

AD-A082 844

INSTITUTE OF BEHAVIORAL SCIENCES HONOLULU HI
PERSON-SITUATION RESEARCH STRATEGIES FOR INTERETHNIC EMPATHY, I--ETC(U)
JAN 80 N DINGES, K TOKUNO

F/6 5/10

N00014-77-C-0345

NL

UNCLASSIFIED

1 of 1
AD-A082 844

END

DATE

FILED

5-80

DTIC

Unclassified

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

LEVEL II

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

READ INSTRUCTIONS
BEFORE COMPLETING FORM

1. REPORT NUMBER

3 and Final

2. GOVT ACCESSION NO.

3. RECIPIENT'S CATALOG NUMBER

4. TITLE (and Subtitle)

Person-Situation Research Strategies for
Interethnic Empathy, Interethnic Competence and
Ethnic Trait Attributions in the Job Setting.

5. TYPE OF REPORT & PERIOD COVERED

Final

6. PERFORMING ORG. REPORT NUMBER

7. AUTHOR(s)

Norman Dinges
Kenneth Tokuno

8. CONTRACT OR GRANT NUMBER(s)

N00014-77-C-0345

9. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME AND ADDRESS

The Institute of Behavioral Sciences
250 Ward Avenue
Honolulu, Hawaii 9681410. PROGRAM ELEMENT, PROJECT, TASK
AREA & WORK UNIT NUMBERS

NR 170-850 857

11. CONTROLLING OFFICE NAME AND ADDRESS

Organizational effectiveness Research Program
Office of Naval Research, Arlington, VA 22217

12. REPORT DATE

January 1980

13. NUMBER OF PAGES

14. MONITORING AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS (if different from Controlling Office)

(9) Rept. no. 3,
(Final),

15. SECURITY CLASS. (of this report)

unclassified

15a. DECLASSIFICATION/DOWNGRADING
SCHEDULE

16. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (for this Report)

Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

DTIC
ELECTE
S MAR 27 1980
D
E

17. DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT (of the abstract entered in Block 20, if different from Report)

18. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE.
THE COPY FURNISHED TO DDC CONTAINED A
SIGNIFICANT NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT
REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.

19. KEY WORDS (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

Person-Situation Interaction
Affective States
Interethnic Competence
Ethnic AttributionsSituation Elicitation Potential
Motivational States

20. ABSTRACT (Continue on reverse side if necessary and identify by block number)

A person x situation research strategy was used in developing videotapes depicting the responses of Japanese-Americans and Caucasian-Americans to different situations within the job setting (e.g., Job Interview, Promotion Seeking and Termination). Judgments of stimulus person's affective and motivational states, response competence, and trait attributions were obtained from both Japanese-American and Caucasian-American judges. Main effects for situation and ethnicity of stimulus person, and higher order interactions between situation, ethnicity of stimulus person, and ethnicity of other

DD FORM 1473
1 JAN 73

EDITION OF 1 NOV 65 IS OBSOLETE

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

393359
SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

within the situation were found for all categories of judgment. Results are discussed in terms of revised interpretations of previous research on inter-ethnic empathy, interethnic competence assessment, and ethnic trait attributions.

S/N 0102-LF-014-6601

SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF THIS PAGE (When Data Entered)

DISCLAIMER NOTICE

**THIS DOCUMENT IS BEST QUALITY
PRACTICABLE. THE COPY FURNISHED
TO DTIC CONTAINED A SIGNIFICANT
NUMBER OF PAGES WHICH DO NOT
REPRODUCE LEGIBLY.**

Person-Situation Research Strategies for Interethnic Empathy,
Interethnic Competence, and Ethnic Trait Attributions in the Job Setting

Norman Dinges
Kenneth Tokuno

The Institute of Behavioral Sciences
Honolulu, Hawaii

This research was sponsored by the Organizational Effectiveness Research
Program, Office Of Naval Research, Contract No. N00014-77-C-0345

Abstract

A person x situation research strategy was used in developing videotapes depicting the responses of Japanese-Americans and Caucasian-Americans to different situations within the job setting (e.g. Job Interview, Promotion Seeking and Termination). Judgments of stimulus person's affective and motivational states, response competence, and trait attributions were obtained from both Japanese-American and Caucasian-American judges. Main effects for situation and ethnicity of stimulus person, and higher order interactions between situation, ethnicity of stimulus person, and ethnicity of other within the situation were found for all categories of judgment. Results are discussed in terms of revised interpretations of previous research on interethnic empathy, interethnic competence assessment, and ethnic trait attributions.

Accession For	
NTIS GRA&I	☒
DDC TAB	☐
Unannounced	☐
Justification	
By	
Distribution/	
Security Codes	
Dist	Avalland/or special
A	23

INTRODUCTION

Conceptual models of effective interethnic relations have relied strongly upon the assumption that there is a set of personal characteristics which defines the competent person. Hammer, et al. (1978) provide one of the more comprehensive reviews of these conceptions, which yield a redundant composite of desirable traits that are presumed to be important in coping with the ethnocultural aspects of interpersonal tasks. These models clearly fail to take situational variables into account and implicitly assume a transsituational concept of interethnic competence. By contrast, models of competence which do consider situational variables in their formulations almost all fail to take ethnocultural factors into account (Dinges & Duffy, 1979). The approach employed in the present research uses inter- and intra-ethnic judgments of competence of persons interacting with problematic life situations. The advantage of this approach lies in the emphasis on both individuals and situations, and the assessment of the specific person x situation interactions that can be used in developing and testing competence criteria.

The approach used in the current research also employs person perception methodology within the context of a person x situation paradigm. Competence is assessed by examining the ability of judges to make accurate attributions about the feelings and motives of ethnically similar and dissimilar stimulus persons. Thus not only the competence of the stimulus person responding to the situation, but the competence of persons making judgments can be analyzed. A design which incorporates both intra- and interethnic judgments allows for a test of the assumption that persons from a given culture or ethnic group are capable of more accurately judging important subjective states of another person from that same culture or ethnic group.

Previous research using this design (Dinges & Tokuno, 1979) with a wider range of situations and ethnic groups found a number of complex interactions between judge or stimulus person ethnicity and situations. Competence was highly varied across situations and ethnicity, and often included interactions between ethnicity and situation. These findings suggested increased focus on specific ethnic differences that might be elicited by situations designed to maximize differences among assessed competencies. Barnlund (1975) found different characteristics attributed to Japanese and Americans based on the judgments of persons who had been exposed to interactions among the two groups. Other studies (e.g., Connor, 1977) have described differences in Japanese and American social interaction styles. For example, Japanese express *Enryo*, or a "holding in" of personal motives, self-aggrandizement, or private disclosure in deference to the group, especially the family. By contrast Americans believe in personal achievement, individuality, and self-revelation. The impact of these different interaction styles may be reflected in the manner in which persons from these two different ethnic backgrounds respond to problematic interethnic situations.

In this study, specific situations were selected and formulated for differential elicitation potential. Recent interest in the development of taxonomies of situations also contributed to situation selection based on elicitation potential. A number of rationales for taxonomies have been suggested, including that situations be categorized by definable, measurable characteristics (Barker, 1965), or be described by a person's perceptions of or reactions to them (Endler and Magnusson, 1976). An interactionist position of taxonomies in which situations elicit responses as a function of individual characteristics of the person(s) within that situation is taken by Lazarus and Launier (1978). Of major importance for assessing response competence is that the situations

be ones in which the "adequate response is unclear, unavailable, difficult to mobilize, or its adequacy doubtful (Lazarus & Launier, 1978, p. 311)."

The overall aim of this study was threefold: (1) To examine the ability of ethnically similar and dissimilar judges to make accurate attributions of affective and motivational states in persons responding to problematic interethnic situations; (2) To examine the manner in which problematic interethnic situations differ in response elicitation; and (3) To examine ethnic differences in the types of responses which are made to problematic interethnic situations and the assessed effectiveness of those responses.

The following report consists of five sections. The first section describes the method by which problematic stimulus situations were developed. The next three sections report the results and discussion for each of the three measures used to assess intra- and interethnic attributions of affect and motivation, competence, and traits, respectively. The final section summarizes the overall results of both field research and laboratory phases of the project.

METHOD FOR DEVELOPMENT AND ANALYSIS OF STIMULUS SITUATIONS

Subjects

Stimulus persons (SPs) were 12 undergraduate students 18-30 years of age and all long time residents of Hawaii (i.e. a continuous portion of their lives spent in Hawaii). They were informed that they were to serve as subjects for making videotaped situations that would be seen by other persons. Three SPs of each sex from each ethnic group (Japanese-American and Caucasian) were used. SPs were paid for their participation.

