism ($p = .217$). We speculate that low and moderate
accommodators are not abandoning their heritage cultures, so they don’t trigger the preservationist concerns that follow from multiculturalism. Increasingly positive evaluations from low to moderate accommodation must come from a more general aspect of psychology (e.g., the similarity-liking principle) rather than from diversity ideology.

Although these results are consistent with the relevance of diversity ideologies to evaluations of high accommodation, correlations with individual difference measures cannot establish the causal relationship between the diversity ideologies that guide perceivers and their evaluation of a visitor who culturally accommodates. Many aspects of personality and life experience may contribute to both ideology endorsement and evaluations of high accommodators, so we cannot rule out that other variables produce the observed associations. To test the causal link between the ideologies and evaluations, we manipulated the situational salience of ideologies, contrasting multiculturalism with polyculturalism.

**Study 2: Manipulating the Salience of Diversity Ideology**

In Study 2, we manipulated diversity ideology (polyculturalism vs. multiculturalism) in a between-subjects design. Instead of including all three degrees of accommodation, we focused on moderate and high accommodation, which is where the interactions occurred in Study 1 and where the prior literature found evaluations to vary from one context to the next.

In Study 2, we sought the underlying mechanism of the effect of diversity ideologies on evaluations. Given that the diversity ideologies involve different views on behaving according to cultural tradition and different conceptions of cultural authenticity (Morris et al, 2015), we expected that they would influence judgments about trustworthiness and heritage identity. Trustworthiness relates to judgments of ability, benevolence, and integrity (Mayer & Davis, 1999; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995). Past research shows that each component
independently affects impressions and relationships in the workplace (e.g., Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007; Ferrin et al., 2008; Naquin & Paulson, 2003). Numerous studies have found that liking for others depends on their prototypicality to social identities (e.g., Abrams, Margues, Bown, & Henson, 2000; Dovidio, Gaertner, Ufkes, Saguy, & Pearson, 2016; Johnson & Ashburn-Nardo, 2014; Scheepers, Saguy, Dovidio, & Gaertner, 2014).

But how would diversity ideologies affect these judgments? Let’s consider the three components of the trustworthiness. First, *ability* refers to the target’s perceived expertise (Giffin, 1967) and competence (Butler & Cantrell, 1984). In the present study, we focused on locals’ judgment of a newcomer’s capability to perform jobs in the local culture instead of general ability. Multiculturalism may influence people to see high accommodation as an inability to perform authentically (Morris et al., 2015). By this logic, high accommodation may be judged as facile mimicry rather than true competence. Given that polyculturalism celebrates cultural exchange (Kelley, 1999), high accommodation is likely to be judged as indicative of cultural learning and dexterity.

Second, *benevolence* refers to a target’s positive intentions and motives (Mayer et al., 1995). Locals’ judgment of an accommodator’s benevolence may depend on their perception of the motives of high accommodation. Are they mirroring local ways out of respect? Or is it motivated by ingratiation? Past studies link negative evaluations of high accommodation to perceived manipulative motives (Coupland, Coupland, Giles, & Henwood, 1988; Thomas & Ravlin, 1995). Given that multiculturalism takes as a premise that cultures are vulnerable to outside influences, it may potentiate perceptions of manipulative or otherwise non-benevolent motives. Given that polyculturalism is associated with warm feelings toward cultural outsiders
(e.g., Bernardo et al., 2013; Rosenthal et al., 2015), it is more likely to give rise to judgments of benevolence.

Finally, integrity refers to the perception of a target as honest and consistent, acting true to their word and their values (Colquitt et al., 2007; Lind, 2001; Mayer et al., 1995). Multiculturalists see people’s cultural traditions as essential to who they are, and hence, high accommodators seem to be acting untrue to themselves—acting without integrity. Through the lens of polyculturalism, individuals internalize elements from different cultures, not only a single culture (Morris et al., 2015; Rosenthal & Levy, 2013). Hence, high accommodators do not seem to be contradicting their inner values. Hence, judgments of low integrity should be greater through the lens of multiculturalism than polyculturalism.

Another judgment that may be particular relevant is that of identity betrayal. Generally, we see people who exemplify culturally prototypical behaviors as the most committed or loyal members (e.g., Hoekstra & Verkuyten, 2015). Conversely, people who stray from ingroup norms are judged as less trustworthy (Hogg, 2007). Past researchers proposed that high accommodation is negatively evaluated because it threatens the distinctiveness of locals’ social identity, but the results have not supported this account (Pornpitakpan, 1999). Our argument, by contrast, involves damage to the heritage culture, not the host culture. Through the lens of multiculturalism, high accommodation is failure to preserve heritage identity, a betrayal. Polyculturalism, by contrast, does not involve a preservationist prescription; it holds cultural accommodation to be a natural and healthy process that regenerates and refreshes cultural identities.

In sum, on the dimension of identity betrayal as well as all three of the basic dimensions of trust, high accommodation may be judged differently in contexts where multiculturalism, as
opposed to polyculturalism, is salient. In Study 2, we manipulate the degree of accommodation as well as which diversity ideology is situationally primed. We measure not only evaluations but also trust and identity related judgments in order to trace the mediating processes of judgment through which ideologies affect evaluations.

Method

Participants. A total of 122 native English speakers from the Mturk population (males = 38.5%; \( M_{\text{age}} = 35.35, SD_{\text{age}} = 13.52 \)) participated in the study in return for monetary compensation. As diversity ideologies may have different meanings to different cultural and ethnic groups (e.g., Morrison, Plaut, & Ybarra, 2010; Plaut, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011), we recruited only European American US citizens.

Procedure and Measures.

Ideology salience manipulation. Participants were told they would be participating in two separate studies. The first part, ostensibly a study of reading comprehension, served to manipulate the salience of the contrasting ideologies, multiculturalism and polyculturalism. Both conditions presented descriptions of cultural education initiatives at a high school. For example, in the multicultural condition, the school created a class that describes how distinctive practices and traditions of different cultural groups have been maintained throughout history. The school cafeteria served cuisine from a different culture at each station. In the polycultural condition, the school created a class that describes how cultures borrow practices from each other evolve accordingly. The school cafeteria served fusion cuisine dishes from more than one cultural tradition.

---

4 One hundred and forty-two participants completed the online survey before it expired. We excluded participants who failed to answer the reading-check question correctly (\( n = 2 \)), reported that they were distracted (\( n = 5 \)), or did not spend sufficient time to answer the questions reliably (\( n = 13 \)).
After reading, participants were asked to think about how the school’s cultural programs could be used more widely and to come up with three potential benefits for the United States. They were then asked to re-read the description to prepare for a recall quiz about the school’s programs. The manipulation texts and the follow-up questions were adapted from previous studies (Gutierrez & Unzueta, 2010; Wolsko et al., 2000). Lastly, as a manipulation check, participants were provided with four concepts, each of which reflected a different value that the high school’s program emphasized. The students were asked to select the one concept that was most in line with the high school’s philosophy (multicultural condition: “acknowledging ethnic and cultural group differences and the importance of supporting the distinct identities of cultural groups”; polycultural condition: “understanding that different cultural groups are connected, overlap and influence each other”). After completing these questions, participants were informed the reading comprehension study was complete, and they followed the on-screen instructions for the second study about social interactions.

**Degree of accommodation.** Once again, participants were told about a corporation with offices in different countries and were asked to take the perspective of an employee in the American office before reading about the visit of a Chinese employee. In one condition the Chinese visitor accommodated to American business etiquette to a moderate degree. In the other condition, the Chinese visitor accommodated to a high degree.

**Dependent variables.** We used the same questions as in Study 1 to measure participants’ evaluation: liking, effectiveness, comfort, and appropriateness. We created an index of positive evaluation by averaging the four items ($\alpha = .92$).

---

5 We presented only one ideology option in each condition along with three unrelated options as the other ideology option might distract participants.
To assess the participants’ perception of the visitor’s factors of trustworthiness, participants were asked to rate their agreement with statements related to perceived ability on a 6-item scale (e.g., “He seems very capable of performing his job in the U.S. office”; \( \alpha = .93 \)), benevolence on a 5-item scale (e.g., “He would really look out for what is important to me”; \( \alpha = .91 \)), and integrity on a 6-item scale (e.g., “Sound principles seem to guide his behaviors”; \( \alpha = .87 \); 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; items adapted slightly from prior items used to measure these dimensions in working relationships, Mayer & Davis, 1999).

Participants were also asked how much they thought the visitor’s heritage identity was betrayed. We constructed a novel scale using seven items (e.g., “His Chinese identity is contaminated”; 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; \( \alpha = .92 \)).

**Manipulation Checks.**

As in the first study, we checked the manipulation of accommodation degree by asking participants to rate, using a 7-point scale (1 = not at all, 7 = very much), how much the Chinese visitor tried to accommodate to American culture (1= not at all, 7= very much; adapted from Francis, 1991) and how similar the visitor’s behavior was to American cultural norms (e.g., Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999).

To check the novel manipulation of diversity ideology salience, we pretested the manipulation with a separate sample of 79 European-American US citizens (males = 36.7%; \( M_{\text{age}} = 40.61, SD_{\text{age}} = 14.48 \)) from the Mturk population. They were presented with the same manipulation—they read a description of either a multicultural or polycultural initiative at a high school. Afterwards, participants were informed that they would start a new task about language proficiency. This was a sentence unscrambling task\(^6\) in which they had to compose a four-word

---

\(^6\) A test of whether an idea has been made salient is whether people are more likely to express that idea in response to an ambiguous prompt such as a scrambled sentence.
sentence (grammatically correct and meaningful) from five words presented to them in a random order (adapted from Srull & Wyer, 1979). The task consisted of eight filler items (e.g., they, fish, magnetic, a, buy) and six culture-related items which could be unscrambled into either a multiculturalist or polyculturalist sentence (e.g., naturally, cultures, are, separated, blended). Two coders independently counted the number of unscrambled sentences expressing polycultural messages (e.g., cultures are naturally blended) or multicultural messages (e.g., cultures are naturally separated). We created the index of multicultural scrambled sentences (kappa range = .76-1.00) and that of polycultural scrambled sentences (kappa range = .46-1.00) by averaging two coders’ counts on each category.

We performed a 2 (scrambled sentence indexes; within-subject factor) x 2 (ideology manipulation; between-subject factor) repeated measure ANOVA. The results showed a significant interaction between ideology conditions and sentence indexes, $F(1, 77) = 5.34, p = .024, \eta^2 = .065$. When decomposing the interaction effect, participants in the polycultural condition ($M = 3.58, SD = 1.08$) composed more polycultural sentences than those in the multicultural condition ($M = 3.05, SD = 1.03$), $F(1, 77) = 5.03, p = .028, \eta^2 = 0.061$. Participants in the multicultural condition ($M = 3.06, SD = 1.17$) composed more multicultural sentences than those in the polycultural condition ($M = 2.42, SD = 1.36$), $F(1,79) = 5.04, p = .08, \eta^2 = .061$. Because the manipulation changed their sense-making process—how they unscrambled the sentences—we conclude that it changed the salience or mental accessibility of each ideology.

Results

**Manipulation Check.** As for the degree of accommodation manipulation, the high accommodator ($M = 6.04, SD = 1.36$) was seen as trying more than the moderate accommodator ($M = 4.35, SD = 1.58$), $F [1, 120] = 38.59, p < .001, \eta^2 = .243$. Likewise, the high
accommodator’s behavior (M = 5.72, SD = 1.11) was perceived as more similar to American norms than the moderate accommodator’s behavior (M = 4.06, SD = 1.42), F [1, 120] = 49.82, p < .001, η² = .293.

**Evaluations.** As in study 1, we conducted a confirmatory factor analysis to test a hypothesized 5-factor model: ability (6 items), benevolence (5 items), integrity (6 items), identity betrayal (7 items), and positive evaluations (4 items). The results showed that CFI is 0.903 and SRMR is 0.073, which indicates that our model is considered acceptable (e.g., Chua, Morris, & Ingram, 2009; Hu & Bentler, 1999). The results suggest that three trustworthiness factors, identity betrayal, and the positive evaluations are distinct factors.  

Table 3 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among the variables. We analyzed evaluations of the visitor with a 2 (ideologies: multiculturalism, polyculturalism) x 2 (accommodation: high, moderate) ANOVA. Age and gender were included as covariates as in Study 1.  

Ideology salience had no main effect on evaluations, F [1, 116] = 2.47, p = .119, η² = .021. However, consistent with the Pilot Study, there was a main effect accommodation degree: participants evaluated the visitor more positively in the moderate than high accommodation conditions, F [1, 116] = 15.72, p < .001, η² = .119. More importantly, ideology salience and accommodation degree interacted (F [1, 116] = 3.36, p = .069, η² = .028) in a marginal effect. Decomposing the interaction with separate analyses for conditions, results showed that for moderate accommodation there was no effect of ideology, B = -.05, t = -.21, p = .835. However, there was an effect for high accommodation, reflecting that high accommodation was evaluated

---

1 We tested the CFA with 2-factors: positive evaluations and all 24 items of ABI and identity betrayal loaded onto a single factor. The results showed that CFI is 0.657 and SRMR is 0.119. Also, we tested the CFA with a 4-factor model in which items of integrity and identity betrayal loaded onto a single factor. The results showed that CFI is 0.810 and SRMR is 0.132. That is, the hypothesized 5-factor model improved a fit significantly.

2 Analyses in both studies show the same effects with or without covariates.
more positively in the context of polyculturalism than multiculturalism, \( B = .57, t = 2.27, p = .025 \).

The other way to decompose the interaction is as simple effects of accommodation degree within ideology conditions. High accommodation was favored less than moderate accommodation in the context of salient multiculturalism, \( B = -.97, t = -4.00, p < .001 \), but not in the context of polyculturalism, \( B = -.35, t = -1.52, p = .131 \) (see Figure 3). In sum, the results support our argument that diversity ideologies underlie differing evaluations of high accommodation and help to explain why moving to the high level of accommodation sometimes reduces evaluations and sometimes does not.

As for the visitor’s perceived ability, results showed neither a main effect of ideology salience or accommodation degree, \( p > .10 \). However, there was an interaction effect, \( F [1, 116] = 6.38, p = .013, \eta^2 = .052 \). For high accommodation ideology, salience mattered in that multiculturalism precipitated lower perceptions of the visitor’s ability than polyculturalism, \( B = .56, t = 2.47, p = .015 \), but not so for moderate accommodation, \( B = -.21, t = -1.04, p = .302 \). Decomposed the other way, accommodation degree had an effect in the context of multiculturalism, \( B = -.58, t = -2.64, p = .01 \), but not polyculturalism, \( B = .19, t = .91, p = .363 \) (see Figure 4).

As for the visitor’s perceived benevolence, there was no effect of ideology salience \( (F [1, 116] = .32, p = .547, \eta^2 = .003) \) and a marginal effect accommodation degree \( (F [1, 116] = 3.65, p \)
As predicted, ideology salience and accommodation degree interacted, \( F[1, 116] = 5.01, p = .027, \eta^2 = .041 \). For high accommodation, the effect of ideology salience existed, showing that multiculturalism engendered lower perceptions of the visitor’s benevolence than did polyculturalism, \( B = .50, t = 1.87, p = .063 \), but not so for moderate accommodation, \( B = -.30, t = -1.27, p = .206 \). In another way of analysis, results showed that accommodation degree had an effect only in the multicultural condition, \( B = -.74, t = -2.87, p = .005 \), not the polycultural condition, \( B = .06, t = .25, p = .801 \).

As for the visitor’s perceived integrity, there was an effect of accommodation degree in that evaluations were higher in the moderate than the high accommodation conditions, \( F[1, 116] = 10.09, p = .002, \eta^2 = .08 \). Yet there was no effect of ideology salience, \( F[1, 116] = .98, p = .324, \eta^2 = .008 \). Notably, however, there was again an interaction effect, \( F[1, 116] = 6.69, p = .011, \eta^2 = .054 \). For high accommodation, multiculturalism engendered lower perceived integrity than did polyculturalism, \( B = .63, t = 2.39, p = .018 \). But for moderate accommodation, no such effect was seen, \( p = .227 \). The other way of decomposing the interaction showed that accommodation degree significantly affected the perceived integrity solely in the multicultural condition, \( B = -1.01, t = -3.98, p < .001 \), not the polycultural condition, \( p = .685 \). In sum, while the strength of the interaction effects for the three trustworthiness dimensions varied, the pattern was parallel: Compared to multiculturalism, polyculturalism induced differing perceptions of the high (but not moderate) accommodator. High accommodators were appraised to be higher in all three components of trust—ability, benevolence, and integrity.

