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ABSTRACT

Facing the increasingly intensified interactions between cultures, why do people sometimes react to foreign cultural influence in a negative way? Three critical conditions were proposed to account for people’s negative reactions toward intrusion of a foreign element into the sacred space of the local community. These three conditions are (a) perceptions of the foreign element as a symbol of the culture it belongs to; (b) the foreign element is perceived to have intruded into the physical space of the local community; and (c) the local space is widely regarded by the local community with reverence and respect. Experiments 1 to 3 tested this proposed framework in different intercultural contexts: Chinese’s responses to the opening of a new McDonald’s shop at the Great Wall of China (Experiment 1); Americans’ responses to an image of Mao Zedong superimposed on that of the Statue of Liberty (Experiment 2); and Americans’ responses to the construction of a Muslim Mosque near Ground Zero in New York City (Experiment 3). The results from these three experiments supported the proposed model. Two additional experiments (Experiments 4 and 5) explored other bases of resistance to spatial intrusions of a foreign element. Results from these additional experiments showed that when cultural intrusions occur in a foreign country or in a competitive political outgroup, individuals may be motivated by culture preservation values, or by political ideology to resist or welcome these intrusions. I close with a discussion on the implications of the results for managing intercultural relations and future research.
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CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

The following four incidents inspired the current investigation:

**Incident 1:** In 2004, the Mexican angrily campaigned to stop Wal-Mart from opening a store near the ruins of Teotihuacan, a sacred cultural heritage for Mexicans (BBC News, 2004).

**Incident 2:** In January 2007, Chenggang Rui, Director and Anchor of *BizChina*, the prime-time daily business show on China Central Television International, led an online campaign to have Starbucks Coffee removed from Beijing’s Imperial Palace Museum. In his online article, Rui (2007) wrote, “The Forbidden City is a symbol of China’s cultural heritage. Starbucks is a symbol of lower middle class culture in the west. We need to embrace the world, but we also need to preserve our cultural identity. There is a fine line between globalization and contamination…. But please don’t interpret this as an act of nationalism. It is just about we Chinese people respecting ourselves. I actually like drinking Starbucks coffee. I am just against having one in the Forbidden City.” Within a few months, this article has attracted more than half a million readers and inspired more than 2700 commentaries, mostly of which are written in Chinese and are sympathetic to Rui’s cause (BBC News, 2007).

**Incident 3:** In 2009, the French was aghast at plans to open a McDonald's restaurant at the Louvre Museum, an enduring symbol of French exceptional accomplishment in the fine arts (The Daily Telegraph, 2009).

**Incident 4:** In June 2010, Imam Fiesal Abdul Rauf campaigned to win over American support for a multi-million dollar Mosque that is slated to open 9-11-2011. In response, a blogger posted an essay on the Internet with the following message: “Most of you have
heard about the controversial plans to construct a mosque at or very near ground zero, the former site of the World Trade Center towers … These Muslims in New York know exactly what they are doing, they know that most Americans will see this mosque as a slap in the face, they don't care at all what we think, they will build it anyway … This ought to infuriate every American, and we ought to be raising Hell in a way they will never forget. We must stop this mosque from being built at this location, at all costs! … This Ground Zero Mosque is an affront to the American people, a symbol of Islam scoffing at us as they take over our sacred ground” (Protest the Left, 2010).

These incidents are all instances of motivated resistance to intrusion of foreign cultures and their symbols in the sacred space of the local community. In this era where interactions among different cultures have accelerated drastically, incidents of this sort seem to be increasingly common. How can these incidents be accounted for? The author of the commentary on the Mosque near Ground Zero is a conservative. Are the incidents listed above expressions of political conservatism? In his essay, Rui (2007) maintained that “It is just about we Chinese people respecting ourselves.” Are the incidents listed above expressions of cultural identification? In this dissertation, I propose that incidents like these represent culturally motivated negative reactions to foreign cultural influence and do not always reflect the individuals’ cultural identity concerns or political ideology.

In the current chapter, I will first define what culturally motivated resistance to foreign cultural influence is. Next, I will review existing theories that may account for these reactions. Based on an analysis of the critical commonalities of the incidents listed above, I propose a theory of negative reactions to foreign intrusions of sacred space to account for these incidents and then connect the proposed theory to the extant literature
of cultural and intercultural dynamics. Next, I will present the main hypotheses of the current investigation, which I tested in the three experiments reported in Chapter 2. Although the present investigation focuses on culturally motivated negative reactions to foreign intrusion of sacred space, I acknowledge that there are other causes of reactions to foreign intrusion of sacred space. In Chapter 3, I explored two such causes in two additional experiments: personal values (e.g., the value of preserving world heritage sites), and political ideology. In Chapter 3, I also discuss the theoretical, practical, and future research implications of my results.