Study Setting and Equipment

Two adjacent rooms were used for the videotaping. The SP was alone in one room seated at a desk before a Sony camera mounted on a tripod. An Experimenter was in the next room with a Sony Transistor Monitor (CVM-115) and a Sony Solid State Videorecorder. The partition between rooms was soundproof.

Situational Stimuli

All stimulus situations represented different aspects of job experiences. The work setting was chosen because it involves a wide range of possible situations which may be stressful or problematic and involves a major portion of most adult's daily activities. Three aspects of the job setting were selected including job application, promotion-seeking, and termination. The job application situation required responding to an interview in the face of competition and a moderate level of stress. The promotion situation was specifically formulated to tap differences between Japanese-Americans and Caucasians in that it required presenting oneself favorably in order to gain a supervisory position over one's co-workers. It was expected that such a situation would reveal a tendency in Japanese-Americans to display Enryo or a holding back of personal wishes in deference to the group. (Note: To save space Japanese-American will be abbreviated to Japanese in subsequent text) The job termination situation was expected to elicit strong emotional reactions due to the highly stressful nature of being fired.

Each of the three situations had two versions, one involving a person of the same ethnic background, another involving a person from a different ethnic background. Additional situations were included to distract the SP from over-focusing on the interethnic nature of the task. The four situations are described below:

Situation 1

You are about to meet with a Japanese/Caucasian interviewer about a job for which you are not sure you are well qualified.

Situation 2 (Promotion)

You want to let your Japanese/Caucasian boss know about certain abilities you have so that you will be promoted to supervisor over your present co-workers.

Situation 3 (Fired)

You have just been fired so that a less qualified Japanese/Caucasian job applicant can be hired.

Distractor situations:

You have just received your grades and you are going to tell your parents that you have failed a course in your major.

You have just received your grades and you are going to tell your parents that you have flunked out of the University.

Videotaping Procedures

Each subject was videotaped individually. The entire videotaping session was recorded including induction trials. SPs were escorted to the videotaping room by the experimenter and were asked to sit at a desk facing the camera. They were informed that they would be videotaped in eight different situations that would be presented to them in written form.

Before videotaping of the experimental situations began, SPs were trained in the general response format with an induction trial. The induction situation dealt with the serious illness of a good friend. SPs were instructed to respond to three major questions in each situation:

- 1) What are you thinking about the situation?
- 2) How are you feeling about the situation?
- 3) What are you going to do about the situation?

SPs were asked to use these questions as a general guide to their response. They were encouraged to use visual imagery or any other means they felt would help them to experience the situation as completely and realistically as possible. The SPs were reminded to respond as fully as possible to all three guideline questions. Any questions the SPs had were answered and suggestions were provided by the inductor if the SP had not followed the correct procedure on the induction trial or had failed to speak loudly or clearly enough for the taping. Upon completion of the response, the inductor returned and assisted the SPs in completing rating scales designed to assess affective and motivational states. The inductor then left the room and the SPs proceeded through the eight situations at their own rate.

SPs followed this sequence for each situation: 1) read the situation to themselves and prepare their response, 2) inform the Es that he/she was ready by indicating so in the microphone, 3) read the situation out loud, 4) respond to the three guideline questions, and 5) complete the affect and motivation scales. Total videotaping time was approximately 60 minutes. The order of the situations was randomized for each SP.

Situation Scale Responses

SPs were required to fill out two scales after they had responded to each of the situations. The first consisted of the 24 items selected from the Differential Emotion Scale (DES) as described in a previous report (Dinges & Tokuno, 1979). The second scale consisted of semantic differential items designed to measure the motivation of the SPs (Motivational States Inventory

Table 1

Differential Emotion Scale and Motivational States Inventory Items and Instructions

Directions: Visualizing yourself in the situation which you've just discussed, complete the items below. Circle the number of the picture or word which best describes your feelings in the situation. Please complete all items.

1-Very slightly or not at all	2-Slightly	3-Moderately	4-Considerably	5-Very Strongly	
Communicating	1	2	3	4	5
Alert	1	2	3	4	5
Mad	1	2	3	4	5
Shy	1	2	3	4	5
Amused	1	2	3	4	5
Awful	1	2	3	4	5
Sluggish	1	2	3	4	5
Tense	1	2	3	4	5
Disgusted	1	2	3	4	5
Happy	1	2	3	4	5
Surprised	1	2	3	4	5
Agitated	1	2	3	4	5
Outraged	1	2	3	4	5

Directions: For each item below, circle a number on the scale in the direction which best describes yourself in the situation. Please complete all items.

In this situation, did you:										
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11
enjoy the challenge of the situation?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
were about how the situation came out?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
express all your feelings?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
feel you were in control of the situation?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
have reasons for what you did?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
worry about how you would be seen by others?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
feel that the outcome depended on your own actions?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
want to control the situation?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
put your interests first?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
want to build up your self-image?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10

- MSI). These items were based on concepts of competence developed by Heath (1977) and on prior research suggesting differences between Japanese and Caucasian styles of social interaction (See Table I for DES and MIS items).

Results

SP responses were analyzed to determine the differential response elicitation of situations and ethnic variation in response patterns of SPs. A 2(Ethnicity) by 2 (Gender) by 8 (Situations) factorial ANOVA with repeated measures was done for the responses to items of the Differential Emotion Scale (DES) and the Motivational States Inventory (MSI). There were a number of significant main effects for situations on DES items (e.g. Amazed, Nervous, Angry, Surprised). There was one significant main effect for Ethnicity of the SP. Caucasians SPs rated themselves as feeling more pleasant across the situations than did the Japanese SPs.

There were significant main effects for Situation on a number of the MSI items (e.g. Cared about outcomes, Had reasons for response, Worried about perceptions of others, Felt outcome depended on their actions). There were also significant main effects for Ethnicity of SP for the items related to concerns about other's perceptions of the SP and the completeness of their emotional expressions. Japanese SPs indicated that they felt less worried about how they would be seen by others and less expressive of all their feelings than the Caucasian SPs.

Discussion

The SP's responses differed significantly across the situations within the job setting suggesting differential elicitation potential. The significant effects for ethnicity on items of the MSI, which were expected in light of previous conceptualizations of Japanese and Caucasian social interaction styles, also reflected the differential elicitation potential of the stimulus situations.

This supported the conclusion that the stimulus situations elicited different responses from the SPs and could be used to examine the effect of situational variance on interethnic judgments of their responses.

METHOD FOR JUDGING STIMULUS SITUATIONS

Preparation of Stimulus Tapes

Videotapes of the SPs responding to the job situations were used for judging their responses. The original tapes were edited so that all three SPs from a particular gender-ethnicity group were on one stimulus tape, (e.g., one tape would consist only of Japanese female SPs). Two of the six situations to which each SP had responded were randomly selected so that all six situations were represented on each of four tapes. For each tape, the three SPs were each seen twice and all six situations were seen once. The order of the situations was randomized for each tape (see Table 2).

Judging Responses to Situations

Judges were 64 undergraduate students 18-24 years of age and local residents of Hawaii with social backgrounds similar to the SPs. They were recruited for study participation through class announcements, posters, and word of mouth communications. They were informed that they were to judge videotapes that would take about 1/2 hour of their time. The 64 judges were composed of 32 Japanese (Male, n=16; Female, n=16) and 32 Caucasians (Male, n=16; Female, n=16). All judges were paid for their participation.

Study Setting and Equipment

The videotapes were viewed in a small office containing a Sony Solid State Videorecorder (AV 3650) and a Sony Transistor Monitor (CVM115). It was furnished in typical office fashion containing bookshelves, chairs, and a work table.