As for perceived identity betrayal, no main effect of ideology salience was found, \( F[1, 116] = 2.57, p = .112, \eta^2 = .022 \). The main effect of accommodation degree was significant, \( F[1, 116] = 28.87, p < .001, \eta^2 = .199 \); participants perceived heritage betrayal more in the high
accommodation than moderate accommodation condition. However, an interaction effect was found, $F [1, 116] = 4.96, p = .028, \eta^2 = .041$ (see Figure 5). For high accommodation, multiculturalism engendered more perceptions of heritage betrayal than polyculturalism ($B = -.710, t = -2.56, p = .012$), but for moderate accommodation, no such difference was found ($B = .12, t = .48, p = .631$). The other way of decomposing the interaction showed that accommodation degree strongly affected perceived heritage betrayal in the multicultural condition, $B = 1.41, t = -5.24, p < .001$, and only weakly in the polycultural condition, $B = .58, t = 2.25, p = .026$.

Insert Figures 4 & 5 about here

Moderated Mediation. We performed a moderated mediation (James & Brett, 1984) test to reveal if trust and identity related judgments mediate the effect of the ideology on evaluations of accommodation at high and moderate degrees. We used the bootstrapping method using Model 8 in the SPSS PROCESS macro (10,000 samples; Hayes, 2008, 2015) with the ideology condition as an independent variable, each trust and identity related judgment as a mediator, accommodation degree condition as a moderator, and positive evaluation as the dependent variable. The bootstrapped confidence interval (95%) indicated that the indirect effect of ideology salience (polyculturalism vs. multiculturalism) on evaluations through perceived ability ($B = .53, SE = .22, CI [.13, 1.03]$) is positively moderated by degree of accommodation (see Table 4). The same result held for perceived benevolence ($B = .31, SE = .15, CI [.07, .68]$), integrity ($B = .48, SE = .20, CI [.12, .91]$), and identity betrayal ($B = .39, SE = .21, CI [.04, .89]$).

In support of the directional interpretation, when an opposite-direction moderated mediation model was examined, the positive evaluation did not mediate the effect of ideology on each trustworthiness factor; ability ($B = .34, SE = .21, CI [-.03, .79]$), benevolence ($B = .27, SE = .18, CI [.01, .69]$), integrity ($B = .35, SE = .21, CI [-.02, .81]$), and Chinese identity betrayal ($B = -.36, SE = .22, CI [-.85, .02]$).
Further, we investigated which trust judgments matter most by including them as mediators simultaneously. Using the same bootstrapping method as above, we found that ability ($B = .33, SE = .17, CI [.08, .75]$) and identity betrayal ($B = .16, SE = .11, CI [.01, .49]$) emerge as the significant mediators. The effect of polyculturalism compared to multiculturalism on positive evaluation was mediated by perceived ability ($B = .24, SE = .12, CI [.07, .54]$) and perceived identity betrayal ($B = .14, SE = .10, CI [.01, .43]$) for high accommodation.

------------------------------------

Insert Table 4 about here

------------------------------------

**General Discussion**

The present studies explored questions left unanswered by past research on how cultural accommodation is perceived: Given that people appreciate moderate accommodation more than low accommodation, why do they not like high accommodation even more? And, why is high accommodation evaluated so differently in studies with different groups and intergroup contexts? The current studies uncovered several key findings relevant to these questions. The Pilot Study confirmed that the riddle replicates: evaluations do not simply rise with accommodation degree; rather, they rise from low to moderate accommodation but not with high accommodation. Study 1 used individual differences measures of diversity ideology endorsement to find support for our proposal that the perceiver’s diversity ideology interacts with the target’s degree of accommodation. That is, multiculturalism was associated with less positive reactions to high accommodation, but not to low or moderate accommodation. Polyculturalism was associated with more positive evaluations at all levels of accommodation.

Study 2 developed a novel manipulation of the salience of diversity ideologies to replicate the general pattern that diversity ideologies interact with accommodation degree and,
more specifically, that high accommodation is evaluated more negativity through the prism of multiculturalism than through that of polyculturalism.

In addition to evaluations, Study 2 also explored trust and identity related judgments potentially relevant to evaluations of accommodation. The literature on accommodation posited that behavioral similarity produces attraction, but this did not account for the varied responses to high accommodation. We proposed that high accommodation evokes different appraisals of the visitor’s trustworthiness and identity betrayal depending on the diversity ideology that guides the perceivers inferences. People in the multicultural condition judged the high accommodator’s ability, benevolence, and integrity to be lower than did those in the polycultural condition. In addition, the new appraisal construct we introduced, perceived heritage-identity betrayal, was markedly higher in the context of multiculturalism than polyculturalism.

While all of these appraisals showed a mediating effect when considered one at a time, we also explored which of these matter most when they are analyzed simultaneously. This analysis revealed that ability and heritage-identity betrayal were the significant mediators. Ability may have emerged because it is an appraisal that can be made from a first impression, whereas benevolence may require evidence from more sustained behavior (Schoorman, Mayer & Davis, 2007). Likewise, integrity appraisals may also play a stronger role to the extent that the perceiver sees contradictions between behaviors observed at different points in time (Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998). Identity betrayal may have dominated because the items in the scale are more specific and vivid than those in related trust appraisals such as integrity.

**Theoretical Implications**

The primary contribution of the current findings is to uncover a factor that explains why evaluations of high accommodation can vary across different kinds of perceivers and different
evaluative contexts. But the current studies also contribute to other literatures, particularly that on diversity ideologies. There have only been a few prior studies distinguishing polyculturalism from multiculturalism and most of them are based on correlational evidence from individual difference measures of polyculturalism. The current Study 2 is the first to experimentally manipulate the salience of polyculturalism as opposed to multiculturalism.

Beyond this methodological advance, our research contributes to the understanding of polyculturalism’s consequences. The positive association between polyculturalism endorsement and evaluations of foreign visitors in Study 1 adds to previous findings by linking polyculturalism to intergroup variables such as interest in friendships across group boundaries (Bernardo et al., 2013). However, Study 2 shows for the first time that polyculturalism leads to more positive evaluations of a target person who crosses cultural boundaries by accommodating to an extreme degree. Recent research in progress has added corroborative evidence for this theme that polyculturalism fosters appreciation for blurring the boundaries of cultures. Salient polycultural ideology heightens preference for experiences that involve cultural fusion rather than cultural purity (Cho, Morris, Slepian, & Tadmor, 2017). Additionally, primed polyculturalism (versus multiculturalism) heightens problem solvers’ inclusion of foreign cultural ideas in a solution (Cho, Tadmor, & Morris, 2016).

**Questions Raised for Future Research**

The current research extends the known consequences of the multiculturalist ideology. Prior research has looked at its relevance to inter-ethnic interactions within a country (e.g., Rosenthal & Levy, 2012). Little attention has been paid to how this very salient framework may also be affecting interactions between people from different national cultures. Recent years have seen a disenchantment with multiculturalist policies in many countries, particularly in Europe.
While multiculturalist policies were created with the goal of tolerance and inclusion, their practical effect in some settings has been to harden group boundaries and foment intergroup distrust. Our research documents for the first time that multiculturalist ideology fosters negative evaluations of cultural outgroup members who try to bridge cultural gaps by high accommodation behavior, but not by low or moderate accommodation behavior. That is, multiculturalists ban complete abandoning heritage culture by high accommodation. We expect that multiculturalism would not foster dislike of a target who deviated from stereotyped expectations on only as single dimension as long as they adhered on other dimensions such as moderate accommodators. This may mean that individuals such as social workers and translators who reach out to minority communities may be appraised negatively by those communities when multiculturalism is the salient guiding ideology. Members of the minority culture who succeed in the mainstream culture may also suffer from these judgments. Bicultural individuals who frame-switch across situations (“cultural chameleons”; Hong, Morris, Chiu, Benet-Martinez, 2000) may be especially castigated. Individuals who play an important role in bridging cultural differences within an organization or society, may experience personal rejection and reduced effectiveness in the context of multiculturalism.

The finding that multiculturalism promotes perceived heritage betrayal is related to the fascinating and increasingly divisive issue of cultural appropriation. Writers from the first world who have written fiction from the perspective of characters from the developing world are increasingly targeted by multiculturalist critics (Nordland, 2016). And such controversies are spreading beyond the art world. Last year, a Canadian college canceled a yoga class for the handicapped because students protested that its white instructor was appropriating an Indian practice (Moyer, 2015). At a US college, East Asian students have protested the appropriation of
their cuisines (Tran, 2015). These protests may follow from a multicultural ideology that culture is vulnerable to contamination and dilution. While preservationist has laudable goals, it easily slips into essentialism, the notion that only a person born into a culture can understand it or practice it (e.g., Cho et al., 2017). The preservationist ethos in multiculturalism leads to a focus on what can be lost by cultural exchange. Polyculturalism, on the other hand, involves a focus on the upsides of exchange.

Does polyculturalism always mitigate tensions between cultural groups and lessen the accusation of cultural appropriation? In the present paper, we focus on a business context in which both cultural groups may gain from the trade. However, other forms of intergroup contact, wars and colonization for example, are not mutually beneficial. Further research could investigate how diversity ideologies such as multiculturalism and polyculturalism guide thinking and behavior in more negative intergroup interactions. The political history of interactions (both negative and positive) between the cultural groups involved also plays a role in how interpersonal interactions such as accommodation are evaluated.

Further, the domain of interaction may matter. Accommodating to local norms in some domains of life, such as religious practices, may be more sensitive than in other domains life, such as mundane consumer goods. Morris et al. (2015) build on Fiske and colleagues (2002) model of intergroup emotions to propose that when members of a group borrow from a particular cultural out-group within a particular domain, it elicits emotional responses. A recent study showed that in Mauritius, multiculturalism mitigated the effect of high group identification on increased in-group bias, but polyculturalism did not (Tseung-Wong & Verkuyten, 2016). Further research on the contrasting effect of the two ideologies will no doubt uncover other moderating factors.
The current findings may also be relevant to the important literature on dimensions of intercultural competence. The notion of cultural intelligence (CQ) developed by Earley and Ang (2003) refers to individuals’ ability to manage cultural diversity. CQ is a well-known antecedent to successful performance in foreign cultures (Ang, Van Dyne, & Tan, 2011), and to management in intercultural contexts (Rockstuhl, Seiler, Ang, Van Dyne, & Annen, 2011). Considering CQ’s impact on intercultural performance, it is a pressing challenge in today’s globalizing world to develop people’s CQ. We propose that polyculturalism may increase one dimension of CQ: behavior CQ. Behavior CQ is the capability to modify behavior according to different cultural situations. Our findings suggest that priming a polycultural ideology may lead people to behave in a particular way by accommodating to culturally diverse situations without feelings of guilt or disgust. Future research should explore a possible relationship between polyculturalism and cultural intelligence.

Future research should also consider the relationship between colorblindness and intercultural interactions. In Study 1, colorblindness predicted positive evaluation marginally (model 3). This is consistent with the positive effects of colorblindness on reduced biases and the perceived similarity to outgroup members (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2000). In addition, people who endorsed colorblindness were motivated to be viewed as unbiased (Apfelbaum et al., 2008), which may have led to the marginal positive effect. Considering that colorblindness is differently construed depending on social goals (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009), when colorblindness leads to positive effects on intercultural interactions would be a future research questions.

The current findings also contribute to the literature on the adaptation of immigrants and refugees. Evidence suggests that the best strategy for acculturation is maintaining ties to the
heritage culture while learning the host culture (Nguyen & Benet-Martinez, 2012; Sam & Berry, 2006). This is akin to moderate accommodation, whereas an assimilation strategy is most akin to high accommodation. However, given that our work shows the risk for newcomers who make a big effort to assimilate (if viewed from a multicultural ideology), the best dynamic in societies with immigration may be mutual accommodation (Berry, 1997) that includes the accommodation of local people, especially majority groups, to integrate newcomers (Horenczyk, Jasinskaja-Lahti, Sam, & Vedder, 2013). Kunst, Thomsen, Sam, and Berry (2015) found that common group identity, including in- and out-group members, caused locals to support the integration of immigrants. Majority members felt exclusion in the context of multicultural ideology (Plaut et al., 2011), so that multiculturalism may not be effective to engender common group identity. Future research should explore how polyculturalism may function to ease tensions and build a common identity when cultures come together.

Interestingly, polyculturalism did not show increased positive evaluations for high accommodation compared to moderate accommodation. Polyculturalism embraces cultural crossing, but it may also involve an appreciation of hybridity (Cho et al., 2017). Future research should consider how the polyculturalist mindset influences judgement of newcomers in various stages of assimilation (e.g., stay in a host country for 1 week, 1 month, or 1 year).

To date, research on cultural accommodation has used hypothetical scenarios rather than real interactions. We operationalized the high-accommodation condition as showing stereotypical behaviors of Americans as past studies did (Francis, 1991; Pornpitakpan, 1999). However, actual behaviors may differ from stereotypical behaviors. We encourage future researchers to use real interactions to gain a deeper understanding of the dynamics of cultural accommodation.
**Practical Implications**

Our research contributes to a more nuanced understanding of the dynamics of cultural accommodation. Whereas decades ago, this might have been limited to salespeople for international companies, now an increasing number of people find themselves in the role of a visitor choosing how much to accommodate or in the role of an evaluator making sense of a visitor’s accommodation. Further, globalization has given rise in many societies to cultural clashes and a distrust of foreigners, so it is particularly important to understand the interactions that trigger trust or distrust. Practically, our research emphasizes how understanding the prevailing ideology can enable a visitor to better adjust his or her degree of accommodation to build trust and positive evaluations. High levels of accommodation will not be appreciated by locals who hold a fixed notion of cultural categories. The key is to understand what the locals regard as respectful and act accordingly.

These recommendations are also relevant in a context of intercultural negotiations. Accommodated behavior can improve negotiation outcomes by increasing trust (e.g., Maddux, Mullen, & Galinsky, 2008; Swaab, Maddux, & Sinaceur, 2011) and affection (e.g., Stel & Vonk, 2010), but we suggest that it can also jeopardize relationships if the adaptor’s integrity is questioned. In intercultural negotiations, negotiators may start with a moderate level of accommodation to counterparts’ cultural practice, but avoid high accommodation in order to eliminate the risk of offending people who endorse multiculturalism.

The current research also raises new areas of inquiry in managerial implications. By highlighting a polycultural perspective in mission or diversity statements, organizations can help employees accept newcomers and encourage those newcomers to adjust. One of the next questions to explore would be which activity or programs engender polycultural beliefs. As the
polycultural prime we used in Study 2 described, simple steps like having fusion cuisines in
dining halls or holding orientation programs that bring together people from different cultural
backgrounds might encourage participants to adopt polyculturalism. Future research might
contribute to the development of programs that promote interaction and exchange.

**Conclusion**

Our findings suggest that using diversity ideologies to examine cultural accommodation
dynamics adds a new perspective to past. The findings promote a greater understanding of the
nuances of cultural accommodation, its perceived success, and its potential influence.
CHAPTER 2

CHOOSING WHETHER TO ACCOMMODATE

Introduction

This era of globalization rewards cultural chameleons, people who can change their cultural habits in response to their setting. Some studies have investigated the competencies and identity structures that enable intercultural flexibility (e.g., Briley, Morris, & Simonson, 2006; Earley & Peterson, 2004; Esparza, Gosling, Benet-Martinez, Potter, & Pennebaker, 2006; Mok & Morris, 2009). However, there is very little work on the process through which a newcomer to a culture becomes to adapt his or her behavior and comes to feel comfortable in doing so. The current chapter proposes that individuals’ different assumptions about cultural relationships and differences—in other words, diversity ideologies (Rattan & Ambady, 2013)—influence the motivations and behaviors involved in accommodating to another culture.

