

IMPRESSION FORMATION AMONG
EGYPTIANS AND LEBANESE

by

Bernadette Pelissier Smith

A Dissertation submitted to the faculty of
The University of North Carolina at Chapel
Hill in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Doctor of
Philosophy in the Department of Sociology.

Chapel Hill

1980

Approved by :

Adviser

David K. Thelen

Reader

[Signature]

Reader

James A. Higgins

A

© 1980

Bernadette Pelissier Smith

ALL RIGHTS RESERVED

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	ii
CHAPTER I : IMPRESSIONS OF SOCIAL ACTORS	1
Introduction.....	1
Review of the Literature.....	2
Evaluation Dynamics.....	8
Potency Dynamics.....	12
Activity Dynamics.....	15
The Semantic Differential Technique in Cross-Cultural Research.....	17
Hypotheses.....	23
CHAPTER II : PROCEDURES	24
Respondents.....	24
Sample of Words.....	28
Rating Scales.....	32
Scale Position Anchors.....	38
Sentence Construction.....	39
Questionnaire Construction.....	41
Questionnaire Instructions.....	44
Instrumentation.....	46
CHAPTER III: ANALYSES AND RESULTS	50
Evaluation Dynamics.....	53
Potency Dynamics.....	59
Activity Dynamics.....	63
CHAPTER IV : CONCLUSIONS	73
APPENDIX A : LIST OF QUESTIONNAIRE STIMULI AND ENGLISH TRANSLATIONS	82
APPENDIX B : QUESTIONNAIRE COVER SHEET - INSTRUCTION PAGES	89
APPENDIX C : TRANSLATION OF INTRODUCTORY LETTER IN ARABIC SENT TO CHAPTER PRESIDENTS BY ESA EXECUTIVE COMMITTEE MEMBER	95
APPENDIX D : EGYPTIAN DATA LISTING	97
APPENDIX E : LEBANESE DATA LISTING	106
REFERENCES	115

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The following individuals provided support and assistance in this research. Dr. David R. Heise introduced me to impression formation studies and provided encouragement and methodological assistance. Dr. Julio Cortes consistently encouraged my learning the Arabic language and provided translation assistance beyond the call of duty. Ahmed Ali, of the Egyptian Student Association, coordinated the distribution of the questionnaires to the Egyptians and assisted in constructing the questionnaire. Alfred Mady of the Lebanese Information and Research Center, Joseph Saleh, Fouad Abdel-Malek and Samir Ataya helped distribute the questionnaires to the Lebanese sample. Abdel Honeim al-Mashat, Samir Abed, Ibrahim Salama, Shihadeh Nayfeh, Sari Ghulmiyyah, and Reverend William Hern helped in constructing the questionnaire. Friends and family members assisted in coordinating questionnaire distribution and provided emotional support. Lastly, I would like to thank the Lebanese and Egyptians who agreed to participate in this study.

CHAPTER I

Impressions of Social Actors

Introduction

Research has examined Americans' impressions of social actors and interpersonal behaviors that are formed from sentences about events (Gollob, 1968; Gollob and Rossman, 1973; Heise, 1969a, 1970, 1978). These studies have found that the impressions of an actor's goodness, potency and activity can be predicted from sentiments about the actor, the behavior, and the object of the behavior. The dynamics can be described with algebraic equations which usually explain at least two-thirds of the variance in the outcome impressions. The three affective dimensions of evaluation, potency and activity (EPA), which are used as measures of impressions in American studies, have been found to be nearly universal in a sample of over 20 cultural communities (Osgood et al., 1975).

This study is an extension of the American impression-formation research and of Osgood et al.'s (1975) research on the universality of affective dimensions. Do affective structures that appear to be universal also function similarly across cultures in impression formation? In particular, this research will identify similarities and/or

differences in impression formation dynamics between Americans, the Irish, Egyptians, and Lebanese. Studies among Americans have shown balance effects in attitudinal dynamics. Literature on balance theory seems to assume that the tendency to balance attitudes is innate to all human beings. This assumption will be examined here.

Osgood et al. (1975) found that the activity dimension was weak among Lebanese Arabs. Prediction formulas for the activity dimension among the Egyptians and Lebanese therefore will be of special concern, providing some new information on whether an activity dimension exists among Arabic speakers and whether it is equivalent to the American activity dimension dynamically.

Theoretical Background

Heider's balance theory (1958) introduced some basic principles of attitude dynamics. Heider's theory uses the framework of a p-o-x system to represent the unit of a cognitive field, where p represents a person, o represents another person, and x represents an impersonal entity (x may be replaced by q to represent a personal entity), and where the relationships between p, o and x are interdependent. According to Heider two types of relations exist between p, o, and x: sentiment relations and unit relations. A sentiment relation refers to a personal evaluation of someone or something (i.e., liking or disliking). A unit relation exists when separate entities are perceived as belonging together through similarity, causality, ownership

and other unit forming characteristics. The question then is how order can be brought to the variety of situations and events towards which individuals attach sentiments. Heider proposes that the tendency of unit relations and sentiment relations toward a balanced state provides this order. A balanced state is said to exist "if entities which belong together are all positive, or if they are all negative" (Heider, 1958: 217). In the case of the triad, balance exists "when all three of the relations are positive or when two of the relations are negative and one is positive. Imbalance occurs when two of the relations are positive and one is negative" (202). Furthermore, it is assumed that imbalance creates tension and that balance will be restored through a variety of alternative mechanisms. "My enemy's enemy is my friend" (title of Aronson and Cope, 1969 article) illustrates a balanced situation whereas "my friend's enemy is my friend" does not.

Numerous studies have found support for balance principles (e.g., see Aronson and Cope, 1969, Rosenberg and Abelson, 1960). On the other hand, Wyer (1974), in reviewing the empirical evidence related to balance theory, concludes that there are some theoretical and empirical limitations to the conditions under which the balance principle can be applied and that even in some cases where balance principles can explain relations, alternative explanations are equally plausible. Nevertheless, Wyer (1974) suggests that the results may be due to the fact that balance principles, as

stated by Heider and by others who revised and extended Heider's principles, are overly generalized and simplified.

Looking at the historical development of balance theory since Heider's initial formulation in 1948, clarifications and extensions of the theory are evident. Newcomb (1953) extended balance principles beyond individuals' perceptions to actual group dynamics. Newcomb's "strain toward symmetry" in interpersonal dynamics is analogous to Heider's "strain toward balance." Although Newcomb (1953) extended the principle to realms other than cognition, he did not address himself to the deficiencies of Heider's formulation, notably its lack of quantification, its inability to deal with multiple entities and multiple relations (i.e., its inability to account for unsymmetric balanced relations), and its lack of distinction between complements and opposites in unit relations (Cartwright and Harary, 1956; Fishbein and Ajzen, 1975; Rosenberg and Abelson, 1960).

Using the mathematical theory of linear graphs, Cartwright and Harary (1956) addressed some of these issues. According to Cartwright and Harary (1956), a balanced situation between two or more entities exists when the closed path between all or any elements is positive (i.e., has an even number of positive relations) and the degree of balance is the ratio of the number of positive cycles (closed paths) to the total number of cycles within a particular graph.

Abelson and Rosenberg (1958) also formalized Heider's balance theory in their "symbolic psycho-logic". Although Wyer (1974) demonstrates the logical invalidity of some of their underlying assumptions, he also notes the advantage of their formulation in its ability to deal with large and complex cognitive systems since their procedure can be programmed for a computer.

The quantification of sentiments was addressed in Osgood and Tannenbaum's (1955) congruity theory. Although congruity theory bears a certain resemblance to balance theory, there are some important differences. Unlike balance theory which looks at the perception of unit relations, congruity theory takes the unit relation between o and x as given. In addition, Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) note, balance is a necessary but not sufficient condition for congruence. In the case of a dissociative relation, congruence exists when the magnitude of the evaluations toward the two entities is equal and in the same direction, whereas in the case of an associative relation the magnitudes of the evaluations need to be equal but in the opposite direction. Balance theory posits a number of alternative mechanisms for restoring balance but is not able to predict which alternative is most likely in individual cases. On the other hand, congruity theory, in its mathematical formulation, predicts shifts in attitudes which occur as a result of incongruity.

Although Osgood and Tannenbaum (1955) present different formulas for predicting attitude change for associative and dissociative relations, Heise (1979), reformulated and combined the equations presented by Osgood and Tannenbaum, bringing to the foreground the balance principles invoked in congruity theory. A single-equation representation of congruity theory is as follows:

$$x' = wry + (1 - w)x$$

where x' equals the new value of attitude toward x , w is the weighting factor which depends on the absolute values of the attitudes such that $w = \frac{|x|}{|x| + |y|}$, r represents the relation (+1 for association and -1 for dissociation), x represents the old attitude toward x , and y represents the old attitude toward y .

The first term of the reformulation shows a balance effect. A negative attitude toward y and a negative relation yields a positive effect on x' whereas a negative attitude toward y combined with a positive relation yields a negative effect on x' . A stability component is represented by the second term in the equation: the new attitude toward x is a function of the original attitude toward x .

Although there has been support for congruity theory (Osgood and Tannenbaum, 1955; Osgood et al., 1957), the theory has not been found to be very accurate in its predictions (Wyer, 1974). This is the case in spite of the fact that the inaccuracy of initial predictions was attenuated somewhat by the addition of an incredulity factor

(if a message is disbelieved there is an attenuation of the change in evaluation toward the source and object of a message) and an assertion constant (the source of a message is less affected than the object of a message). The assumption that the influence of a component is directly proportional to its relative extremity has been seen as somewhat arbitrary (Hyer, 1974). Osgood et al. (1957) themselves note some limiting conditions of the congruity principle. They state that one must take into account the intensity of the assertion, the contiguity of signs in assertions and the relevance of the assertion. But one of the more important limitations they identify seems to be that the theory does not account for the meaning of the action itself as a variable. Like Heider's balance theory, congruity theory looks primarily at attitude dynamics for objects and only considers two aspects of the action linking the objects: association and dissociation.

Nevertheless, congruity theory does suggest that the interaction of various attitudes toward concepts takes place within a linguistic framework:

"The most typical situation in which one expects to find changes in attitude is that in which some source makes some evaluative statement about some object or concept in a message that is received and decoded by a receiver" (Osgood et al., 1957: 209).

Even Heider (1967) himself, some 20 years after his original conceptualization of balance theory, proposed that we look at sentences as cognitive units within which we can examine attitude dynamics.

Evaluation Dynamics

From the recognition that attitudinal dynamics occur within a linguistic framework, it is a short step to the recognition of action as an attitudinal variable. This is evident in the SVO (subject-verb-object) approach introduced by Gollob (1968). SVO studies use semantic differential ratings of a sentence component within the context of a sentence as the dependent variable and the ratings of sentence components in isolation as the independent variables for developing regression equations. The approach explains over 75% of the variance in in-context ratings.

In his study of how people process verbal information in forming evaluative impressions of others, Harry Gollob (1968) attempted to predict the attitudinal changes toward men described in the context of a sentence of the form: "The adjective man verbs noun" from the attitudes associated with the subject (S), verb (V), and object (O) in isolation. An 11-point good-bad scale was used to measure attitudes toward the sentence components. To insure variation in the independent variables, Gollob's 192 sentences contained all possible combinations of positive and negative adjectives for the subject, positive and negative verbs and positive and negative objects. Mean ratings of the subject, verb and

object in isolation were used as independent variables and mean ratings of the subject in the context of a sentence as the dependent variable. The following regression equation using unstandardized regression coefficients was found to account for 86% of the variance in the dependent variable:

$$S_e = -.43 + .39 A_e + .48 V_e + .15 V_e O_e$$

S_e' represents the evaluation of the subject in the context of a sentence. A_e , V_e and O_e represent the out-of-context evaluations of the modified subject (adjective -man), the verb and the object respectively.

The A_e term of the equation represents a stability component: the attitude change toward the subject of a sentence is constrained by the original attitude. A good actor tends to be seen as somewhat good regardless of his actions towards others. The V_e term indicates that the action is important. A good act produces favorable evaluations whereas a bad act produces unfavorable evaluations. The last term of the equation, $V_e O_e$ represents a balance effect. Favorable impressions result from good being done unto good or bad being done unto bad and unfavorable impressions result from good being done unto bad or bad being done unto good. A_e explains 43% of the variance, V_e 41% of the variance and $V_e O_e$ 16% of the variance. The out-of-context attitude toward the object word was found to have a negligible effect. (Although most of the interaction between verbs and objects is represented by the $V_e O_e$ term, an analysis of variance model which includes

other aspects of verb x object interaction is able to account for 97.9% of the variance). It must be noted that the small size of the balance coefficient as compared to the other coefficients is to be expected with unstandardized interaction effects: for the same amount of change in a dependent variable score, unstandardized interaction coefficients will always be smaller than main effect coefficients due to the larger numerical value of an interaction term.

A similar study by Heise (1969a) with sentences consisting of a subject, transitive verb, and object produced an equation very similar to that identified by Gollob (1968):

$$Se^0 = -.15 + .37 Se + .55 Ve + .07 Oe + .25 VeOe$$

Se rather than Ae is used to represent the fact that Heise used different nouns for the subject term rather than the adjective -man term. Heise (1969a) used a 7-point scale for ratings as opposed to the 11-point scale used by Gollob (1968). In order to facilitate comparisons between the two studies Heise (1979) rescaled the regression coefficients of Gollob's findings to apply to a 7-point rating scale. Gollob's rescaled equation is as follows:

$$Se^0 = -.26 + .39 Ae + .48 Ve + .25 VeOe$$

The similarity of these two equations indicates that the results were not particular to the sample of sentences or respondents. The Heise (1969a) formula explains less variance than the Gollob equation, 70% versus 86%, but this

possibly can be attributed to the inclusion of a number of near-neutral verbs in the Heise sentences (85% of the variance is explained when near-neutral verbs are deleted from the analysis).

In addition to the general balance effect represented in the $VeOe$ term, other more specific dynamics resulting from a consideration of all terms of the equation reveal more detailed attitudinal dynamics:

"An actor can engage in extremely negative or positive acts toward moderately bad objects without greatly affecting his evaluation. If an object is extremely bad, however, an actor who does even mildly good things to him should be evaluated more negatively by others. If the object is extremely good, on the other hand, even mildly bad acts could reflect very negatively on the actor" (Gollob, 1968: 351).

Dissociation from bad objects does not always result in a positive evaluation toward the subject (as implied by Heider's balance theory). When the object is only slightly disliked the $V \times O$ interaction term cannot counterbalance the deevaluation resulting from the negative verb. Likewise, a positive association with a bad object does not always result in a negative evaluation. When the object is evaluated slightly negatively, the $V \times O$ interaction term

cannot counterbalance the positive effect of the verb (Heise, 1969a). Furthermore, in cases where the verb is neutral or where the object has a negative value of -1.57, the evaluation of the subject is a function solely of the subject evaluation in isolation (Heise, 1969a).

Potency Dynamics

Although such attitude research considers an evaluative dimension only, research by Osgood et al. (1957) indicate that affective responses are multidimensional. Using different subject populations, different concepts to be judged, different methods of selecting descriptive scales and different methods of factor analysis, Osgood et al. (1957) found that affective responses have three basic dimensions: evaluation (good-bad), potency (strong-weak) and activity (active-passive). (Other factors have also been identified but they explain an extremely small amount of the variance). The generality of these three dimensions is also supported by cross-cultural research (Osgood et al., 1975). Correlation studies of the semantic differential with the Thurstone attitude measurements indicate a higher multiple R when predicting Thurstone scale scores from all three semantic differential factors in comparison to the zero order correlation coefficient obtained from correlating Thurstone scores with scores on the evaluation factor only (Triandis, 1971).

These three factors have been found to be fairly independent of one another except when the sample of

concepts being judged is limited to some narrow category. The order of magnitude in which the factors usually emerge is evaluation, potency and activity; the evaluative factor is central. Potency usually accounts for about half as much variance as evaluation and activity accounts for almost as much variance as potency (Osgood et al., 1957).

Since affective responses are multidimensional, predictable response dynamics may exist for the potency and activity dimensions. Heise (1969a, 1970) explored this possibility by looking at potency and activity dynamics using the same SVO framework used to study evaluation dynamics.

With a sample of 54 sentences containing all the possible combinations of high and low potency ratings for the subject, verb and object positions in a sentence, Heise (1970) regressed the in-context potency ratings of the sentence subject on the out-of-context potency ratings. The following multiple regression equation accounted for over 60% of the variance in the outcome:

$$Sp^c = -.14 + .33 Sp + .53 Vp + .15 Op$$

Sp^c represents the in-context potency rating of the subject and Sp , Vp and Op represent the out-of-context potency ratings for the subject, verb and object respectively.

The above formula for potency dynamics shows that the verb effect is the strongest. Actors engaging in powerful acts are seen as potent. There is also a stability effect represented by the subject term. The object (Op) term

indicates a small tendency for an actor to be seen as potent when associated with a potent object.

In Heise's (1970) study the verbs which were rated low on the potency dimension also tended to be negatively evaluated. Thus the data were reanalyzed with evaluation measurements included in the regression equation. No change in the equations or variance explained was found.

However, a study of potency dynamics done by Gollob and Rossnan (1973) does show that potency impressions of actors are partially a result of evaluations, notably of verb evaluations. Gollob and Rossnan (1973) used 128 sentences of the form "Bill verbed the object" (using different personal names). Potency ratings thus varied only for verbs and objects, contrary to the variation for all three sentence positions in Heise's (1970) study. The following formula describes how potency impressions of actors were formed (results rescaled to a 7-point scale):

$$Sp^i = -.19 + .77 Vp + .35 VeOe -.15 VeOp$$

Similar to Heise's (1970) results, the above formula indicates the importance of the out-of-context verb potency which accounts for approximately 50% of the outcome variance. However, there are two significant interaction terms, both including an effect for the verb evaluation (no stability effect is possible since the subject terms were personal names). The $VeOe$ term which accounts for 21% of the variation not accounted for by Vp indicates that actors who behave "justly" (i.e., who benefit a good person or harm a

bad person) are perceived as more potent. Potency dynamics then seem to incorporate the same balance effect as was found in evaluation dynamics. The VeOp term accounts for an additional 2.7% of the variance and indicates that an actor's potency increases if he harms an object high in potency or benefits a weak object but decreases if he harms a weak object or benefits a powerful object. The latter instances can be viewed as ingratiation or appeasement attempts and in these cases the actor does not risk any retaliation (Gollob and Rossman, 1973).