Table 2

Randomized Order of Presentation of
Situations and Stimulus Persons
on Videotapes

<u>Japanese Males</u>	<u>Japanese Females</u>
Fired in favor of Caucasian Other	Interview with Caucasian Other
Promotion with Japanese Supervisor	Fired in favor of Japanese Other
Interview with Japanese Other	Fired in favor of Caucasian Other
Interview with Caucasian Other	Promotion with Japanese Supervisor
Promotion with Caucasian Supervisor	Interview with Japanese Other
Fired in favor of Japanese Other	Promotion with Caucasian Supervisor
<u>Caucasian Males</u>	<u>Caucasian Females</u>
Interview with Caucasian Other	Promotion with Caucasian Supervisor
Fired in favor of Japanese Other	Promotion with Japanese Supervisor
Interview with Caucasian Other	Interview with Japanese Other
Promotion with Caucasian Supervisor	Interview with Caucasian Other
Fired in favor of Japanese Other	Fired in favor of Caucasian Other
Promotion with Japanese Supervisor	Fired in favor of Japanese Other

Videotape Judging Procedures

Except for two instances in which two judges viewed the videotapes together, each judge viewed the videotapes individually. Judges were given a general orientation to their task and were presented with scales to be used in judging the SPs responses. Explanation was given for the different instruction formats and the requirements of the judgment task. Judges were given a practice trial using one of the distractor situations to familiarize them with the scales. The stimulus situations were shown one at a time by E, and the judges completed the scales after each presentation.

Experimental Design

Each tape, consisting of all situations with the three SPs of the same gender and ethnicity, was viewed by 16 judges, 4 of each gender x ethnicity combination. For example, the Caucasian Males tape was viewed by 4 Japanese Males, 4 Japanese Females, 4 Caucasian Males, and 4 Caucasian Females, all of whom viewed all six situations. The Caucasian Females, Japanese Males and Japanese Females were judged by a separate set of Ss with the same gender and ethnicity composition.

Videotape Judging Scales

The scales for judging SP responses to the job situations included items from prior studies but were expanded to include several items designed to detect specific differences between the two groups used in this study (see table 3). In addition, bipolar scales consisting of the traits found to distinguish Japanese and American styles of social interaction (Barnlund, 1975) were included (see table 4).

The DES and the MSI that SPs had rated were also completed by the judges. They were instructed to rate the scale items as the SPs had rated themselves in the situations to which they had previously responded.

Results for Discrepancy Measures

ANOVA for Ethnicity of Judge (2) x Sex of Judge (2) x Ethnicity of Stimulus Person (2) x Gender of Stimulus Person (2) x Situation (3) x Other within Situation (2) was performed on the discrepancy scores of SPs and judges ratings for the DES and MSI.

Discrepancy scores differed consistently across situations. SPs in the Promotion situation had the largest discrepancies compared to SPs in other situations for the DES factors: Distress, Anger, Enjoyment, and Surprise; and for the MSI items: Put Their Own Interests First, Felt in Control of the Situation, and Expressed All of Their Feelings. SPs in the Interview situation had the smallest discrepancies for the DES factors: Shyness and Fatigue; and for the MSI items: Felt in Control of the Situation and Enjoyed the Challenge of the Situation. SPs in the Fire situation had the largest discrepancy for the MSI item: Enjoyed the Challenge of the Situation; and the smallest discrepancy scores for the MSI items: Cared About How the Situation Came Out and Wanted to Control the Situation.

Discrepancy scores also differed consistently for the Ethnicity of SP. For all DES factors, Japanese SPs had smaller discrepancy scores than Caucasian SPs. For MSI items Japanese SPs had the smaller discrepancy score for Want to Build up Their Self-Image, Enjoyed the Challenge of the Situation, and Cared About How the Situation Came Out. Caucasian SPs had the smaller discrepancy score for the MSI item, Worry About How They Would be Seen by Others.

There were also significant interactions for Situation x Ethnicity of SP. For the MSI item, Cared About How the Situation Came Out, the smaller discrepancy scores for Japanese SPs occurred for the Promotion situation. For the item, Felt the Outcome Depended Upon Their Own Actions, Caucasian SPs had smaller discrepancy scores than Japanese SPs but only in the Fire situation. Japanese

SPs had smaller discrepancy scores in the Promotion situation for the DES factors: Surprise, Shyness, Distress, Enjoyment, Fear; and smaller discrepancy scores in the Fire situation for the DES factors: Surprise and Fear.

For the effect of the Other within the Situation, SPs involved with Same ethnic others had smaller discrepancy scores than SPs involved with Different ethnic others for the DES factors: Enjoyment, Shyness, Distress, Anger, and Fatigue but larger discrepancy scores than SPs with Different ethnic others for the MSI items: Worry About How They Would be Seen by Others and Felt They Were in Control of the Situation, but larger discrepancy scores for the item: Want to Build up Own Self-Image.

The interaction between Ethnicity of Judge and Ethnicity of Stimulus Person was of special interest. For the MSI item, Put Their Own Interest First, discrepancy scores for the Japanese Judges were about equal across the SPs but for Caucasian Judges, discrepancy scores were smaller for Japanese SPs than for Caucasian SPs. For the DES factors, Surprise and Interest, Japanese SPs had much larger discrepancy scores than Caucasian SPs from Japanese Judges, but the difference between Japanese and Caucasian SPs discrepancy scores was not that large for Caucasian Judges.

The effect for Ethnicity of SP was also related to the Other within the Situation. Japanese SPs had smaller discrepancy scores only when the Other was of the Same ethnicity for the DES factors: Anger, Fatigue, Surprise, Shyness, and Enjoyment; and for the MSI item, Worry About How Seen by Others.

There were a number of significant three-way interactions between Ethnicity of SP x Situation x Other within Situation. Caucasian SPs had larger discrepancy scores than Japanese SPs in the Promotion situation only if the other in the situation was of the Same ethnic group for the MSI items: Cared About How They Were Seen by Others, Had Reasons for What They Did, Want to Build up Their Own Self-Image, and Wanted to Control the Situation. Japanese SPs with

a Different other in the Interview situation had smaller discrepancy scores than Caucasian SPs for the MSI items: Had Reasons for What They Did, Wanted to Build up Their Own Self-Image, Want to Control the Situation; and for the DES factor, Enjoyment. For the DES factor, Surprise, the reverse was true in that Japanese SPs with Different others in the Interview situation had larger discrepancy scores than Caucasians. Japanese SPs with the Same other in the Interview situation had larger discrepancy scores than Caucasian SPs in the same situation for the MSI items: Had Reasons for What They Did and Wanted to Build up Their Own Self-Image. The reverse was true for the DES factors, Fatigue and Enjoyment, for which Japanese had smaller discrepancy scores. In the Promotion situation involving interaction with a Different ethnic other, Japanese SPs had larger discrepancy scores than Caucasians for the MSI item, Wanted to Control the Situation, but Japanese SPs had smaller discrepancy scores than Caucasians for the DES factor, Enjoyment. In the Fire situation involving others of Different ethnicity, Japanese SPs had larger discrepancy scores than Caucasian for the MSI item, Felt that the Outcome Depended upon Their Own Actions, but lower discrepancy scores than Caucasians for the DES factor, Surprise.

The interaction of Situation x Other within Situation x Ethnicity of Stimulus Person x Gender of Stimulus Person was frequently significant. This interaction is a measure of an individual SP responding to a specific situation and the discrepancy scores reflect the accuracy of judgments of a single SP. For example the Caucasian Female SP involved with others of the Same ethnic group in the Interview situation had larger discrepancy scores versus other groups or conditions for all DES factors.

The variance of discrepancy scores was examined to clarify the above results. Discrepancy score distributions for all items showed that judgments centered around zero or underestimated the SP's self-ratings. In cases where there were

significant ethnic differences, the Caucasian SP self-ratings were more likely to have been under-estimated by the judges than were the Japanese SP self-ratings. Another interesting feature of the discrepancy distributions was that the variation was greater for the Promotion situation than for Interview or Fired situations.

Although main effects for Sex were found, they have not been reported in detail because the effects of ethnicity and situations were of central concern for this study. No interactions of sex with either ethnicity or situations were found which changed any of the above results.

Discussion for Discrepancy Measures

The accuracy of judgments of SP's self-rated affect and motivation varied depending upon the situation in which they were judged. This replicated a previous finding, (Dinges & Tokuno, 1979) lending strength to the argument that the ability to understand the internal experience of others is more dependent upon the situation in which that other person is viewed than on the ethnic similarity of judge and stimulus person. The Promotion situation differed significantly from the Interview and Firing situations for most items in that the discrepancy scores were larger for that situation. Examination of the distributions of discrepancy scores showed that they were larger due to the greater variance in the Promotion situation. This indicated that the judges were less able to discern the SP's feelings and motives in the Promotion situation.