Cultural accommodation is defined as a newcomer adopting behaviors to fit the norms of the host culture (e.g., Francis, 1991). It has been found to help intercultural interactions and long-term cultural adjustment (Black & Mendenhall, 1991). The social etiquette of one culture is not always acceptable in another (Gudykunst, 1988), so that appropriate behaviors vary by culture (O’Connell, Lord, & O’Connell, 1990). Even though people may realize the importance of cultural accommodation, following a new set of behavioral norms is challenging, as behavioral prescriptions in the host culture might conflict with the heritage identity (Molinsky, 2013; Baumeister, 1986; Maertz, Hassan, & Magusson, 2009). Furthermore, identity conflicts can evoke negative responses such as stress, anxiety, and guilt (Meglino & Ravlin, 1998; Molinsky, 2007), which can hinder cultural accommodation (Leong & Ward, 2000; Maertz et al., 2009). When people believe that attempting cultural accommodation amounts to disloyalty to their
heritage identity and values, they may be reluctant to change their behaviors. Research findings suggest that identity continuity serves a positive role for managing threats and challenges (e.g., Iyer & Jetten, 2011; Landau, Greenberg, & Solomon, 2008). It is therefore important to have secure perceptions of heritage identity when faced with new behavioral norms in order to promote cultural accommodation.

This chapter reports studies of how people choose whether to accommodate or not when outside of their heritage culture. We predict that diversity ideologies that provide people with frames to understand their cultural identities (Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015) affect their perception of whether new behaviors compromise their identity. Specifically, we distinguish three major diversity ideologies (colorblindness, multiculturalism, polyculturalism) and examine how they guide judgments about contamination of heritage identity and in turn, influence cultural accommodation. In addition to cultural accommodation, we examine the effects of diversity ideologies on cultural adjustment, which refers to psychological fit or comfort in relation to the host culture (Black & Stephens, 1989).

Theoretically, the current chapter extends research on cultural accommodation by identifying a novel predictor, diversity ideology. Adding to accumulative research on immigrants’ identity negotiation between the host and the heritage cultural identities in the acculturation process (e.g., Berry, 1997; Chen, Benet-Martinez, & Harris-Bond, 2008), our research suggests the important role of a dynamic concept of heritage identity in newcomers’ adjustment to a new culture. On a practical level, findings about how and when people choose to accommodate are relevant to the problem of how to prepare people for performing roles in other countries or facing cultural communities other than their own.

From Cultural Accommodation to Cultural Adjustment
Cultural accommodation is defined as immediate behavioral changes in newcomers according to a host culture’s customs (e.g., Francis, 1991), while cultural adjustment is defined as their longer-term attitude and self-perception of belonging to a host culture (Black & Gregersen, 1991). When expatriates first enact local cultural customs (cultural accommodation) and then come to feel competent and comfortable in the new environment (cultural adjustment), they tend to have better outcomes interpersonally and professionally (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, Harrison, Shaffer, & Luk, 2005; Black & Stephens, 1989; Molinsky, 2007). Positive relationships with locals are forged, stereotypes are reduced, and communication gaps are bridged (Earley & Ang, 2003; Pommitakpan, 2003; Thomas & Ravlin, 1995; Thomas & Toyne, 1995). In the intrapersonal domain, cultural adjustment enhances individuals’ creativity, job satisfaction, and career development (e.g., Benson & Pattie, 2008; Daily, Certo, & Dalton, 2000; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Zhu, Wanberg, Harrison, & Diehn, 2015).

However, expatriates cannot always accommodate their behaviors to local norms and this is one reason why they may fail to adjust to the culture and gain the attendant benefits (Mendenhall & Oddou, 1985). Lack of adjustment leads to poor performance and even high rates of quitting for expatriates after their overseas assignments (Bhaskar-Shrinivas, et al.,2005; Kraimer, Shaffer, Harrison, & Ren, 2012; Zhu et al., 2015). As a result, seventy to eighty percent of expatriates stated that working in foreign countries did not advance their career (Riusala & Suutari, 2000; Peltonen, 1999). In addition, this failure of adjustment costs the organization (Shaffer, Harrison, Gregeren, Black, & Ferzandi, 2006). Thus, we need research on the challenges of behavioral accommodation to prepare expatriates for some of the obstacles toward adjustment (Black, Mendenhall, & Oddou, 1991; Maertz, Takeuchi, & Chen, 2016; Takeuchi, 2010).
To enact appropriate behaviors in foreign cultures, people need to manage conflicts between new cultural behaviors and their heritage identity (Baumeister, 1986; Leong & Ward, 2000). Host-culture practices may be incompatible with home-culture values, creating identity conflicts (Maertz et al., 2009; Molinsky, 2007). That is, even when the newcomer has learned the contingencies of appropriate behaviors in the new setting, enacting these behaviors may take an emotional toll (Bazeman, Tenbrunsel, & Wade-Benzoni, 1998; Javidan, Dorfman, Sulley De Luque, & House, 2006; Maetz et al., 2009). Molinsky (2007) proposed that people who experience identity threat feel guilty and anxious upon accommodating to foreign norms. Molinsky’s (2013) qualitative study with international students identified different ways of managing identity conflicts. However, little empirical research has investigated what gives rise to identity threat in the first place. We propose that a person’s diversity ideology sets the stage for construing cultural accommodation as threatening or nontargeting to one’s identity.

**Diversity Ideologies**

Diversity ideologies are background beliefs about the nature of culture and cultural differences. Intergroup research has found that they influence attitudes and behaviors (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). The current research tests the proposal that diversity ideologies affect decisions about whether or not to engage in cultural accommodation. Specifically, we predict that diversity ideologies influence individuals’ perceived threats to their heritage identity posed by host cultural behaviors, leading to varying degrees of cultural accommodation and adjustment.

*Colorblindness* is an ideology that emphasizes the underlying commonality among all people and discourages acknowledgement of and attention to ethnic/cultural differences. It assumes that intergroup conflicts are caused by imposition of categories that create the illusion of
difference (Gaertner & Dovidio, 2000). The endorsement of colorblindness causes people to suppress and ignore distinguishing cultural characteristics, resulting in more positive intergroup attitudes at the explicit level (e.g., Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008). However, this ideology lessens people’s motivation to learn about other cultures (Morris et al., 2015). Hence, we predict that it motivates less accommodation to other cultures. Further, colorblindness does not serve the individual’s need to belong (Baumeister & Leary, 1995) and identify with a cultural group (Markus, Steele, & Steele, 2000; Zirkel, 2008). Thus, we propose that colorblind people’s intentional unawareness of cultures would suppress concerns about their heritage identity.

In contrast to the ideology of colorblindness that typically pressures minorities to drop their cultural identities (Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Zirkel, 2008), multiculturalism suggests that people should recognize and appreciate the uniqueness of each culture (Plaut, 2010; Zirkel, 2008) and should oppose ignoring diverse cultural identity (Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Multiculturalism leads to positive effects such as reducing prejudice (e.g., Richeson & Nussbaum, 2004) and increasing the self-esteem of minority group members (Verkuyten, 2009). It seems multiculturalism may encourage cultural accommodation and adjustment based on its prescription of respecting other cultural traditions. However, another aspect of multiculturalism contradicts this prediction.

Multiculturalism views cultures as separate, bounded, and fixed over time (Prashad, 2001), which heightens stereotyping of outgroups (e.g., Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). It also leads people to prefer stereotypical out-group members over counterstereotypical out-group members (Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010). As multiculturalism values the maintenance of cultural identities (Yinger, 1994), it may influence people to view cultural accommodation as damaging to a heritage culture. Gudykunst and Kim (2003) suggested that in order to
accommodate to a new culture, immigrants must forget the behaviors of their native culture. Multiculturalism may understand accommodation as emblematic of the loss of existing identity, leading to the underestimation of others’ accommodation (Cho, Morris, & Dow, in press). Multiculturalism may not be a predictor of cultural accommodation because of the conflict between its emphasis on preservation of original identity and the need to learn other cultural practices.

A newly developed ideology, polyculturalism, also emphasizes the recognition of cultural differences but places further value on the interactions and connections between cultures (Kelley, 1999; Prashad 2001; 2003). Polyculturalism is opposed to the notion that cultures are distinctive and fixed; instead, it stresses interaction among cultures and cultural fluidity (Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001). We propose that polyculturalism encourages cultural accommodation because it leaves room for the interpenetration of cultures. Recent studies show that people who endorse polyculturalism are likely to feel comfortable with cultural differences (Rosenthal & Levy, 2012) and display more positive attitudes toward people from different cultures (Bernardo, Rosenthal, & Levy, 2013). Polyculturalism was positively associated with welcoming immigrants and trusting cultural accommodators (Cho et al., in press; Rosenthal, Levy, Katser, & Bazile, 2015). We predict that substantial cultural accommodation will occur when individuals endorse polyculturalism, which places value on interactions and mutual influences between cultures.

We further hypothesize that polyculturalism reduces concern about damaging heritage identity through accommodation based on its premise that people may belong to plural cultures without conflict (Morris et al., 2015). Furthermore, polyculturalism reduces concern about purity related to the combining of different cultures (Cho, Morris, Slepian, & Tadmor, 2017) and correlates with openness to update traditional ways of thinking (Rosenthal, Levy, & Moss,
Based on these findings, polyculturalism may lead people to view adopting new behavioral norms as a sign of identity evolution rather than identity dissolution. Thus, we posit that polyculturalism reduces fear of identity damage and invigorates cultural accommodation and adjustment.

**Overview of Current Studies**

To test the relationship between diversity ideologies and cultural accommodation, we first measured incoming students’ endorsements of diversity ideologies and their motivation to change their behaviors to adjust to a new culture in Study 1. Study 2 explored the effects of diversity ideologies on behavioral changes and concerns about identity contamination in a simulated new culture. In Study 3, we tested the causal link between diversity ideologies and identity concern by priming a diversity ideology with American participants and assessing their concern about American identity contamination while accommodating to a Chinese culture. Lastly, in Study 4, we investigated the effects of international students’ endorsements of diversity ideologies on their adjustment to U.S. culture and their level of identity concern.

**Study 1: Individual Differences in Diversity Ideology**

**Method**

**Participants.** Two hundred and thirteen MBA students (males = 60.1%; $M_{Age} = 27.25$; $SD_{Age} = 1.81$; 73.2% U.S. citizens) were recruited to complete an online survey as a voluntary part of their MBA program orientation activities.

**Procedure and measures.** Students were asked to complete an online survey regarding their attitudes toward diversity and social interaction.
Diversity ideology. The students’ endorsements of three ideologies were measured as in Study 1 of Chapter 1 (See Appendix A; $\alpha_{\text{colorblindness}} = .76$; $\alpha_{\text{multiculturalism}} = .70$; $\alpha_{\text{polyculturalism}} = .79$).

Cultural accommodation motivation. After participants completed the ideology measures, they were informed that they would be asked about their future collaborations on assignments and interactions with their learning team, a culturally diverse group of five or six students to which each MBA is assigned, throughout their first year. Then, participants were asked to imagine that they were working with their culturally diverse learning team. To measure their motivation to accommodate to the new cultural landscape, we adapted Leung, Au, and Chiu’s general-other accommodation scale, created to assess “the motivation to change the self to accommodate people in one’s environment” (Leung, Au, & Chiu, 2014, p. 54). Participants were asked to rate the extent to which they would change their behaviors based on the concerns and preferences of people in the team as well as people in the school using a 7-point scale (1 = not at all to 7 = change very much; two items; $\alpha = .91$).

Control variables. Participants reported their age, gender, and citizenship, which were included as control variables in cultural adjustment studies (e.g., Froese & Peltokorpi, 2011; Hemmasi & Downes, 2012). Additionally, we assessed their personalities (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003) and total months living in foreign countries, which related to cultural adjustment (e.g., Caligiuri, 2000; Ward, Leong, & Low, 2004; Shaffer et al., 1999).

Results

Table 5 displays the descriptive statistics and correlations among all Study 1 variables. In a multiple regression analysis, we included only control variables in Model 1, only endorsements of three diversity ideologies in Model 2, and all variables in Model 3 (see Table 6). The students
who more strongly endorsed polyculturalism expressed a greater willingness to change their behaviors without (Model 2: $B = .30, SE = .13, t(209) = 2.41, p = .017, 95\%CI = [.06,.55]$, and with control variables (Model 3: $B = .27, SE = .13, t(200) = 2.12, p = .036, 95\%CI = [.02,.53]$). However, neither colorblindness ($p_{model2} = .954; p_{model3} = .948$) nor multiculturalism ($p_{model2} = .229; p_{model3} = .231$) predicted the motivation.

------------------------------------------------
Insert Tables 5 & 6 about here
------------------------------------------------

**Study 2: Introducing a Behavioral Measure of Cultural Accommodation**

Study 2 aimed to replicate the findings of Study 1, broaden a new cultural context to the national level, and introduce a behavioral measure. In addition, we hypothesized that individuals endorsing polyculturalism would experience a lower level of cultural identity concern when they behaved like the locals of another culture, leading them to accommodate their behaviors to a greater extent. To control for the effect of existing knowledge of a new culture, all participants were presented with a cultural training session during which they learned about cultural behavioral norms.

**Method**

**Participants.** We recruited European-American citizens on www. MTurk.com to hold the same objective cultural distance to a simulated new culture (China) considering that cultural distance is a predictor of cultural adjustment (Dunbar, 1992; Ward & Kennedy, 1993; Selmer, Chiu, & Shenkar, 2007). Further, only European Americans were recruited because ethnicity predicted different endorsements of diversity ideologies and led to different construals of them (e.g., Pluat, Garnett, Buffardi, & Sanchez-Burks, 2011). A total of 209 Mturk participants completed an online survey (males = 38.8%; $M_{Age} = 33.65; SD_{Age} = 12.84$).
Procedure and measures. Participants were informed that two separate studies would be included in the survey. The first would concern diversity attitudes and the second would concern social interactions and perception.

Diversity ideology. Participants’ endorsement of each diversity ideology was measured using the same scales as in Study 1 of Chapter 1 (\(\alpha_{\text{colorblindness}} = .78; \alpha_{\text{multiculturalism}} = .84; \alpha_{\text{poly-culturalism}} = .83\)).

Cultural accommodation. After participants completed the ideology measures, they were told that the first study was completed. In the second study, they were asked to imagine that they were working for an international corporation that had decided to send them to the company’s Chinese office. Participants were presented with several pictures to enhance their experience of this scenario: a map of the Chinese office, a view from the office, and a picture of their Chinese co-workers. After that, participants read the contents of a “cultural preparation” training manual mandated by the company, in which they were informed about typical Chinese behaviors.

After the training, participants were asked to compose emails to their new Chinese boss and coworkers in three different situations. In the first situation, participants were asked to introduce themselves and request to meet their new Chinese boss. In the second situation, participants were shown an email with a calculation error that they had received from a Chinese colleague, and they were asked to address this error. In the last email, participants were informed that there was a new project, and they were asked to express their interest in managing the new project.

To assess the degree of cultural accommodation in the participants’ emails, two independent coders who are familiar with Chinese culture evaluated each email with respect to how similar it was to a typical Chinese email (1 = not at all to 5 = very much; ICC = .75). The
accommodating behavior score was computed as the mean of each email’s rating. A higher score means that participants accommodated more to the Chinese culture.

**Accommodation motivation.** The participants’ motivation to accommodate to the new culture was measured by asking the same questions used in Study 1 (1 = not change at all to 7 = change very much; α = .92).

**Cultural identity concern.** Next, we measured participants’ cultural identity concern about contamination after asking them to imagine that they behave like Chinese people with 7 items (e.g., “My American identity is contaminated”), using a 7-point scale (1 = not at all to 7 = change very much; α = .91; adapted from Cho et al., in press).

**Control variables.** Participants were asked to report their demographic information (age, gender), months living abroad, and whether they had visited China before.

**Results**

Table 7 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among all variables in Study 2. Multiple regression analyses with the same steps in Study 1 were conducted for each dependent variable (See Tables 8 & 9).

**Motivation.** The result replicated the finding of Study 1 that the endorsement of polyculturalism increased the motivation for behavioral change without (Model 2: $B = .37, SE = .12, t(205) = 2.99, p = .003, 95\% CI = [.13, .61]$) and with control variables (Model 3: $B = .36, SE = .12, t(201) = 2.92, p = .004, 95\% CI = [.12 , .60]$). Although no effect was found in Model 2 ($p = .117$), in Model 3, colorblindness predicted less willingness to change marginally, $B = -.12, SE = .07, t(201) = -.17974, p = .075, 95\% CI = [-.25 , .01]$. No effect for multiculturalism was found ($p_{model2} = .439; p_{model3} = .458$; see Table 8 for complete results).
Accommodating behaviors. Polyculturalism predicted an increase in accommodating behaviors without (Model 2: $B = .17, SE = .08, t(205) = 2.26, p = .025, 95\% CI = [.02, .32]$) and with control variables (Model 3: $B = .19, SE = .08, t(201) = 2.46, p = .015, 95\% CI = [.04, .34]$). However, colorblindness was associated with less accommodating behaviors in Model 2 ($B = -.15, SE = .04, t(205) = -3.54, p < .001, 95\% CI = [-.23, -.06]$) and Model 3 ($B = -.15, SE = .04, t(201) = -3.64, p < .001, 95\% CI = [-.23, -.07]$). Again, no effect for multiculturalism was found ($p_{model2} = .563; p_{model3} = .326$; see Table 8).