**Culturally Motivated Resistance to Foreign Cultures**

Social psychologists studying the cultural effects of globalization have identified two qualitatively different types of responses to foreign cultures in intercultural interactions (Chiu & Cheng, 2007, 2010). The first set of responses is referred to as exclusionary reactions, which are emotional reactions to fear of cultural contamination or erosion. Individuals who exhibit exclusionary reactions worry that cultural inflows from foreign countries could lead to contamination and erosion of the heritage culture and hence perceive such cultural inflows as cultural threats. Exclusionary reactions include behavioral attempts to isolate, reject and even attack foreign cultural intruders. In contrast, the second set of responses, often referred to as inclusionary reactions, refers to goal-oriented reactions geared toward problem solving. Individuals who display inclusionary reactions see foreign cultural inflows as cultural resources that can be appropriated to facilitate the pursuit of valued personal or collective goals. Inclusionary behavioral responses include acceptance of foreign cultural inflows and attempts to integrate and mix foreign and local cultural ideas or practices to create new ideas or
practices. Recently, inclusionary reactions have received some research attention. This research has examined how individuals integrate their ideas and practices from different cultures to enhance creative performance (Leung & Chiu, 2010; Leung, Maddux, Galinsky, & Chiu, 2008). In contrast, exclusionary reactions have received relatively little research attention.

**Critical Communalities of Negative Reactions Toward Cultural Intrusions**

The four incidents listed at the beginning of this chapter share the following commonalities:

a) They all involve intrusion of a foreign element into the physical space of a local community. The foreign element could be a person, a building, a business or an organization from a foreign culture;

b) The physical space is regarded by the local community as a sacred space;

c) Such intrusion has evoked negative, exclusionary reactions;

d) The intruder is seen as a representative of its culture;

e) The intruder is perceived to have the intention of trampling the local culture; and

f) The negative reactions are directed toward both the intruder and the cultural group to which it belongs.

**Theories of Exclusionary Reactions**

Several theories can account for some aspects of this phenomenon. First, the social identity theory (SIT; Tajfel & Turner, 1979) argues that group membership is a part of personal identity and people are motivated to feel good about the self. Therefore, people are motivated to view their ingroup as positive and superior to the outgroup. One way to maintain this perception is via outgroup derogation. Thus, individuals who
strongly identify with their own culture are more motivated to evaluate outgroup culture and their representatives negatively.

However, Brewer (1999) proposes that ingroup love does not necessarily automatically translate into outgroup hate. Thus, ingroup identification is independent of negative attitudes toward outgroups, and intergroup conflict is primarily motivated by preferential treatment of ingroup members rather than direct hostility toward outgroup members.

Second, politically conservative individuals are motivated to follow conventional norms in their own culture and not open to ideas and practices from other cultures (Jost, Glaser, Kruglanski, & Sulloway, 2003). Thus, politically conservative individuals are particularly likely to perceive anything from a foreign culture (e.g., Mao for Americans; American companies for the Chinese) as representative of the foreign culture and to resist cultural inflows from other countries.

Finally, the realistic conflict theory (Sherif, 1966) assumes that people in a certain community will negatively evaluate a competitive outgroup when they perceive the outgroup to be a realistic threat to their ingroup community. The realistic conflict theory would predict negative evaluation of an outgroup culture and its representatives when the perceivers feel that the outgroup culture may out compete the ingroup community.

**The Contextual Nature of Culturally Motivated Negative Reactions Toward Cultural Intrusions**

The social identity theory, the theory of political conservatism, and the realistic conflict cannot fully account for the contextualized nature of culturally motivated negative reactions to cultural intrusions. For example, social identity theory predicts that
individuals would react negatively to a foreign culture when ingroup cultural identity is salient, either because the individuals have chronic high levels of cultural identification, or because the situation renders the ingroup cultural identity salient. For instance, ingroup cultural identity is rendered salient when reminders of the contrast between ingroup and outgroup cultural membership are present (Turner, Hogg, Oakes, Reicher, & Wetherell, 1987). Figure 1 shows two pictures of the Starbucks Coffee at the Imperial Palace Museum in Beijing before it was forced to move out of the Museum. It could be argued that this shop evoked strong negative reactions from the Chinese because its architectural style mixed elements of global culture with Chinese culture. Such culture mixing increases the perceptual salience of the contrast between ingroup and outgroup cultures and hence the salience of the ingroup cultural identity.