The Promotion situation, as opposed to the Fire or Interview situations, meets the criteria Lazarus and Launier (1978) cite for coping situations (e.g. response unclear, unavailable, difficult to mobilize, or adequacy doubtful), and may have engendered more complex internal states which were difficult for others to judge. Stereotyped interpersonal strategies for dealing with a promotion situation and the accompanying internal states which could serve as

a common reference point may have been lacking for both the judges and the SPs. Another interpretation is that the situation demanded a prospective examination of possible responses, as contrasted to responses to an event which is about to or has already occurred, and produced more complex subjective reactions which were inherently difficult for others to judge.

The failure to find significant differences for the ethnicity of judge also replicated previous findings (Dinges & Tokuno, 1980). In the previous study, it was possible that the range of ethnicity (i.e. Japanese, Chinese, Filipino, Caucasian) attenuated any differences for ethnicity of judges, perhaps by increasing the number of degrees of freedom without a concurrent increase in variance. In the present study using only two ethnic groups, there was also no difference for ethnicity of judges. Despite described differences in social interaction (Johnson and Johnson, 1975) the socialization experiences of both groups may be similar enough so that attributions about the subjective experiences of others are highly similar. In the Hawaiian multi-ethnic setting there may have been enough exposure to members of both ethnic groups so that persons from either group are equally capable of "reading" the feelings and motives of the other (Samuels, 1970).

The finding of significant differences for the ethnicity of SP replicated a previous finding. All DES items were significant with smaller discrepancy scores for the Japanese SPs. The distributions of discrepancy measures showed that scores for Japanese SPs clustered around zero while the Caucasian SPs were under-rated by the judges. Several items of the MSI were selected in order to examine specific differences between the ethnicity of SPs involved in this study. There were ethnic differences for SP's for the items, Express all Your Feelings and Worry About How You Would be Seen by Others. Discrepancy scores failed to reveal any ethnic difference indicating that the

Judges were able to perceive the difference in the SPs responses to these items. However, on the items, Want to Build up Self-Image, Enjoyed the Challenge of the Situation, and Cared about How the Situation Came Out, the judges underestimated the Caucasian SPs. This pattern may be due to the SPs self-rating themselves higher without providing overt cues about their internal states which would be consistent with higher ratings. By contrast, the judges might have failed to recognize the overt cues for internal states for the Caucasian SPs. An alternative interpretation is that the Japanese SPs were better at accurately portraying their inner states, or responded in ways which were easier to interpret. In either case, the results speak against the stereotypical notion of oriental inscrutability in general and Japanese suppression of emotional display in particular.

The number and type of significant interaction effects mitigates against a simple interpretation of the results. In some cases, Japanese responses may have been more obscure than Caucasian responses. In the extreme case, the four way interaction of Situation x Other within Situation x Ethnicity of SP x Gender of SP is best interpreted by noting that the effect is due to ratings of a single SP responding to a specific situation. This interaction is a consistently significant finding and would seem to indicate that individual differences in responding to problematic interethnic situations are a prominent consideration in person x situation research strategies.

Results for Analysis of Competence Items

ANOVA for Ethnicity of Judge (2) x Sex of Judge (2) x Ethnicity of SP (2) x Sex of SP (2) x Situation (3) x Other within Situation (2) was performed on the judges ratings of competence of the SP's Overall Responses, Thoughts, and Feelings. Table 3 summarizes these results. For the main effect of Ethnicity of Judge, inspection of the means showed that Japanese judges rated SPs higher

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPETENCE

		Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation	Situation	Ethnicity of Judge X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other with in Situation X Situation
The PERSON'S THOUGHTS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Biased	Fair	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Organized	Disorganized	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Realistic	Unrealistic	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Not disrupted by their feelings	Disrupted by their feelings	N.S.	N.S.	**	*	N.S.	N.S.
Considered the other's point of view	Did not consider the other's point of view	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
The PERSON'S FEELINGS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Unjustified	Justified	N.S.	N.S.	***	****	*	N.S.
Not Obvious	Obvious	N.S.	N.S.	*	****	N.S.	****
Positive	Negative	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	*
Weak	Strong	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Expressed with difficulty	Expressed with ease	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Displayed over a wide range	Displayed over a narrow range	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
The PERSON'S OVERALL RESPONSE IN THE SITUATION showed they:							
Controlled the way they appeared to others	Did not control the way they appeared to others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Did not make the impression they wanted	Made the impression they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	****
Knew what they wanted	Did not know what they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	***
Would not do what they say	Would do what they say	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	*
Knew how to approach others	Did not know how to approach others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	***
Did not know what was appropriate for the task	Knew what was appropriate for the task	N.S.	*	N.S.	**	N.S.	***
Were obligated to the group	Were obligated to themselves	*	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	**
Were respectful to authority	Were disrespectful to authority	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Did not find it difficult to handle	Found it difficult to handle	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*
Valued others	Did not value others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	*
Learned something useful for future situations	Did not learn something use- ful for future situations	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	**	N.S.	N.S.
Did not take a problem solving approach	Took a problem solving approach	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	*	****
Considered different solutions	Did not consider different solutions	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	*
Anticipated the conse- quences of their response	Did not anticipate the conse- quences of their response	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	*	N.S.
Were immediately effective	Were not immediately effective	*	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Were non-creative	Were creative	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	****
Would not be effective in the long run	Would be effective in the long run	N.S.	N.S.	****	***	N.S.	N.S.

N.S. = Not Significant

0.05

SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPETENCE

		Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation	Situation	Ethnicity of Judge X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other within Situation X Situation
The PERSON'S THOUGHTS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Classed	Fair	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Organized	Disorganized	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Realistic	Unrealistic	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Not disrupted by their feelings	Disrupted by their feelings	N.S.	N.S.	**	*	N.S.	N.S.
Considered the other's point of view	Did not consider the other's point of view	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
The PERSON'S FEELINGS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Unjustified	Justified	N.S.	N.S.	***	****	*	N.S.
Not Obvious	Obvious	N.S.	N.S.	*	****	N.S.	****
Positive	Negative	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	*
Weak	Strong	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Expressed with difficulty	Expressed with ease	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	****
Displayed over a wide range	Displayed over a narrow range	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
The PERSON'S OVERALL RESPONSE IN THE SITUATION showed they:							
Controlled the way they appeared to others	Did not control the way they appeared to others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Did not make the impression they wanted	Made the impression they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	****
Knew what they wanted	Did not know what they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	***
Would not do what they say	Would do what they say	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	*
Knew how to approach others	Did not know how to approach others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	***
Did not know what was appropriate for the task	Knew what was appropriate for the task	N.S.	*	N.S.	**	N.S.	***
Were obligated to the group	Were obligated to themselves	*	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	**
Were respectful to authority	Were disrespectful to authority	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Did not find it difficult to handle	Found it difficult to handle	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*
Valued others	Did not value others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	*
Learned something useful for future situations	Did not learn something useful for future situations	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	**	N.S.	N.S.
Did not take a problem solving approach	Took a problem solving approach	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	*	****
Considered different solutions	Did not consider different solutions	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	*
Anticipated the consequences of their response	Did not anticipate the consequences of their response	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	*	N.S.
Were immediately effective	Were not immediately effective	*	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	N.S.
Were non-creative	Were creative	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	****
Would not be effective in the long run	Would be effective in the long run	N.S.	N.S.	****	***	N.S.	N.S.

N.S. = Not Significant
 * = $p \leq .05$
 ** = $p \leq .01$
 *** = $p \leq .005$
 **** = $p \leq .001$

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
 FROM CO. 1. 100

TABLE
SUMMARY OF ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE FOR COMPETENCE

		Other within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other within Situation X Situa- tion X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Situation X Ethnicity of Judge X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person
The PERSON'S THOUGHTS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Interested	Fair	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Organized	Disorganized	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.
Realistic	Unrealistic	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.
Not disrupted by their feelings	Disrupted by their feelings	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.
Considered the other's point of view	Did not consider the other's point of view	**	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
The PERSON'S FEELINGS IN THE SITUATION were:							
Unjustified	Justified	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Not Obvious	Obvious	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Positive	Negative	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.
Weak	Strong	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.
Expressed with difficulty	Expressed with ease	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.	****	N.S.
Displayed over a wide range	Displayed over a narrow range	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.	*	N.S.
The PERSON'S OVERALL RESPONSE IN THE SITUATION showed they:							
Controlled the way they appeared to others	Did not control the way they appeared to others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*
Did not make the impression they wanted	Made the impression they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.
Knew what they wanted	Did not know what they wanted	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.
Would not do what they say	Would do what they say	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.
Knew how to approach others	Did not know how to approach others	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Did not know what was appropriate for the task	Knew what was appropriate for the task	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	***	N.S.
Were obligated to the group	Were obligated to themselves	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.
Were respectful to authority	Were disrespectful to authority	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Did not find it difficult to handle	Found it difficult to handle	N.S.	**	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.
Valued others	Did not value others	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Learned something useful for future situations	Did not learn something use- ful for future situations	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	****	N.S.
Did not take a problem solving approach	Took a problem solving approach	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Considered different solutions	Did not consider different solutions	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	*	*
Anticipated the conse- quences of their response	Did not anticipate the conse- quences of their response	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Were immediately effective	Were not immediately effective	N.S.	****	*	N.S.	*	N.S.
Were non-creative	Were creative	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.
Would not be effective in the long run	Would be effective in the long run	N.S.	N.S.	*	N.S.	N.S.	N.S.