The difference in the role of evaluation ratings in potency dynamics between the Heise (1970) and Gollob and Rossman (1973) studies might be due to the different types of objects used in these two studies. In Heise's sentences the majority of the objects were impersonal entities whereas in Gollob and Rossman's study the objects were all personal entities. The role of the VeOe and VeOp interaction terms, as indicated above, is based upon the possibility of retaliatory acts by the object. Reanalyzing the Heise data, looking separately at sentences with personal objects and sentences with impersonal objects, results indicate a formula very similar to Gollob and Rossman's (1973) for sentences with personal objects.

Activity Dynamics

Again using the SVO study design, Heise (1969a) examined activity dynamics. A regression analysis using a sample of 24 sentences resulted in the following equation,

which accounted for 75% of the variance for in-context activity ratings of the subject words.

$$Sa^2 = .16 + .79 Sa + .29 Va + .26 Oa$$

(the terms used are similar to those used in the evaluation dynamics except that activity measurements are being dealt with). Here the stability coefficient seems to be most important. That the act engaged in by the actor does not contribute any more than the activity ratings of the subject word or object word out-of-context eliminates the common-sense postulate that the character of one's action is crucial. Rather it is the source of the action which is the crucial factor influencing activity impressions.

In summary, the SVO approach to studying affective dynamics demonstrates the utility of both quantifying attitudes and of considering attitudinal dynamics as occurring in a linguistic context with attitudes towards objects and verbs both being important. The quantification of attitudes allows for a precise identification of balance effects in impression formation and is capable of generating quite accurate predictions of attitude changes occurring within the linguistic context of a sentence. This approach has also been fruitful in specifying mechanisms other than the balance effect, such as the stability effect, which are informative in and of themselves. The approach has shed further light on balance dynamics; for example, no balance effect occurs in evaluative dynamics when the verb in the sentence is neutral. The SVO research overcomes problems of

oversimplification and overgeneralization of previous balance principle formulations as noted by Wyer (1974).

Evaluation dynamics identified in SVO research provide greater precision of prediction in attitude changes than the congruity formulation which implicitly incorporated in it a balance effect and a stability effect. The congruity theory assumption that components should be weighted according to their intensities has not been supported empirically (e.g., see Heise, 1969, footnote 4).

The SVO research has also shown that attitudinal dynamics exist for all three dimensions of attitudes, evaluation, potency and activity, and that the dynamics for each attitudinal dimension differ.

The consistency of the significance of the stability, behavior, and balance effects in impression formation has been recently replicated in another Western culture. Unpublished Irish impression formation results obtained by Heise indicate a high degree of similarity to American impression formation results for all three affective dimensions (these results will be discussed in Chapter 3).

The Semantic Differential Technique in Cross-Cultural Research

Although the Sapir-Whorf hypothesis suggests that language influences thought, the fact that a sample of over 20 cultural communities generated indigenous bi-polar scales yielding the same three dimensions of affective response - evaluation, potency, and activity - indicates that certain

aspects of cognition are universal (Marsh, 1967). Moreover, an examination of the method used to derive semantic differential factors in each culture reveals that Osgood et al. (1975), avoided common pitfalls of cross-cultural research identified by Triandis, Malpass and Davidson (1971). First of all, the scales used for other cultures were not translations of Western semantic differentials but were developed indigenously. In each culture scales were developed by presenting respondents with 100 universal substantives in order to elicit qualifiers. Another sample of respondents was then used to elicit opposites from a partial list of the obtained qualifiers, pruned on the basis of productivity and independence, in order to develop bipolar scales which were then factor analyzed. Avoidance of judgments of factorial similarity which may be biased through translation of scales or through the subjective semantic intuitions of the researcher was accomplished by using pan-cultural factorizations rather than indigenous factorizations to determine the generality of the three affective dimensions. Osgood et al. (1975) put the data cubes from different cultural communities into the same mathematical space. Thus, "if a scale for community x and a scale for community y both have high loadings on the same common factor, we can say they are functionally equivalent" (355-356). Secondly, the technique is not constrained to allow for only unique or only universal aspects of culture to appear; the technique allows for both. Different cultures

use different qualifiers in characterizing the three affective dimensions (unique aspects) but yet use the same three basic criteria of evaluation, potency and activity with which to judge concepts (universal aspect).

In their conclusions, Osgood et al. (1975) note that the evaluation and potency dimensions were clearly common to all the cultures sampled. Activity is common to all, except perhaps Lebanon (356). Although the conclusion that Lebanese Arabs have a very weak activity dimension is based on the pancultural factor analyses in both the tool-making and tool-using phases, indigenous factor analyses and bi-cultural factor analyses (i.e., the two cultures being America combined with another culture) were conducted in the tool-making phase. The indigenous factor analysis for Lebanese Arabs indicates that the third factor to emerge is not activity but uniqueness (rare-plentiful, little-much, and particular-general are the three highest loadings scales on this factor) and that activity emerges as the fourth factor. The bicultural factorization of American and Lebanese data also results in activity being the fourth factor with the third factor being liveliness-emotional. On the pancultural factor analysis the Lebanese have an identifiable activity dimension as the third factor although the loadings are the lowest among the 21 cultural communities sampled in the tool-making stage. The highest-loading scale on the Lebanese and American activity dimension is fast-slow. For the Lebanese the scale loading

is only .36 in comparison to the scale loading of .61 among the Americans. The short-form semantic differential developed by Osgood and his associates to use in Atlas ratings adopts scales from the fourth pancultural factor to represent the Lebanese activity dimension.

It is possible that activity appears as the third factor for the Lebanese in the pancultural analyses because of the "pressure" of the other cultures, most of which have activity as the third factor in the indigenous analysis. On the other hand, it is possible that the fluctuation of the Lebanese activity dimension from the third and fourth extracted factors between the indigenous, bi-cultural and pancultural factor analyses results from a problem in factorial purity. There is a high degree of consistency among the Americans in the scales loading on the first three factors across all the factor analyses - indigenous, bi-cultural and pancultural - whereas such consistency appears to occur only on the evaluation dimension for the Lebanese. A sizeable proportion of the concepts characterizing potency in the indigenous analysis for the Lebanese become activity qualifiers (i.e., load on the third factor) in the pancultural analysis. This could be attributed to the fact that in the indigenous analysis the scale fast-slow which is the highest loading concept on the activity dimension was shown to have a high loading on potency also. It is noteworthy also that in the generalized short-form semantic differential, three of the four concept pairs loading on the

fourth pancultural factor (the factor used to represent the Lebanese activity dimension) are concepts used to represent the indigenous potency factor.

The lack of an adequately identified activity dimension among the Lebanese suggests one of two alternatives. The first is that an activity dimension exists for them but that the qualifiers which emerged in this particular study are not capable of identifying an activity dimension which is independent of the other affective dimensions. It may be that other qualifiers should be used. This problem may be in part a result of language use. The study of the Lebanese was done in modern standard Arabic which is a written language and a spoken language only in formal occasions. Since another language, the colloquial, is used for most day to day interactions it may be the case that qualifiers based upon only one language segment does not represent the total cognitive structure of the Lebanese Arabs. On the other hand, the "weak" activity dimension could be an artifact of the theoretical inadequacy of the traditional factor analytic techniques used by Osgood. The recent introduction of the confirmatory factor analytic techniques by Joreskog (1969) allows one to test the fit of a hypothesized model (in this case EPA) to the data. As used in cross-cultural research this technique allows one to cross validate factors found in different samples directly, rather than by judgment (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973). This problem of factorial purity could possibly have been resolved using

confirmatory factor analysis.

The second alternative is that the Lebanese do not in fact have activity as their third affective dimension. Rather they may have two potency factors as suggested by the potency and "activity" scales used in the generalized short-form semantic differential. Osgood et al. (1975) assumed that the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor (which is identifiable as a second potency factor) rather than the third (identifiable as an activity dimension, although a weak one) is functionally similar to the American activity dimension. This selection was most likely based on the fact that in the indigenous Lebanese factor analysis, activity emerged as the fourth factor.

There is no theoretical basis upon which to posit one alternative as being more likely than the other. However, the fact that most cultures sampled by Osgood et al. (1975) do have an identifiable activity dimension suggests that it is unlikely that Lebanese Arabs should be so unique as to not have an activity dimension. In addition, in the tool-using phase pancultural factor analyses, the third factor which emerges for the Lebanese and which is clearly interpretable as activity, is not as "weak" as the activity dimension emerging in the tool-making phase pancultural factor analyses. In this analysis the two highest-loading scales fast-slow and active-passive have loadings of .53 and .44 respectively.

Hypotheses

The preceding discussion suggests that the following hypotheses deserve examination.

1) The structure of evaluation, potency, and activity (EPA) impression formation dynamics among Egyptians and Lebanese is similar to that among Americans.

2) The structure of impression formation dynamics among Egyptians and Lebanese for the third pancultural factor (rather than the fourth pancultural factor) is similar to the structure of activity impression formation dynamics among Americans.

CHAPTER THREE

Analyses and Results

Mean ratings of the social actor in the context of a sentence were regressed on the mean ratings of the three out-of-context sentence elements: actors, behaviors and objects of the behavior. The number of respondents upon which the mean ratings are based are shown in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1

Number of Egyptian and Lebanese respondents for each questionnaire form

	<u>Egyptians</u>	<u>Lebanese</u>
Questionnaire #1	25	14
Questionnaire #2	21	12
Questionnaire #3	23	10

This table indicates that for the Egyptians each stimuli is rated by from 21 to 25 respondents and that for the Lebanese each stimuli is rated by from 10 to 14 respondents. The number of respondents varies somewhat with the questionnaire form as the number of returned questionnaires was not equal for each different questionnaire form. A complete listing of the Egyptian and Lebanese in-context and out-of-context mean

ratings for the 88 sentences are found in Appendix D and Appendix E. Since the unit of analysis for the regressions is the event sentence rather than the total number of respondents per questionnaire, the sample size for the regression procedure is 88 - the total number of event sentences. Thus, although the mean number of ratings for each stimuli is based upon a different number of respondents for the Egyptians as compared to the Lebanese, both these cultural groups have the same N of 88 for the regression analyses.

The regression model for each dimension included all first-order cross-dimensional effects as independent variables (for example, the effect of behavior potency and activity on the evaluation of the actor). In addition, the interaction effect of the evaluation of the behavior (Be) and the evaluation of the object (Oe) was included, since it represents the theoretically important balance effect and has been repeatedly shown to be important in previous studies of impressions (Gollob, 1968; Gollob and Rossman, 1973; Heise, 1969a). Thus, the format of the prediction equations for the in-context impressions of social actors is as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} Ax' = & b + b_1Ae + b_2Ap + b_3Aa + b_4Be + b_5Bp \\ & + b_6Ba + b_7Oe + b_8Op + b_9Oe + b_{10}BeOe \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} Ax' = & b + b_1Ae + b_2Ap + b_3As + b_4Be + b_5Bp \\ & + b_6Bs + b_7Oe + b_8Op + b_9Os + b_{10}BeOe \end{aligned}$$

The first equation uses the third Lebanese pancultural factor as representative of the activity dimension and the second equation uses the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor as representative of the activity dimension (a represents the third pancultural factor and s represents the fourth pancultural factor). X' can be either e, p, or a in the first equation or e, p, or s in the second equation. A, B, and O represent the actor, behavior and object respectively.¹

The regression results for the Egyptians and Lebanese will be compared to recent unpublished results obtained by Heise from two American samples and one Irish sample. Although American results are available from other samples, these two were selected for comparison both because they are recent and are most comparable in study design. The American samples were drawn from a University of North Carolina (UNC) student population in 1977 and 1978. Like the Middle Eastern samples, all respondents are males. Construction of the sentences for these samples (including the Irish sample) followed the sentence paradigm in Table 2.1. The Irish data, although not comparable in terms of sex since the results are based on males and females combined, is the only other cross-cultural impression formation data available at the present.² The samples will be referred to as UNC77, UNC78 and Belfast in the following Tables. All regression coefficients reported in the following tables are unstandardized.

Evaluation Dynamics

The regression coefficients for predicting in-context actor evaluations in four countries are contained in Table 3.2.³ The results for the Egyptian and Lebanese samples indicate that the same coefficients are significant in both samples, that the magnitude of these coefficients are almost identical (within .03 units of one another) and that the variance explained with this set of predictors is also quite similar in both samples. For the Egyptians $R^2 = .45$ and for the Lebanese $R^2 = .51$. The evaluation of an actor is a function of his out-of-context evaluation (A_e) and of the interaction product between the evaluation of the behavior and of the object (BeO_e). The A_e coefficient is a stability coefficient: actors tend to retain some of their prior evaluation regardless of behavior engaged in or of object with whom engaged. The BeO_e coefficient represents a balance effect: actors who do good acts to a good object or bad acts to a bad object gain in evaluation whereas actors who do good acts to a bad object or bad acts to a good object lose in evaluation. Both the stability and balance effects are consistent with the data from the American and Irish samples as well as with the original Gollob (1968) and Heise (1969a) data. The difference lies in the smaller magnitude of the Egyptian and Lebanese coefficients. The most striking inter-sample difference lies in the Be coefficient. In the American and Irish results, this positive coefficient indicates that an actor's evaluation is a function of his

Table 3.2 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Evaluations of a Social Actor from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; a : activity

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	UNC77	UNC78	Belfast	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	.01	-.15	-.15	-.70	-.17
Ae	<u>.40</u>	<u>.54</u>	<u>.49</u>	<u>.29</u>	<u>.32</u>
Ap	<u>-.14</u>	-.07	-.09	.14	.19
Aa	.06	.01	<u>.11</u>	-.03	-.04
Be	<u>.50</u>	<u>.41</u>	<u>.36</u>	.19	.12
Bp	.09	.07	.12	-.02	.26
Ba	<u>-.38</u>	-.11	.02	-.08	<u>-.39</u>
Oe	-.09	<u>-.11</u>	-.03	.02	.02
Op	-.01	.03	.03	.20	.01
Oa	<u>.11</u>	.00	.04	-.23	.01
BeOe	<u>.18</u>	<u>.19</u>	<u>.16</u>	<u>.13</u>	<u>.14</u>
R ²	.80	.74	.68	.45	.51

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

behavior. If one engages in a good act then one is considered to be a good person. This coefficient is not significant for either the Egyptians or Lebanese although the coefficient is positive. The balance coefficient is smaller for the Lebanese and Egyptians than for the Americans and the Irish and is smaller in all four cultural groups than other significant coefficients. However, the size of any unstandardized interaction coefficient will always be smaller than an unstandardized main effect coefficient which produces the same net change in the dependent variable score. This is due to the larger magnitude of interaction terms as they are the product of two or more main effect scores. In this study the main effect scores range from -3 to +3 but the balance effect scores range from -9 to +9.

Other coefficients are significant in the American and Irish samples, but are not consistently significant across all samples. Since these coefficients which are not consistently significant across samples also do not relate to any social psychological theoretical traditions, interpretations of their psychological significance cannot be made at the present. Therefore, these coefficients will not be discussed unless they are also significant in one or both of the Middle Eastern samples.

An average of 25% less of the variance is explained in the Middle Eastern samples as compared to the American and Irish samples. The principal investigator, not being a

native Egyptian or Lebanese, was unable to determine if some of the 88 sentences used as stimuli were perceived as bizarre, thus resulting in unreliable ratings and "bad" sentences. To examine the possibility that the lower variance explained in the Egyptian and Lebanese samples was caused by a few "bad" sentences, and assuming that such sentences would have high residuals, the residuals were examined for each attitudinal dimension. For each sample a listing was made of the 12 sentences having the highest residuals for each attitudinal dimension. Among the Egyptians, it was found that seven sentences shared high residuals on all four attitudinal dimensions and that three had high residuals on three of the four dimensions. These 10 sentences were deleted for new regressions.⁴ Among the Lebanese there was also a high degree of overlap in sentences with high residuals on each dimension. 9 of the Lebanese sentences were deleted for new regressions. Eight of these sentences had high residuals on at least three dimensions and two had high residuals on two dimensions.⁵

Although the consistency of overlap in high residuals across all dimensions indicates a problem for these deleted sentences, a search for an explanation of the high residuals occurring in these particular sentences was fruitless. None of the sentences were ones in which there was a high percentage checking the question mark box as a response. In addition, only three of the sentences were in common for the Egyptians and Lebanese.⁶ The high residual sentences were

shown to a professor of the Arabic language and to several Egyptian respondents, none of whom were able to identify any grammatical or cultural explanation.

The regression coefficients for the in-context evaluation of actors when the high residual sentences are deleted from the analysis are shown in Table 3.3. In the case of the Egyptians, the significant coefficients are identical to those in the analysis using all sentences. The difference lies in the increase of 12% in explained variance. For the Lebanese explained variance increases by 9%. However, for the Lebanese the number of significant coefficients changes. In addition to the coefficients significant in the previous analysis, the Ap, Bp, and Ba coefficients are significant. The positive Ap and Bp coefficients indicate that an actor's evaluation is enhanced when his out-of-context potency is high and when his behavior is a potent one. The negative Ba coefficients indicates that active actors lose evaluation and passive actors gain in evaluation. The Ba coefficient significant in the UNC77 sample is almost identical to that found among the Lebanese. The Ap coefficient was also significant in the UNC77 sample but was in the opposite direction. The Bp coefficient was not significant in any of the other samples. In short, the regressions with deviant sentences removed suggest some extra effects that might turn up in larger studies of Arabic speakers. However, the behavior evaluation effect does not run to the level found in other studies.

Table 3.3 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Evaluations of a Social Actor from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements - Sentences with High Residuals Deleted from Analysis

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; a : activity

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-. <u>68</u>	-.16
Ae	.24	. <u>36</u>
Ap	.22	. <u>33</u>
Aa	-.04	-.12
Be	.03	.08
Bp	.25	. <u>39</u>
Ba	-.15	-. <u>41</u>
Oe	.05	.06
Op	.27	-.07
Oa	-.24	.02
BeOe	. <u>12</u>	. <u>15</u>
R ²	.57	.60

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

Also the R-squares do not rise greatly considering that deletion of deviant cases affects these statistics directly.

In summary, the impressions of social actors on the evaluation dimension are quite similar across a sample of two Western and two non-Western cultures, with the most notable difference being that the effect for the evaluation of an actor's behavior (Be) is not significant in the non-Western samples but is significant for the Western samples.

Potency Dynamics

Regression results for in-context impressions of an actor's potency are shown in Table 3.4. The significant coefficients are quite similar in both the Egyptian and Lebanese samples. An actor's potency is affected by his out-of-context potency (Ap). This is the stability coefficient. The BeOe coefficient indicates the operation of the balance effect also seen in evaluation dynamics. Both the Ap and BeOe coefficients are almost identical in magnitude in both samples. The third significant coefficient is the Be effect: actors who engage in good behaviors are more potent than actors who engage in bad behaviors. Although this effect is significant only for the Egyptians it is almost significant for the Lebanese ($p=.10$) and is in the same direction.