Identity concern. The individuals endorsing polyculturalism experienced a lower level of concern about their American identity being contaminated in Model 2 ($B = -.49, SE = .14, t(205) = -3.58, p < .001, 95\% CI = [-.75, -.22]$) and Model 3 ($B = -.45, SE = .14, t(201) = -3.35, p = .001, 95\% CI = [-.72, -.19]$). Neither colorblindness ($p_{model2} = .356; p_{model3} = .300$) nor multiculturalism ($p_{model2} = .265; p_{model3} = .319$) predicted the identity concern (see Table 9).

Indirect effects on cultural accommodation through identity concern. We conducted the bootstrapping method (with 5,000 samples; Hayes & Preacher, 2014) to test for mediation with all control variables. Polyculturalism increased the motivation for behavior change through reducing identity concern (indirect effect = .11; $SE = .05; 95\% CI = [.03, .23]$). Again, identity concern significantly mediated the direct effect of polyculturalism on accommodating behaviors (indirect effect = .05; $SE = .02; 95\% CI = [.01, .11]$). However, identity concern did not mediate the effects of colorblindness and multiculturalism (see Table 10).

Insert Tables 7-9 about here

Insert Table 10 about here
Study 3: Experimentally Manipulating Diversity Ideology

The goal of Study 3 is to investigate a potential causal relationship between diversity ideologies and heritage identity concern.

Method

Participants. A total of 393 European-American MTurk participants who were born in the United States and who identified the United States as their home culture completed an online survey. Twenty-nine participants who failed to answer the reading check questions correctly were excluded. Thus, 364 participants remained for the following analyses (males = 42%; $M_{\text{Age}} = 38.41; SD_{\text{Age}} = 12.74$).

Procedure and measures. Participants were informed that two different studies would be included in the survey. The first would be about reading comprehension, and the second would be about social interactions and perception.

Diversity ideology manipulation. We used news magazine types of articles in which people could read ideas and supporting examples of each ideology (Cho et al., 2017; Cho, Tadmor, & Morris, 2016; Appendix B). Participants were randomly assigned to one of the four articles, which served as a prime of each ideology (colorblindness, multiculturalism, polyculturalism, and control). The participants who were assigned to the colorblind condition read an article that addressed the commonality that each cultural tradition and practice has. The participants who were assigned to the multicultural condition read an article that addressed the cultural differences and uniqueness that each cultural group has developed and maintained. The participants who were assigned to the polycultural condition read an article that showed the

---

10 Participants were asked to select “not at all” to show they were reading, and 11 participants failed to answer this question correctly. To check whether they read the article or not, we asked them to choose one correct statement that described their assigned reading article among three statements at the end of the survey, and 18 participants failed to answer it correctly.
cultural interactions and influences among different cultural groups. The participants who were assigned to the control condition read a scientific article that was adapted from the *New York Times* (Gorman, 2015). All participants were asked to write down the major theme of the presented article.

**Cultural identity concern.** After participants completed the reading task, they were informed that the first study was finished. In the next study, participants were asked to imagine that they were working for an international corporation and were asked to work in its Chinese office. Instead of presenting Chinese cultural behavior norms as in Study 2, we presented a text that described their day in the Chinese office (see Appendix C). In the text, participants were pictured as accommodating their behaviors to Chinese behavioral norms. After they read the description, we assessed their identity contamination concern using three items (“Acting Chinese compromises my American identity,” “Emulating Chinese behavior and manners is at odds with my American identity,” and “Adapting Chinese mannerisms and behaviors interferes with upholding my American identity; 1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree; α = .89).**

**Results**

Concerns about American identity contamination differed by the diversity ideology condition, \(F(3, 360) = 2.60, p = .052, \eta^2 = .021\) (see Figure 6). Post hoc comparisons using the LSD test indicated that participants in the polycultural condition \((M = 2.95, SD =1.41)\) reported the concern of American identity contamination less than people in the control condition \((M = 3.44, SD =1.61, p = .028)\). The colorblind prime \((M = 2.92, SD =1.40)\) also reduced identity concern compared to the control condition, \(p = .015\). However, no difference was found between the control and multicultural conditions \((M = 3.24, SD =1.52, p = .363)\).
Study 4: Measured Diversity Ideology and Cultural Adjustment

Since we found the positive effects of polyculturalism on motivation for cultural accommodation (Studies 1 & 2) and behavior accommodation (Study 2), Study 4 attempted to extend the positive effects of polyculturalism on international students’ cultural adjustment (Black & Stephens, 1989) to the United States. As we revealed the causal link between diversity ideology and identity contamination concern (Study 3), we investigated whether the effects of diversity ideologies on their cultural adjustment to U.S. culture was mediated by their identity contamination concern.

Method

Participants. We recruited international MBA students who identified non-U.S. countries as their home culture at an East Coast university in the United States. In the United States, since Caucasian vs. non-Caucasian international students have different degrees of adjustment difficulties (e.g., Constantine, Anderson, Berkel, Caldwell, & Utsey, 2005; Mori, 2000), we only recruited non-Caucasian students. A total of 60 students completed the survey (males = 56.7 %; \(M_{\text{Age}} = 29.13, SD_{\text{Age}} = 2.05\)).

Procedure and measures. Using the same scales in Studies 1 and 2, we measured their endorsements of three ideologies; \(\alpha_{\text{colorblindness}} = .81; \alpha_{\text{multiculturalism}} = .78; \alpha_{\text{polyculturalism}} = .67\).

Cultural identity concern and cultural adjustment. After asking to list their heritage culture, we assessed their heritage identity concern (e.g., “Acting like an American compromises my cultural identity;” three items; \(\alpha = .85\)). Lastly, they were asked to rate how well adjusted they were with regard to 14 aspects of living in the United States (Black & Stephens, 1989; e.g.,
socializing with Americans, speaking with Americans; 1 = not adjusted at all, 7 = Completely adjusted; α = .91).

**Control variables.** Participants reported their demographic information (age, gender), months living abroad (depth), and number of foreign countries lived in (breadth). We assessed their personalities (Gosling et al., 2003) and months they have stayed in the United States.

**Results**

Table 11 presents the descriptive statistics and correlations among all variables in Study 4. Multiple regression analyses with the same steps in Study 2 were conducted.

**Cultural adjustment.** Polyculturalism predicted an increase in cultural adjustment without (Model 2: \( B = .52, SE = .23, t(56) = 2.11, p = .039, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.03, 1.02] \)) and with control variables (Model 3: \( B = .56, SE = .24, t(46) = 2.36, p = .023, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.08, 1.04] \)). However, neither colorblindness (\( p_{\text{model2}} = .679; p_{\text{model3}} = .758 \)) nor multiculturalism (\( p_{\text{model2}} = .787; p_{\text{model3}} = .932 \)) predicted cultural adjustment (see Table 12 for complete results).

**Identity concern.** The individuals endorsing polyculturalism experienced a lower level of concern about their heritage identity being contaminated without (Model 2: \( B = -.95, SE = .37, t(56) = -2.58, p = .013, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-1.69, -.21] \)) and with control variables (Model 3: \( B = -1.08, SE = .35, t(46) = -3.08, p = .003, 95\% \text{ CI} = [-1.78, -.38] \)). No effect of colorblindness was found (\( p_{\text{model2}} = .942; p_{\text{model3}} = .568 \)). However, multiculturalism predicted an increase in their identity concern without (Model 2: \( B = .79, SE = .33, t(56) = 2.41, p = .019, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.13, 1.45] \)) and with control variables (Model 3: \( B = .99, SE = .30, t(46) = 3.34, p = .002, 95\% \text{ CI} = [.40, 1.59] \); see Table 12).

------------------------------------------------
Insert Tables 11 & 12 about here
------------------------------------------------
Indirect effects on cultural adjustment through identity concern. We ran bootstrapping analyses (with 5,000 samples; Hayes & Preacher, 2014) including control variables (see Figure 7). The results indicated that cultural identity concern mediated the positive effect of polyculturalism on cultural adjustment (indirect effect = .37; SE = .17; 95% CI = [.09, .79]). The indirect effect of colorblindness was not significant (indirect effect = -.02; SE = .05; 95% CI = [-.14, .07]). However, multiculturalism increased individuals’ concerns about identity contamination when accommodating to American culture, which reduced their cultural adjustment (indirect effect = -.34; SE = .15; 95% CI = [-.73, -.09]).

General Discussion

The current research used diverse samples (MBA incoming students, MTurk participants, and international students) to reveal a novel effect of diversity ideologies on people’s cultural accommodation. We found that polyculturalism promoted motivation to change behavior (Studies 1 and 2) and enact new behaviors (Study 2) and encouraged cultural adjustment (Study 4). Furthermore, polyculturalism predicted less concerns about heritage identity contamination while adapting to foreign cultural norms across studies (Studies 2–4). Consistently, identity concerns mediated the positive effects of polyculturalism on cultural accommodation and adjustment.

By contrast, colorblindness served as a predictor for reluctance to accommodate one’s behaviors to a host culture (Study 2). The identity concern did not explain the effect of colorblindness on cultural accommodation (Study 2) or adjustment (Study 4).
Finally, multiculturalism has no significant effect on accommodation motivation and behaviors (Studies 1 & 2). Interestingly, the more international students endorse multiculturalism, the more they are concerned about heritage identity damage from changing behaviors, which in turn reduced their feeling of comfort in U.S culture (Study 4).

**Implications of Current Findings**

The present work contributes to the literature by bridging intergroup relationships, culture, and expatriate adjustment research. We provide the first empirical evidence that diversity ideologies relate to cultural accommodation and adjustment. Although past studies have focused on diversity ideologies’ effects within their own cultural spaces (e.g., Rosenthal & Levy, 2012), the current research focused on their effects when people enter or stay in new cultural environments. Polycultural people are more open to newcomers who accommodated to local culture in Chapter 1. In Chapter 2, results showed that they are more likely to change their behaviors and adjust to a new culture. That is, polyculturalism leads people to welcome changes not only for others but also for themselves. Remaining consistent with the findings that colorblindness suppressed portrayals of cultural membership (e.g., Apfelbaum, Pauker, Ambady, Sommers, & Norton, 2008; Norton, Sommers, Apfelbaum, Pura, & Ariely, 2006), our experimental study showed that colorblindness explicitly suppressed identity concerns when colorblindness was primed. Furthermore, this suppression did not contribute to cultural accommodation or adjustment. Our findings suggest that colorblindness may discourage the absorption of new behavioral norms. Multiculturalism may not be an ideal approach for expatriates, as it increases dissonance between the newly acquired behavioral norms and the heritage identity in foreign situations, which supports the finding that multiculturalism encourages stereotypical thinking (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2000).
Second, we extend research on identity management for sojourners (Berry, 1997; Leong & Ward, 2000) by proposing that concern about identity contamination is a unique predictor that affects cultural accommodation and adjustment. To reduce the identity conflict, one traditional approach is abandonment of heritage identity by developing ties with the host culture (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003; Kagan & Cohen, 1990; Ward & Searle, 1991). Another approach is integrating the heritage identity and the host cultural identity (Berry, 1997; Cheng, Lee, & Benet-Martinez, 2006; Sam & Berry, 2010). Bicultural individuals whose two identities are in conflict tend to resist following cultural cues (Mok & Morris, 2009). Overall, the current findings are consistent with identity integration work, which shows that vulnerability of heritage identity reduces cultural adjustment. In addition to the importance of the strength of identification and management of two identities (e.g., Cheng et al., 2006; Morris, Mok, & Mor, 2011), we suggest that the feeling of identity continuity matters. Considering that attachment to the home culture increased feelings of security and cultural adjustment (Fu, Morris, & Hong, 2015; Hong, Fang, Yang, & Phua, 2013) and that a sense of identity continuity reduced negative attitudes toward immigrants (e.g., Jetten & Wohl, 2012), concerns about identity damage hamper first behavioral change and later cultural adjustment in the context of a new culture.

Third, the present research will contribute to expatriate adjustment research by demonstrating that cultural learning is not enough to account for decision-making about accommodation. We discovered that three diversity ideologies play a differing role in moving from cultural learning to behavioral change. We purport that colorblindness hinders the recognition of cultures, which may block the application of learned cultural knowledge to behaviors (Cho et al., 2016). Multiculturalism, on the other hand, was shown to have no positive effect on an increase of accommodating behaviors. This implies that an appreciation of cultural
differences and a desire to preserve the heritage tradition may evoke cultural cognitive dissonance in instances of accommodation (Maetz et al., 2009). Polyculturalism, with its assumption that cultures evolve by interaction and exchange, motivated people to adjust to a host culture by expanding their concept of identity (Hong et al., 2001; Morris et al., 2015). When training expatriates before overseas assignments (e.g., Black & Mendenhall, 1990), priming polyculturalism may boost the learning effects of their adjustment.

Limitations and Future Directions

Simulating a new foreign cultural context, we controlled for previous knowledge of a host culture and assessed the inclusion of newly learned behavioral norms in behavior. Although this method was novel and effective for observing behavior changes, we also acknowledge that further research is needed to investigate the effect of diversity ideologies on actual expatriates’ behavioral accommodation. Our behavioral measure for cultural accommodation can spark other behavioral methods that cultural trainers or local colleagues can apply to assess the levels of expatriates’ behavioral accommodation. In addition, future research is needed to confirm priming effects of polyculturalism. Although the current four studies documented the positive effects of polyculturalism on cultural accommodation and adjustment, we only primed diversity ideologies in one study. Thus, future research could investigate the short- and long-term effects of primed polyculturalism on people’s behavioral and psychological adjustment to host cultures.

Moreover, future research may include the direction of the accommodation: who accommodates to whose culture? Selmer and Lauring (2009) showed that German expatriates adjusted better to the U.S. culture than U.S. expatriates did to the German culture. It would be interesting to see whether polyculturalism spurs or inhibits cultural accommodation depending on the culture being accommodated. Beyond expatriates, these research questions may provide
insights into intercultural negotiators who need to decide whether to accommodate to counterparts or expect others’ accommodation.

Finally, although our research provides support for identity concern as the underlying mechanism for the positive effect of polyculturalism, it is possible that polyculturalism carries out its effects through other mechanisms such as motivation orientation. For example, polyculturalism may be associated with a promotion orientation that espouses new experiences instead of a prevention orientation that pursues the protection of a current stance (Crowe & Higgins, 1997). Future research may benefit from exploring other avenues through which diversity ideologies may impact cultural accommodation.
CHAPTER 3
CREATING BY INTEGRATING IDEAS FROM DIFFERENT CULTURES

Introduction

As globalization brings people into contact with different cultures, researchers and policymakers have sought to understand how best to facilitate positive interactions in diverse societies and organizations (Bezrukova, Jehn, & Spell, 2012; Rattan & Ambady, 2013). In this quest, intergroup researchers have found that a key ingredient influencing how people judge and treat members of cultural out-groups is the individuals’ diversity ideology (for reviews, see Rattan & Ambady, 2013; Rosenthal & Lisa, 2010). Diversity ideologies, basic assumptions about what cultures are and how they should be handled, provide a blueprint for acting in intercultural situations and judging others’ actions. Research in the areas of intergroup and diversity has long found that diversity ideologies, such as colorblindness versus multiculturalism, affect intergroup interactions (e.g., Correll, Park, & Smith, 2008; Vorauer, Gagnon, & Sasaki, 2009; Wolsko, Park, Judd, & Wittenbrink, 2000). Whereas most studies to date have investigated the effects of diversity ideologies in the context of cross-ethnic interpersonal relations, the current chapter proposes that diversity ideologies will also affect the crossing of national cultures in the intrapersonal realm.

While in other chapters I have explored the consequences for interpersonal actions and evaluations thereof, in this chapter I explore the consequences for bringing together ideas from different cultures when solving problems. More specifically, past research has implicated that drawing on foreign ideas contributes to creativity in problem solving. This chapter aims to test

---

11 This research is a collaborative work with Carmit T. Tadmor. The earlier version of this research was presented at Academy of Management Annual Meeting Symposium (Cho, Tadmor, & Morris, 2016).
the prediction that diversity ideologies affect how people make use of their foreign knowledge, thereby impacting their personal creativity.