N.S. = Not Significant
 * = p < .05
 ** = p < .01
 *** = p < .005
 **** = p < .001

THIS PAGE IS BEST QUALITY PRACTICABLE
FROM COPY FURNISHED TO BDC

on their overall responses for the items, Learned Something Useful for Future Situations and Knew What Was Appropriate for the Situation. For the main effect of Ethnicity of SP, Japanese were rated higher for Show Value for Others and Obligated to the Group.

The main effect of situations was significant across most competence items. Inspection of the means indicated that responses to the Fire situation were rated lower than other situations for, Feelings Expressed with Difficulty, Obligated to the Group, Respectful of Authority, Anticipating of the Consequences, and Considered Others point of View. In the Fire situation SP responses were rated higher for, Creative, Immediately Effective, Effective over the Long Run, Took Problem Solving Approach, Considered Other Solutions, and Knew What They Wanted; Thoughts Organized, Realistic and Disrupted by Feelings; and Feelings Justified, Negative, and Strong. Responses to the Promotion situation were rated higher for, Show Value for Others, Did Not make the Impression They Wanted, Obligated to the Group, Respectful of Authority, and Considered Others Point of View, but lower for, Knew How to Approach Others. Responses to the Interview situation were rated lower for: Thoughts Disrupted by Feelings.

For the main effect of Other within Situation, responses were rated higher for Feelings Justified and Considered Different Solutions with others of the same ethnic group and higher for Thoughts Biased, Thoughts Disrupted by Feelings and Feelings Obvious with others of different ethnic groups.

The interaction for Ethnicity of SP and Ethnicity of Judge was significant for the items Learned Something Useful for Future Situations, Were Immediately Effective, and Would not be Effective in the Long Run. For Learned Something Useful for Future Situations, differences between means occurred only for Japanese SPs who were rated higher for this item than Caucasian SPs by Japanese judges. The same pattern occurred for the item Were Immediately Effective.

For Would be Effective in the Long Run, Japanese judges rated Japanese SPs higher than Caucasian SPs and Caucasian judges rated Caucasian SPs higher than Japanese SPs.

A Situation x Ethnicity of Judge x Ethnicity of SP interaction occurred for Controlled the Way They Appeared to Others. Inspection of the means showed that Japanese judges rated Japanese SPs higher than Caucasian SPs in the Promotion situation, but rated Caucasian SPs higher than Japanese SPs in the Fire situation. Caucasian judges rated Japanese SPs higher than Caucasian SPs in the Fire situation.

An Ethnicity of Judge x Ethnicity of SP x Other within Situation interaction was significant for the item Showed They Valued Others. All judges rated Japanese SPs higher in situations involving different others as opposed to situations with same others, but Japanese judges rated Caucasian SPs lower with different others as opposed to situations with same others.

The interaction of Other within Situation x Situation was statistically significant for a large number of items. Inspection of means indicated that the Fire situation showed consistent differences depending upon the ethnicity of the other person involved. SPs in the Fire situation involving same ethnic others were rated higher than SPs in the Fire situation involving different ethnic others for the items, Learned Something Useful for Future Situations, Immediately Effective, Creative, Took a Problem Solving Approach, Knew What They Wanted, Made the Impression They Wanted, Would Do What They Say, Knew How to Approach Others, Knew What Was Appropriate for the Situation, Thoughts Organized: Feelings Obvious, Feelings Positive, and Feelings Strong. SPs in the Fire situation were rated lower in the situation involving same ethnic others as opposed to different ethnic others for the items, Obligated to the Group, Found the Situation Difficult to Handle, and Feelings Expressed with Difficulty. The same effect was infrequent for the Promotion situation where

SPs were rated at about the same level whether or not the other in the situation was of the same ethnicity or not. In the Interview situation, SPs involved with same ethnic others were rated higher than SPs involved with different others for the items, Made the Impression they Wanted, Obligated to the Group, and Feelings Expressed with Difficulty. Under the same conditions there were lower ratings for the item, Learned Something Useful for Future Situations, Knew How to Approach others, Thoughts Organized, Feelings Obvious, and Feelings Strong.

The interaction of Situation x Ethnicity of SP was significant for six competence items. In the Promotion situation, Japanese were rated higher than Caucasians for the item Were Immediately Effective. Compared to all other situations, SPs were rated higher on Were Immediately Effective in the Fire situation, but within that situation, Caucasian SPs were rated higher than Japanese. Japanese SPs were generally rated higher than Caucasian SPs across situations for the item Showed Value for Others, but this rating was notably higher in the Promotion situation. For the item, Considered Different Solutions, Caucasian SPs were rated higher than Japanese SPs in the Interview situation. Similarly, Caucasian SPs were rated higher for Thoughts Biased in the Interview and Promotion situations, and for Expressed Feelings with Ease in the Fire situation. Japanese SPs were rated higher than Caucasians for the item Displayed Feelings over a Wide Range in the Promotion situation, but lower than Caucasians on the same item for the Interview situation.

The interaction of Other within Situation x Ethnicity of SP was significant for five competence items. Caucasian SPs were rated higher with same ethnic others as opposed to with different ethnic others for the item Took a Problem Solving Approach. Japanese SPs were rated higher on Effective in the Long Run with Different ethnic others than with same ethnic others, but for Caucasians

the higher rating on this item was for interactions with same ethnic others. Caucasian SPs were rated higher with different than same ethnic others for the item Found the Situation Difficult to Handle. Japanese SPs were rated higher than Caucasian SPs for the same item with different ethnic others and Japanese SPs with same ethnic others. Japanese SPs were rated higher in situations with different as opposed to same ethnic others for the item, Considered Others Point of View. Caucasians involved with same ethnic others were rated higher than Caucasians with different others or than Japanese with same others for the item, Feelings displayed over a Wide Range.

The interaction of Other within Situation x Situation x Ethnicity of SP was most frequently significant. There is a consistent difference between Japanese and Caucasian SPs within the Interview situation involving a same ethnic other. Caucasian SPs with same ethnic other were rated higher than Japanese for the items, Anticipated the Consequences of the Response, Would Do What They Say, Knew How to Approach Others, Knew What Was Appropriate for the Situation, Thoughts Organized, Thoughts Realistic, Feelings Positive, and Feelings Strong. The Caucasian SPs were rated lower than Japanese SPs in the Interview situation with the same ethnic other for the items, Obligated to the Group, Found the Situation Difficult to Handle, Feelings Expressed with Difficulty, and Feelings Displayed Over a Wide Range. Caucasian SPs with different others in the Interview situation were rated lower than Japanese SPs for the items: Anticipated the Consequences of their Response, Would Do What They Say, Knew How to Approach the Situation, Knew What Was Appropriate for the Situation, Thoughts Realistic, Feelings Positive, Feelings Strong, and Feelings Displayed Over a Wide Range. Caucasian SPs in the Promotion situation involving same ethnic other were rated higher than Japanese in the other situations for the items, Thoughts Disorganized, Feelings Expressed with Difficulty, and Found the Situation Difficult to Handle. Within the

differences for judges indicates the possibility of common criteria for assessing response competence which are also similar in magnitude of ratings. The effect for situations demonstrated that judgments of competence are also influenced by the particular situation in which the person is judged.

Several points are of interest in examining the more specific aspects of situational effects. The finding that SPs were rated lower on some items in the Fire situation such as Considered Others Point of View and Respectful of Authority, indicated that their responses in this situation were spontaneous and primarily concerned with the threat to them, as might be expected of one who has just lost a job. This is further supported by findings which show that SPs in the Fire situation were rated higher for Strong, Negative, and Justified feelings, as well as having their Thoughts Disrupted by Their Feelings. On the other hand, the Fire situation elicited responses which were rated higher for items which indicated direct coping with the problem, such as Immediately Effective, Thoughts Organized, and Knew What They Wanted. The Promotion situation elicited responses which indicated the SPs' awareness and concern for others. Items such as Obligated to the Group, Respectful of Authority, and Showed Value for Others were rated higher for SPs in the Promotion situation.