Both the stability coefficient (Ap) and the balance effect (BeOe) are significant in the American and Irish samples. However, for the Western samples the third consistently significant coefficient is not Be but Bp. An actor's potency is a function of the potency level of his

Table 3.4 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions of a Social Actor's Potency from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; P : potency; a : activity

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	UNC77	UNC78	Belfast	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-.12	-.15	.18	-.69	-.21
Ae	.06	-.15	-.03	-.05	-.08
Ap	.26	.57	.38	.48	.45
Aa	.06	.11	.07	-.03	.03
Be	.04	.01	-.12	.33	.17
Bp	.44	.40	.45	-.51	-.10
Ba	-.19	-.02	-.27	.25	-.12
Oe	-.09	-.02	-.06	.03	.07
Op	-.01	.00	-.04	.21	.23
Oa	.05	.05	.08	-.25	-.16
BeOe	.12	.01	.08	.09	.06
R ²	.68	.79	.68	.55	.48

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

behavior: the more potent the behavior the more potent the actor. Although a positive behavior effect exists in all four countries, the dimension upon which this effect occurs varies. The B_e coefficient is significant for the Irish but is in the opposite direction of the B_e coefficient among the Egyptians and Lebanese.

Regression analyses with the same high residual sentences deleted as described previously yields somewhat different results, although the change in significant coefficients concerns effects which are not consistently significant in the American or Irish results. For the Lebanese the model reported in Table 3.5 is quite similar to the model where all sentences are included in the analysis, with the exception of the O_e coefficient becoming significant. The variance explained increases by 12%. Table 3.5 shows that for the Egyptians, the two coefficients A_e and O_a are now significant. The negative A_e coefficient is consistent with the UNC78 results. However, the negative O_a coefficient does not compare with the positive O_a coefficient among the Irish.

In summary, as with the evaluation dynamics, two of the three coefficients which are consistently significant in Western cultures for potency impressions of actors are also significant in the non-Western samples, indicating substantial similarity in potency dynamics across these cultures. The difference in the third significant coefficient lies in the attitudinal dimension. The

Table 3.5 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions of a Social Actor's Potency from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements - Sentences with High Residuals Deleted from Analysis

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; a : activity

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-. <u>75</u>	-. <u>32</u>
Ae	-. <u>10</u>	-.07
Ap	. <u>53</u>	. <u>62</u>
Aa	-.02	-.07
Be	. <u>30</u>	.14
Bp	-. <u>51</u>	-.09
Ba	.33	-.07
Oe	.06	. <u>12</u>
Op	.19	.10
Oa	-. <u>22</u>	-.09
BeOe	. <u>08</u>	. <u>06</u>
R ²	.74	.60

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

Westerners have a significant effect for the potency of the behavior whereas the Middle Easterners have one for the evaluation of the behavior.

Activity Dynamics

Since two different scales were used as potential equivalents to the American activity dimension, two separate regression analyses were conducted. In the first, the regression model included evaluation, potency and the third Lebanese pancultural factor (symbolized by a). The second regression model includes evaluation, potency and the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor (symbolized by s). Following a discussion of the results concerning these two alternative measures of activity, a comparative assessment of the results will be made to determine which activity measure is most functionally similar to the American activity dimension in its impression formation dynamics.

Results using the third Lebanese pancultural factor will be discussed first. This factor is the one which most clearly resembles the American activity dimension in its scale qualifiers. Results for the four cultures sampled are shown in Table 3.6.

The two coefficients which are consistently significant in previous results are those for the stability effect (Aa) and for the activity of the behavior (Ba), with the stability effect being the most important. Table 3.6 shows the stability coefficient to be significant among the two Middle Eastern samples, although it is significant only at

Table 3.6 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions of a Social Actor's Activity from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; a : activity*

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	UNC77	UNC78	Belfast	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-.07	<u>.15</u>	.07	<u>-.41</u>	.13
Ae	.03	.03	-.02	-.03	-.14
Ap	-.03	-.02	.00	.16	.14
Aa	<u>.38</u>	<u>.63</u>	<u>.47</u>	.20	<u>.34</u>
Be	-.07	<u>-.10</u>	.00	.27	.04
Bp	.13	<u>.16</u>	-.02	-.44	-.11
Ba	<u>.34</u>	<u>.18</u>	<u>.21</u>	.14	.07
Oe	.00	.02	-.06	-.00	.04
Op	.05	.01	-.01	.17	.12
Oa	<u>-.08</u>	-.05	.03	-.19	-.05
BeOe	.01	.02	.01	<u>.07</u>	<u>.06</u>
R ²	.71	.87	.76	.47	.62

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

*Activity symbolized by a is the third Lebanese pancultural factor

the .07 level for the Egyptians. The Ba effect is not significant in either of the Middle Eastern samples, although the coefficient is positive as it is in the Western samples. The second significant effect for the Egyptians and Lebanese is the balance effect (BeOe), an effect not significant in the other samples.

The increase in the number of significant coefficients in the Egyptian and Lebanese samples when deleting the high residual sentences, as shown in Table 3.7, are for effects not significant in the Western samples.

Results using the fourth pancultural factor, which is most readily interpretable as a variant potency dimension in its scale qualifiers, are reported in Table 3.8. These results show the least consistency across the two Middle Eastern samples. In both samples the balance effect (BeOe) is significant. However, in these two samples the second effect which is significant differs. For the Egyptians there is a positive effect for the activity of the behavior (Bs) but no significant stability effect. For the Lebanese there is a significant stability effect but no significant effect for the activity of the behavior. When the high residual sentences are deleted the results, as shown in Table 3.9, are almost identical.

From these results it is somewhat difficult to determine which of the two alternative activity measures functions most similarly to the American activity dimension in attitudinal dynamics. The results using both alternative

Table 3.7 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions of a Social Actor's Activity from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements - Sentences with High Residuals Deleted From the Analysis

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; a : activity*

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-. <u>45</u>	.09
Ae	-.06	-. <u>13</u>
Ap	.19	. <u>28</u>
Aa	. <u>22</u>	. <u>23</u>
Be	.21	.04
Bp	-.39	-.08
Ba	.22	.08
Oe	.02	.07
Op	.15	.06
Oa	-.18	-.02
BeOe	. <u>06</u>	. <u>06</u>
R ²	.67	.72

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

*Activity symbolized by a is the third Lebanese pancultural factor

Table 3.8 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions
of a Social Actor's Activity from Out-of-Context
Ratings of Event Elements

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; P : potency; s : activity*

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	Coefficients	
	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	-. <u>48</u>	-.24
Ae	.07	.02
Ap	.10	.10
As	.08	<u>.25</u>
Be	.12	-.03
Sp	-.27	-.09
Bs	<u>.22</u>	.25
Oe	-.02	-.09
Op	.09	.04
Os	-.11	.04
BeOe	<u>.08</u>	<u>.07</u>
R ²	.38	.30

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different
from zero, $p < .05$.

*Activity symbolized by s is the fourth Lebanese pancultural
factor

Table 3.9 Coefficients for Predicting In-Context Impressions of a Social Actor's Activity from Out-of-Context Ratings of Event Elements - Sentences with High Residuals Deleted from Analysis

Abbreviations: A : actor; B : behavior; O : object;
e : evaluation; p : potency; s : activity*

Out-of-Context Prediction Term	Egypt	Lebanon
constant	<u>-.52</u>	<u>-.33</u>
Ae	.05	.01
Ap	.12	.06
As	.13	<u>.31</u>
Be	.08	.01
Bp	-.20	-.08
Bs	<u>.21</u>	.13
Oe	-.01	-.06
Op	.09	.02
Os	-.11	.09
BeOe	<u>.07</u>	<u>.06</u>
R ²	.54	.36

Note: Underlined coefficients are significantly different from zero, $p < .05$.

*Activity symbolized by s is the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor

activity measures are quite similar to one another and differ from the American and Irish activity results in a similar manner. For both activity measures, a balance effect consistently appears, an effect never significant in Western activity dynamics. The one effect which is most consistent in all samples, regardless of activity measure, is the stability effect: an actor's activity impression is a function of his previous activity level. A comparison of evaluation and potency dynamics when using the alternative activity measures indicates no difference: the same coefficients are significant and the magnitudes are almost identical (within .04 units of one another). When using the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor as an activity measure, the Egyptians have a significant effect for the activity of the behavior, but the Lebanese have a significant stability effect. This does not help differentiate between them since both these effects are significant among the Americans and Irish.

There are only a few bases upon which one might want to conclude that the third pancultural factor most closely resembles the American activity dimension. First of all, this factor is the one most clearly interpretable as activity on the basis of its scale qualifiers. Secondly, although there is not much difference between the results on this factor and those on the fourth pancultural factor, the model for this factor is able to explain a much higher proportion of the variance. Using the third pancultural

factor R^2 ranges from .47 to .62 in the analysis using all sentences. Using the fourth pancultural factor, R^2 ranges from .30 to .38 in the analysis using all sentences.

Thirdly, among the Western samples the stability effect is the most important effect. In general the stability coefficient is larger than the activity of the behavior effect when using the third pancultural factor, but is not when using the fourth pancultural factor (with the exception of the Lebanese analysis with high residual sentences deleted).

Footnotes

¹ The symbols A, B, and O are equivalent to the symbols S, V, and O used in the earlier phases of impression formation research. Heise (1979) uses the symbols A, B, and O to emphasize events as the primary object of concern.

² Although the Irish data are based upon respondents of both sexes, and the other data upon male respondents only, this is not expected to confound comparison of the results. Unpublished American data indicate no significant sex differences in impression formation of social actors.

³ The coefficients reported for the Egyptians and Lebanese in the following Tables have been rescaled from a 7-point scale to a 9-point scale. This was done to facilitate comparison of the coefficients across all samples: the American and Irish ratings were completed on a 9-point scale.

Although two regression analyses were completed, the results reported use the third Lebanese pancultural factor as a measure of activity except where indicated otherwise. As will later be noted, the evaluation and potency results are almost identical when using either the third or fourth pancultural factors as a measure of activity.

⁴ The 10 sentences with large residuals deleted for the Egyptians are as follow: 1) The landlord ignored the lawyer.

2) The guest amused the patient. 3) The professor forgave the madman. 4) The daughter avoided the do-nothing. 5) The author despised the cripple. 6) The director saved the coward. 7) The devil amused the employer. 8) The daughter insulted the guest. 9) The simpleton abandoned the villain. 10) The lawyer loved the criminal.

⁵ The 9 sentences with large residuals deleted for the Lebanese are as follow: 1) The beggar doublecrossed the tyrant. 2) The guest admired the do-nothing. 3) The policeman coerced the employer. 4) The daughter avoided the do-nothing. 5) The author despised the cripple. 6) The witch excited the coward. 7) The simpleton abandoned the villain. 8) The assistant warned the watchman. 9) The do-nothing forgave the tyrant.

⁶ The three sentences which were deleted for both the Egyptians and Lebanese are: 1) The daughter avoided the do-nothing. 2) The author despised the cripple. 3) The simpleton abandoned the villain.

CHAPTER FOUR

Summary and Conclusions

In summary, impression formation research among Egyptians and Lebanese sampled in this study supports the idea that impression formation among Arabs is reasonably similar to impression formation among Anglo-Saxons. Most of the coefficients which are significant for predicting in-context impressions of social actors among the Americans and the Irish are also significant among the Egyptians and the Lebanese. There is also some support for the hypothesis that impression formation dynamics for the third Lebanese pancultural factor, which most closely resembles the American activity dimension in its scale qualifiers, are similar to American activity dynamics.

The most reliable difference between cultures seems to be lower explained variance for the two Middle Eastern cultures. The greatest differential in explained variance occurs on the evaluation dimension. It is possible that the differential in explained variance could be decreased in a study where the sentences constructed conformed to a greater degree with the paradigm for the design of stimulus sentences shown in Table 2.1. Egyptian or Lebanese attitudinal ratings for a large number of social identities

or behaviors was not available and sentences were constructed on the basis of pre-test ratings of a limited number of social identities and behaviors. Although the sentences constructed followed the paradigm in Table 2.1 on the basis of pre-test results, the mean ratings obtained in the final study indicate much less independence between the attitudinal dimensions since the pre-test means differ from the means obtained in the final study. Not all of the eight attitudinal profiles were well represented in the sentences. This restricted variance in the Egyptian and Lebanese ratings could be affecting the magnitude of the explained variance.

The most striking difference between the cultures lies in the direct effect of the actor's behavior. The behavior effect is pervasive across all three types of affective dynamics for the Westerners. The behavior effect of evaluation dynamics explains as much variance as the stability effect. The behavior effect of potency dynamics accounts for approximately half of the explained variance. Only in the case of activity dynamics is the behavior effect less important than other effects: in activity dynamics the stability coefficient is most important. In potency dynamics alone is there a direct behavior effect for the Egyptians and Lebanese, and even here the effect is on a different dimension from Americans and the Irish. For the Westerners, the effect occurs on the same dimension as the dependent variable - potency. For the Egyptians and Lebanese the

behavior effect is a cross-dimensional one. The Be effect consistently found in Western evaluation dynamics is not significant for the Egyptians and Lebanese. The Ba effect found in Western activity dynamics is significant only for the Egyptians and only when using one of the activity measures - the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor.

One explanation which can be offered to account for these behavior effect differences is methodological. The results reported in this study and in the cited Western studies use zero as the neutral point. Middle Eastern regression results using a neutral point of 4 (with scale values ranging from 1 to 7 rather than -3 to +3) indicate the presence of a significant behavior effect in evaluation dynamics, although the effect is negative rather than positive. Although the behavior effect is consistent among Western samples, it is known that, in general, main effects in regression equations with interaction terms change with changes in the specified scale neutral point. It is possible therefore, that a Middle Eastern behavior effect similar to the Western behavior effect exists, but that it has not yet been identified because the Middle Eastern neutral point equivalent to the Western neutral point is unknown.

A second explanation for the behavior effect differences lies in the structure of the language. The Arabic language has no separate verb infinitive as does the English language. The Arabic equivalent to the infinitive is the verbal noun. It is possible that a Middle Eastern

behavior effect does not appear because different attitudes are evoked when behaviors are described by verbal nouns (as is the case in the out-of-context behavior ratings) as opposed to being described by transitive verbs (as is the case in the in-context ratings).

The existence of diglossia among Arabic speaking cultural groups provides another linguistic explanation. Diglossia is a situation characterized by the coexistence of a written/formal language with an informal spoken language. The English language merges the formal and informal components. A more comprehensive comparison of Western and Middle Eastern affective dynamics would require results based on the colloquial languages of the Egyptians and the Lebanese.

A third explanation is cultural. Attitudes have been described as having two components, a fundamental component which is the stable component, resistant to change, and the transient component, which is the attitude manifest at any given time and is brief and momentary in nature (Heise, 1979). The out-of-context attitude ratings are measures of fundamental attitudes whereas attitudes towards actors within the context of a sentence are transient attitudes. The lack of a direct behavior effect among the Middle Easterners may indicate that transient feelings towards social actors are less likely to deviate from fundamental feelings than is the case among Westerners, although Western fundamental attitudes are also resistant to change.

Impressions of social actors among Egyptians and Lebanese are more dependent upon the fundamental attitudes towards these actors: the stability effect is the most important effect in all three types of Middle Eastern affective dynamics.

Historical developments in Middle Eastern culture demonstrate a propensity for stability. Modern standard Arabic is very similar to the classical Arabic used in the Koran. Recent events in the Middle East, notably the well-publicized religious fundamentalist trend in Iran, demonstrate strong resistance to change. Discussions with Egyptians concerning impressions of actors indicate that Middle Easterners are less likely than Americans to express transient attitudes towards an actor which are very different from the fundamental attitudes. One example concerns political leaders: once a political leader is established as a good or bad person, no matter what that person does, opinions of him as good or bad will not change. It is possible that since the rate of cultural change in the past century has been slower in Middle Eastern countries than Western countries, the greater degree of stability in Middle Eastern attitudes towards social actors, as evidenced by the lack of a direct behavior effect, reflects the level of adaptation to change required in a given culture. Adaptation in American culture may require greater flexibility in attitudes than adaptation in Middle Eastern cultures. Thus, although the lack of a direct behavior

effect appears to be an important difference between Westerners and Middle Easterners, the importance of this difference should be examined in light of how the behavior effect is related to the other components of impression formation. The lack of a direct behavior effect may be indicative of a difference in degree of emphasis on stability rather than of qualitatively different dynamics.

While the behavior effect is more important for Western affective dynamics than for Middle Eastern affective dynamics, the reverse is the case for the balance effect. The balance effect exists in all three types of Middle Eastern affective dynamics. In American evaluation dynamics the balance effect is persistent. The balance effect has occasionally been significant in potency dynamics but has never been significant in American activity dynamics.

The pervasiveness of the balance effect among the Middle Easterners is consistent with the cultural explanation for the lack of a direct behavior effect. The balance effect can be seen as a mechanism which prevents social actors from engaging in behaviors which are incongruent with behaviors expected on the basis of their basic goodness, potency or activity. It is not that Arabs do not consider an actor's behavior but that behaviors are considered only in the context of the object of the behavior. Thus one might conclude that Westerners and Middle Easterners use the same components when forming impressions of an actor - the original attitude towards the actor, the

actor's behavior, and the object of the behavior - but differ in the emphasis placed on behaviors as considered out-of-context of the situation described in a particular sentence. Americans are willing to consider the goodness, potency or activity of an actor's behavior in isolation whereas Middle Easterners consider the behavior within a context, notably within the context of the recipient of the behavior.

There are a number of effects, primarily cross-dimensional ones, which are difficult to interpret. First of all, many of these effects are not consistent across cultures. For example, in Egyptian potency dynamics there is a positive effect for the evaluation of the behavior (Be) but in the only other cultural groups with a Be effect in potency dynamics - the Irish - the effect is negative. Secondly, many of these effects are not consistently found in different samples of the same cultural group. For example, the positive effect for the activity of the behavior (Ba) in evaluation dynamics was found in the UNC77 sample but not in the UNC78 sample. Thirdly, the psychological significance of these effects is difficult to assess since they are not rooted in any social psychological theoretical tradition. Further studies would be required to determine which of these effects are important and what their psychological significance is for affective dynamics.

Although further studies comparing attitudinal dynamics and attitude change between Westerners and Middle Easterners

would be necessary to validate the cultural explanation as opposed to other explanations for the differences in impression formation, there is some indication of stability and reliability in the Middle Eastern results. Although considered members of the same Middle Eastern cultural group, the Egyptians and Lebanese are religiously dissimilar: the Egyptians are all Muslims whereas the Lebanese sampled are predominantly Christian. This difference could have generated divergent attitudinal dynamics but did not. Secondly, the mean ratings for the Lebanese are based on a much smaller number of respondents than those of the Egyptians. This smaller number of respondents could quite possibly result in unstable means and thus in impression formation differences, yet the Egyptian and Lebanese results are strikingly similar.