Previous research has established links between drawing on foreign ideas and creative problem solving (e.g., Cho & Morris, 2015; Leung, Maddux, Chiu, & Galinsky, 2008; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009). Yet, incorporating foreign cultural ideas is not always easy. Mixing foreign elements with domestic elements in images sometimes induces negative responses such as disgust, perceived cultural threat, and defensiveness (Cheon, Christopoulos, & Hong, 2016; Chiu & Kwan, 2016). A recent study showed that diversity ideologies influence preferences for cultural fusion experiences, in part because of triggering cultural contamination concerns (Cho, Morris, Slepian, & Tadmor, 2017). The current research extends this finding by examining how diversity ideologies affect individual abilities to mix different cultures. We propose that diversity ideologies affect whether people are likely to include or exclude foreign cultural ideas into their problem solving.

This research has theoretical and empirical implications. We extend theory on diversity ideologies by showing that they impact an individual’s performance beyond interpersonal interactions. At a practical level, organizations can help employees’ management and integration of ideas from different cultures by exposing them to one of the diversity ideologies through a diversity policy statement or diversity training (Apfelbaum, Stephens, & Reagans, 2016; Ely & Thomas, 2001; Neville, Awad, Brooks, Flores, & Bluemel, 2013). Our findings suggest a new channel to foster creativity by shaping people’s understanding of cultural differences without their being bicultural or having lived abroad (Leung et al., 2008; Tadmor, Galinsky, & Maddux, 2012).

Diversity Ideologies
Research has focused on three major types of diversity ideologies, with each providing a unique set of assumptions and ideas about how to manage cultural diversity: colorblindness, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism (Morris, Chiu, & Liu, 2015; Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Colorblindness, rooted in civil rights movements, treats cultural and ethnic backgrounds as skin-deep and best ignored in the way people are treated. Multiculturalism, rooted in ethnic pride movements, treats cultural traditions as central to people’s identities and seeks to actively preserve minority cultures against assimilation. Polyculturalism, which has become distinguished as a separate view in the last decade’s debates about multiculturalism, likewise celebrates cultures as important but sees them as inherently intertwined. As opposed to stressing the preservation of group differences, which is at the heart of multiculturalism, polyculturalism encourages intercultural connection and exchange. Each of these policies seeks to reduce intergroup prejudice and conflict, but does so using different understandings of how conflict originates. We predict that these different premises will also have different cognitive implications for how willing people will be to utilize foreign cultural concepts.

Colorblindness maintains that the problem is overattention to ethnic and cultural categories. Thus, it suppresses difference and highlights similarities such as an individual’s status as a human being or as a member of a relevant collectivity, such as the nation (see Rosenthal & Levy, 2010). Research on the consequences of a colorblind mindset has found that it is associated with reduced out-group stereotyping, but also reduces people’s perception of actual cultural differences (Wolsko et al., 2000). Colorblindness leads to rebound prejudice under high
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12 The term “multiculturalism” should not be confused with the idea of “multicultural experience” which refers to the experiences in which people interact with various elements of foreign cultures (e.g., Leung et al., 2008; Maddux, Bivolaru, Hafenbrack, Tadmor, & Galinsky, 2013; Saad, Damian, Benet-Martinez, Moons & Robins, 2012; Tadmor, Hong, Chao, Wiruchnipawan, & Wang, 2012). Whereas the former refers to a person’s blueprint of how he approaches outgroup members, the latter refers to actual exposure experiences to foreign cultures (e.g., through living abroad or having foreign friends). Thus, we use the original meaning of multiculturalism found in ideology literature.
conflict situations (Correll et al., 2008) and reduces people’s detection of racial discrimination (Apfelbaum, Pauker, Sommers, & Ambady, 2010). Moreover, the colorblind mindset increases the appearance of being biased in intergroup interactions (Apfelbaum, Sommers, & Norton, 2008), and can lead some people under intergroup threat to use it as a means to maintain existing group status (Knowles, Lowery, Hogan, & Chow, 2009). Taken together, it appears that colorblindness inhibits people’s attention to cultural differences and leads to less engagement of intercultural interactions. Consequently, colorblindness may hinder people’s willingness to cross cultural boundaries and draw on foreign ideas.

Multiculturalism emphasizes the need to recognize cultural identity and take measures to preserve cultural traditions against assimilation (Stephan & Stephan, 2001). It sees prejudice and conflict as arising from the failure to respect differences (Takaki, 1993). Research on its consequences has found that it fosters more accurate perceptions of actual cultural differences (Wolsko et al., 2000), greater perspective taking (Todd & Galinsky, 2012), and improved interracial interactions (Berry & Kalin, 1995; Vorauer et al., 2009). And yet, by emphasizing the need to preserve authentic cultural traditions (Morris et al., 2015; Prashad, 2001, 2003), it induces categorical thinking (Wolsko et al., 2000) as well as a preference for out-group members who fit their group’s stereotype (Gutiérrez & Unzueta, 2010) and negative evaluations of those who abandoned behaviors of their cultural heritage (Cho, Morris, & Dow, in press). Thus, it appears that multiculturalism promotes opposing forces with regards to foreign idea inclusion, increasing recognition of cultural diversity, but protecting cultural boundaries to keep the originality of each culture.

In contrast to both of these approaches, polyculturalism sees cultural traditions not as static and independent systems but as evolving through continual interaction with other cultures
(Kelley, 1999; Prashad, 2001, 2003). Polyculturalism inherited the concept of cultural difference from multiculturalism, but adopted a more dynamic approach with cultural interaction as the driving force underlying cultural diversity. Research on polyculturalism has found that it is associated with eagerness for intergroup contact and positive attitudes toward people from different cultures (Bernardo, Rosenthal, & Levy, 2013). It predicts positive judgments of foreigners who adopt local customs (Cho et al., in press) and a general openness to change one’s own culture (Rosenthal, Levy, & Militano, 2014; Rosenthal, Levy, & Moss, 2012). Also, polyculturalism has been shown to increase preferences for experiences that mix foreign cultures as opposed to unitary cultural experiences (Cho et al., 2017). It follows from past theory and research that polyculturalism will encourage people to be willing to utilize foreign ideas during problem-solving.

**Relevance to Foreign-Idea Inclusion and Creativity**

The ability to implement foreign ideas during problem-solving is a component to increased creativity (Chiu & Hong, 2005; Leung et al., 2008; Tadmor et al., 2012; Tadmor, Hong, Chiu, & No, 2010). Bringing together ideas from foreign cultures and one’s own culture can break down familiar categories and increase the chance of designing something genuinely novel (Hampton, 1997; Smith, Ward, & Finke, 1995; Wan & Chiu, 2002; Ward, 1994; Ward, Smith, & Vaid, 1997). In experiments that present people with ideas from multiple cultures simultaneously and field studies that assess people’s naturally occurring experiences of other cultures, exposure to multiple cultures is associated with greater creativity (Leung & Chiu, 2010; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Tadmor et al., 2012).

But in order for these benefits to be fully realized, people must be willing to put foreign ideas to use. And that is not without risk. Studies have demonstrated that general negative
reactions to foreign cultural influence on one’s own culture, such as threat or fear, lead to the exclusion of foreign cultural ideas and interactions (e.g., Cheon et al., 2016; Chiu & Cheng, 2007; Chiu & Kwan, 2016; Morris, Mok, & Mor, 2011). Differences in individual cognitive style, values, and personality moderate reactions to foreign influences. For example, individuals high in Need for Cognitive Closure reacted negatively toward the mixing of elements from their own culture with those of another culture (De keersmaecker, Assche, & Roets, 2016). Similarly, American students high in Patriotism experienced disgust in response to pictures that fused iconic images from American and Chinese cultures (Cheon et al., 2016). In addition, people who were low in openness to experience performed poorly in creative performance when a foreign cultural symbol (i.e., McDonald’s) was embedded on an image of a cultural sacred place of their homeland (the Great Wall; Chen et al., 2016).

Hence, a topic of increasing current research is the search for the conditions under which people welcome combinations of ideas from different cultures (e.g., Cheon et al., 2016; Chiu & Cheng, 2007; Chiu & Kwan, 2016; Chiu & Leung, 2010; Morris et al., 2011). Given that we predict that diversity ideologies will differentially affect individual’s willingness to include foreign culture concepts in their thinking, we theorize that these ideologies will further differ in the odds of producing a creative burst, at least in the cultural domain. Specifically, we predict that colorblindness will inhibit creativity whereas polyculturalism will boost creativity. We made no prediction about an indirect effect of multiculturalism as past work suggests competing predictions about its direct effect on foreign inclusion.

**Overview of Current Studies**

We tested these predictions in three studies using different populations of participants (Americans, Israelis), different methodologies (correlational, experimental), and different
measures of creativity (flexibility and novelty). Specifically, Study 1 was a correlational study that tested the relationship between American participants’ endorsements of diversity ideologies and a creative problem-solving task. Study 2 randomly assigned Israeli participants to one of four diversity ideology conditions (colorblindness, multiculturalism, polyculturalism, and control) and assessed their creative problem-solving ability. These studies included both cultural and non-cultural tasks. In Study 3, we primed different ideologies in American participants and tested the cognitive mediator of inclusion of foreign culture on two cultural problem-solving tasks.

Study 1

In the first study, we sought to explore the nature of the association between diversity ideology and creative problem solving.

Method

Participants. We recruited 184 students from an east coast university who were born in the United States, and 10 participants who spent insufficient or excessive time completing the survey were excluded; thus, 174 participants remained for analysis (108 women, $M_{\text{age}} = 20.47$ years, $SD = 4.61$).

Procedure and measures. Participants’ endorsement of colorblindness, multiculturalism, and polyculturalism were measured by using established scales as in Study 1 of Chapter 1 ($\alpha_{\text{colorblindness}} = .863; \alpha_{\text{multiculturalism}} = .698; \alpha_{\text{polyculturalism}} = .830$).

Remote Associates Test (RAT). To measure creativity, we used the RAT. This task assesses participants’ ability to form new combinations from mutually remote associative clusters (Mednick, 1962). It requires participants to find a solution word that can be linked to three stimulus words. Participants completed 12 items for which the solution required the ability
to make connections among concepts associated with different cultures (cultural RAT; Chua, 2013; e.g., Roman, State, British: EMPIRE) and 12 general RAT items (e.g., light, birthday, stick: CANDLE; Zhong, Dijksterhuis, & Galinsky, 2008; see Appendix D). The sum of correct problems solved in each forms our measure of cultural and general RAT.

**Control variables.** As in previous research (see Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Tadmor et al., 2012), we controlled for age, gender, amount of time that they had spent living abroad, and the Big Five personality scale (Gosling, Rentfrow, & Swann, 2003). We further assessed racial essentialism (No, Hong, Liao, Lee, Wood, & Chao, 2008) by asking participants to what degree they agreed with eight statements (e.g., “To a large extent, a person’s race biologically determines his or her abilities and traits”) using a 6-point scale (1 = strongly disagree, 6 = strongly agree; α = .66). To measure closed mindedness, we used the closed-mindedness subscale of the Need for Cognitive Closure scale (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994; α = .55).

**Results**

Table 13 shows the descriptive statistics and bivariate correlations among all variables. In multiple regression analyses, we included only control variables in Model 1, only endorsements of three diversity ideologies in Model 2, and all variables in Model 3.

**Cultural RAT.** Colorblindness ($B = -.00, SE = .12, p = .985, 95% CI = [-.23, .23]$) and multiculturalism ($B = -.28, SE = .20, p = .159, 95% CI = [-.67, .11]$) were not significant predictors of performance on the cultural RAT in Model 2. However, the more participants endorsed polyculturalism, the greater the number of correct solutions in the cultural RAT (Model 2; $B = .63, SE = .25, p = .013, 95% CI = [.13, 1.12]$). When controlling for covariates in Model 3, the positive effect of polyculturalism remained significant ($B = .57, SE = .26, p = .032, 95%$
CI = [.05, 1.09]) but the effects of colorblindness ($p = .888$) and multiculturalism ($p = .093$) were not (see Table 14).

**General RAT.** No significant effects of diversity ideologies were found either before ($p_{cb} = .847; p_{mc} = .857; p_{pc} = .146$) or after including control variables ($p_{cb} = .962; p_{mc} = .913; p_{pc} = .111$; see Table 14).
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**Study 2**

Study 1 provided correlational evidence for the connection between diversity ideologies and creativity, at least in the cultural domain, but it cannot make any arguments related to causality. Thus, Study 2 aimed to establish a causal link between diversity ideologies and creativity through the use of priming techniques. Specifically, we utilized the fact that like other lay theories (e.g., Levy, West, & Rosenthal, 2012; Tadmor et al., 2013), beliefs about how to manage diversity are a part of people’s declarative knowledge. Consequently, they follow the principles of knowledge activation (Higgins, 1996) and can be experimentally activated by reading persuasive arguments that support each position (e.g., Wolsko et al., 2000). As in Study 1, we included both cultural- and general- RAT problems so we could test the reach of the diversity ideology effect and we also included measures of racial essentialism and closed mindedness to test them as potential mediators (Tadmor et al., 2013). Unlike Study 1, we tested our effect on a sample of Israeli participants to test the generalizability of the effects.

**Method**

**Participants.** One-hundred and five Israeli-born participants completed the online experiment. To safeguard data quality, we excluded participants (1) who failed to correctly
answer two questions describing and recalling the article’s content \((n = 3)\) and (2) who took too little or too much time to fill out the survey (e.g., two standard deviations below or above the rest of the sample; \(n = 9\)). Thus, the final sample included 93 Israeli-born participants (52 women, average age = 22.56, \(SD = 2.23\)).

**Materials and procedure.** We invited students to participate in two unrelated research projects conducted online. They were told that the first study was intended to test reading comprehension and that the second study would investigate their problem-solving abilities. We introduced the diversity ideology manipulations during the first project and administered the creativity tasks as part of the second project. As in Study 1, we measured racial essentialism (No, Hong, Liao, Lee, Wood, & Chao, 2008; \(\alpha = .84\)) and closed-mindedness (Webster & Kruglanski, 1994; \(\alpha = .49\)). At the end of the study, we asked participants to provide additional demographic information and then thanked, debriefed, and dismissed them.

**Ideology manipulation.** Participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: colorblind prime (CB), multicultural prime (MC), polycultural prime (PC) and no-prime control group (Cho et al., 2017). The priming articles were the same as in Study 3 of Chapter 2. The articles were translated into Hebrew and then back translated into English by two bilinguals to verify accuracy. After reading the article, all participants were asked to describe the main theme of the article and to recall three major findings.

**Task equivalence across conditions.** To ensure that participants did not differ in their reading experiences across conditions, after the task was completed, we asked them to indicate: (1) how they felt about the general tone of the article on a scale from 1 (extremely pessimistic) to 7 (extremely optimistic); (2) how much effort they put into the reading task on a scale from 1 (very little effort) to 7 (a lot of effort); (3) how much they liked the reading task on a scale from 1
(did not like it at all) to 7 (liked it very much). They also rated their emotions after reading the article, including both positive emotions (happy, pleased, content, satisfied; α = .973) and negative emotions (angry, afraid, worried, irritated, anxious; α = .915) on a 5-point scale.

**Cultural RAT and general RAT.** As in Study 1, participants received twelve triads to solve. Six items tested cultural associations (Chua, 2013) and six items tested general associations (Tadmor et al., 2013). All items were tested by native Hebrew speakers who verified they were linguistically and conceptually sound.

**Results**

**Contrast coding.** To test the effects of the diversity ideology manipulation, we conducted regression analyses, using three contrast vectors which together test for effects of all the experimental conditions (Hayes & Preacher, 2011; also see, Cohen, Cohen, West & Aiken, 2003). Following Vorauer and Sasaki (2010), the first contrast, labeled Ccb, compared the colorblind condition to the control condition. The second contrast, labeled Cmc, compared the multicultural condition to the control condition. The third contrast, labeled Cpc, compared the polycultural condition to the control condition.