As illustrated by the above examples, the differential elicitation potential of the situations in type and intensity of responses is reflected in the pattern of both negative and positive emphases which are combined in the overall responses. This further reflects the psychosocial dynamics of coping with problematic interethnic situations which do not permit standardized responses.

The competence analyses showed few significant differences for Ethnicity of SP. Where these effects were found, they were for appropriate items and in the expected directions. For example, the Japanese SPs were rated higher than Caucasian SPs in showing value for others and in showing that they were obligated

Promotion situation involving same ethnic other, Caucasian SPs were rated higher than Japanese SPs for the items, Anticipated the Consequences of Their Response, Feelings Positive, and Thoughts Disrupted by Feelings. In the same situation Caucasian SPs were rated lower than Japanese SPs for the items, Knew How to Approach Others, Knew What was Appropriate for the Situation, and Thoughts Realistic. Ethnic differences between SPs in the Promotion situation involving different ethnic others indicated that Japanese were rated higher than Caucasian SPs for the items, Anticipated the Consequences of the Response, Obligated to the Group, Feelings Positive, and Feelings Displayed Over a Wide Range.

The interaction of Situation x Other within Situation x Ethnicity of SP x Gender of SP was frequently significant. This reflects judgments about individual SP responses to situations. For example examination of cell means for the items Were Immediately Effective, showed that across situations, Japanese and Caucasian Males were rated about equal, while the Japanese female was rated higher than the Caucasian female in all but the Interview and Fire situations involving same ethnic others. The Caucasian Female SP was rated higher for this item in the Fire situation with same ethnic other. In the Fire situation with different ethnic other and in the Interview situation involving same ethnic other, the Caucasian Male SP was rated higher than the Japanese Male SP for Were Immediately Effective. Other interactions of this type were equally complex.

Discussion for Competence Results

Analysis of competence results is similar to analysis of discrepancy scores in that there were few significant effects for Ethnicity of Judge, while there were consistent significant effects for Situations. The failure to find ethnic

to a group. These results support the Japanese value of placing ones primary group before one's own needs. In other respects, the Japanese and Caucasian SPs were rated equally competent in overall coping with the situations, including the cognitive and effective aspects of their responses.

The number of significant interactions points to the complexity of the responses as a function of the variables which were controlled for in this study. Of particular interest was the effect of the Other within the Situation, which was more frequently significant within interactions than as a main effect (e.g. there were a large number of significant interactions for Other within Situation X Situation.) This demonstrates empirically that situational content with probable elicitation potential may be significantly influenced by varying the ethnicity of significant others in the situation. For example, SPs were rated higher on several appropriate items for the Fire situation involving someone of the same ethnicity rather than someone of a different ethnicity. This is contrary to prediction, since it might be expected that losing one's job to a person of another ethnic group would strongly suggest ethnically motivated discriminatory behavior of one's employer and this would elicit more intense responses. Other interactions support the basic point that no single factor determines responses to problematic interethnic situations or the assessed competence of the response to such situation.

The results for the interaction of Ethnicity of SP x Other within situation x Situation lends additional support to the conclusion that ethnicity and situation must be examined as related factors. This interaction generally shows that Caucasian SPs with same ethnic others were rated as more competent than Japanese SPs with same ethnic others in the Interview and Promotion situations. The effects for Other within Situation x Situation interactions showed that the Fire situation accounted for most of the effects of the Other

within Situation. However, this three-way interaction shows that the Interview and Promotion situations also elicited similar differences, but in opposite directions for ethnically different SPs. This effect might be explained by the prior experience of SPs with interviews or relations with supervisors who were Caucasians, or who modelled their behaviors after Caucasians. If so, it might be predicted that both Caucasian and Japanese SPs would be judged more competent in interacting with a Caucasian interviewer or supervisor. Simply considering the two-way interaction between various situation and person factors is insufficient.

Interaction effects for ethnicity were also apparent in the results for the Ethnicity of SP x Situation effects. The Japanese were rated significantly higher than Caucasian SPs in the Promotion situation for the Item, Showed Value for Others. Although the Japanese SPs were rated generally higher than Caucasian SPs across situations, the difference for the Promotion situation was especially large. This validates the use of this item to judge Enryo in Japanese SPs. It also indicates that some situations were particularly potent for eliciting differential responses on the basis of the perceived effectiveness in ethnically appropriate terms for a specific situation. For other items, Japanese SPs were rated as being either more or less competent than Caucasian SPs depending upon the situation. For example, Japanese were rated higher for Expressing Their Feelings Over a Wide Range than the Caucasian SPs in the Promotion situation. On the other hand, the Japanese SPs were rated lower for Expressing their Feelings over a Wide Range than the Caucasian SPs in the Interview situation, where self-assertion is more appropriate.

The significance of these results for performance appraisal in task-oriented situations is indicated by the possibility of Enryo-type situations, which might be revealed by more extensive taxonomic investigation. This would be particularly

NS = Not Significant
* = p .05
** = p .01
*** = p .005
**** = p .001

Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge
allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic
independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent
lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively
frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank
spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous
relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed
assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive
formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal
humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous

TABLE 4
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Traits

NS = Not Significant
* = p .05
** = p .01
*** = p .005
**** = p .001

Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Judge	Other Within Situation X Ethnicity of Stimulus Person
allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic	allergic
independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent	independent
lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively	lively
frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank	frank
spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous	spontaneous
relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed	relaxed
assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive	assertive
formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal	formal
humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous	humorous

TABLE 4
Summary of Analysis of Variance for Traits

true if taxonomic efforts were focused on identifying situations with maximum differential elicitation potential for various ethnic groups. If significant numbers of such situations were found, performance criteria problems could result. This would be most clearly seen for behavioral demands in situations which led to systematically underrated responses as a function of the socialization history of the person being assessed (e.g. individual non-assertion in group task situations).

In terms of competence assessment most interethnic situations may be problematic insofar as standard, automatic responses are ineffective in achieving desired outcomes, especially for those interactions in which a service is to be rendered, knowledge transferred, or a skill learned. The usual solution of matching the ethnicity of principal interactants in such situations seems questionable in light of the variability in responses which occurs when task demands are narrowly defined to value instrumental behaviors without considering ethnocultural factors. One outcome may be the sacrifice of group cohesion and morale for instrumental task achievement, although the former may be more essential for effective group performance under conditions of ethnocultural heterogeneity.

Results for Trait Items

ANOVA was performed for Ethnicity of Judge (2) x Sex of Judge (2) x Ethnicity of SP (2) x Sex of SP (2) x Situation (3) x Other within Situation (2). Significant effects are reported in Table 4. The following is a summary of findings of major interest.

Ethnicity of Judge was significant with Caucasian judges rating the SPs as more Humorous. Sex of Judge was significant with Female judges rating the SPs more Assertive and more Independent. Ethnicity of SP was significant for most items, with Caucasian SPs rated higher than Japanese SPs for the items, Assertive, Independent, Talkative, Lively, Frank, and Spontaneous. The main

effect for Sex of SP was significant with the Male SPs rated higher for the items, Independent, Lively, and Informal.

The main effect for Situation was significant for all items except Humorous. Inspection of means showed that SPs in the Promotion situation were rated more Formal, Cautious, and Tense than SPs in the Interview or Fire situations, and SPs in the Fire situation were rated more Lively, Assertive, Independent, Talkative, Frank, and Spontaneous.

Significant effects for Other within Situation x Situation occurred for most items. Inspection of means showed that SPs involved with Same ethnic others in the Fire situation were rated more Relaxed, Talkative, Spontaneous, Frank, Assertive, Independent, and Lively.

Significant interactions for Ethnicity of SP x Situation x Other within Situation indicated that Japanese SPs were rated more Assertive in the Promotion situation with Same ethnic others. With Different ethnic others, Japanese SPs were rated more Lively in the Promotion situation and more Assertive and Independent in the Interview situation.

Discussion of Results for Trait Items

The results for the main effects of Ethnicity of SP support Barnlund's (1975) findings regarding differences between Americans and Japanese when extended to Japanese-Americans and Caucasian-Americans in Hawaii. The Caucasian SPs were rated higher for the trait items, Assertive, Independent, Talkative, Lively, Frank, and Spontaneous; however, there were interaction effects which qualify these results. For example, SPs traits were judged differently depending on the situation in which they were judged.