The most problematic assessment in this study is determining which of the two alternative Lebanese "activity" dimension measures is functionally equivalent to the American activity dimension. Osgood et al. (1975) proposed the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor, interpretable as a variant potency dimension, to be functionally equivalent to the American activity dimension. This study finds more support for designating the third Lebanese pancultural factor, clearly interpretable as an activity dimension, to be functionally similar to the American activity dimension. However, this assessment is not definitive since the dynamics for both the third and the fourth Lebanese

pancultural factors are quite similar.

Osgood et al. (1975) concluded that there are three universal affective dimensions. The results reported in this study suggest that some of the dynamics on these three dimensions may also be universal - at least there is no disconfirmation here. Although cultures may promote different attitudes towards different social identities and behaviors, our results suggest that the attitude changes which occur when attitudes are evoked together within the cognitive framework of a sentence may follow similar processes regardless of culture. The existence of the balance effect in both Middle Eastern samples is an important social psychological finding. The balance principle, in its various theoretical forms, is central to the American social psychological tradition. This tradition has assumed that the tendency to balance attitudes is innate to all human beings. The results of this study support this assumption while also specifying the exact nature of the balance principle in mathematical terms, its Middle Eastern nature being similar to that found in American and Irish impression formation studies. Certainly impression formation studies need to be replicated in many other cultures to validate the generality of this conclusion. Nevertheless, the fact that the four cultures now examined are from two very dissimilar cultural groups indicates a fair likelihood of further replications.

CHAPTER II

Procedures

Respondents

Respondents were selected from two Middle Eastern Arabic-speaking cultural groups: Lebanon and Egypt. The semantic differential scales were based on scales indigenously developed in Lebanon, so the Lebanese sample eliminates the possibility that biased findings result from imposing upon a culture the use of an attitudinal dimension which may be metaphorically different from that indigenous to the culture.¹ Egyptians were selected since they are noted for being more homogeneous than almost any other nation in the Middle East (Van Nieuvenhuize, 1971). The homogeneity of respondents is desirable to minimize attitudinal variation within concepts so acceptably low standard error of measurement means can be obtained with fewer respondents (Hamblin, 1971).

Respondents were fluent in modern standard Arabic. This requirement is important because in all Arab nations a situation of diglossia exists for all literate individuals. The first language that individuals learn to speak is the dialect of their country or region of the country. This is referred to as the colloquial language and is primarily a

spoken language. If an individual goes to school and learns to read and write, learning is done in modern standard Arabic. This language is common to all Middle Easterners and is the language used for writing and for speaking in formal settings (classroom lectures, radio, T.V., and political speeches). Any questionnaire must be completed in modern standard Arabic. Since it is not spoken in most day to day interactions, only those individuals with many years of schooling would be expected to be very fluent in modern standard Arabic. Thus respondents selected have obtained at least some university level education.² The selection of highly educated Egyptian and Lebanese respondents also facilitates comparability with the American impression formation studies which were conducted among university students.

Although it cannot be denied that the respondents will have adopted some aspects of American culture which could bias the results, it is expected that the construction of the questionnaire in modern standard Arabic will elicit Egyptian and Lebanese cultural responses. A study in which French-English bilinguals were given the TAT (Thematic Apperception Test) at two different points in time, once in English and once in French, demonstrated that with each of the two different languages, cultural themes were elicited (Erwin, 1964).

Since the use of Egyptians residing in Egypt and Lebanese residing in Lebanon was politically infeasible, the

subject population consisted of Egyptians and Lebanese residing in the U.S. The Egyptian Student Association facilitated locating Egyptian respondents both of university level education and with a minimal exposure and/or orientation towards American culture. Most of its members are male graduate students who will return to Egypt after completing their Ph.D. degrees. More than half are funded by the Egyptian government and many are married.

The Egyptian Student Association (ESA) in the U.S. is composed of approximately 50 chapters with 450-500 members. About three-fifths of these chapters have a membership of less than 10 (the average for these chapters being approximately 5). The Executive Committee of the ESA granted permission for questionnaire distribution to its members and provided a list of the names and addresses of each chapter president.

The larger chapters with memberships ranging from 10 to 30 were sampled since students in these chapters would be members of a larger Egyptian community and would be less likely to integrate into the American community. A total of 15 chapters were sampled through the mail. The total number of questionnaires sent out to these chapters was 160 of which 60 were returned. Since questionnaires were not mailed to individuals it is not possible to assess response rates for each chapter: questionnaires not returned could be a result of lack of distribution by the chapter president. The remainder of the questionnaires - 21 - were obtained from

in-person distribution in two chapters and from distribution by an Executive Committee member of the ESA at the annual election meetings attended by all chapter presidents.

From a total of 81 returned questionnaires, 12 were discarded from the analysis. Eight of these were discarded because the respondents were female. The other four were discarded for obvious misunderstanding of instructions. 69 questionnaires were used in the Egyptian data analysis.

Lebanese respondents were obtained through developing a network of contacts. In general, one or two Lebanese residing in a city with a Lebanese community was contacted either by phone or through a meeting and arrangements were made for this individual to distribute several questionnaires to Lebanese in that community. The arrangement of meetings for group administration of the questionnaires was not feasible. The individuals contacted were university students, officials of a Lebanese organization or owners of a business. The Lebanese sample was drawn from 8 cities in which there was a community of at least 20 Lebanese. Response rates could not be calculated given that the number of questionnaires distributed is unknown. From the total of 55 questionnaires returned by the Lebanese, 36 were used in the data analysis. Of the nineteen questionnaires discarded from the analysis, thirteen of these were discarded because the respondents were female. Three were discarded due to obvious misunderstanding of instructions and three due to a lack of background

information on respondent's sex.

Both samples consist of male respondents only. The mean number of years spent in the U.S. for the Egyptian sample is 2.57.³ For the Lebanese sample the mean number of years in the U.S. is 2.38.⁴ A t-test for the difference between means indicates that the difference between the Egyptians and Lebanese in the number of years living in the U.S. is not significant ($t=.087$). The mean age of the Lebanese sample is 26 indicating comparability with the Egyptian graduate student sample.⁵

The difference between the two samples exists in respect to religion. The Egyptians sampled are all Muslims. The Lebanese sampled are 30.5% Muslim and 69.5% Christian. The Lebanese Muslims are either Sunni or Druze. The Lebanese Christians belong to various sects such as Roman Catholic, Armenian, Greek Orthodox, and Maronite, with the majority being Maronite. The underrepresentation of the Moslems in the sample (they compose approximately 50% of the Lebanese population) is accounted for by the fact that the majority of Lebanese immigrants to the U.S. are Maronites.

Sample of Words

All concepts rated were social identities or interpersonal behaviors. Since some cultural differences in ratings of social identities and interpersonal behaviors are to be expected, the concepts selected as stimuli could not simply be translated from American studies. Such translating could lead to a bias in the number of concepts of particular

evaluation, potency or activity intensities or could possibly limit the range of variance in EPA ratings across all concepts. Furthermore, one of the affective dimensions examined in this study does not have a counterpart in the studies of American English.

No data on semantic differential ratings of social identities and behaviors exist for Egyptian Arabs. There is, however, data on a set of approximately 70 social identities for Lebanese Arabs included in Osgood et al.'s (1975) Atlas of semantic differential ratings of 620 concepts for 23 cultural communities. These data were used to select some of the social identities for the semantic differential questionnaire. However, many of the 39 identities used were not derived from the Atlas data since only two of the eight EPA profiles were well represented in the Atlas data.⁶ 37 of the Atlas social identities are of positive evaluation and potency and negative activity and 18 are of positive evaluation, potency and activity. Only 12 of the social identities are of negative evaluation.

Because no data were available for the Atlas social identities on the third pancultural factor (which most clearly resembles the American activity dimension), identities selected from this data required pre-testing on this factor. Pre-testing and final selection from the Atlas social identities was made using the following procedure. 24 social identities with the greatest departure from neutral ratings (on the three dimensions used in Atlas ratings) were

selected for pre-testing on the third pancultural factor. 15 of these social identities with the greatest departure from neutrality on all four attitudinal dimensions were selected for use in the final questionnaire. 8 of these identities were from the two EPA profiles well-represented in the Atlas ratings and 7 of these identities were from the six remaining EPA profiles.

The majority of identities to be rated were selected using the following procedure. Using the dictionary generated by Heise (1978) which contains mean EPA ratings for 650 social identities and 600 interpersonal behaviors, a list was drawn up of familiar concepts whose connotation departed from neutral. These concepts were selected for translation into Arabic. Although differences were to be expected in Egyptian and Lebanese EPA ratings as compared with American ratings for "identical" concepts, the procedure offers some advantages in acquiring a list of Arabic concepts with diverse profiles.⁷ In fact, it was expected that many of the social identities would have very similar profiles. A comparison of the profiles of Americans and Lebanese for the 70 social identities included in the Atlas indicates a great deal of similarity, especially on the evaluation dimension.

The principal investigator conducted the translation of the English concepts into Arabic using two English-Arabic dictionaries.⁸ Items from the list were eliminated from the translation process when no dictionary entry existed for a

particular concept or when the only translation for a concept consisted of several Arabic terms or a lengthy phrase. For the remaining concepts the initial translation process consisted of listing several alternative translations for each concept. Each of the alternative Arabic translations for a particular concept was then looked-up in the Hans Wehr Dictionary of Modern Written Arabic (1976), one of the most comprehensive Arabic-English dictionaries. Since all Arabic words are based on a root verb, the meaning of concepts could be checked in the context of other words from the same root. An Arabic term which was found to differ significantly in meaning from the other Arabic terms given as a translation for a particular English word were eliminated.

The list of English concepts and the Arabic translations were then taken to a professor of the Arabic language who was asked to indicate which of the synonymous concepts listed as translation for an English concept was the most commonly used word as well as the least ambiguous in meaning (there are some concepts in Arabic which have almost the opposite meaning depending upon the context in which they occur. Since these words would have to be rated in isolation, ambiguity of meaning needed to be minimized).

The items selected by the Arabic professor were used for the pre-test. In order to maintain a pre-test of reasonable length, items were eliminated when many concepts with similar meanings occurred. In total 48 social

identities obtained through the translation procedure were pre-tested on all four attitudinal dimensions and 24 obtained from the Atlas data were pre-tested on the third pancultural factor only.

The selection of the interpersonal behavior stimuli followed the above described procedure with the exception that original translations were obtained from all the English EPA profiles since no data on interpersonal behaviors exist in Osgood et al.'s (1975) Atlas. 56 interpersonal behaviors were included in the pre-test.

Rating Scales

As with the concepts to be rated, the scales used for ratings cannot be translated from English. That an evaluation factor exists in different cultures does not necessarily imply that the factor is represented by the same set of bipolar scales, as the cross-cultural research certainly shows. An examination of the composition of the evaluation factor across 22 linguistic/cultural communities indicates that there are metaphorical differences in the qualifiers used to represent this factor. For example, among Americans the indigenous evaluation factor is primarily aesthetic-sensory (sweet-sour, mild-harsh) and emotional (happy-sad, nice-awful). Among Lebanese Arabs it is primarily social (merciful-cruel, loyal-treacherous, honest-dishonest) and abstract (good-bad, great-contemptible) (Osgood et al., 1975:209). Since the reliability of single scales is low and since the correspondence between the

hypothetical variable represented by the factors and the actual semantic scales defined by adjectives such as "good-bad", "strong-weak", and "active-passive" is low for single scales. Daves (1972) suggests that three or four scales be used to represent each factor. Furthermore, the relevance of a single scale for a particular stimuli varies with the stimuli (Beise, 1969b). On the other hand, the aggregation of more than four scales to represent a factor increases redundancy while decreasing factorial purity (Osgood et al., 1975:171). Thus, sets of adjectives representing a particular attitudinal dimension were aggregated on one scale. The scales were selected from the pancultural factor analysis results of Osgood et al. (1975), in particular from the short-form semantic differential which was used to collect ratings for the 650 Atlas concepts. In this generalized short-form semantic differential, four adjective pairs represent each affective dimension.

The evaluation and potency adjectives were adopted directly from Osgood's generalized short-form semantic differential for the Lebanese. Evaluation is represented by the concepts good-bad, beautiful-ugly, safe-dangerous, and vivifying-fatal (as translated from the original Arabic). The potency dimension is represented by large-small, strong-weak, long-short, and high-low (as translated from the original Arabic).

As previously noted, the Lebanese factor which is functionally similar to the American activity factor has not

been clearly identified. Thus the third factor used in the short-form semantic differential Atlas ratings among Lebanese will be only one of the two possible representatives of the activity dimension. This study will determine which of the two factors, the third or the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor, is functionally similar to the American activity factor in impression formation dynamics. To test the alternative propositions scales were selected from both the third and fourth Lebanese pancultural factors. The third factor is interpretable as an activity factor whereas the fourth factor used in the short-form semantic differential by Osgood and his associates as equivalent to activity can be interpreted as a type of potency factor.

The three highest loading concept-pairs for each of these two factors were presented to four Egyptian informants and one Lebanese informant. Each informant was asked to select the two concept-pairs most appropriate for judging social identities and interpersonal behaviors. Since all five informants agreed upon which scales were inappropriate, additional informants were not consulted. The three concept pairs presented from the third pancultural factor were fast-slow, alive-dead and active-passive (as translated from the original Arabic). All agreed on deleting the adjective pair alive-dead. The concept pairs presented from the fourth pancultural factor were sturdy-not sturdy, logical-emotional, and heavy-light. (as translated from the original Arabic). All informants agreed on deleting the adjective

pair heavy-light.

The pre-test was distributed to two Egyptians and two Lebanese who indicated a high degree of consensus concerning problems in the use of the potency dimension. The informants felt that the adjective pairs were not appropriate to rating social identities and behaviors. This problem resulted from the fact that of the four adjective pairs representing this dimension, three refer to physical attributes.

In order to render the adjectives more appropriate to the stimuli pool of this study, the pre-test respondents were asked to identify which of the four adjective pairs used to represent potency was least similar to the other adjective pairs and least appropriate for describing social identities and behaviors. All respondents identified the adjective pair high-low. This adjective pair was then deleted from the potency scale used in the final study.

The Lebanese scales are also used for the Egyptians. The Lebanese scales are assumed similar to those which would have been elicited in Egypt since Egyptians and Lebanese belong to the same cultural and linguistic group. Of course, the problem of defining cultural boundaries has been a concern of cross-cultural research, especially for studies of national character (Terhune, 1970). Cultural boundaries do not necessarily correspond with political boundaries. Complications arise particularly when in a given territorial span there are some common cultural characteristics yet some groups within this territory having different cultural

characteristics.

A number of social scientists have suggested that the Middle East should be considered as a cultural area because of several key elements, some common to all Middle Eastern countries and others common to most Middle Eastern countries (and if not common having a strong influence nevertheless), all of which have created a push towards a common culture. These elements include the desert-oasis environment, the religion of Islam as a way of life, the Arabic language and a series of common historical experiences (Gulick, 1976; Van Nieuwenhuijze, 1971). It must also be noted that the boundaries for many Middle Eastern nations were in many cases arbitrarily set in relatively recent times, as for example the boundaries of Syria and Lebanon, which were set with the British and French mandates.

Osgood et al.'s (1975) cross-cultural data contains scales used for four other Middle Eastern communities: Turkey, Iran, Afghan Dari, and Afghan Pashto. Lebanon was selected as a basis for Egyptian scales primarily because it is the only Middle Eastern country sampled which uses the same language - Arabic - as its predominant language. Furthermore, it is the country most similar culturally. The Northern-Tier - Turkey, Iran and Afghanistan - is considered to be a political and cultural watershed and the countries of Turkey, Iraq, Iran and Afghanistan are considered to be not very far apart socioculturally (Van Nieuwenhuijze, 1971).

Making the assumption that the Lebanese scales are similar to those which would have arisen if semantic differential scales had been developed indigenously among Egyptians is not so untenable given some of the research findings, although scanty, concerning scale similarity in culturally similar communities. Osgood and his associates (1975) conducted a bicultural factorization between the two cultural communities (from a sample of approximately 20 communities) most closely related linguistically and culturally, the Flemish and the Dutch. A close similarity in the scales was apparent for the first three factors of evaluation, potency and activity, and even through the fourth factor of modernity (150). In a bilingual and bicultural tri-community factor analysis of Iranian Farsi, Afghan Dari and Afghan Pashtu, greater similarity was found between the culturally similar Afghan Dari and Afghan Pashtu than between the linguistically similar Iranian Farsi and Afghan Dari.

In addition, an examination of the evaluation scales in the sampled Middle Eastern countries demonstrates a high degree of similarity in the metaphorical flavor of this dimension. With the exception of Turkey, the evaluation dimension among these countries is primarily social and abstract in nature. The concepts of safe-dangerous appear in three of these countries. The highest loading scales for the Iranians (whose scales are most similar to the Lebanese) include safe-dangerous, harmless-harmful, life-giving-

killing, and just-tyrannical, compared to the scales safe-dangerous, loyal-treacherous, merciful-cruel, and honest-dishonest for the Lebanese.

Scale Position Anchors

Semantic differential studies have used both numbers and adverbial qualifiers as anchors for the rating scale positions. Two Lebanese and two Egyptian informants were presented with the English adverbs used for a 7-point semantic differential scale and asked to identify adverbs in Arabic which would be equivalent in meaning. Although all four informants agreed upon an appropriate translation for the adverbial anchor "very" there were problems with the other anchors. The informants pointed out that an equivalent to the English adverbial qualifier "quite" is very difficult to conceptualize in Arabic and most often suggested that the adjective itself with no adverbial qualifiers be used to represent this scale point. The most appropriate conceptualization of the neutral point was felt to require the use of an expression incorporating the scale adjectives since most translations of "neutral" have political connotations. It was thus decided to use numbers as scale point anchors. The neutral point was marked with a zero and each side of the scale used the numbers 1 to 3.⁹ Although numbers were used as scale markers, the instructions describe the meaning of the numbers with reference to adverbial qualifiers or phrases to provide some clarification in their usage.

Sentence Construction

The 39 social identities and 28 interpersonal behaviors were combined to form 88 sentences describing social events of the form "The actor behavior the object " (where the actor and object are social identities and the behavior is interpersonal). The construction of these sentences followed the paradigm shown in Table 2.1 wherein the 8 non-neutral attitudinal profiles are combined to yield 64 basic sentences such that there is maximum variance in the verb-object combinations. All possible combinations of EPA values for the actor, behavior and object could not be represented as this would generate a total of 512 event descriptions.