**Task Equivalence.** As expected, results revealed no systematic differences across conditions in task tone \((F(3, 89) = 1.29, p = .282)\), task effort \((F(3, 93) = 1.52, p = .214)\), and negative emotions \((F(3, 89) = .63, p = .598)\). There was an overall effect for task liking \((F(3, 89) = 3.210, p = .027)\), but none of the specific contrasts were significant \((ps > .110)\). Finally, participants did differ in how positive they felt \((F(3, 89) = 2.68, p = .052)\), with participants in the multicultural mindset condition feeling marginally more positive relative to control participants \((C_{mc}: B = .58, p = .079)\). However, neither colorblind-primed participants \((C_{cb}: B = .29, p = .401)\) nor polycultural-primed participants \((C_{pc}: B = -.165, p = .641)\) differed from the
control.

**Cultural RAT.** Regression results revealed that relative to the control condition, a colorblind mindset led participants to solve significantly less cultural RAT items (C<sub>cb</sub>: B = -.82, SE = .35, p = .020; 95% CI = [-1.50, -.13]). A multicultural mindset, relative to the control, did not affect the number of cultural RAT items solved (C<sub>mc</sub>: B = -.11, SE = .32, p = .728; 95% CI = [-.76, .53]). However, a polycultural mindset led participants to correctly solve significantly more cultural RAT items (C<sub>pc</sub>: B = .86, SE = .35, p = .016; 95% CI = [.16, 1.56]; see Table 15).

**General RAT.** Responses on the general RAT were not affected by either the colorblind or multicultural mindset contrast (C<sub>cb</sub>: B = -.15, SE = .34, p = .660; 95% CI = [-.83, .53]; C<sub>mc</sub>: B = -.09, SE = .32, p = .789; 95% CI = [-.72, .55]). Also, a polycultural mindset had a nonsignificant effect on the number of general RAT problems solved correctly (C<sub>pc</sub>: B = .44, SE = .35, p = .206; 95% CI = [-.25, 1.13]; see Table 15).

**Indirect effects of racial essentialism and closed mindedness.** We used Hayes and Preacher’s (2014) bootstrapping method with 5,000 resamples to test the indirect effect of diversity ideology on cultural and general RAT via racial essentialism and closed-mindedness in Studies 1 and 2. As can be seen in Table 16, although neither significantly mediated the polyculturalism–creativity relationship, for Study 2, essentialism was a significant mediator of the colorblind-cultural RAT relationship.

Our results thus far seem to converge on the conclusion that diversity ideologies seem to induce predicted differential changes in cultural creativity levels. However, we have yet to
demonstrate empirically why this might be so. Therefore, in Study 3, we sought to test the hypothesized mediating role of willingness to include foreign ideas. As in previous studies, we included a cultural RAT task but in Study 3, we also included a new chicken dish recipe task in which participants were asked to invent a recipe using a list of foreign and local ingredients (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks, & Lee, 2008). The latter task allowed us to count the number of foreign ingredients used in the recipe, providing an unobtrusive and objective indicator of foreign-idea inclusion.

**Method**

**Participants.** We attempted to recruit 200 American students who were born in the United States from an east coast university. Using parallel exclusion criteria to those used in Study 2, the final sample included 192 participants (115 women, average age = 21.76, SD = 5.07).

**Materials and procedure.** As in Study 2, participants were informed that they would participate in two unrelated research projects.

**Diversity Ideology manipulation.** Using the same mock articles in Study 2, participants were randomly assigned to one of four conditions: colorblind prime (CB), multicultural prime (MC), polycultural prime (PC) and no-prime control group.

**Cultural RAT.** As in Study 2, participants were given six triads of cultural RAT that were nestled between two filler items.

**Recipe task.** Following Cheng et al. (2008), participants were presented with a list of ingredients from different cultures (e.g., wasabi sauce, barbeque sauce, chickpeas) and were asked to develop a creative chicken dish (defined as “new, delicious, and popular with potential customers”) for a new restaurant.
To determine diversity ideologies’ impact on how people cognitively relate to foreign cultures, two coders who were blind to the hypotheses and conditions calculated the percentage of foreign ingredients in all ingredients used in the recipe. This formed our index of foreign culture inclusion, which served as our mediator. To assess the novelty aspect of creativity, two other coders (one Asian and one American) rated the recipe creativity using a 5-point scale (1 = not creative at all, 5 = highly creative; ICC(2) = .66).

**Results**

**Cultural RAT.** A colorblind mindset (C\textsubscript{cb}: B = .06, SE = .16, p = .693; 95% CI = [-.23, .37]) and multicultural mindset (C\textsubscript{mc}: B = -.23, SE = .17, p = .168; 95% CI = [-.56, .10]) were not significantly associated with the number of correct cultural RAT items solved. A polycultural mindset led participants to correctly solve a significantly greater number of cultural RAT items (C\textsubscript{pc}: B = .33, SE = .17, p = .049; 95% CI = [0.001, .66]; see Table 17).

**Recipe creativity.** The recipes of participants in the colorblind mindset were rated as significantly less creative, relative to the control group (C\textsubscript{cb}: B = -.25, SE = .13, p = .049; 95% CI = [-.51, -.001]). The multicultural mindset (C\textsubscript{mc}: B = .05, SE = .16, p = .733; 95% CI = [-.22, .31]) did not predict recipe creativity. The polycultural mindset did not significantly increase recipe creativity (C\textsubscript{pc}: B = .20, SE = .14, p = .146; 95% CI = [0.07, .46]; see Table 17).

**Foreign idea inclusion.** The colorblind prime led participants to use proportionally fewer foreign ingredients (C\textsubscript{cb}: B = -6.24, SE = 2.50, p = .013, 95% CI = [-11.17, -1.30]). The multicultural prime did not affect the proportion of foreign idea inclusion (C\textsubscript{mc}: B = -2.33, SE = 2.63, p = .378, 95% CI = [-7.52, 2.86]). The polycultural prime led participants to use a significantly greater proportion of foreign culture ingredients (C\textsubscript{pc}: B = 7.05, SE = 2.63, p = .008, 95% CI = [1.86, 12.24]; see Table 17). These results are illustrated in Figure 8.
Indirect effects on recipe creativity through foreign idea inclusion. We used Hayes and Preacher’s (2014) bootstrapping method with 5,000 resamples to test the indirect effect of diversity ideology on recipe creativity via foreign inclusion. Results revealed that foreign inclusion mediated the negative effect of the colorblind prime (C_{cb}: indirect effect = -.18; SE = .08; 95% CI [-.33, -.03]) as well as the positive effect of the polycultural prime on the rated creativity of the chicken recipe (C_{pc}: indirect effect = .20; SE = .08; 95% CI [.05, .34]) as the bias-corrected 95% confidence intervals excluded zero (see Figure 9). In contrast, the indirect effect for multiculturalism (C_{mc}: indirect effect = -.07; SE = .07) was not significant, as the bias-corrected 95% confidence interval did include zero (95% CI [-.21, .08]).

Indirect effects on cultural RAT through foreign idea inclusion. As can be seen in Figure 10, using 5,000 resamples, results indicated that foreign culture inclusion significantly mediated the effect of the colorblind prime on cultural RAT (C_{cb}: indirect effect = -.06; SE = .04; 95% CI [-.18, -.01]. Foreign culture inclusion also mediated the effect of the polyculturalism prime on cultural RAT (C_{pc}: indirect effect = .07; SE = .04; 95% CI [.011, .17]). In contrast, foreign culture inclusion was not a significant mediator of the multicultural mindset-cultural RAT relationship (C_{mc}: indirect effect = -.02; SE = .03) as the bias-corrected 95% confidence interval did include zero (95% CI [-.11, .02].
General Discussion

Previous research has steadily explored the effects of diversity ideologies on interpersonal and intergroup relations. For the first time, we show that diversity ideologies affect intrapersonal cultural crossing, specifically in the realm of integrating foreign ideas into one’s problem solving. Across three studies, we found that polyculturalism led to increased creative ability on problems that rewarded cultural integration. This positive effect was mediated through the propensity for foreign-idea inclusion. By contrast, colorblindness reduced inclusion of foreign ideas, which impeded creative problem-solving. The multicultural mindset did not affect participants’ creativity relative to the baseline. We found similar patterns regardless of the type of creativity task (flexibility or novelty) and regardless of the country sampled (Israel or USA). These findings contribute to the blossoming literature on culture and creativity.

Implications

Effects of multicultural experience versus multicultural ideology. First, the effects of polyculturalism, not multiculturalism, help to clarify how creativity depends on experience with other cultures versus ideologies held about cultural diversity. Many past studies have looked at “multicultural experience” as a predictor of creativity, operationalizing it as time living in foreign countries (e.g., Maddux & Galinsky, 2009) or exposures to images of different cultures in the lab (e.g., Leung & Chiu, 2010). These findings are sometimes referred to as multiculturalism effects, but this is an unfortunate blurring of terminology. Multiculturalism is an ideology embodied by multiculturalist policies that seek to preserve and protect cultural communities (see Canadian Multiculturalism Act, 1985). Multicultural experience seems to increase creativity by increasing individuals’ foreign knowledge, thus broadening the pool of elements he or she can draw upon (e.g., Leung & Chiu, 2010; Maddux, Adam, & Galinsky,
Multicultural ideology, on the other hand, does not increase creativity. The ideology that increases creativity is polyculturalism, as it increases the willingness to draw upon the foreign knowledge that one possesses.

The different effects of multicultural and polycultural ideologies may be elucidated by phase models of intercultural development. Researchers have looked at long-term and serial changes of expatriates in background assumptions about cultures (e.g., Bennett, 1986, 1993; Kim & Ruben, 1988; Selmer, Torbiorn, & de Leon, 1998). A development model of intercultural sensitivity (DMIS; Bennett, 1986, 1993) features people’s worldview progression from a simple ethnocentric to complex ethnorelative orientations. During the first stage, people only perceive worlds through their own culture, and cultural differences are denied or underrecognized. Accepting cultural differences is the first step necessary to progress from the ethnocentrism stage to the ethnorelative stage where people understand how interrelated their own culture is with others and therefore accept other cultures equally (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). From recognizing cultural differences and adapting other cultural practices, people reach the final stage of intercultural sensitivity, integrating differences (Bennett, 1986, 1993). To obtain a creative advantage, the current research also suggests that acceptance of cultural difference is not enough. We posit that the final development stage can be achieved through the effect that a polycultural mindset has on the cognitive way people relate to other cultures.

**Extending the scope of consequences of diversity ideologies.** The current studies extend research on diversity ideologies from the interpersonal/intergroup to the intrapersonal. Our finding that not all diversity ideologies yield equally creative insights meshes well with previous research showing that diversity ideologies are not equally effective in advancing harmonious relations (e.g., Rattan & Ambady, 2013). Thus, we emphasize the conclusion that
although all diversity ideologies share a common goal for improving intergroup relations, the specific approaches they take can have either positive or negative effects, not only on interpersonal, but also intrapersonal processes.

In addition, our findings contribute to understanding what leads people to mix elements from different cultures. Prior work in cultural psychology has investigated when and why people like or dislike cultural mixtures produced by others (e.g., Cheon et al., 2016; De keersmaecker et al., 2016). The current research exhibits that polyculturalism encourages not only the consumption (Cho et al., 2017) but also the production of cultural mixing.

**The Practical goal of fostering creativity.** From a practical perspective, the current research has implications for fostering creativity. Organizations have focused much attention on uncovering the potential individual, social, and organizational factors that affect creativity (Anderson, Potecnik, & Zhou, 2014; Zhou & Hoever, 2014). As such, the present research contributes to identify diversity ideology as a novel antecedent to creative performance: the induction of a polycultural approach may provide a double whammy of not only increasing tolerance but also enhancing creative performance. In contrast, the activation of a colorblind belief may be a necessary tool to dismantling discrimination in policy or in organizations (Morris et al., 2015) but it may unintentionally preclude out-of-the-box thinking. Thus, our findings carve a potentially useful blueprint for practitioners by suggesting that instead of colorblindness or multiculturalism not uniformly positive in their impact (e.g., Rattan & Ambady, 2013) polyculturalism may offer a more failsafe approach.

**Limitations and Future Directions**

Notably, the creative impact associated with diversity ideologies appears to be limited to the cultural domain. And yet, this makes sense considering that it drives its effect through
affecting people’s propensity to use foreign cultural ideas but not through more general mechanisms such as reducing essentialist thinking or closed-mindedness (cf., Tadmor et al., 2013). Indeed, in Study 3 the pattern of the mediation results remained significant even with the inclusion of these variables.\textsuperscript{13} It is possible to speculate, however, that foreign inclusion may serve as a crucial first step in the creative expansion process (cf., Chiu & Hong, 2005; Smith et al., 1995). Starting out, polyculturalism’s impact may thus be limited to the cultural domain. However, over time, once individuals become accustomed to using foreign ideas, they may become more comfortable switching frameworks, ultimately leading to creative advantages that transcend the cultural sphere (e.g., Leung, et al., 2008; Maddux & Galinsky, 2009; Maddux et al., 2013; Tadmor et al., 2012). Future research may benefit from investigating these suggestions.

Importantly, we acknowledge several additional limitations with the current work that could open up potentially fruitful avenues for future research. First, the current research provides an initial attempt to measure the effects of diversity mindsets on people’s creativity. As such, we were limited in the number of creativity tasks we tested as well as in our reliance on a single study to test the mediation. And while it is heartening that we were able to find experimental evidence for our effect across different measures and cultural samples with the use of an objective measure of the mediator, future research would benefit from replicating this effect on other measures and through other measurements of foreign idea inclusion. Second, although we found effects of ideology primes on undergraduate students’ creativity in lab environments, our research did not reveal whether the effects would translate to the effect of diversity ideologies on employees in organizational settings. In this sense, it is encouraging that previous lab findings

\textsuperscript{13} With essentialism and closed-mindedness, foreign culture inclusion still mediated the positive effect of polycultural mindset on recipe creativity (indirect effect = .17, \textit{SE} = .08, 95\% CI [.03, .35]), on cultural RAT (indirect effect = .06, \textit{SE} = .04, 95\% CI [.01, .16]). Similarly, the indirect effects of colorblind mindset held on recipe creativity (indirect effect = -.19, \textit{SE} = .07, 95\% CI [-.34, -.05]) and on cultural RAT (indirect effect = -.06, \textit{SE} = .04, 95\% CI [-.17, -.002]).
have been extended into real-world effects. For example, the benefits associated with exposure to foreign culture experiences have been successfully replicated on real-world organizational outcomes, including organizational innovation and job market success (e.g., Godart, Maddux, Shipilov, & Galinsky, 2015; Maddux, Bivolaru, Hafenbrack, Tadmor, & Galinsky, 2014; Tadmor et al., 2012). Looking forward, it would be worthwhile to replicate our findings in organizational field studies as well as to explore whether organizational diversity policies can successfully stimulate the intended ideology mindsets. Finally, it would be valuable to extend our findings by investigating whether individuals’ creative gains from a polycultural mindset can also lead to enhancing team-level creativity. Indeed, given that cultural diversity sometimes hurts group performance (see Van Knippenberg & Schippers, 2007), a polycultural mindset may promote team functioning in terms of both improving interpersonal relations and increasing the scope from which categories of ideas can be drawn.

To conclude, in spite of the limitations, our findings establish the potential benefits and hindrances of diversity ideologies for creativity. Whereas previous research has focused almost exclusively on the interpersonal impact of people’s cultural preconceptions about how to manage and accommodate diversity, we show that these can also have critical implications for intrapersonal performance by changing the way people relate to foreign cultures. The current work suggests that both organizational scholars and practitioners should take into consideration that their diversity policies may unintentionally prime specific individual mindsets that may increase or decrease performance in completely unrelated domains.
### Table 1

**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1, Chapter 1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male (1 = Male, 0 = Female)</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Colorblindness</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Multiculturalism</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>0.77</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Polyculturalism</td>
<td>5.89</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>5.40</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Liking of the visitor</td>
<td>5.31</td>
<td>1.28</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Effectiveness</td>
<td>5.10</td>
<td>1.44</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Comfort with the visitor</td>
<td>5.63</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.86</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Appropriateness</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>1.21</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note: N = 164.