The Caucasian SPs were generally rated higher in assertiveness, but in the Promotion situation Japanese other, the Japanese SPs, and the Japanese Male SPs in particular, were rated more Assertive. Paradoxically, the content

situation for the items, Lively, Assertive, Independent, Talkative, Frank, and Spontaneous. The stress of being fired could reasonably be expected to elicit behaviors leading to trait attributions of this type and to diminish ethnic differences.

On the other hand, the situations were not the sole determinant of trait attributions even though the Fire situation seemed to level ethnic differences. This example can be qualified, however, by examination of the interaction effect for Situation x Other within Situation. For example, when different ethnic others are involved in the Fire situation, the ratings were similar to other situations. With same ethnic others higher ratings occurred for the traits Relaxed, Lively, Assertive, Independent, Spontaneous, Talkative, and Frank. Thus, SPs responses received differentially higher trait attributions when others of the same ethnic group replaced them in their jobs. The opposite might be predicted since being fired so that a person of another ethnic group could be hired would lead to SPs inferring that they were victimized ethnic quota system.

An essential aspect of these findings is the importance of interactional research strategies for examining trait attributions presumed to be broadly characteristic of a specific ethnic group. The results illustrate that controlling for situational factors may enhance understanding of stressful interethnic interactions. Moreover, findings contrary to predictions derived from previous research strongly suggests a revision of ethnic trait attributions.

of the Japanese Male SPs response in this situation indicated that they would not make an effort to obtain a promotion at the expense of their co-workers, but this response is made with a conviction that could be interpreted as an assertive deferential response to the group.

In the Fire situation, the ratings for Japanese and Caucasian SPs are similar for the items, Lively, Frank, and Spontaneous even though Caucasian SPs are rated higher. This may indicate that an attributional leveling effect occurred in the Fire situation which neutralized ethnic differences for those items which were differentially rated in other situations. It would appear that the Fire situation was sufficiently stressful to mitigate individual response differences for the traits of liveliness, frankness, and spontaneity.

In the Interview situation with a different ethnic other, Japanese SPs were rated higher for Assertive and Independent than Caucasian SPs, but very similar for Spontaneous, Frank, and Talkative. This was a somewhat paradoxical outcome which may be interpreted in two basically different ways. First, the Japanese SPs may have had more experience with Caucasian job interviewers and had become more effective in dealing with that type of situation. Second, the Japanese SPs confronted with an interviewer of different ethnicity may be more competent in adopting responses that are perceived as appropriate for that type of interaction. In either case, the results indicated that stereotypical ethnic attributions of character traits are directly influenced by situational factors.

One of the major results involved differences for SP ratings as a function of the situation. These differences followed predictions of those traits which would be rated higher in a specific situation. SPs were rated higher for the items Formal, Cautious, and Tense in the Promotion situation. This situation might be expected to elicit these trait attributions because of the formal aspects of seeking a promotion. By contrast, SPs were rated higher in the Fire

Project Summary-Final Report

This section provides a summary of project research efforts. The field research phase is described and the laboratory studies are summarized.

Field Research Phase

The goals in the field research phase were primarily exploratory. Research efforts consisted of attempts to collect a representative sample of concrete, problematic interethnic situations among Hawaiian ethnic groups in the job setting. A variety of methods and a number of data sources were used to "triangulate" on these problematic situations. The primary method involved face-to-face interviews with persons in multi-ethnic job settings. The interview sources included personnel directors, job supervisors, and workers in a number of service and retail outlet businesses. Direct naturalistic observation of problematic situations was also used and persons actively involved in interethnic situations made self-observations and recorded problematic interethnic situations as they actually experienced them. The primary interest was in identifying meaningful situations in which most persons in similar roles must cope effectively in order to be considered competent. It was also important that truly "problematic" situations be identified in which the most effective response to the situation was not immediately apparent.

The critical incidents technique that had been used in a variety of intercultural and interethnic research studies was used in data collection. However, the conventional methodology was extended to include more emphasis on response analysis in terms of (1) scaled responses of self-rated effectiveness of the interviewee's response to a situation, and (2) scaled degree of difficulty of situations as perceived by the interviewee. In addition, data was obtained on the attributions of persons involved in problematic interethnic situations in

terms of the personality, ethnicity and situational components of the situation.

Although considerable familiarity with local job settings and experience with the intricacies of conducting field research with Hawaiian ethnic groups was gained, this phase of research yielded empirically marginal results. Interview subjects were able to provide data on problematic interethnic situations but the reported and observed type, amount, and difficulty of the situations was very discrepant. Employers would report minimal difficulty among multi-ethnic sales teams only to have interviewers observe what appeared to be hostile interactions between supervisory and sales staff. Mid-level supervisors were overruled by upper management in defining an incident as an interethnic problem. It was impossible to gain entry to one of the major multi-ethnic staff employers in Hawaii because of sensitivities about their affirmative action program. Field research aimed at investigating problematic interethnic situations thus ran headlong into defensiveness, social desirability, and depending on one's position within public institutions, the fear of legal liability.

However, there were major benefits to this phase of the research which should not be underestimated. The salient variables involved in problematic interethnic interactions in Hawaii became clearer. These efforts also provided important insights into alternative methodologies that would be more effective in gaining control over important variables. This led to further methodological refinements in attempts to study interethnic competence. Two aspects of the field research results--the lack of control of situation factors and vague criteria for effective responses--were of major concern and formed the core of laboratory research.

Laboratory Research Phase

Although ethnocultural variables had not previously been incorporated in reported studies using person-situation research strategies, this approach

seemed appropriate for the research goals of the project. Preliminary efforts also involved critical comparison of available models of competence. This resulted in a technical report that reviewed psychological models of competence for potential applicability to research on ethnocultural factors in social competence assessment.

Subsequent studies were conducted using person-situation research strategies for assessing ethnocultural factors in social competence. Videotapes were developed that depicted the responses of different Hawaiian ethnic groups responding to simulated problematic life situations in general, and problematic interethnic job situations in particular. Three separate studies were conducted. One varied the ethnicity of videotaped respondents (Chinese, Japanese, Filipino, Caucasian) and obtained judgments of internal states and assessed response competence from ethnically similar judges. A second study obtained similar judgments of Japanese and Caucasian respondents from Japanese, Caucasian, and mixed parentage Japanese-Caucasian judges. A third study obtained similar judgments of Japanese and Caucasian respondents viewed by Japanese and Caucasian judges.

Significant effects were found for situation and ethnicity of the respondent across all studies. Significant effects for ethnicity of the judge did not occur. Numerous interactions effects occurred between situation and ethnicity of respondent, as well as higher order interactions between other study variables. These results are summarized in detail in Technical Report No. 2, Person x Situation Research Strategies for Assessing Ethnocultural Factors in Social Competence, and in the above sections of this report.

In summary, the project has contributed to both the theoretical and empirical basis of interethnic competence, interethnic judgments of internal states, and ethnic trait attributions. The overall results strongly suggest that a person-situation approach to future research of this type is indicated both in terms

of data yield and theoretical understanding. Of greatest concern for practical purposes may be the need to conduct task-oriented performance evaluations based on more systematic understanding of the differential elicitation potential of specific situations for different ethnic minorities. Global approaches are needed for expanding the taxonomic framework of person-situation interactions. Setting-specific taxonomic approaches, such as that used in the present research, are indicated for conducting more efficient and equitable performance evaluations. This is of particular importance if taxonomic efforts are focused on identifying those situations which have maximum differential elicitation potential for ethnic minorities. If systematic person-situation relations are found that relate to interethnic interactions, the probability of person-organization match and organizational effectiveness may be greatly enhanced.