Since it was unknown which of the Lebanese pancultural factors, the third or the fourth, is functionally similar to the American activity dimension, the sentences constructed had to follow the paradigm requirements in respect to both the third and fourth pancultural Lebanese factors simultaneously. Some sentences were constructed such that the attitudinal profiles of the actor, behavior and object were identical on both the third and fourth pancultural factors. Other sentences were constructed such that the attitudinal profiles for the third pancultural factor represented one cell of the sentence paradigm but represented another cell of this paradigm for the fourth pancultural factor. However, in order to avoid excessive use of a word representing a particular attitudinal profile, it was necessary in some cases to construct two sentences for a

Table 2.1

Paradigm for Design of Stimulus Sentences

Note. Each cell corresponds to a sentence. The EPA profile for the sentence Subject is indicated within the cell; the profile for the Verb is shown as the row label; and the profile for the Object is given as the column label.

Verb Profile	Object Profile							
	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
A	C	D	E	F	G	H	A	B
B	D	E	F	G	H	A	B	C
C	E	F	G	H	A	B	C	D
D	F	G	H	A	B	C	D	E
E	G	H	A	B	C	D	E	F
F	H	A	B	C	D	E	F	G
G	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H
H	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	A

Key (the three signs refer to high or low values on Evaluation, Potency, and Activity, respectively):

A + + +	E - + +
B + + -	F - + -
C + - +	G - - +
D + - -	H - - -

particular cell, one sentence representing the paradigm in respect to the third pancultural factor and one sentence representing the paradigm in respect to the fourth pancultural factor.

An attempt was made to use each word an equal number of times, although this was not possible when few concepts representative of a particular attitudinal profile were available. Furthermore, an attempt was made to use each social identity in approximately equal frequencies in the subject and object positions of the sentence. This was necessary to minimize excessive repeated exposure to the same in-context stimulus, particularly given the fact that the number of sentences constructed necessitated the use of each social identity in a sentence an average of 3.7 times, with approximately two thirds of the social identities being used four or more times. Any identity used four times or more would, of necessity, appear twice in at least one of the three questionnaire forms. In sum, the above described process necessitated the construction of 88 sentences rather than the 64 sentences outlined in Table 2.1.

Questionnaire Construction

In order to construct a questionnaire of moderate length and minimize repeated exposure to the same stimulus, three different questionnaires were constructed.

Pilot tests among Americans have indicated difficulty in alternating between rating nouns and verbs. Thus, questionnaires were assembled such that respondents first

rated isolated social identities, then the behaviors and lastly the actors within the context of a sentence. In order to prevent incomplete pages before the switching of stimuli type the number of one stimuli type to be rated by a respondent varied with the type of questionnaire. Table 2.2 shows the distribution of the stimuli types in the different questionnaire forms.

Table 2.2 Distribution of Stimuli Types in The Three
Questionnaire Forms

	<u>Number of Stimuli</u>		
	<u>Group 1</u>	<u>Group 2</u>	<u>Group 3</u>
Out-of-context actors	16	12	12
Out-of-context behaviors	8	12	8
In-context actors	28	28	32

Although it was inevitable that some stimuli would appear more than once in a questionnaire, the selection of the stimuli to be included in each questionnaire was completed in a manner minimizing repetitions. Since most verbs were used in an average of three sentences (with a maximum of six repetitions for two verbs from attitudinal profiles with few representatives) sentences were first distributed on the basis of each verb occurring an equal number of times in each questionnaire. In the majority of

cases, each behavior stimulus would appear once in-context and once out-of-context. Next, sentences were assigned to the different questionnaires with an attempt to evenly distribute the occurrence of each social identity stimulus. In several cases where a particular social identity profile had very few representations and was used repeatedly in sentences, the distribution was also based on whether the social identity was found in the subject or object position of the sentence. Thus, if a particular social identity appeared four times in a given questionnaire, it would occur twice in the subject of sentence position and twice in the object of sentence position.

Sentences were subsequently ordered within each questionnaire form with the constraint that no stimulus appear twice on any given page and such that the distance between identical stimulus in the same questionnaire be maximized.

The behaviors and social identities for the out-of-context ratings were assigned to the respective questionnaires after the selection of sentences and this selection was completed in the following manner. First, all social identities and behaviors for which there was no in-context rating in the particular questionnaire were selected. Secondly, if a behavior stimulus occurred in two or more sentences in any given questionnaire, there would, whenever possible, be no out-of-context rating for this same behavior in that questionnaire. Thirdly, after these

criteria were fulfilled, identities and behaviors were randomly selected with the only constraint being that there be an approximately equal distribution of the eight attitudinal profiles. Appendix A contains a complete listing of the stimuli used in the questionnaires accompanied by their English translations.

Questionnaire Instructions

Equivalence of meaning across cultures is one of the most crucial and central problems encountered by cross-cultural researchers (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973; Marsh, 1967). Nonequivalence in the meaning of research instruments is a major source of error and leads to invalid results. The equivalence of meaning problem has already been addressed in respect to the stimuli content of this study through the use of indigenously developed semantic differential scales. However, the issue remains to be addressed in respect to the questionnaire instructions.

Unless a researcher is bicultural and not merely bilingual, the replication of a study in a different culture requires the use of bilingual translators from the other culture. The method used to develop Arabic instructions for the questionnaire was back-translation. This method involves the use of two bilinguals, one who translates from the source language (in this case English) to the target language (in this case Arabic) and the other who translates from the target language back to the source language. (Brislin, Lonner and Thorndike, 1973).

The English instructions used as the basis for translation into Arabic were adopted from the instructions used in recent impression formation studies conducted by David E. Heise. These instructions were altered somewhat to fit the frame of four scales rather than the three used in American studies. In addition, segments of the instructions with the adjectives labeling the poles of the scale and the rating position anchors were not translated (see section on Rating Scales). These sections were presented in Arabic to the translators. Several background questions were formulated as well as an introductory letter which contained segments from the oral instructions used by Heise in the distribution of semantic differential forms. The instructions and the introductory letter were presented to a bilingual Egyptian for translation into Arabic. These Arabic translations were then presented to a Lebanese, an American who had spent 15 years in Lebanon and is very fluent in Arabic, and to a Western professor of the Arabic language. The three resulting back translations were quite similar to one another and to the original English version. Nevertheless, changes in a few words were made based on the suggestions of these three translators.

The four informants who completed the pre-test were asked to check the clarity of the instructions and to make suggestions for improvements. All pre-test respondents indicated they felt the instructions to be adequate. Appendix B contains the original English used as the basis

for the Arabic translation and copies of the introductory letter and instructions in Arabic as they appeared in the questionnaire. The adjectives and the description of the numerical ratings positions presented in the English version are as translated from the Arabic, since the scale qualifiers were adopted from cross-cultural research results (see section on Rating Scales).

Instrumentation

Questionnaires were distributed primarily by mail as described previously. Each package of questionnaires sent to an Egyptian or a Lebanese responsible for its distribution included an approximately equal number of each of the three questionnaires forms. Each questionnaire distributed to an individual contained an introductory letter, the questionnaire and a stamped self-addressed return envelope. An additional introductory letter was included in each questionnaire package sent to the Egyptian Student Association (ESA) chapter presidents. This letter was written by the Treasurer of the ESA. A copy of this letter along with an English translation are contained in Appendix C.

All questionnaires contained 13 pages of stimuli, a cover page with instructions, and a page with instructions for the in-context ratings and a few background questions. The background questions asked of the Egyptians were the number of years in the U.S. and sex. For the Lebanese age and religion of respondents were also identified. The types

of stimuli were grouped together and occurred in the following order: social identities, interpersonal behaviors, and in-context ratings of social actors. Social identities were presented in the indefinite form as in studies among Americans. Interpersonal behaviors were presented as verbal nouns. In Arabic verbal nouns (nouns expressing the action) are the equivalent of infinitives in English. The Arabic language often prefers the use of nominal phrases with verbal nouns rather than the verbs themselves (Wright, 1975). Translated literally the infinitive "to praise someone" would be "the praising of someone." In the event sentences the verbs were presented in the past tense as in the American studies.

Each stimulus was followed by scales for the four attitudinal dimensions. Four stimuli were presented on each page. The order of presentation of the four rating scales and the orientation of each scale (right or left) was varied on each page. Each scale had seven rating positions. A box with a question mark was provided for each stimulus, in the event that a respondent did not know the meaning of a particular stimulus.

Notes - Chapter II

¹ See discussion of metaphorical differences in evaluation scales across various cultures in section on Rating Scales.

² Although a few Lebanese respondents have not had university education, they are all fluent in modern standard Arabic.

³ The mean for each questionnaire group is as follows: 2.79 for questionnaire #1, 2.19 for questionnaire #2, 2.70 for questionnaire #3.

⁴ The mean for each questionnaire group is as follows: 2.38 for questionnaire #1, 2.50 for questionnaire #2, and 2.22 for questionnaire #3.

⁵ Although no precise information is available, the majority of Egyptian students in the U.S. are between the ages of 27 and 34.

⁶ In the Atlas the dimension labeled activity is the fourth pancultural factor for the Lebanese.

⁷ For those two attitudinal profiles already accounted for by Osgood et al.'s Atlas ratings, translation of social identities was largely ignored.

⁸ One dictionary compiled by Wortabet and Porter (1954) usually contained only one Arabic translation per English word. The second dictionary compiled by al-Ba'labakki (1969)

is a comprehensive dictionary with several Arabic translations listed for each English word.

9 Negative numbers usually used in American semantic differential scales were avoided since informants indicated that Arabs tend to associate negative numbers with "bad".

APPENDIX A

List of Questionnaire Stimuli and English Translations

SOCIAL IDENTITIES

ASSISTANT	صاعد
AUTHOR	مؤلف
BABY	طفل
BEGGAR	شعاز
BOY	صبي
BRUTE	وحش
CHEAT	محتال
COWARD	جبان
CRIMINAL	مجرم
CRIPPLE	مشلول
DAUGHTER	ابنة
DEVIL	شيطان
DIRECTOR	مدير
DO-NOTHING	كسلان
EMPLOYER	مستخدم
ENEMY	عدو
GHOUL	غول
GIRL	بنت
GRANDMOTHER	جدة

GUEST	ضيف
LADY	سيدة
LANDLORD	ملاك
LAWYER	محام
HADMAN	مجنون
MAID	خارمة
MISER	بخيل
OLD WOMAN	عجوز
PATIENT	مريض
PEASANT	فلاح
PICKPOCKET	نحال
POLICEMAN	شرطي
PROFESSOR	استاذ
SEAMSTRESS	خياطة
SIMPLETON	مففل
THIEF	حرامي
TYRANT	جبار
VILLAIN	سافل
WATCHMAN	خفير
WITCH	ساحرة

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS

ABANDON	هجر شخص ما
ADMIRE	اعجاب بشخص ما
AVOID	تجنب شخص ما
COMPLIMENT	ملاطفة شخص ما

COERCE	أجبار شخص ما
CONGRATULATE	تهنئة شخص ما
DECEIVE	خدعة شخص ما
DESPISE	اهانة شخص ما
DOUBLECROSS	خيانة شخص ما
ENCOURAGE	تشجيع شخص ما
EXCITE	اثارة شخص ما
FORGIVE	عفو عن شخص ما
GLORIFY	تكبير شخص ما
HATE	كراهة شخص ما
HONOR	تسريفة شخص ما
IGNORE	انكار شخص ما
INSULT	احتقار شخص ما
LAUGH AT	الهنز بشخص ما
LOVE	حب شخص ما
MISLEAD	تضليل شخص ما
PRAISE	اطراء شخص ما
PROTECT	حماية شخص ما
SAVE	تنجية شخص ما
SERVE	خدمة شخص ما
TEMPT	اغواء شخص ما
TORMENT	تعذيب شخص ما
VISIT	زيارة شخص ما
WARN	تحذير شخص ما

EVENT SENTENCES

THE MISER CONGRATULATED THE WITCH.	هنا <u>البخيل</u> <u>الساحرة</u>
THE PATIENT ENCOURAGED THE WATCHMAN.	شجع <u>المريض</u> <u>الخفير</u>
THE GIRL PRAISED THE OLD WOMAN.	اطرت <u>البنيت</u> <u>المجوز</u>
THE ENEMY FORGAVE THE GUEST.	عفا <u>المدو</u> عن <u>الضيف</u>
THE MAID ABANDONED THE SEAMSTRESS.	هجرت <u>الخارمة</u> <u>الخيطة</u>
THE AUTHOR GLORIFIED THE MADMAN.	كهر <u>المؤلف</u> <u>المجنون</u>
THE BEGGAR DOUBLECROSSED THE TYRANT.	خان <u>الشحاز</u> <u>الجبار</u>
THE CHEAT INSULTED THE COWARD.	احتقر <u>المحتال</u> <u>الجبان</u>
THE WITCH SAVED THE CRIPPLE.	نجت <u>الساحرة</u> <u>المشلول</u>
THE BRUTE PROTECTED THE PEASANT.	حمى <u>الوحش</u> <u>الفلاح</u>
THE THIEF COERCED THE ASSISTANT.	اجبر <u>الحرامي</u> <u>المساعد</u>
THE GRANDMOTHER LAUGHED AT THE DIRECTOR.	هزأت <u>الجدة</u> <u>بالطير</u>
THE EMPLOYER ADMIRED THE PICKPOCKET.	أعجب <u>المستخدم</u> <u>بالضال</u>
THE OLD WOMAN AVOIDED THE PROFESSOR.	تجنبت <u>المجوز</u> <u>الاستاذ</u>
THE PATIENT DESPISED THE MISER.	اهان <u>المريض</u> <u>البخيل</u>
THE BABY LOVED THE POLICEMAN.	احب <u>الطفل</u> <u>الشرطي</u>
THE COWARD CONGRATULATED THE ENEMY.	هنا <u>الجبان</u> <u>المدو</u>
THE WATCHMAN WARNED THE BEGGAR.	حذر <u>الخفير</u> <u>الشحاز</u>
THE DO-NOTHING EXCITED THE AUTHOR.	اثار <u>الكسلان</u> <u>المؤلف</u>
THE LADY MISLED THE GUEST.	ضلت <u>السيدة</u> <u>الضيف</u>
THE TYRANT ABANDONED THE WITCH.	هجر <u>الجبار</u> <u>الساحرة</u>
THE BRUTE PRAISED THE SIMPLETON.	اطرى <u>الوحش</u> <u>المنفل</u>
THE MAID TORMENTED THE DAUGHTER.	عذبت <u>الخارمة</u> <u>الابنة</u>
THE CRIMINAL COMPLIMENTED THE CRIPPLE.	لاطف <u>المجرم</u> <u>المشلول</u>
THE ENEMY HONORED THE VILLAIN.	شرف <u>المدو</u> <u>السافل</u>

THE GHOUL DECEIVED THE PATIENT.
 THE PEASANT HATED THE MISER.
 THE OLD WOMAN GLORIFIED THE DEVIL.
 THE OLD WOMAN LAUGHED AT THE BOY.
 THE WITCH PROTECTED THE GRANDMOTHER.
 THE DIRECTOR SERVED THE BRUTE.
 THE VILLAIN HONORED THE GIRL.
 THE GUEST ADMIRERED THE DO-NOTHING.
 THE PEASANT ABANDONED THE LANDLORD.
 THE COWARD PRAISED THE POLICEMAN.
 THE CRIPPLE CONGRATULATED THE AUTHOR.
 THE TYRANT HATED THE OLD WOMAN.
 THE DEVIL VISITED THE SEAMSTRESS.
 THE WATCHMAN EXCITED THE ENEMY.
 THE PROFESSOR MISLED THE ASSISTANT.
 THE SIMPLETON INSULTED THE WITCH.
 THE CRIMINAL DOUBLECROSSED THE MISER.
 THE POLICEMAN COERCED THE EMPLOYER.
 THE LANDLORD IGNORED THE LAWYER.
 THE GUEST COMPLIMENTED THE PATIENT.
 THE PROFESSOR FORGAVE THE MADMAN.
 THE BRUTE DECEIVED THE TYRANT.
 THE DAUGHTER AVOIDED THE DO-NOTHING.
 THE COWARD HONORED THE LADY.
 THE PICKPOCKET LAUGHED AT THE CHEAT.
 THE SEAMSTRESS SAVED THE LAWYER.
 THE AUTHOR DESPISED THE CRIPPLE.

خدع الغول المريض
 كره الفلاح البخيل
 كبرت المجوز الشيطان
 هزأت المجوز بالصبي
 حمت الساحرة الجدة
 خدم الطدير الوحش
 شرف الصافل البنت
 أُعجِبَ الضيف بالكسلان
 هجر الفلاح الملاك
 اطرى الجبان الشرطى
 هنا المشلول المؤلف
 كره الجبارة المجوز
 زار الشيطان الخياطة
 اثار الخفير المدو
 ضلل الاستاز المساعد
 احتقر المففل الساحرة
 خان المجرم البخيل
 اجبر الشرطى المستخدم
 انكر الملاك المحامى
 لطف الضيف المريض
 عفا الاستاز عن المجنون
 خدع الوحش الجبار
 تجنبت الابنة الكسلان
 شرف الجبان السيدة
 هزأ النشال بالمحتال
 نجت الخياطة المحامى
 اهان المؤلف المشلول

THE OLD WOMAN PRAISED THE BRUTE.	اطرت <u>المجوز</u> الوحش
THE WITCH ADMIRER THE BABY.	أعجبت <u>الساحرة</u> بالطفل
THE TYRANT LOVED THE MAID.	احب <u>الجبار</u> الخادمة
THE MISER ABANDONED THE GRANDMOTHER.	هجر <u>البخيل</u> الجدة
THE VILLAIN PRAISED THE POLICEMAN.	اطرى <u>الساقل</u> الشرطي
THE ASSISTANT AVOIDED THE BRUTE.	تجنب <u>الساعد</u> الوحش
THE OLD WOMAN PROTECTED THE MISER.	حمت <u>المجوز</u> البخيل
THE MADMAN EXCITED THE BEGGAR.	اثار <u>المجنون</u> الشحاز
THE LADY ABANDONED THE GIRL.	هجرت <u>السيدة</u> الهنت
THE SEAMSTRESS TORRENTED THE WATCHMAN.	عذبت <u>الخيطة</u> الخفير
THE BOY GLORIFIED THE GHOUL.	كبر <u>الصبي</u> الغول
THE DIRECTOR SAVED THE COWARD.	نجا <u>الدير</u> الجبان
THE LAWYER ADMIRER THE CHEAT.	أعجب <u>المحامي</u> بالحتال
THE CRIPPLE DESPISED THE MADMAN.	اهان <u>المشلول</u> المجنون
THE AUTHOR TEMPTED THE ENEMY.	اغوى <u>المؤلف</u> العدو
THE DEVIL COMPLIMENTED THE EMPLOYER.	لاطف <u>الشیطان</u> المستخدم
THE BRUTE DOUBLECROSSED THE WITCH.	خان <u>الوحش</u> الساحرة
THE GRANDMOTHER ENCOURAGED THE PICKPOCKET.	شجعت <u>الجدة</u> النشال
THE THIEF FORGAVE THE OLD WOMAN.	عفا <u>الحرامي</u> عن المجوز
THE MAID SERVED THE SIMPLETON.	خدمت <u>الخادمة</u> المغفل
THE POLICEMAN LOVED THE ASSISTANT.	احب <u>الشرطي</u> الساعد
THE WATCHMAN VISITED THE PEASANT.	زار <u>الخفير</u> الفلاح
THE MISER MISLED THE DO-NOTHING.	ضل <u>البخيل</u> الكسلان
THE MAID LAUGHED AT THE BOY.	هزأت <u>الخيطة</u> بالصبي
THE EMPLOYER PRAISED THE TYRANT.	اطرى <u>المستخدم</u> الجبار
THE WITCH EXCITED THE COWARD.	اثارت <u>الساحرة</u> الجبان
THE DAUGHTER INSULTED THE GUEST.	احتقرت <u>الابنة</u> الضيف

THE CHEAT IGNORED THE DEVIL.
 THE ENEMY COERCED THE THIEF.
 THE OLD WOMAN DECEIVED THE CRIPPLE.
 THE SIMPLETON ABANDONED THE VILLAIN.
 THE MAID HONORED THE BRUTE.
 THE ASSISTANT WARNED THE WATCHMAN.
 THE MADMAN GLORIFIED THE PROFESSOR.
 THE LAWYER LOVED THE CRIMINAL.
 THE DO-NOTHING FORGAVE THE TYRANT.