*p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001.*
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
<th>Model 4A</th>
<th>Model 4B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.06 (.04)</td>
<td>.02 (.40)</td>
<td>.04 (.04)</td>
<td>.05 (.04)</td>
<td>.05 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>.13 (.18)</td>
<td>.06 (.17)</td>
<td>.03 (.16)</td>
<td>.06 (.16)</td>
<td>.01 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodation Condition</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast D1 (low vs. moderate &amp; high)</td>
<td>1.01*** (.17)</td>
<td>1.03*** (.17)</td>
<td>2.10* (1.25)</td>
<td>.64 (1.66)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contrast D2 (moderate vs. high)</td>
<td>.12 (.20)</td>
<td>.23 (.20)</td>
<td>4.18** (1.38)</td>
<td>4.57* (2.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>-.18 (.11)</td>
<td>-.12 (.11)</td>
<td>-.16 (.11)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>.43** (.15)</td>
<td>.44** (.15)</td>
<td>.45** (.16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism × D1</td>
<td>-.18 (22)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism × D2</td>
<td>-.71** (.25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism × D1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.07 (.28)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism × D2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.73* (.41)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td>10.17**</td>
<td>7.84***</td>
<td>7.48***</td>
<td>6.52***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: N = 164. Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. 
*p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 3
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2, Chapter 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Age</td>
<td>35.35</td>
<td>13.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Male (1 = Male, 0 = Female)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>- .14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Positive evaluation</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Ability</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>- .03</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>.64***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Benevolence</td>
<td>4.88</td>
<td>0.99</td>
<td>- .07</td>
<td>- .08</td>
<td>.46***</td>
<td>.57***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Integrity</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>- .04</td>
<td>- .11</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>.75***</td>
<td>.71***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* N = 122.
***p < .001.
### Table 4

Conditional Indirect Effects of Ideology on Evaluation (Study 2, Chapter 1)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Mediator</th>
<th>Moderator (degree of Accommodation)</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ability</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>[-.47, .15]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>[.13, .71]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benevolence</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>[-.37, .06]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>[.04, .42]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>[-.41, .07]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>[.07, .65]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity betrayal</td>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>[-.24, .11]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>[.02, .75]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* When CIs of the indirect effect of a mediator do not include 0, this mediator is statistically significant (Preacher & Hayes, 2008). Results indicate that the mediation effect was found only in high accommodation condition.
Table 5

Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1, Chapter 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Colorblindness</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiculturalism</td>
<td>5.77</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Polyculturalism</td>
<td>5.99</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.36***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Accommodation motivation</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Age</td>
<td>27.25</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. U.S citizen</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.22**</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Total months in abroad</td>
<td>18.07</td>
<td>32.37</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.20**</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.44***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.94</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.28***</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.16*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>5.07</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.12†</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.28***</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.84</td>
<td>.90</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.14*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.18**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>5.59</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.21**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.13*</td>
<td>.13†</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.22**</td>
<td>.15*</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. *p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>-.00 (.07)</td>
<td>.00 (.07)</td>
<td>.00 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>.13 (.11)</td>
<td>.14 (.11)</td>
<td>.14 (.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>.30* (.13)</td>
<td>.27* (.13)</td>
<td>.27* (.13)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02 (.04)</td>
<td>.01 (.04)</td>
<td>.01 (.04)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.21 (.17)</td>
<td>-.19 (.16)</td>
<td>-.19 (.16)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U.S. citizen</td>
<td>.05 (.18)</td>
<td>.07 (.18)</td>
<td>.07 (.18)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total months in abroad</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
<td>-.00 (.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.03 (.06)</td>
<td>-.04 (.05)</td>
<td>-.04 (.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.10 (.08)</td>
<td>.09 (.08)</td>
<td>.09 (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>-.00 (.07)</td>
<td>-.02 (.07)</td>
<td>-.02 (.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.14 (.08)</td>
<td>-.15† (.08)</td>
<td>-.15† (.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.11 (.09)</td>
<td>.08 (.09)</td>
<td>.08 (.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$F$</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>3.64*</td>
<td>1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note:* Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

†$p < .10$; *$p < .05$
Table 7
Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 2, Chapter 2)

|                   | Mean | SD  | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    |
|-------------------|------|-----|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1. Colorblindness | 3.62 | 1.19|      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 2. Multiculturalism| 5.65 | .86 | -3.33***| |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 3. Polyculturalism| 5.78 | .68 | -0.06| .47***| |      |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 4. Accommodation motivation| 5.47 | 1.11| -0.15*| .21**| .26***| |      |      |      |      |      |      |
| 5. Accommodating behavior| 2.70 | .68 | -1.25***| .12†| .17*| .22**| |      |      |      |      |      |
| 6. Identity concern | 2.30 | 1.21| -0.05| -0.24**| -0.34***| -0.21**| |      |      |      |      |      |
| 7. Age            | 33.65| 12.84| -0.08| -0.04| -0.07| -1.8*| 0.01| 0.15*| |      |      |      |
| 8. Female         | —    | —   | -0.06| 0.23**| 0.07| 0.02| 0.15*| 0.06| 0.11| |      |      |
| 9. Total months in abroad | 6.12 | 19.89| -0.04| 0.01 | 0.06 | 0.11 | 0.02 | -1.2†| -1.2†| 0.02| |      |
| 10. Been to China | 0.03 | 0.17| -0.04| 1.12†| 0.16*| -0.01| -0.04| -0.06| -0.05| 0.08| 0.22**| |

Note. *p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 8

Regression Analyses on Motivation and Accommodated Behavior (Study 2, Chapter 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Motivation</th>
<th>Accommodating Behaviors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.12†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.10)</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
<td>-.02**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.16)</td>
<td>(.15)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total months in</td>
<td>.01*</td>
<td>.01†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>abroad</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been to China</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(.46)</td>
<td>(.45)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.77*</td>
<td>6.67***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 9

Regression Analysis on Identity Concern (Study 2, Chapter 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Model 1</th>
<th>Model 2</th>
<th>Model 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>(.07)</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td>(.14)</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.02*</td>
<td>(.01)</td>
<td>.02*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>(.17)</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total months in abroad</td>
<td>-.01‡</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
<td>-.01‡</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Been to China</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>(.51)</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.43*</td>
<td>4.63**</td>
<td>3.23**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$R^2$</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
**Table 10**

Indirect Effects on Cultural Accommodation (Study 2, Chapter 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Mediator: Identity Concern</th>
<th>DV: Accommodation</th>
<th>DV: Accommodating Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>Behavior</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness (CB)</td>
<td>-.10 (.06)</td>
<td>-.15*** (.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism (MC)</td>
<td>.11 (.10)</td>
<td>-.05 (.06)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism (PC)</td>
<td>.25* (.12)</td>
<td>.14† (.08)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Identity Concern</td>
<td>-.24*** (.06)</td>
<td>-.10** (.04)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Indirect effects at 95% CI*

| CB Indirect Effect     | [-.02, .02]               | -.01 (.01)        |
| [LL95%CI, UL95%CI]      | [-.07, .03]               | [-.04, .01]       |
| MC Indirect Effect     | -.03 (.03)                | -.01 (.01)        |
| [LL95%CI, UL95%CI]      | [-.10, .03]               | [-.04, .01]       |
| PC Indirect Effect     | .11 (.05)                 | .05 (.02)         |
| [LL95%CI, UL95%CI]      | [.03, .23]                | [.01, .11]        |

*Note:* Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. We included control variables. 

†p < .10; ‡p < .05; *p < .01; ***p < .001
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Colorblindness</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiculturalism</td>
<td>5.93</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Polyculturalism</td>
<td>5.94</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultural adjustment</td>
<td>5.50</td>
<td>.95</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.28</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Identity concern</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>129.13</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Female</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Breadth</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Depth</td>
<td>367.22</td>
<td>68.89</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Months in US stay</td>
<td>31.63</td>
<td>33.67</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.23</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>-.34</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agreeableness</td>
<td>5.02</td>
<td>1.04</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>4.86</td>
<td>1.31</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.31</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.53</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.46</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>5.13</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* †*p < .10; *p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
Table 12
Regression Analyses on Cultural Adjustment & Identity Concern (Study 4, Chapter 2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cultural Adjustment</th>
<th>Identity Concern</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>(.22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>.52*</td>
<td>(.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>(.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>-.21</td>
<td>(.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Breadth</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>(.05)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Depth</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Months in US stay</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>(.00)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>(.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>(.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>(.09)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>(.11)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>2.59*</td>
<td>3.18*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .10; †p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001
### Table 13
**Descriptive Statistics and Correlations (Study 1, Chapter 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
<th>13</th>
<th>14</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Colorblindness</td>
<td>2.96</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Multiculturalism</td>
<td>5.75</td>
<td>0.73</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Polyculturalism</td>
<td>6.05</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>0.33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Cultural RAT</td>
<td>3.43</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>-0.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. General RAT</td>
<td>4.07</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Racial essentialism</td>
<td>2.92</td>
<td>0.63</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>-0.26</td>
<td>-0.22</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Closed-mindedness</td>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Age</td>
<td>20.47</td>
<td>4.61</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Gender (female = 1, male = 0)</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.24</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Total months in abroad</td>
<td>8.69</td>
<td>29.65</td>
<td>-0.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>-0.08</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Extraversion</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.07</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>-0.00</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Agreeableness</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.11</td>
<td>0.09</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>0.27</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Emotional Stability</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>1.42</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.02</td>
<td>0.13</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>-0.01</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>-0.04</td>
<td>0.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Conscientiousness</td>
<td>5.34</td>
<td>1.17</td>
<td>-0.14</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.06</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>-0.10</td>
<td>-0.18</td>
<td>0.01</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. Openness to Experience</td>
<td>5.26</td>
<td>1.05</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.06</td>
<td>0.00</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>-0.11</td>
<td>-0.30</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>-0.09</td>
<td>0.02</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>-0.21</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* ***p < .001, **p < .01, *p < .05, † p < .10.*
### Table 14

**Regression Analyses on Cultural RAT & General RAT (Study 1, Chapter 3)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Cultural RAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>General RAT</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
<td>Model 1</td>
<td>Model 2</td>
<td>Model 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness</td>
<td>-.00 (12)</td>
<td>-.02 (12)</td>
<td>.11 (16)</td>
<td>.01 (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism</td>
<td>-.28 (20)</td>
<td>-.36† (21)</td>
<td>.05 (27)</td>
<td>-.03 (28)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism</td>
<td>.63† (25)</td>
<td>.57† (26)</td>
<td>.50 (34)</td>
<td>.56 (35)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>.03 (03)</td>
<td>.02 (03)</td>
<td>.06 (04)</td>
<td>.05 (04)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender (female =1, male = 0)</td>
<td>.22 (31)</td>
<td>.27 (31)</td>
<td>.38 (41)</td>
<td>.34 (42)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total months in abroad</td>
<td>.00 (01)</td>
<td>.00 (01)</td>
<td>-.01 (01)</td>
<td>-.01 (01)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>-.09 (10)</td>
<td>-.06 (10)</td>
<td>.05 (14)</td>
<td>.06 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agreeableness</td>
<td>.12 (14)</td>
<td>.16 (14)</td>
<td>.41† (18)</td>
<td>.42† (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Stability</td>
<td>.05 (11)</td>
<td>.02 (11)</td>
<td>.00 (14)</td>
<td>-.03 (14)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conscientiousness</td>
<td>-.19 (12)</td>
<td>-.21† (12)</td>
<td>-.46** (16)</td>
<td>-.49** (16)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Openness to Experience</td>
<td>.08 (14)</td>
<td>.09‡ (14)</td>
<td>.08 (19)</td>
<td>.10 (19)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Racial essentialism</td>
<td>-.20 (22)</td>
<td>-.21 (23)</td>
<td>.03 (30)</td>
<td>.11 (31)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Closed-mindedness</td>
<td>-.24 (15)</td>
<td>-.16 (16)</td>
<td>-.21 (20)</td>
<td>-.14 (21)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.14</td>
<td>2.30†</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>1.83‡</td>
<td>.88</td>
<td>1.62†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( R^2 )</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note:** Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.  
†\( p < .10 \); ‡\( p < .05 \); **\( p < .01 \); ***\( p < .00 \)
Table 15

Means and Standard Error as a Function of Prime Condition (Study 2, Chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Colorblind Condition</th>
<th>Multicultural Condition</th>
<th>Polycultural Condition</th>
<th>$F$ (3, 89)</th>
<th>$p$</th>
<th>$\eta^2$</th>
<th>$C_{db}$ b(SE)</th>
<th>$C_{mc}$ b(SE)</th>
<th>$C_{pc}$ b(SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural</td>
<td>4.09 (1.88)</td>
<td>3.21 (2.04)</td>
<td>3.91 (1.95)</td>
<td>4.89 (.76)</td>
<td>2.79</td>
<td>.045*</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>-.82*</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.86*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAT</td>
<td>2.58 (1.87)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.86)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.69)</td>
<td>3.22 (1.44)</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.019</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.
*p < .05
### Table 16

**Indirect Effects of (1) Essentialism and (2) Closed-mindedness for (a) Study 1; (b) Study 2 (Chapter 3)**

#### (a) Study 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Mediator Cultural RAT</th>
<th>Mediator General RAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>Closed-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colorblindness (CB)</td>
<td>.00 (.12)</td>
<td>.02 (.12)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Multiculturalism (MC)</td>
<td>-.33 (20)</td>
<td>-.26 (.20)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyculturalism (PC)</td>
<td>.58* (.25)</td>
<td>.55* (.25)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>-.30 (.22)</td>
<td>-.21 (1.83)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect effects at 95% CI**

| CB Indirect Effect | [-.04, .01] | [-.09, .01] | [.02, .03] | [-.10, .02] |
| MC Indirect Effect | [.05, .05]  | [-.02, .03] | [-.01, .06] | [-.02, .04] |
| PC Indirect Effect | [.05, .05]  | [.07, .06] | [-.01, .06] | .06 .08     |

#### (b) Study 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IV</th>
<th>Mediator Cultural RAT</th>
<th>Mediator General RAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Essentialism</td>
<td>Closed-mindedness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;cb&lt;/sub&gt; (CB vs. Control)</td>
<td>-.95** (.35)</td>
<td>-.82* (.35)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;mc&lt;/sub&gt; (MC vs. Control)</td>
<td>-.03 (.32)</td>
<td>-.11 (.33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C&lt;sub&gt;pc&lt;/sub&gt; (PC vs. Control)</td>
<td>.96** (.35)</td>
<td>.87* (.36)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mediator</td>
<td>-.41+ (.21)</td>
<td>-.02 (.30)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Indirect effects at 95% CI**

| CB Indirect Effect | [.00, .42] | [-.09, .13] | [.01, .35] | [-.03, .24] |
| MC Indirect Effect | .08 (.08)  | .00 (.04)  | -.06 (.07) | .03 (.05)  |
| PC Indirect Effect | [.34, .02] | [.06, .10] | [.28, .02] | [.03, .20] |
| Mediator           | [.41, .20]  | [.15, .08] | [.33, .02] | [.28, .03] |

**Note:** Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses. *p < .05; **p < .01
Table 17

Means and Standard Error as a Function of Prime Condition (Study 3, Chapter 3)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>DV</th>
<th>Control Condition</th>
<th>Colorblind Condition</th>
<th>Multicultural Condition</th>
<th>Polycultural Condition</th>
<th>F (3, 188)</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>η²</th>
<th>C_{cb} \ b(SE)</th>
<th>C_{inc} b( SE)</th>
<th>C_{pc} b(SE)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural RAT</td>
<td>2.70 (1.33)</td>
<td>2.92 (1.14)</td>
<td>2.63 (1.31)</td>
<td>3.19 (1.31)</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td>.158</td>
<td>.027</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipe</td>
<td>2.96 (1.09)</td>
<td>2.70 (1.04)</td>
<td>3.00 (1.01)</td>
<td>3.15 (1.0)</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.206</td>
<td>.024</td>
<td>-.25*</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Foreign Idea</td>
<td>31.21 (19.23)</td>
<td>23.46 (20.72)</td>
<td>27.37 (20.35)</td>
<td>36.75 (20.79)</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>.014*</td>
<td>.055</td>
<td>-6.24*</td>
<td>-2.33</td>
<td>7.05**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Estimates are unstandardized regression coefficients with standard errors in parentheses.