References

- Baralund, D. C. Public and private self in Japan and the United States: Communication styles in two cultures. Tokyo: The Simal Press, Inc. 1975.
- Barker, R. G. Explorations in ecological psychology. American Psychologist, 1965, 20, 1-14.
- Conno, J. Tradition and change in three generations of Japanese-Americans. Chicago: Nelson-Hall, 1977.
- Dinges, N. & Duffy, L. Culture and competence. In: T. Marsella, R. Tharp & T. Chotkowski (eds.) Perspectives in cross-cultural psychology. New York: Academic Press, Inc., 1979, pp. 209-232.
- Dinges, N. & Tokuno, K. Assessing interethnic competence: Models and strategies for examining ethnocultural factors in response to life situations. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, In press.
- Endler, N. & Magnusson, D. (eds.) Interactional psychology and personality. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1976.
- Hammer, M., Cudykunst, M. & Wiseman, R. Dimensions of intercultural effectiveness: An exploratory study. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 1978, 2, 382-393.
- Johnson, C. L. & Johnson, F. A. Interaction rules and ethnicity: The Japanese and Caucasians of Honolulu. Social Forces, 1975, 54 (2), 452-466.
- Lazarus, R. & Launier, R. Stress-related transactions between person and environment. In: Lawrence Pervin & Michael Lewis (eds.) Perspectives in interactional psychology. New York: Plenum Press, 1977, pp. 287-327.
- Samuels, P. The Japanese and the Haoles of Honolulu: Durable group interaction. New Haven: College & University Press, 1970.

LIST 1

MANDATORY

Office of Naval Research (3 copies)
(Coda 432)
800 N. Quincy St.
Arlington, Virginia 22217

Defense Documentation Center
(12 copies)
Accessions Division
ATTN: DDC-TC
Cameron Station
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Commanding Officer
Naval Research Laboratory
Coda 2627
Washington, D. C. 20375

Science and Technology Division
Library of Congress
Washington, D.C. 20540

LIST 2

ONR FYEED

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
Bldg. 114, Section D
666 Summer St.
Boston, Massachusetts 02210

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
1030 E. Green St.
Pasadena, California 91106

Psychologist
ONR Branch Office
536 S. Clark St.
Chicago, Illinois 60605

LIST 3

ARPA

Director (3 copies)
Program Management
ARPA, Room 813
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209

Director
Cybernetics Technology Office
ARPA, Room 625
1400 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209

LIST 4

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATORS

Dr. Earl A. Alluisi
Performance Assessment Laboratory
Old Dominion University
Norfolk, Virginia 23508

Dr. James A. Dayton
Department of Psychology
Howard University
Washington, D. C. 20001

Dr. H. Russell Bernard
Department of Sociology
and Anthropology
West Virginia University
Morgantown, West Virginia 26506

Dr. Arthur Blalock
Human Factors Laboratory
Code N-71
Naval Training Equipment Center
Orlando, Florida 32813

Dr. Milton R. Blood
College of Industrial Management
Georgia Institute of Technology
Atlanta, Georgia 30332

Dr. William Bowerman
Psychology Department
University of Kansas
Lawrence, Kansas 66044

Dr. David G. Bowers
Institute for Social Research
P.O. Box 1248
University of Michigan
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48106

Dr. Joseph V. Brady
The Johns Hopkins University
School of Medicine
Division of Behavioral Biology
Baltimore, Maryland 21205

Dr. C. Brooklyn Derr
Visiting Associate Professor
325-C Milton Bannion Hall
University of Utah
Salt Lake City, Utah 84112

Dr. Norman C. Dinges
The Institute of Behavioral Sciences
250 Ward Avenue - Suite 226
Honolulu, Hawaii 96814

Dr. Carson K. Eoyang
Naval Postgraduate School
Department of Administrative Sciences
Monterey, California 93540

Dr. Paul S. Goodman
Graduate School of Industrial
Administration
Carnegie-Mellon University
Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania 15213

Dr. J. Richard Hackman
School of Organization and Management
56 Hillhouse Avenue
Yale University
New Haven, Connecticut 06520

Dr. Asa C. Hillford, Jr.
The Urban Institute for Human Services, Inc.
P.O. Box 15068
San Francisco, California 94115

Ms. Kirsten Hinsdale
Vice-President, Research & Development
Validated Instruction Associates, Inc.
P.O. Box 386
Auburn, Michigan 49224

Dr. Edwin Hollander
Department of Psychology
State University of New York at Buffalo
4230 Ridge Lea Rd.
Buffalo, New York 14226

Dr. Charles L. Hollin
Department of Psychology
University of Illinois
Champaign, Illinois 61820

Dr. Favis Kirkland
University City Science Center
Center for Social Development
3624 Science Center
Philadelphia, Pennsylvania 19104

LIST 4, (cont'd.)

Dr. Rudi Klaus
Syracuse University
Public Administration Department
Maxwell School
Syracuse, New York 13210

Dr. Arthur L. Korotkin
Vice President and Director
Washington Office
Richard A. Gibbons Associates, Inc.
10405 Concord St. - Suite 203 A
Kensington, Maryland 20795

Dr. Edward R. Lavier
Zetelle Human Affairs Research Centers
4200 N.E., 41st St.
P.O. Box 5395
Seattle, Washington 98105

Dr. Arie Y. Levin
Duke University
Duke Station
Durham, North Carolina 27706

Dr. Morgan V. McCall, Jr.
Center for Creative Leadership
P.O. Box P-1
Greensboro, North Carolina 27402

Dr. Terence R. Mitchell
School of Business Administration
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. William N. Mobley
College of Business Administration
University of South Carolina
Columbia, South Carolina 29208

Dr. John M. Neale
State University of New York at
Stony Brook
Department of Psychology
Stony Brook, New York 11794

Dr. Peter G. Nordlie
Human Sciences Research, Inc.
7710 Old Springhouse Rd.
McLean, Virginia 22101

Dr. Robert D. O'Connor
Behavior Design, Inc.
11212 N. May Ave. - Suite 111
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73120

Dr. Manuel Ramirez
Systems and Evaluations
232 Swanton Blvd.
Santa Cruz, California 95060

Dr. Irwin Sarason
Department of Psychology
University of Washington
Seattle, Washington 98195

Dr. Saul B. Sells
Institute of Behavioral Research
Drew-C.
Texas Christian University
Fort Worth, Texas 76129

Dr. H. Wallace Sinaiko
Program Director
Manpower Research & Advisory Services
Southwestern Institution
601 N. Pitt St. - Suite 120
Alexandria, Virginia 22314

Mrs. Alice I. Snyder
Anthropological Inquiry Services
1749 Navajo Lane
El Cajon, California 92020

Dr. Bertram I. Spector
CACT, Inc. - Federal
Ann Arbor Office
1325 S. Maple Rd.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103

Dr. Richard Stetson
Graduate School of Management
and Business
University of Oregon
Eugene, Oregon 97403

Dr. Philip G. Zimbardo
Department of Psychology
Stanford University
Stanford, California 94305

LIST 5

MISCELLANEOUS

Air Force
AFOSR/NL (Dr. Fragly)
Building 410
Boiling AFB
Washington, D. C. 20332

ARMY
Army Research Institute (2 copies)
5001 Eisenhower Ave.
Alexandria, Virginia 22333

Marine Corps
Commandant of the Marine Corps
(Code MP1-20)
Washington, D. C. 20380

Coast Guard
Joseph J. Cowan
Chief, Psychological Research Branch
U.S. Coast Guard (G-P-1/2/62)
Washington, D. C. 20590

Navy
Bureau of Naval Personnel
Scientific Advisor (Pers Or)
Washington, D.C. 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 6)
Assistant Chief of Naval Personnel
for Human Resource Management
Washington, D. C. 20370

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 6a3)
Human Resource Management
Washington, D. C. 20370

CAPT Paul D. Nelson, MSC, USN
Director of Manpower & Facilities
(Code 60)
Navy Medical R & D Command
Bethesda, Maryland 20014

Superintendent (Code 1424)
Naval Postgraduate School
Monterey, California 93940

NAVY (cont'd.)
Training Officer
Human Resource Management Center
Naval Training Center (Code 9600)
San Diego, California 92133

Scientific Director
Naval Health Research Center
San Diego, California 92152

Navy Personnel R & D Center (5 copies)
San Diego, California 92152

Human Resource Management Center
Box 23
FPO New York 09510

Human Resource Management Detachment
Naples
Box 3
FPO New York 09521

Human Resource Management Detachment
Rota
Box 41
FPO New York 09540

Human Resource Management Center
Norfolk
5621-23 Tidewater Dr.
Norfolk, Virginia 23511

Human Resource Management Center
Building 304
Naval Training Center
San Diego, California 92133

Human Resource Management School
Naval Air Station Memphis (36)
Millington, Tennessee 38054

Bureau of Naval Personnel (Pers 65)
Washington, D. C. 20370

Director, Human Resource Training Dept.
Naval Amphibious School
Little Creek
Naval Amphibious Base
Norfolk, Virginia 23521

Commanding Officer
HSCC Washington
1300 Wilson Blvd.
Arlington, Virginia 22209