انكر المحتال الشيطان
 اجبر العدو الحراس
 خدعت العجوز المشلول
 هجر المففل السافل
 شرفت الخارمة الوحش
 حذر المساعد الخفير
 كبر المجنون الاستاذ
 احب المحامي المجرم
 عفا الكملان عن الجبار

APPENDIX B

Questionnaire Cover Sheet - Instruction Pages

FROM YOUR VIEWPOINT

In the middle of each of the following pages, you'll see words for people or acts. Express your feelings about them by putting an X in each row of boxes following the words. Here is an example with the X's filled in. The X's on the right hand side refer to the adjectives on the right hand side of the zero. The X's on the left hand side refer to the adjectives on the left hand side of the zero.*

		مساعدة شخص ما								
جيد ، سالم ، محي ، جميل		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
ضعيف ، صغير ، قصير		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
عاطفي ، ركيك		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
بطيء ، مستكين		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	
		<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	<input type="checkbox"/>	

The X's above mean that you think helping someone is

There is a special box to use just in case you are not sure what a word means. If that happens put an X in the question box:

and go on to the next word to be rated.

Be sure to put one X in every row of boxes: you have to fill out all rows in order to show all your feelings. Rate all words on each page. Do all of the pages.

*This last sentence is not from the original English instructions.

من وجهة نظرك

في منتصف كل الصفحة الآتية صعد كلمات لأشخاص أو أفعال . عبر عن مشاركتك
تجاربها بوضع علامة (X) في أي مربع تختار في كل صف من الصفوف الأربع .
(X) في الجهة اليمنى تشير إلى الصفات التي تقع على يمين الصف . (X)
في الجهة اليسرى تشير إلى الصفات التي تقع على يسار الصف .
و هذا مثال بوضع كيف تضع علامة (X) في المربع .

		مساعدة شخصي ما							
جيد ، سليم ، محي ، جميل	X	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
ضعيف ، صغير ، قصير	3	4	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
عاطفي ، ركيك	2	3	X	1	2	3	4	5	6
بطيء ، مستكين	3	4	1	X	2	3	4	5	6
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8

العلامات (X) السابقة تعني بأنك تعتقد مساعدة شخصي ما ، أي الفعل ،
هو جيد جدا و سليم جدا و محي جدا و جميل جدا ، و ان مساعدة شخصي ما ،
أي الفعل ، هو ما بين جدا و بالكار للاتي قوي و كبير و طويل ، و ان مساعدة
شخصي ما ، أي الفعل ، هو بالكار عقلي و بالكار متبين ، و ان مساعدة شخصي ما ،
أي الفعل ، هو ليس بطيء ام مستكين و ليس سريع ام نشيط .
هناك أيضا مربع خاص يمكنك استخدامه في حالة عدم تأكدك من المعنى المقصود
من أي كلمة . اذا حدث ذلك ضع علامة (X) في المربع الذي به علامة استفهام .

2

و استمر في القراءة و اختيار الكلمة الأخرى . عليك التأكد من وضع علامة (X)
واحدة فقط في كل صف من الصفحات ، و عليك ان تضع علامة (X) في كل صف
من الصفوف حتى يكون التعمير من مشاركتك كاملا . ثم استمر في كل صفحة و هكذا .

Instructions for In-Context Ratings and
Background Questions

Before going on, please check whether you are

_____ Male or _____ Female

and length of time you have been residing in the U.S.

_____ 1 year or less
 _____ 2 years
 _____ 3 years
 _____ 4 or more years

Please indicate your

_____ religion and

_____ age*

Next are events described by sentences with some words underlined, like this:

The judge convicted the thief.

Show how you feel toward the underlined person after seeing that event. For example, how do you feel about the judge who convicted the thief. Put X's in the four rows of boxes after each sentence to show your feelings.

The events on each page don't relate to each other. Consider each event by itself, and rate the underlined person in that particular event.

* The questions on religion and age were omitted for the Egyptians.



THE UNIVERSITY OF NORTH CAROLINA
AT
CHAPEL HILL

Department of Sociology

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill
Hamilton Hall 070 A
Chapel Hill, N.C. 27514

الاستبيان التالي تم توزيعه على اعضاء الاتحاد الطلبة المصريين
في الولايات المتحدة كجزء من اطروحتي في علم الاجتماع بجامعة نورث
كارولينا .

ان الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو اختبار انطباعاتك تجاه بعض الاروار
الاجتماعية و السلوك الاجتماعي للانفراد و الوقائع الاجتماعية .
سيأخذ الاستبيان منك حوالي نصف ساعة . ارجو عدم كتابة اسلك على
الاستبيان الذي تجيب عليه . لا توجد اجابة صحيحة و اخرى خطأ . ضع
انطباعاتك الاولى . هذه الانطباعات هي التي احتاج اليها . اتنى ان يكون
لديك الوقت الكافي لاستكمال الاستبيان . و اذا اردت ان تعرف اشياء اخرى
حول الاستبيان ، ارجو ان تخبرني بذلك .

Bernadette Pelissier Smith
Bernadette Pelissier Smith

Introductory Letter

The following questionnaire is being distributed to members of the Egyptian Student Association in the United States as part of my dissertation research in sociology at the University of North Carolina.

The purpose of this study is to examine your impressions of various social actors, interpersonal behaviors and social events.

The questionnaire will take between one half hour to one hour for completion. All of your answers are confidential. Do not put your names on the questionnaire you receive. There are no right or wrong answers. Put down your first impressions. Your first impressions are what we want. I hope you will take the time to complete this questionnaire thoughtfully. If you wish to know more about the research be sure to let me know.

الاستبيان التالي تم توزيعه على اعضاء الاتحاد الطلبة المصريين
في الولايات المتحدة كجزء من اطروحتي في علم الاجتماع بجامعة نورث
كارولينا .

ان الغرض من هذه الدراسة هو اختبار انطباعاتك تجاه بعض الادوار
الاجتماعية و السلوك الاجتماعي للافراد و الوقائع الاجتماعية .
سيأخذ الاستبيان منك حوالي نصف ساعة . ارجو عدم كتابة اسمك على
الاستبيان الذي تجيب عليه . لا توجد اجابة صحيحة و اخرى خطأ . ضع
انطباعاتك الاولى . هذه الانطباعات هي التي احتاج اليها . اتنى ان يكون
لديك الوقت الكافي لاستكمال الاستبيان . و اذا اردت ان تعرف اشياء اخرى
حول الاستبيان ، ارجو ان تخبرني بذلك .

APPENDIX C

Translation of Introductory Letter in Arabic Sent to
Chapter Presidents by ESA Executive Committee Member

To: Colleagues in the chapters
From: Treasurer of the Egyptian Student Association,
representative of the executive committee

Subject:

Enclosed in this letter are questionnaires for doctoral research being conducted by an American student at the University of North Carolina. This research concerns the study of attitudes among Lebanese and Egyptian students in the U.S.

It is the viewpoint of the executive committee of the organization to assist her in contacting Egyptian students in the U.S. and Canada in order that she obtain replies to these questionnaires. Thus we request that you distribute these questionnaires to some of your colleagues in the chapters in order that they reply and send them back to the address found on the special envelope with which is included the necessary postage. We are very well aware of the extent of the importance in carrying out this project because, first of all, it is a duty concerning our image and secondly, because it is scientific research for obtaining a doctorate.

We hope that you will give my thanks and the thanks of my colleagues who are members of the executive committee to all the colleagues who are chapter members. May God help us all in the service of our Egyptian Arab homeland.

Treasurer of the Organization

Ahmed Ali

بِسْمِ اللَّهِ الرَّحْمَنِ الرَّحِيمِ



لنساعد الفارين من العبودية في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية وكندا

الزملاء والزميلات مقررين الوعده :-
من : المسؤل المالي للاتحاد :- "ناجى عم اللجنة التنفيذية"

الموضوع :

مرفعه هي تلك الرسالة عدد مدم قوائم الاسئلة الخاصة
ببحث للدكتوراه تقوم به طالبة أمريكية من جامعة كارولينا
الشمالية Univ. of N.C وتعلم دراسات سلوكية على
الطلبة المصريين والمغتربين في الولايات المتحدة الأمريكية :-
وقد زارت اللجنة التنفيذية للاتحاد مساعداً من الاتصال
بالدارس المصريين في الولايات المتحدة وكندا للحصول على إجاباتهم
على تلك الاسئلة :- لذا نرهب توزيع قوائم الاسئلة
هذه على بعض الزملاء بالوعده :- للاجابة للطلبة وارسال
الى العنوان المذكور على الطرف الاخرى بذلك والموجود عليهم
ورقم البوستة اللازم لذلك :- ولا يخفى علينا جميعاً
مدى أهمية الخبرة في تنفيذ ذلك فقلنا واهتمنا جميعاً
أولاً :- ثم نجت على لدرجة الدكتوراه ثانياً :-

أرجو أنه تطلع شكري وشكر جميع الزملاء أعضاء اللجنة التنفيذية
للإتحاد لجميع الزملاء أعضاء الوعده :- وفقنا اللهم جميعاً
خبره وكلنا مصر العربية <

المسؤل المالي للاتحاد
أحمد عبد العتيق

APPENDIX D

Egyptian Data Listing

This appendix contains a complete listing of the Egyptian data set used in the analyses. The social identities and interpersonal behaviors are listed in alphabetical order. The event sentences are listed according to their appearance in the questionnaires.

The key for interpreting the entries are as follow.

Column 1 contains the label for the stimulus: a social identity, an interpersonal behavior or an event sentence.

Column 2 contains the average evaluation rating (E) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (bad) to +3 (good). Below the mean evaluation rating is the standard deviation.

Column 3 contains the average potency rating (P) of the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (weak) to +3 (strong). Below the mean potency rating is the standard deviation.

Column 4 contains the average activity rating (S) (as measured by the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (emotional) to +3 (logical). Below the mean activity rating is the

standard deviation.

Column 5 contains the mean activity rating (A) (as measured by the third Lebanese pancultural factor) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (slow) to +3 (fast). Below the mean activity rating is the standard deviation.

Column 6 contains the minimum number of observations involved in the evaluation, potency or activity ratings.

SOCIAL IDENTITIES

ASSISTANT	1.65	1.05	1.00	1.26	19
	1.04	1.75	1.37	1.94	
AUTHOR	2.69	1.72	1.00	1.63	22
	.63	1.16	2.14	1.09	
BABY	2.34	-0.64	-1.37	1.23	21
	.98	2.28	1.81	2.14	
BEGGAR	-1.12	-1.34	-1.37	-1.43	18
	1.91	2.00	1.64	1.54	
BOY	2.28	0.08	-0.20	1.76	25
	.94	2.06	2.16	1.71	
BRUTE	-2.37	1.54	-0.14	1.77	22
	1.14	2.02	2.03	1.51	
CHEAT	-2.20	0.12	1.24	1.28	25
	1.41	2.07	2.20	2.22	
COWARD	-1.72	-2.19	-1.62	-1.78	21
	1.19	1.29	1.34	1.63	
CRIMINAL	-1.67	0.00	0.25	1.27	20
	1.71	2.34	1.77	1.93	
CRIPPLE	0.12	-2.00	-0.68	-2.28	25
	1.39	1.73	2.09	1.70	
DAUGHTER	2.58	1.69	-1.42	1.25	23
	1.14	1.56	2.32	1.67	
DEVIL	-2.17	0.72	-0.30	0.82	17
	1.20	2.56	2.36	2.10	
DIRECTOR	1.26	1.72	1.38	2.05	18
	1.76	1.13	1.86	1.00	
DO-NOTHING	-1.74	-2.13	-1.57	-2.74	23
	1.39	1.25	1.34	.54	
EMPLOYER	1.83	1.05	1.38	1.63	18
	1.10	2.07	1.58	.96	
ENEMY	-1.85	0.64	0.50	0.61	17
	1.60	1.97	2.01	1.82	
GHOUL	-2.00	1.00	-0.65	0.85	14
	1.56	2.29	1.94	2.31	
GIRL	2.16	-0.24	-1.16	0.12	25
	1.03	2.12	2.28	2.27	
GRANDMOTHER	1.88	-0.48	0.04	-0.56	25
	1.51	1.98	2.28	2.12	
GUEST	1.40	1.04	0.60	0.35	20
	1.53	1.72	1.57	2.01	
LADY	2.38	-0.20	-1.27	0.47	18
	.92	2.21	1.62	1.78	
LANDLORD	2.30	0.19	-0.35	0.65	20
	1.30	2.08	1.84	2.01	
LAWYER	2.12	2.28	2.44	2.40	25
	1.48	.89	.87	.82	
MADMAN	-1.74	-1.05	-1.22	-0.44	23
	1.25	1.36	1.20	1.56	
MAID	1.26	0.05	0.10	1.21	19
	1.56	2.14	1.65	1.44	

MISER	-1.64	-1.28	-0.10	-1.40	22
	1.00	1.88	1.72	1.85	
OLD WOMAN	1.13	-0.69	-0.22	-1.32	22
	1.49	1.64	1.98	1.46	
PATIENT	-0.14	-1.19	-1.24	-1.43	21
	1.42	1.40	1.95	1.47	
PEASANT	1.95	1.71	1.47	1.95	21
	1.21	1.61	1.67	1.17	
PICKPOCKET	-2.40	-0.12	0.12	2.00	24
	1.29	1.87	2.00	1.63	
POLICEMAN	2.12	2.08	2.48	2.20	25
	1.20	.95	.82	1.08	
PROFESSOR	2.48	2.08	2.72	2.44	25
	.82	1.29	.61	.82	
SEAMSTRESS	2.08	0.70	1.08	2.00	24
	.83	1.49	1.61	.98	
SIMPLETON	-1.73	-1.28	-1.96	-1.32	22
	1.24	1.78	1.13	1.36	
THIEF	-2.39	-0.65	0.23	1.27	17
	.92	1.80	2.19	1.96	
TYRANT	-1.00	0.90	1.45	1.30	20
	1.68	1.84	1.28	1.22	
VILLAIN	-2.32	-1.65	-1.24	-0.95	17
	1.11	1.66	2.08	2.01	
WATCHMAN	2.26	2.36	1.47	1.78	19
	.99	.89	1.30	1.27	
WITCH	-1.40	-0.30	-0.84	0.79	23
	1.72	2.18	2.24	2.04	

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS

ABANDON	-1.60	-1.67	-1.64	-1.08	24
	1.32	1.37	1.70	1.47	
ADMIRE	2.24	2.00	-0.04	1.20	25
	.97	1.00	2.35	1.47	
AVOID	-0.67	-0.82	0.23	-0.53	21
	1.68	1.84	1.81	1.72	
COMPLIMENT	2.14	0.47	-0.23	0.31	21
	1.59	2.04	1.85	2.12	
COERCE	-1.69	-1.37	-0.73	-0.73	18
	.88	1.74	1.81	1.67	
CONGRATULATE	2.52	1.47	0.42	0.72	21
	.98	1.47	2.13	2.00	
DECEIVE	-2.58	-2.48	-1.06	-0.65	17
	1.42	.72	1.95	2.06	
DESPISE	-2.68	-2.00	-2.20	-1.52	25
	1.03	1.47	1.19	1.61	
DOUBLECROSS	-2.56	-2.25	-1.38	-1.63	16
	1.04	1.24	1.78	1.63	

ENCOURAGE	2.66	2.31	1.26	2.26	19
	.66	1.06	1.88	.99	
EXCITE	-1.52	-1.12	-0.60	-0.48	25
	1.58	1.86	2.00	2.12	
FORGIVE	2.30	1.78	0.25	1.42	19
	1.17	2.20	2.42	1.68	
GLORIFY	1.00	0.61	0.58	1.05	17
	1.50	2.06	2.00	1.60	
HATE	-1.81	-1.00	-0.55	-0.53	21
	1.21	1.22	1.76	1.47	
HONOR	1.87	1.40	-0.60	0.63	22
	1.32	1.44	1.68	1.46	
IGNORE	-2.46	-1.92	-1.34	-1.17	24
	.78	1.21	1.68	1.71	
INSULT	-2.04	-1.24	-1.24	-0.96	25
	1.51	1.66	1.94	1.67	
LAUGH AT	-2.00	-1.10	-0.77	-0.30	20
	1.55	1.77	1.95	1.89	
LOVE	2.85	1.94	-0.56	1.66	18
	.49	1.70	2.48	1.53	
MISLEAD	-2.50	-2.12	-1.06	-1.17	18
	1.43	1.57	1.98	2.06	
PRAISE	0.94	-0.23	-0.34	-0.48	18
	1.55	1.48	1.45	1.54	
PROTECT	2.65	2.00	1.04	1.86	22
	.93	1.45	1.96	1.32	
SAVE	2.23	1.47	1.52	1.84	19
	1.33	1.74	2.24	1.86	
SERVE	2.45	1.80	1.44	2.00	24
	.98	2.02	2.12	1.59	
TEMPT	-1.34	-1.42	-0.95	-0.30	17
	1.88	1.70	1.80	1.57	
TORMENT	-2.64	-1.83	-1.89	-1.12	17
	1.01	1.81	1.41	2.23	
VISIT	2.60	1.44	-0.36	0.96	25
	.58	1.16	2.21	1.43	
WARN	2.21	1.70	1.31	1.65	19
	1.03	1.69	1.80	1.46	