*p < .05; **p < .01
Figure 1. Effects of Degree of Accommodation on Positive Evaluation

![Graph showing the effects of degree of accommodation on positive evaluation. The x-axis represents Low Accommodation, Moderate Accommodation, and High Accommodation, while the y-axis represents positive evaluation scores ranging from 4 to 7.](image-url)
Figure 2. Interactive Effect of Accommodation Degree and Ideology on Positive Evaluation

*Note:* Plots show adjusted means at 1 SD above and below the mean of multiculturalism

*Note:* Plots show adjusted means at 1 SD above and below the mean of polyculturalism
Figure 3. Interaction between Accommodation and Ideology on Positive Evaluation
Figure 4. Interactive Effect of Accommodation Degree and Ideology Salience on Perceived Ability, Benevolence and Integrity
Figure 5. Interaction between Accommodation and Ideology on Identity Betrayal
Figure 6. Diversity Mindset Effects on Identity Concern

Note: Error bars show standard errors of the mean.
Figure 7. Indirect Effects on Cultural Adjustment through Identity Concern

Note: $B =$ unstandardized coefficient. * * $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$
Figure 8. Diversity Mindset Effects on Foreign Ingredients Inclusion

Note: Error bars show standard errors of the mean.
Figure 9. Indirect Effects on Recipe Creativity through Inclusion

Note: $B =$ unstandardized coefficient. $^* p < .05$; $^{**} p < .01$; $^{***} p < .000$
Figure 10. Indirect Effects on Cultural RAT through Inclusion

Note: $B =$ unstandardized coefficient. $^* p < .05; ^{**} p < .01; ^{***} p < .000$
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Appendix A

Diversity Ideologies Measure

Colorblindness Items (Rosenthal and Levy, 2012)

- Ethnic and cultural group categories are not very important for understanding or making decisions about people.
- It is really not necessary to pay attention to people’s racial, ethnic, or cultural backgrounds because it doesn’t tell you much about who they are.
- At our core, all human beings are really all the same, so racial and ethnic categories do not matter.
- Racial and ethnic group memberships do not matter very much to who we are.
- All human beings are individuals, and therefore race and ethnicity are not important.

Multiculturalism Items (Wolsko et al., 2006)

- We must appreciate the unique characteristics of different ethnic groups in order to have a cooperative society.
- Learning about the ways that different ethnic groups resolve conflict will help us develop a more harmonious society.
- In order to live in a cooperative society, everyone must learn the unique histories and cultural experiences of different ethnic groups.
- When interacting with a member of an ethnic group that is different from your own, it is very important to take into account the history and cultural traditions of that person’s ethnic group.
- If we want to help create a harmonious society, we must recognize that each ethnic group has the right to maintain its own unique traditions.

Polyculturalism Items (Rosenthal and Levy, 2012)

- Different cultural groups impact one another, even if members of those groups are not completely aware of the impact.
- Although ethnic groups may seem to have some clear distinguishing qualities, ethnic groups have interacted with one another and thus have influenced each other in ways that may not be readily apparent or discussed.
- There are many connections between different cultures.
- Different cultures and ethnic groups probably share some traditions and perspectives because these groups have impacted each other to some extent over the years.
- Different racial, ethnic, and cultural groups influence each other.
Appendix B

Ideology Manipulation (Cho et al., 2017)

1. Polycultural Condition

“Cultural groups continually influence each other’s traditions and perspectives as a result of interaction and contact. It is through this inter-cultural exchange that cultures dynamically change and evolve.”

In our daily lives, we constantly encounter diverse cultural groups. Each culture has a distinctive set of observable characteristics, including cuisine, style of dress, language, literature, and history, as well as a distinctive set of unobservable characteristics, including codes of conduct, narratives, attitudes, values, and norms.

But do cultures really differ? Are the qualities of different cultures unique?

Although humankind is typically divided into distinct cultural groups, these groups have interacted and influenced each other’s cultures over time. Cultures dynamically change and evolve in relation to other cultures. Professor George Levinger, a prominent scholar of cultural history, concluded that national cultures are not stable over time; they evolve from one generation to the next through inter-cultural exchange. Many of the traditions and customary behaviors that appear unique to a specific cultural group have originated through previous encounters with other cultures.

Even the most central elements of some national cultures often come from abroad. The tomato came to Italian cuisine after being brought to Europe from Mexico by 15th century Conquistadors and many of the chilli peppers in Indian curries have similar New World origins. Japanese tempura is a refinement of a fried vegetable dish introduced by Portuguese missionaries. The cuisines of different nations are largely the product of past interactions with other cultures, though people are not always aware of it.

Borrowing can also be seen in the arts, even martial arts. Historian Vijay Prashad found that Kung Fu started at the Shaolin Temple in China after traveling Indian monks brought Buddhism as well as exercise practices from India. Moreover the region of India from which these monks originated had traded across the Indian sea with Africa, where similar exercises and dance techniques had been long practiced. Surprisingly, even a practice as quintessentially Chinese as Kung Fu, has origins in India and Africa.

Linguistics provides further evidence that cultures have been shaped by their past interactions. Some English words, such as barbecue, hammock, and hurricane, were adapted from Native American terms. Moreover, grammatical structures of language can be shaped by past interactions across cultures. Linguists find that Turkish and Korean have a striking degree of similarity in their syntax. Considering the geographic distance of these nations, this similarity puzzled scholars. Then philologist Vilhelm Thomsen deciphered the Turkic Orkhon inscriptions in Mongolia and found evidence of trade between the ancestors of modern-day Turks and Koreans. Though we think globalization is a new phenomenon, a great deal of intercultural trade and learning occurred via the Silk Road that connected Europe and Asia for centuries.

Even the values and lifestyles of cultures change as its people gain exposure to different cultures. Some of Plato’s philosophical arguments that reshaped classical Greek society were drawn from his 13 years studying in Egypt and absorbing more ancient Egyptian traditions of cosmology and natural science. Similar shifts have occurred within recent generations. American culture shifted in the late 1960s and 1970s as the young generation rejected the ideals of the mainstream conformist 1950s. However, central elements of the hippie “counterculture”—hypnotic music, meditation, and vegetarianism—were borrowed from Hindu Indian practices taught by visiting gurus such as Maharishi and propagated by their rock star devotees, such as The Beatles. As these ideals and lifestyles have become part of the mainstream of Californian culture in the ensuing decades, American cultural values have shifted toward those of India.

Conversely, India has also been affected in recent decades by American culture. In cities like Hyderabad and Bangalore, the young generation works at high-tech startup companies and embraces the lifestyle of Silicon Valley—blogging, burritos, informal workplaces and high risk/high reward careers.

The cultures we know today have been shaped by thousands of years of interactions—trade, exploration, invasions, and migrations. Striving to keep a culture “pure” of foreign influence is an illusion, as there is little in the culture that hasn’t been influenced by the past exchange of ideas and products between peoples throughout history and prehistory. But that is no less reason to appreciate and celebrate the richness and beauty of each culture.

Historians and scientists increasingly study the interaction and evolution of cultures. Cultural traditions are not separate and static patterns, but inter-linked and fluid systems. Historian Robin Kelley stated, “So-called ‘mixed race’ children are not the only ones with a claim to multiple heritages. All of us, and I mean ALL of us are the inheritors of European, African, Native American, and even Asian pasts, even if we can’t exactly trace our blood lines to all of these continents.” Cultures are not fixed traditions that have been passed down from our ancestors; rather, they are records of our history of interactions.
2. Multicultural Condition

Humans and Culture

“Every culture has its own unique and unchangeable characteristics. The distinct cultural traditions have been preserved and appreciated over history.”

By WILLIAM HILTON

In our daily lives, we constantly encounter diverse cultural groups. Each culture has a distinctive set of observable characteristics, including cuisine, style of dress, language, literature, and history, as well as a distinctive set of unobservable characteristics, including codes of conduct, narratives, attitudes, values, and norms.

But do cultures really differ? Are the qualities of different cultures unique?

Humankind is divided into distinct cultural groups. Each cultural group possesses unique ideas and customs developed over history and embedded into every member of each group. Professor George Levinger, a prominent scholar of cultural history, concluded that cultural groups develop their own unique traditions, which are then transmitted from generation to generation. Even as members of different cultural groups increasingly come into contact with one another in this global era, their unique cultural identities are sustained.

Food is emblematic of cultural differences. Obviously, foods have different origins (red sauce originated in Italy; curry in India; champagne in France), but they also assume specific cultural values. Hindus in India and Nepal do not eat holy cows and Muslims consider the consumption of pork to be taboo. In China, long noodles symbolize longevity and are consumed on the New Year for good luck. Each dish has its own tradition and meaning, which makes it culturally significant.

Distinct cultural traditions can also be seen in the arts, even martial arts. The Chinese martial art Kung Fu and the Brazilian martial art Capoeira are both martial arts, but their meanings and practices differ. Kung Fu developed as a human attempt to imitate animal movements and emulate the immortals. Chinese people practice Kung Fu in parks and have preserved the art’s core emphasis on self-regulation and inner peace. Capoeira is more game-like and involves dance, acrobatics, and music. The movements of Capoeira expressed freedom within limited spaces, and the art developed as a symbol of resistance to the oppression in Brazil. Even examples that seem culturally parallel diverge when you consider their development and purpose.

Linguistics provides further evidence of the distinctiveness of cultural groups. Edward Sapir posited that language shapes one’s thinking and worldview due to the strong link between culture and language. Languages have different lexical categories that influence perception. For example, Arabic language has words for categories of horses that are not distinguished in other languages. The Inuit language has over 30 words for types of snow.

Differences in grammatical structure and tone across languages can highlight important cultural differences. For example, agency is often emphasized in English (“John spilled the milk”) but not in Spanish or Japanese (“the milk spilled”). In a study conducted by Caitlin Fausey at Stanford University, English speakers were more likely to remember the agent when confronted with videos of accidents than were Spanish or Japanese speakers. Cultural groups with different languages have different perceptions of causality.

People inherit the unique values and lifestyles of cultures through rituals. Although many cultures have important rituals to celebrate the coming of age for a young person, the age at which this transition occurs and the meaning of adulthood vary across cultures. Indian people relate adulthood to having a responsibility to the family and society, emphasizing their membership in groups and social hierarchies. On the other hand, the coming of age in America is associated with having more freedom and independence as an individual.

Different traditions and worldviews have been appreciated over the course of human advancement. For example, the Chinese calendar was invented in 2637 B.C. and is based on observations of the longitude of the sun and the phases of the moon. Even today, Chinese communities continue to celebrate social events based on the Chinese calendar. Islamic cultures also use their own ancient calendar that bases the months on moon cycles to plan religious and social events in their communities. The Gregorian calendar, also called the Western calendar, is based on the motion of the Sun, with the spring equinox tied to the date of Easter.

Cultures are products of the accumulated wisdom and values of their respective groups. Although it is within human nature to explore and borrow from other cultures, individuals have maintained cultural traditions and identities over centuries. Regardless of speedy changes in environments and technologies, cultural characteristics have been stable and protected.

Historians and scientists constantly provide us with evidence that cultures are unique and not merely reflections of one another. In the late 18th century, people began to understand the essence of different cultural groups. By the 20th century, research on culture had advanced and developed into the disciplines of anthropology and ethnography. These disciplines have demonstrated that even emotional expressions are culturally determined and aligned to systemic values. Jimmy Carter stated, “We become not a melting pot but a beautiful mosaic. Different people, different beliefs, different yearnings, different hopes, different dreams.” The preservation of different cultures is an essential component of our history and also our future.

---With reporting by Brian Ross/NEW YORK
Humans and Culture

“Different cultures share a common origin, as people everywhere are really all the same at the core. All cultural practices have common goals and purposes to satisfy human beings’ needs and desires.”

By WILLIAM HILTON

In our daily lives, we constantly encounter diverse cultural groups. Each culture has a distinctive set of observable characteristics, including cuisine, style of dress, language, literature, and history, as well as a distinctive set of unobservable characteristics, including codes of conduct, narratives, attitudes, values, and norms.

But do cultures really differ? Are the qualities of different cultures unique?

Although humankind is typically divided into distinct cultural groups due to superficial variances, we share a common core. Professor George Levinger, a prominent scholar of cultural history, concluded that all human beings have the same ancestry, desires, and needs. Individuals all adapt and react to their surroundings in the same ways according to human nature. Thus, regardless of their cultural group, individuals’ customary behaviors and practices serve the same function and purpose.

Even the most central elements of some national cultures are merely reflections of environmental differences. For example, national cuisines such as Italian’s red sauce, Indian’s curry, and Japanese tempura have evolved out of the climate and natural resources locally available.

Arts such as martial arts evolve out of a basic need for self-defense, competition, physical enhancement, and entertainment. This is true across cultures and throughout history. In the earliest human societies, martial arts sought to improve hunting and battle techniques. Archeologists have unearthed paintings of combat practices such as wrestling and boxing matches in caves across the world. Although Kung Fu, a Chinese martial art and Capoeira, an Afro-Brazilian art form may look different on the surface to an observer, but they both share a common ancestry and motivations like other types of martial arts.

Linguistics provides further evidence that cultures are nothing but evolutionary reactions to different environments. Linguists proposed that all of the 7,200 known spoken languages are actually derived from one proto-human language. Dr. Noam Chomsky supported the argument that different languages actually have a universal grammar. Recently, linguist Caleb Everett and his colleagues analyzed more than 3,700 languages and found correlations between climate and the tonality of language. More humid regions produced more tonal languages because humidity fosters the pronunciation of complex tones. This finding points to the fact that people are predisposed to develop the same language sound system and that further linguistic differences are factors of environmental differences. All individuals adapt and react to their surroundings in the same ways according to human biology.

Even cultural traditions that appear unique to specific groups fall into a common pattern when you look at their underlying function. All across the world, people celebrate the harvest by feasting with friends and neighbors, regardless of creed or nationality. Anthropologists tell us that this has been true in every culture since human history began. Today we celebrate Thanksgiving in the United States and Canada, Pongal in Southern India, Choosuk in Korea, and the Yam festival in West Africa. Cave paintings depict similar ceremonies hundreds of thousands of years ago.

Culture is just a mirage. Cultural categories do not help us understand other individuals because we are in no way molded by culture, but rather by human nature. Cultural features are learned from our own reactions to our environments; they do not ultimately define who we become.

Historians and scientists constantly study the common origins and processes of human development. Developmental psychologists have shown that all individuals go through the same cognitive and moral development stages. When they compared the development of members of the same age group across various cultural groups, they found that people in the same age group have identical learning processes, regardless of the cultural category to which they belong. They demonstrate that emotions and their expressions are universal to human culture as Charles Darwin proposed. The words of Confucius are as true today as when they were 2,500 years ago: “All people are the same; only their habits differ.” Even if there are surface differences, they are merely inherent to the nature of all people. ____________ With reporting by Brian Resser/New-York
Appendix C

Please read a description below and picture your day in the Beijing office.

Your Day in Beijing Office

Imagine that the Chinese office manager asks you to come into the office early at 7 am a few weeks after you arrive in Beijing. Once you arrive, you are told that all employees are expected to participate in morning group exercises. You and your colleagues enter an open area, take off your shoes, and stand several feet apart in rows. The office manager then leads the group in 15 minutes of stretching and cardio exercises. Each person mimics the manager’s movements while counting aloud in Chinese.

Today, there is a department meeting. In the meeting, you realize there is an error in your colleague’s presentation. But you don’t mention the error in the meeting as you normally would in the American office. Instead, you approach your colleague after the meeting and discuss the possible error in the presentation, although you are sure the error is evident.

After the meeting, when returning to your office, you meet Xingming Zhang, a new director of another department. You greet him by presenting him with your business card using both hands.

After work, you are asked to join a formal business banquet. Your colleagues choose a Chinese restaurant with specialties from the region. Everyone is seated around a circular table, and the office manager orders food for everyone. Everyone toasts with high alcohol rice liquor in small toasting cups, and the office manager gives a short speech to welcome you. Your colleagues serve you samples of each dish directly into your bowl without consulting you first. You taste all the dishes you are offered.
Appendix D

Cultural and General RAT Items (Chua, 2013; Zhong et al., 2008)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cultural RAT</th>
<th>General RAT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Triad</strong></td>
<td><strong>Answer</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walk</td>
<td>Cake</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ire</td>
<td>Green</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle Eastern Square</td>
<td>Highland Dance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearl Thames</td>
<td>Kwai River</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American Swiss</td>
<td>Munster Cheese</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saw Wick Cold War</td>
<td>Down Question Check Mark</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Forbidden Angels Quebec City</td>
<td>Carpet Alert Ink Red</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roman State British Empire</td>
<td>Blank List Mate Check</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Swan Ontario Maggiore Lake</td>
<td>Test Runner Map Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monkey Gate Triangle Golden</td>
<td>Wheel Hand Shopping Cart</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Queen Sea China Red</td>
<td>Wagon Break Radio Station</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>French American Boer Revolution or War</td>
<td>Man Glue Star Super</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>