EVENT SENTENCES

MISER CONGRATULATED WITCH	-1.86	-1.77	-0.39	-0.96	21
	1.68	1.61	2.22	1.86	
PATIENT ENCOURAGED WATCHMAN	0.26	-0.16	0.10	-1.06	19
	1.85	1.86	1.49	1.58	
GIRL PRAISED OLD WOMAN	1.57	0.42	-0.39	0.33	21
	2.06	2.04	2.31	2.00	
ENEMY FORGAVE GUEST	0.65	0.95	0.65	0.87	23
	2.48	1.82	1.85	1.49	

MAID ABANDONED SEAMSTRESS	-0.81	-1.39	-0.77	0.00	21
	1.36	1.43	1.64	1.58	
AUTHOR GLORIFIED MADMAN	0.45	0.00	-0.05	0.45	20
	2.19	1.97	2.33	1.73	
BEGGAR DOUBLECROSSD TYRANT	-1.05	-1.53	-0.05	-0.91	21
	2.01	1.25	2.10	1.97	
CHEAT INSULTED COWARD	-0.96	0.00	-0.41	0.54	22
	2.01	1.69	2.08	2.04	
WITCH AVOIDED CRIPPLE	0.72	0.50	0.54	0.72	22
	2.35	2.22	2.15	1.90	
BRUTE PROTECTED PEASANT	0.40	2.13	-0.05	1.68	22
	2.50	1.28	2.10	1.49	
THIEF COERCED ASSISTANT	-1.95	-0.27	-0.11	1.05	19
	1.61	2.44	2.23	1.64	
GRANDMOTHER LAUGHED DIRECTOR	-0.37	-1.10	-1.14	-0.91	22
	2.03	1.80	2.14	1.48	
EMPLOYER ADMIRD PICKPOCKET	-0.96	-1.23	-1.00	-0.96	22
	2.10	1.90	2.05	1.62	
OLD WOMAN AVOID PROFESSOR	0.00	-1.86	-0.91	-1.15	21
	1.95	1.23	1.87	1.59	
PATIENT DESPISED MISER	-0.61	-0.66	-0.70	-0.44	23
	1.82	1.85	1.63	1.62	
BABY LOVED POLICEMAN	2.54	0.28	-0.36	1.08	24
	.78	2.39	2.36	2.08	
COWARD CONGRATULATD ENEMY	-2.17	-1.67	-1.30	-0.38	24
	1.05	1.76	1.90	1.86	
WATCHMAN WARNED BEGGAR	0.95	1.41	0.37	1.12	24
	1.88	1.61	1.93	1.65	
DO-NOTHING EXCITED AUTHOR	-0.92	-0.74	-1.00	-1.18	23
	1.88	1.51	1.70	1.85	
LADY MISLED GUEST	-1.52	-1.24	-1.08	-0.32	25
	1.92	1.92	1.93	2.05	
TYRANT ABANDONED WITCH	0.42	0.38	0.04	0.38	21
	2.09	2.06	2.04	1.77	
BRUTE PEASED SIMPLETON	-1.53	0.47	-0.65	1.00	17
	1.70	2.29	2.09	1.93	
MAID TORMENTED DAUGHTER	-2.08	-1.76	-1.20	-0.16	25
	1.75	1.59	1.85	1.82	
CRIMINAL COMPLIMENTED CRIPPLE	0.17	1.21	-0.22	0.65	23
	2.42	1.56	2.21	1.70	
ENEMY HONORED VILLAIN	-2.00	-1.43	-0.79	-0.85	19
	1.20	1.86	1.96	1.86	
GHOUL DECEIVED PATIENT	-2.15	0.09	-0.34	0.38	21
	1.56	2.47	2.24	1.88	
PEASANT HATED MISER	1.58	0.29	1.33	0.79	24
	1.47	1.68	1.52	1.69	
OLD WOMAN GLORIFIED DEVIL	-0.17	-1.23	-0.67	-0.67	18
	2.20	1.89	1.85	1.97	
OLD WOMAN LAUGHED AT BOY	-1.59	-0.95	-1.48	-1.48	17
	1.50	1.89	1.37	1.54	
WITCH PROTECTED GRANDMTHR	-0.25	0.06	-0.40	0.20	15
	2.02	2.08	1.45	2.08	

DIRECTOR SERVED BRUTE	-0.60	0.00	0.20	0.30	10
	2.06	2.36	1.87	1.42	
VILLAIN HONORED GIRL	-0.80	-0.60	0.12	-0.60	15
	2.51	2.06	2.03	1.88	
GUEST ADMIRER DO-NOTHING	-0.43	-1.20	-0.32	-0.75	19
	2.04	1.64	1.56	1.86	
PEASANT ABANDONED LANDLORD	0.50	-0.58	0.21	-0.39	18
	1.54	1.98	1.62	1.58	
COWARD PRAISED POLICEMAN	-1.43	-1.69	-1.28	-1.39	18
	2.06	1.29	1.49	1.33	
CRIPPLE CONGRATULATED AUTHR	0.88	-0.28	-0.17	-0.48	18
	1.41	2.27	1.69	1.95	
TYRANT HATED OLD WOMAN	-1.84	-0.95	-1.50	-0.45	18
	1.42	2.21	1.20	2.00	
DEVIL VISITED SEAMSTRESS	-2.00	0.26	-0.47	0.31	15
	1.21	2.19	2.00	1.85	
WATCHMAN EXCITED ENEMY	1.10	1.05	0.44	1.11	18
	2.08	1.86	2.30	1.84	
PROFESSOR MISLED ASSISTANT	-1.91	-0.69	-0.32	-0.64	19
	1.92	2.19	2.31	2.38	
SIMPLETON INSULTED WITCH	-0.63	-1.13	-1.24	-1.38	16
	1.96	1.71	2.05	1.31	
CRIMINAL DOUBLECROSSED MISER	-1.37	-0.20	-0.74	0.30	19
	1.86	1.94	1.66	1.84	
POLICEMAN COERCED EMPLOYER	0.00	0.45	0.68	0.78	19
	1.83	2.01	1.63	1.62	
LANDLORD IGNORED LAWYER	0.43	0.37	0.87	0.37	16
	1.90	1.82	1.02	1.50	
GUEST COMPLIMENTED PATIENT	2.61	2.42	0.36	2.00	19
	.92	1.01	2.75	1.33	
PROFESSOR FORGAVE MADMAN	1.65	1.73	1.36	1.68	19
	1.56	1.69	2.24	1.49	
BRUTE DECEIVED TYRANT	-0.65	0.85	-0.29	0.78	14
	1.60	1.70	1.98	1.67	
DAUGHTER AVOIDED DO-NOTHING	2.33	1.50	1.15	1.94	18
	.91	1.62	1.74	1.08	
COWARD HONORED LADY	-0.50	-0.50	-0.23	-0.34	18
	2.18	1.79	1.73	1.91	
PICKPOCKET LAUGHED CHEAT	-1.17	-0.79	-0.17	-0.10	18
	1.65	1.58	1.76	1.86	
SEAMSTRESS SAVED LAWYER	1.38	0.72	1.05	1.57	18
	1.19	1.41	1.87	1.39	
AUTHOR DESPISED CRIPPLE	-1.50	-1.50	-1.00	-1.48	19
	1.70	1.96	1.82	1.87	
OLD WOMAN PRAISED BRUTE	-0.22	-0.50	-1.14	-0.79	14
	1.62	1.60	1.41	1.42	
WITCH ADMIRER BABY	0.11	0.00	-0.42	0.29	17
	1.68	1.80	1.50	1.83	
TYRANT LOVED MAID	-0.65	0.15	-0.60	0.00	19
	1.69	1.83	1.73	1.91	
MISER ABANDONED GRANDMOTHER	-1.65	-1.69	-1.10	-1.06	19
	1.56	1.29	1.89	1.58	

VILLAIN PRAISED POLICEMAN	-1.46	-1.39	-0.77	-0.96	21
	1.68	.97	1.13	1.43	
ASSISTANT AVOIDED BRUTE	-0.43	-0.95	-0.06	-0.85	19
	2.27	1.88	2.34	1.92	
OLD WOMAN PROTECTED MISER	-0.82	-1.14	-0.87	-1.19	22
	1.79	1.04	1.54	1.13	
MADMAN EXCITED BEGGAR	-0.95	-0.65	-0.65	0.28	20
	1.57	1.46	1.72	1.58	
LADY ABANDONED GIRL	-0.91	-0.90	-0.70	-1.00	20
	1.64	1.41	1.38	1.17	
SEAMSTRESS TORMENTED WATCHMAN	-1.48	-1.60	-0.96	-1.00	21
	1.72	2.01	1.59	1.79	
BOY GLORIFIED GHOUL	-1.28	-0.71	0.00	-0.13	16
	1.60	1.31	1.17	1.26	
DIRECTOR SAVED COWARD	-1.05	-1.48	-1.10	-1.67	21
	1.56	1.75	1.23	1.49	
LAWYER ADMIRER CHEAT	-1.43	-1.29	-1.05	-0.48	21
	1.75	1.42	1.76	1.63	
CRIPPLE DESPISED MADMAN	-1.58	-2.00	-0.70	-1.15	20
	1.50	1.41	1.72	1.22	
AUTHOR TEMPTED ENEMY	-0.90	0.11	0.66	0.29	17
	2.02	2.02	2.22	2.11	
DEVIL COMPLIMENTED LAWYER	-1.79	-0.95	-0.30	-0.37	19
	1.55	2.27	1.87	2.09	
BRUTE DOUBLECROSSED WITCH	-0.74	0.75	-0.32	0.21	19
	1.91	2.05	1.76	1.96	
GRNDMTHR ENCOURAGED PICKPOCKET	-1.96	-2.15	-1.53	-1.48	21
	1.36	1.42	1.72	1.43	
THIEF FORGAVE OLD WOMAN	0.57	0.20	-1.20	-0.40	20
	2.23	2.33	1.91	1.98	
MAID SERVED SIMPLETON	-0.24	-0.78	-0.58	-1.19	21
	1.76	1.88	1.29	1.57	
POLICEMAN LOVED ASSISTANT	2.19	2.09	0.36	1.38	21
	1.54	1.48	1.94	1.46	
WATCHMAN VISITED PEASANT	1.66	1.14	0.57	1.00	21
	1.46	1.68	1.80	1.34	
MISER MISLED DO-NOTHING	-1.40	-0.58	0.35	0.10	20
	1.60	1.96	2.11	1.77	
MAID LAUGHED AT BOY	-1.67	-1.91	-0.91	-1.00	21
	1.01	1.34	1.38	2.00	
EMPLOYER PRAISED TYRANT	-0.83	-0.48	-0.53	-0.56	17
	1.88	1.97	1.42	1.62	
WITCH EXCITED COWARD	-0.83	0.11	-0.59	0.50	17
	1.98	1.96	1.87	1.82	
DAUGHTER INSULTED GUEST	-2.19	-1.05	-1.53	-0.96	21
	1.40	2.01	1.40	1.80	
CHEAT IGNORED DEVIL	-0.56	-0.48	0.17	-0.18	17
	1.50	1.50	1.33	1.84	
ENEMY COERCED THIEF	0.36	0.52	0.05	0.57	19
	1.80	1.71	1.47	1.57	
OLD WOMAN DECEIVED CRIPPLE	-2.24	-1.43	-0.62	-0.91	21
	1.22	1.75	1.88	1.92	

SIMPLETON ABANDONED VILLAIN	0.68	0.66	1.05	0.83	18
	1.92	1.75	1.86	1.54	
MAID HONORED BRUTE	-1.00	-1.06	0.00	-0.57	16
	1.32	1.43	1.46	1.71	
ASSISTANT WARNED WATCHMAN	1.23	1.14	0.59	0.90	21
	1.67	1.62	1.56	1.44	
MADMAN GLORIFIED PROFESSOR	-0.34	-0.67	-0.27	-0.23	18
	1.91	1.68	2.08	1.99	
LAWYER LOVED CRIMINAL	-2.10	-1.28	-1.43	-1.10	21
	1.41	1.45	1.77	1.73	
DO-NOTHING FORGAVE TYRANT	-0.75	-1.30	-1.05	-1.40	20
	1.48	1.72	1.60	1.39	

APPENDIX E

Lebanese Data Listing

This appendix contains a complete listing of the Lebanese data set used in the analyses. The social identities and interpersonal behaviors are listed in alphabetical order. The event sentences are listed according to their appearance in the questionnaires.

The key for interpreting the entries are as follow.

Column 1 contains the label for the stimulus: a social identity, an interpersonal behavior or an event sentence.

Column 2 contains the average evaluation rating (E) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (bad) to +3 (good). Below the mean evaluation rating is the standard deviation.

Column 3 contains the average potency rating (P) of the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (weak) to +3 (strong). Below the mean potency rating is the standard deviation.

Column 4 contains the average activity rating (S) (as measured by the fourth Lebanese pancultural factor) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (emotional) to +3 (logical). Below the mean activity rating is the

standard deviation.

Column 5 contains the mean activity rating (A) (as measured by the third Lebanese pancultural factor) for the stimuli listed in column 1. Scores range from -3 (slow) to +3 (fast). Below the mean activity rating is the standard deviation.

Column 6 contains the minimum number of observations involved in the evaluation, potency or activity ratings.

SOCIAL IDENTITIES

ASSISTANT	2.16	1.18	0.72	1.63	11
	1.19	1.78	2.10	1.75	
AUTHOR	2.44	1.77	0.66	1.44	9
	.88	.97	2.12	1.81	
BABY	3.00	-0.34	-1.00	-0.10	9
	.00	2.34	1.12	1.91	
BEGGAR	-0.50	-2.46	-0.40	-2.30	10
	1.72	.82	1.58	.82	
BOY	1.84	1.75	1.33	1.75	12
	1.40	1.35	1.67	1.42	
BRUTE	-1.77	1.42	1.00	1.15	13
	1.36	1.22	1.47	2.30	
CHEAT	-2.00	0.61	1.15	2.07	13
	1.11	1.32	1.77	.86	
COWARD	-1.12	-1.89	-1.34	-1.89	9
	1.62	1.17	1.22	1.36	
CRIMINAL	-2.40	0.20	-0.70	0.50	10
	1.07	1.62	1.63	1.52	
CRIPPLE	0.46	-1.93	-0.85	-2.31	13
	1.66	1.20	2.23	1.18	
DAUGHTER	2.57	-0.17	-0.93	1.00	12
	.75	1.70	2.40	1.73	
DEVIL	-2.00	0.72	0.90	1.27	11
	1.21	2.24	1.76	1.74	
DIRECTOR	2.25	1.36	1.09	2.27	11
	1.14	.92	2.16	.79	
DO-NOTHING	0.07	-1.85	-1.39	-1.93	13
	1.55	1.34	1.26	1.59	
EMPLOYER	-0.19	1.27	1.41	0.09	11
	1.83	2.10	1.88	2.12	
ENEMY	-1.70	1.30	1.90	0.70	10
	1.25	2.06	1.04	2.21	
GHOUL	-1.40	1.44	0.00	0.88	9
	1.26	1.51	1.73	2.09	
GIRL	1.57	0.69	-1.00	1.07	13
	1.50	1.89	1.96	1.80	
GRANDMOTHER	1.66	-0.25	-1.24	-0.67	12
	1.61	1.71	1.69	2.53	
GUEST	2.22	1.44	1.33	1.55	9
	.97	1.13	1.58	1.13	
LADY	2.00	-0.20	1.18	1.00	10
	1.33	1.62	1.72	2.11	
LANDLORD	1.80	1.40	0.90	1.40	10
	.92	1.17	1.37	1.17	
LAWYER	2.46	2.15	1.85	2.38	13
	1.19	.99	1.56	.65	
MADMAN	-0.93	0.00	-1.62	0.14	13
	2.02	1.78	1.76	2.07	
MAID	1.00	0.63	-0.60	1.27	10
	1.09	1.29	1.90	1.19	

MISER	-1.23	-1.45	-0.34	-1.78	9
	2.17	1.42	1.12	1.20	
OLD WOMAN	2.10	-1.20	-0.90	-2.00	10
	1.10	1.75	2.28	1.15	
PATIENT	0.50	-1.60	-1.40	-1.80	10
	.85	1.17	.97	1.13	
PEASANT	2.40	2.50	1.80	3.00	10
	.70	.71	1.81	.00	
PICKPOCKET	-1.50	0.61	0.69	1.23	13
	1.34	1.80	2.43	2.42	
POLICEMAN	1.38	0.92	1.46	1.61	13
	1.66	2.37	1.98	1.44	
PROFESSOR	2.00	0.92	2.78	2.07	13
	1.22	1.38	.42	.86	
SEAMSTRESS	0.92	-0.08	0.69	1.42	13
	2.18	1.75	1.80	1.45	
SIMPLETON	-0.92	-0.50	-1.75	-1.84	12
	1.97	1.68	.75	.72	
THIEF	-2.17	0.54	1.54	2.45	11
	1.03	2.62	1.63	1.03	
TYRANT	1.80	2.50	2.10	2.50	10
	1.23	.71	1.45	.71	
VILLAIN	-2.19	-0.30	-0.30	0.00	10
	.87	1.95	2.16	1.76	
WATCHMAN	1.09	2.18	1.27	1.91	11
	1.87	1.33	1.90	1.24	
WITCH	-0.54	0.23	0.53	1.28	13
	1.71	1.79	2.37	1.32	

INTERPERSONAL BEHAVIORS

ABANDON	0.61	-0.43	-0.08	0.15	13
	1.85	2.17	2.29	2.11	
ADMIRE	2.46	1.92	1.00	1.53	13
	.66	.95	2.18	1.45	
AVOID	0.80	-0.40	1.10	-0.10	10
	1.87	2.46	1.59	1.91	
COERCE	-0.92	0.00	0.09	-0.91	11
	1.93	1.84	1.30	1.76	
COMPLIMENT	1.60	0.30	-1.20	0.10	10
	1.58	1.49	1.75	1.59	
CONGRATULATE	2.40	1.50	1.40	1.60	10
	1.58	1.08	2.17	1.64	
DECEIVE	-1.50	-1.73	0.00	0.72	11
	2.71	2.10	1.73	1.68	
DESPISE	-2.08	-1.31	-0.93	-0.70	13
	1.44	2.01	2.10	1.89	
DOUBLECROSS	-2.00	-1.82	-0.19	0.09	11
	1.13	1.66	1.60	1.37	

ENCOURAGE	2.50	1.18	0.81	0.45	11
	1.73	1.99	1.77	1.91	
EXCITE	0.23	1.16	0.50	1.00	12
	2.45	2.12	2.54	2.09	
FORGIVE	2.10	1.22	0.30	0.40	9
	1.52	2.05	2.63	1.84	
GLORIFY	0.36	-1.75	0.00	0.00	11
	1.86	1.54	2.19	1.34	
HATE	-1.60	-1.30	-0.60	-0.50	10
	1.71	1.25	1.84	.71	
HONOR	1.66	1.22	0.44	1.55	9
	2.00	1.48	1.81	1.13	
IGNORE	-0.93	-1.50	-1.00	-1.39	13
	1.70	1.45	1.82	.96	
INSULT	-1.15	-0.39	-0.39	-0.31	13
	1.99	2.10	2.22	1.80	
LAUGH AT	-1.50	-0.90	-0.60	-0.30	10
	1.51	.99	.70	1.42	
LOVE	2.75	1.27	-0.46	1.45	11
	.62	1.79	2.62	1.63	
MISLEAD	-2.00	-1.78	-0.20	0.00	9
	1.84	1.30	1.81	1.15	
PRAISE	-0.84	-1.00	-0.34	-0.17	6
	2.23	1.79	2.50	1.72	
PROTECT	2.70	0.60	0.90	0.80	10
	.48	2.31	1.79	1.99	
SAVE	2.00	0.63	0.45	1.09	11
	1.81	2.50	2.58	2.51	
SERVE	2.53	1.00	0.69	2.21	13
	.78	2.48	2.53	.97	
TEMPT	-1.67	-1.20	0.44	0.11	9
	1.32	1.47	1.81	.60	
TORMENT	-2.46	-1.40	-1.00	-0.80	10
	1.81	2.01	1.82	1.81	
VISIT	2.41	1.00	0.00	0.54	11
	.67	1.48	1.35	1.69	
WARN	1.20	0.09	0.60	0.60	10
	2.04	2.30	2.27	1.96	

EVENT SENTENCES

MISER CONGRATULATED WITCH	-0.86	-0.08	-0.16	-0.70	13
	1.41	1.66	1.68	1.49	
PATIENT ENCOURAGED WATCHMN	1.53	-0.31	0.35	0.38	13
	1.56	1.89	2.20	2.02	
GIRL PRAISED OLD WOMAN	1.41	0.58	-0.54	0.16	12
	1.88	2.10	2.29	1.70	
ENEMY FORGAVE GUEST	1.00	1.23	0.83	1.33	12
	1.95	1.48	2.12	1.30	

MAID ABANDONED SEAMSTRESS	0.07	-0.79	-0.85	0.00	12
	1.70	1.53	1.40	2.09	
AUTHOR GLORIFIED MADMAN	0.08	0.08	0.07	0.91	12
	2.50	1.97	2.21	1.78	
BEGGAR DOUBLECROSSD TYRANT	-0.31	-0.34	-1.09	0.00	12
	1.79	1.97	1.50	1.86	
CHEAT INSULTED COWARD	-0.50	0.15	-0.08	0.23	13
	2.07	1.62	2.02	2.05	
WITCH AVOIDED CRIPPLE	0.92	1.50	-0.17	1.33	12
	2.06	1.31	2.20	1.43	
BRUTE PROTECTED PEASANT	1.41	1.30	-0.59	1.41	12
	2.06	1.80	1.93	1.68	
THIEF COERCED ASSISTANT	-0.75	-0.39	-0.67	1.08	12
	1.71	1.94	1.87	1.56	
GRANDMOTHER LAUGHD DIRECTOR	0.15	-0.22	-1.16	0.38	13
	2.11	2.01	1.72	1.98	
EMPLOYER ADMIRD PICKPOCKET	-0.24	-0.86	0.07	-0.47	13
	2.05	1.56	1.98	1.85	
OLD WOMAN AVOID PROFESSOR	1.38	-0.50	-0.85	-1.00	13
	1.32	2.10	1.72	1.96	
PATIENT DESPISED MISER	0.61	-1.08	-1.24	-0.93	13
	1.56	1.73	1.88	1.70	
BABY LOVED POLICEMAN	1.42	-0.16	-0.31	0.84	13
	1.74	2.27	2.36	1.95	
COWARD CONGRATULATD ENEMY	-1.59	-1.73	-1.64	-0.91	11
	1.56	1.42	1.75	2.02	
WATCHMAN WARNED BEGGAR	1.30	-0.20	0.90	1.10	10
	1.89	2.20	1.70	1.66	
DO-NOTHING EXCITED AUTHOR	-0.84	-1.00	-0.67	-0.62	12
	1.03	1.65	1.67	2.18	
LADY MISLED GUEST	-0.92	-0.84	-1.09	-0.75	12
	1.44	1.70	1.73	1.66	
TYRANT ABANDONED WITCH	0.81	1.25	0.45	0.90	11
	1.47	1.60	1.81	1.39	
BRUTE PFAISED SIMPLETON	-0.46	0.83	-0.46	0.54	11
	1.97	1.75	1.75	1.91	
MAID TORMENTED DAUGHTER	-0.50	-0.54	-0.85	0.46	13
	2.02	1.81	1.67	1.51	
CRIMINAL COMPLIMENTED CRIPPLE	-0.08	0.69	-0.77	0.76	13
	2.30	1.84	1.53	1.48	
ENEMY HONORED VILLAIN	-1.22	-0.77	0.30	-0.24	13
	2.42	2.20	1.84	1.83	
GHOUL DECEIVED PATIENT	-1.62	1.50	-0.75	0.91	12
	1.39	1.51	1.76	1.56	
PEASANT HATED MISER	1.00	0.42	0.23	0.15	13
	1.73	1.83	1.96	2.23	
OLD WOMAN GLORIFIED DEVIL	-1.43	-0.77	-0.31	-0.70	13
	1.70	1.69	2.18	1.70	
OLD WOMAN LAUGHED AT BOY	-1.70	-1.60	-0.23	-1.34	9
	1.89	1.43	1.86	1.41	
WITCH PROTECTED GRANDMTHR	-0.13	0.66	1.00	1.37	8
	1.55	1.11	1.60	1.19	

DIRECTOR SERVED BRUTE	-0.67	-0.13	0.66	0.12	8
	2.06	2.17	2.06	1.64	
VILLAIN HONORED GIRL	-0.50	-0.25	0.33	0.75	8
	1.85	1.58	2.12	1.16	
GUEST ADMIRER DO-NOTHING	-0.80	-0.23	-1.00	-0.89	9
	1.93	2.33	1.76	1.05	
PEASANT ABANDONED LANDLORD	1.11	1.70	1.44	1.60	9
	1.90	1.57	1.74	1.84	
COWARD PRAISED POLICEMAN	-0.56	0.00	-0.64	-0.45	9
	1.81	1.87	2.46	1.74	
CRIPPLE CONGRATULATED AUTHOR	1.80	-1.23	0.10	-0.23	9
	1.13	2.33	2.38	2.44	
TYRANT HATED OLD WOMAN	-1.45	0.70	-0.40	1.22	9
	1.59	2.26	2.01	1.20	
DEVIL VISITED SEAMSTRESS	-1.88	0.71	0.57	1.14	7
	1.26	1.98	1.71	1.46	
WATCHMAN EXCITED ENEMY	0.30	0.90	1.77	1.44	9
	1.89	2.51	.97	.73	
PROFESSOR MISLED ASSISTANT	-0.64	-0.89	0.55	0.66	9
	2.01	2.15	1.81	1.41	
SIMPLETON INSULTED WITCH	-0.45	0.11	-0.50	-0.50	8
	1.42	1.96	1.93	.76	
CRIMINAL DOUBLECROSSED MISER	-1.67	-0.89	0.90	1.55	9
	1.66	2.20	2.07	1.33	
POLICEMAN COERCED EMPLOYER	1.55	2.22	1.70	1.88	9
	1.42	1.09	1.16	1.05	
LANDLORD IGNORED LAWYER	-0.40	1.22	0.90	0.66	9
	1.71	1.09	1.79	1.50	
GUEST COMPLIMENTED PATIENT	2.72	1.00	0.33	0.22	9
	.47	.87	2.18	1.48	
PROFESSOR FORGAVE MADMAN	1.60	0.88	2.10	1.75	8
	1.95	1.76	1.45	1.28	
BRUTE DECEIVED TYRANT	-1.38	1.87	1.66	1.87	8
	1.92	1.36	1.73	.99	
DAUGHTER AVOIDED DO-NOTHING	1.72	0.88	1.66	1.44	9
	1.49	1.76	1.11	1.01	
COWARD HONORED LADY	0.30	-0.10	-1.00	-0.70	10
	1.95	1.73	1.34	1.34	
PICKPOCKET LAUGHED CHEAT	-1.00	-1.28	0.90	1.10	10
	1.63	1.68	1.44	2.02	
SEAMSTRESS SAVED LAWYER	1.60	1.11	1.30	1.33	9
	1.84	1.69	1.77	1.50	
AUTHOR DESPISED CRIPPLE	-0.73	-2.10	-0.90	-0.50	10
	2.15	1.22	1.37	2.12	
OLD WOMAN PRAISED BRUTE	0.90	-0.30	-0.34	-0.89	9
	2.13	1.06	1.58	1.83	
WITCH ADMIRER BABY	0.44	0.10	-0.20	1.00	9
	1.01	1.37	1.75	1.22	
TYRANT LOVED MAID	1.63	1.90	-0.40	1.50	10
	.67	1.76	1.50	1.08	
MISER ABANDONED GRANDMOTHER	-1.40	-1.46	-0.80	-0.37	10
	.84	1.92	1.31	1.36	

VILLAIN PRAISED POLICEMAN	-1.75	-1.00	-0.88	0.50	8
	1.75	1.85	1.64	1.93	
ASSISTANT AVOIDED BRUTE	-0.13	-0.38	0.62	0.62	8
	2.10	1.92	1.50	1.50	
OLD WOMAN PROTECTED MISER	0.22	-1.00	-1.00	-1.00	9
	1.09	1.58	.71	1.66	
MADMAN EXCITED BEGGAR	-0.89	-0.34	-1.00	0.11	9
	1.17	2.06	1.50	1.69	
LADY ABANDONED GIRL	-0.56	-0.34	-0.67	-0.23	9
	1.33	1.66	1.41	1.09	
SEAMSTRESS TORMENTED WATCHMAN	-0.63	-0.13	0.25	-0.38	8
	1.77	1.73	1.49	2.06	
BOY GLORIFIED GHOUL	-0.88	0.00	-0.50	0.37	8
	2.70	2.33	2.00	2.26	
DIRECTOR SAVED COWARD	1.30	1.10	0.90	0.80	10
	1.77	1.20	1.59	1.32	
LAWYER ADMIRER CHEAT	1.10	0.40	-0.40	0.66	9
	1.79	1.95	2.27	1.94	
CRIPPLE DESPISED MADMAN	-0.30	-2.00	-1.30	-2.00	10
	1.34	1.05	1.06	1.05	
AUTHOR TEMPTED ENEMY	0.66	1.33	1.50	1.16	6
	1.63	1.63	1.38	1.94	
DEVIL COMPLIMENTED LAWYER	-1.90	0.80	0.90	0.70	10
	1.37	1.93	1.97	1.70	
BRUTE DOUBLECROSSED WITCH	-1.12	1.22	-0.25	0.88	8
	2.03	1.64	1.75	2.31	
GRNDMTHR ENCOURAGED PICKPOCKET	-1.25	-1.50	-0.88	-1.50	8
	2.31	1.19	.99	1.20	
THIEF FORGAVE OLD WOMAN	-0.70	1.00	-0.50	1.30	10
	2.50	2.26	2.17	1.34	
MAID SERVED SIMPLETON	0.33	-0.12	0.11	0.77	9
	2.18	1.53	1.61	1.64	
POLICEMAN LOVED ASSISTANT	2.90	2.00	1.20	2.10	10
	.32	1.49	2.34	1.10	
WATCHMAN VISITED PEASANT	2.85	1.42	-0.15	1.28	7
	.38	1.40	1.86	1.38	
MISER MISLED DO-NOTHING	-1.90	-1.10	0.10	-0.20	10
	1.60	1.29	1.60	1.81	
MAID LAUGHED AT BOY	-0.90	-1.50	-0.90	0.20	10
	1.45	1.08	1.79	1.40	
EMPLOYER PRAISED TYRANT	1.14	1.00	-0.29	1.16	6
	2.03	1.73	2.06	1.72	
WITCH EXCITED COWARD	0.00	0.62	1.25	1.62	8
	2.33	1.77	1.49	1.50	
DAUGHTER INSULTED GUEST	-1.10	-1.00	-0.50	-0.60	10
	1.60	1.05	1.84	1.26	
CHEAT IGNORED DEVIL	0.70	0.20	1.00	1.20	10
	2.26	1.62	1.33	1.23	
ENEMY COERCED THIEF	0.00	0.75	0.37	1.62	8
	2.27	1.83	.92	1.06	
OLD WOMAN DECEIVED CRIPPLE	-1.80	-1.70	-0.70	-1.10	10
	1.69	1.83	1.49	1.66	

SIMPLETON ABANDONED VILLAIN	0.28	0.57	0.57	-0.29	7
	1.89	2.07	1.40	2.14	
MAID HONORED BRUTE	-1.00	-1.00	-1.67	-0.45	9
	1.58	1.73	1.58	1.33	
ASSISTANT WARNED WATCHMAN	1.87	1.75	1.00	1.87	8
	1.12	1.67	1.85	1.73	
MADMAN GLORIFIED PROFESSOR	-1.10	-0.40	-0.10	-0.10	10
	1.29	.97	1.29	1.66	
LAWYER LOVED CRIMINAL	-0.50	0.00	-1.70	-0.10	9
	2.01	2.24	1.42	2.08	
DO-NOTHING FORGAVE TYRANT	-0.50	-0.20	-1.20	-1.60	10
	1.35	2.15	1.62	1.43	

REFERENCES

- Abelson, Robert P. and Milton J. Rorerberg
1958 "Symbolic psycho-logic: a model of attitudinal cognition." Behavioral Science 3: 1-13.
- al-Ba'labakki, Munir
1969 Al-Mawrid; a Modern English-Arabic Dictionary. Beirut: Dar el-ilm lil-malayan.
- Aronson, Elliot and Vernon Cope
1969 "My enemy's enemy is my friend." Pp. 495-500 in Edgar P. Borgatta (ed.), Social Psychology: Readings and Perspective. Chicago: Rand McNally Co.
- Brislin, Richard W., Walter J. Lonner, and Robert M. Thorndike
1973 Cross-Cultural Research Methods. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Cartwright, D. and Frank Harary
1956 "Structural balance: a generalization of Heider's theory." Psychological Review 63:277-293.
- Daves, Robyn M.
1972 Fundamentals of Attitude Measurement. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Ervin, Susan
1964 "Language and TAT content in French-English bilinguals." Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology 68:500-507.
- Fishbein, Martin and Icek Ajzen
1975 Belief, Attitude, Intention and Behavior: An Introduction to Theory and Measurement. Reading, Mass.: Addison-Wesley.
- Gollob, Harry F.
1968 "Impression formation and word combination in sentences." JPSP 10: 341-353.
- Gollob, Harry F. and Betty B. Rossman
1973 "Judgments of an actor's 'power and ability to influence others'." Journal of Experimental Social Psychology 9: 391-406.
- Gulick, John
1976 The Middle East: An Anthropological Perspective. Pacific Palisades, Calif.: Goodyear Publishing Co.

- Hamblin, Robert L.
1971 "Mathematical experimentation and sociological theory: A critical analysis." *Sociometry* 34:423-452.
- Heider, Fritz
1958 The Psychology of Interpersonal Relations. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
1967 "On social cognition." *American Psychologist* 22: 25-31.
- Heise, David R.
1969a "Affectual dynamics in simple sentences." *JPSP* 11: 204-213.
1969b "Some methodological issues in semantic differential research." *Psychological Bulletin* 72:406-422.
1970 "Potency dynamics in simple sentences." *JPSP* 16:48-54.
1977 "Social action as the control of affect." *Behavioral Science* 22: 163-177.
1978 Computer-Assisted Analysis of Social Action. Chapel Hill, N. C: Institute for Research in Social Science.
1979 Understanding Events: Affect and the Construction of Social Action. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press
- Joreskog, K. G.
1969 "A general approach to confirmatory maximum likelihood factor analysis." *Psychometrika* 34: 183-202.
- Marsh, Robert M.
1967 Comparative Sociology: A Codification of Cross-Societal Analysis. New York: Harcourt, Brace and World.
- Newcomb, Theodore
1953 "An approach to the study of communicative acts." *Psychological Review* 60: 393-404.
- Osgood, Charles E., William H. May and Murray S. Hiron
1975 Cross-Cultural Universals of Affective Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.

- Osgood, Charles E., George J. Suci and P. H. Tannenbaum
 1957 The Measurement of Meaning. Urbana: University of Illinois Press.
- Osgood, Charles E. and Percy H. Tannenbaum
 1955 "The principle of congruity in the prediction of attitude change." Psychological Review 62: 42-55.
- Rosenberg, M. J. and R. P. Abelson
 1960 "An analysis of cognitive balancing." In Rosenberg et al. (eds.), Attitude Organization and Change: An Analysis of Consistency Among Attitude Components. New Haven: Yale University Press.
- Terhune, Kenneth W.
 1970 "From national character to national behavior: a reformulation." Journal of Conflict Resolution 14: 203-263.
- Triandis, Harry C.
 1971 Attitude and Attitude Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons.
- Triandis, Harry C., Roy S. Malpass and Andrew R. Davidson
 1971 "Cross-cultural psychology." In Bernard J. Siegel (ed.), Biennial Review of Anthropology, 1971. Stanford: Stanford University Press.
- Van Nieuwenhuijze, C. A. O.
 1971 Sociology of the Middle East: A Stocktaking and Interpretation. Leiden: E. J. Brill.
- Wortabet, John and Harvey Porter
 1954 English-Arabic and Arabic-English Dictionary. New York: Frederick Ungar Publishing Co.
- Wright, W.
 1975 A Grammar of the Arabic Language. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Wyer, Robert S., Jr.
 1974 Cognitive Organization and Change. New York: John Wiley and Sons.