![Figure 1. Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum](image)

Nonetheless, cultural mixing itself does not always increase the likelihood of negative reactions from the local community. The Starbucks coffee shop in the tourist area in Beijing (see Figure 2) has the same architectural style as the Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum but does not evoke negative reactions from the Chinese.
The theory of political conservatism predicts a generalized negative attitude toward foreign cultures, particularly when elements of foreign cultures are perceived to have contaminated traditional culture. However, negative reactions toward foreign intrusion of local space do not reflect blanket hostility of the local community toward the intruder. Although Wal-Mart in the ruins of Teotihuacan, McDonald’s at Louvre, and Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum evoked strong negative reactions from the local communities, in 2010, there were 175 Wal-Mart in Mexico, 1,161 McDonald’s in France, and 230 Starbucks in China, and the numbers are increasing. Politically conservative individuals may be particularly concerned about preserving the purity of the traditional culture. Thus, they may react negatively to culture mixing. Although political conservatism can explain individual differences in negative reactions to culture mixing, it does not explain contextual variations in negative reactions to culture mixing (e.g., why the Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum evoked negative reactions but the one shown in Figure 2 does not).
The realistic conflict theory also does not account for the contextual variations in negative reactions to culture mixing, because there is no reason to believe that the Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum will present a greater realistic threat to China than does the one shown in Figure 2, or the one shown in Figure 3, which is located in a popular shopping area in Beijing.

*Figure 3. A Starbucks in a popular shopping area in Beijing*

My analysis of the critical commonalities of the four incidents listed at the beginning of the current chapter and the contextual variations in local people’s negative reactions toward foreign intrusions of local space suggests that two critical conditions must be met for the negative reactions toward foreign spatial intrusion to emerge. First, the local community must regard the local space as a *sacred* space in the community (the ruins of Teotihuacan in Mexico; the Imperial Palace Museum in China; the Louvre Museum in France; Ground Zero in the United States). Many cultural communities have
their sacred space (e.g., the Alamo for Texas). This space is widely regarded by community with reverence or respect. A threat to the purity and integrity of this space will be perceived as a threat to the dignity of the whole culture. This sentiment is evident in the commentary on the construction of a Mosque near Ground Zero. The Starbucks in Beijing’s tourist area does not evoke negative responses from the Chinese, probably because the Chinese do not consider the tourist area in China as a sacred space.

Second, the foreign element that enters the sacred space of the local community is perceived to be a symbol of foreign culture. As Rui (2007) puts it, “Starbucks is a symbol of lower middle class culture in the West.” Similarly, the Mosque is a symbol of Islam, and McDonald’s and Wal-Mart are symbols of global or capitalist culture.

Based on this analysis, I propose a theoretical model to account for people’s negative reactions toward foreign intrusion of local space. This model is depicted in Figure 4. According to this model, people expect foreign cultures to show respect to the local culture by staying away from the sacred space of the local community. The local community regards its sacred space as a sanctuary of their culture, and foreign cultures are expected to show their respect to this space by keeping a physical distance from it. This idea is consistent with a recent finding that people generally associate maintaining a larger spatial distance from each other with expression of higher levels of politeness (Brown & Levinson, 1987; Stephan, Liberman, & Trope, 2010). Behavioral violations of this expectancy will be viewed as disrespectful intrusions and the intruder will be evaluated negatively.
For a spatial intrusion to occur, the intruder must be seen as a representative of the culture to which it belongs. When the intruder is perceived as a representative of its culture, the intrusion will be seen as one in which a foreign culture attempts to trample over the local culture. Most incidents of spatial intrusion have ambiguous meanings and could be interpreted in different ways. For instance, the Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum may be interpreted as a coffee shop, but may also be perceived as an agent of cultural influence or infiltration. A recent study (Tong, Pam, Kwan, & Peng, 2011) shows that when a foreign business tries to take over a local brand that is an icon of the local culture, the local community would interpret the acquisition culturally and experience fear of cultural erosion. In contrast, when the foreign business is considered to be an economic entity, the local community will perceive the acquisition as an economic transaction and appraise it more positively when the acquisition benefits both the foreign and local businesses than when it does not.

Based on this analysis, I propose the following hypotheses:
Hypothesis 1: People in the local community are more likely to perceive a foreign element as a cultural intrusion when the foreign element is perceived (vs. not) as a representative of its culture entering (vs. staying away from) the sacred space of the local community.

Hypothesis 2: People in the local community are more likely to perceive a symbolic element of a foreign culture as a cultural intrusion when it enters (vs. stays away from) a space that is more strongly believed to be a scared place of the local community.

Furthermore, the more people in the local community perceive a foreign element to be a cultural intrusion, the more negatively they would react toward the intruder. This is the case because a cultural intrusion can potentially undermine the vitality of the local culture, which confers important psychological benefits to the individual. Two defining characteristics of a cultural tradition are its sharedness and continuity (Chiu, Leung, & Hong, 2010). The shared values, beliefs and norms in a culture are conventionalized solutions to frequently encountered problems in the society (Chiu & Hong, 2006). Adherence to cultural values, beliefs, and norms when making behavioral decisions confers epistemic security to the individuals. Consistent with this idea, research has shown that dispositional and experimentally induced need for epistemic security tends to increase reliance of cultural knowledge in sense making and behavioral decision (Chao, Zhang, & Chiu, 2010; Chiu, Morris, Hong, & Menon, 2000; Fu, Morris, Lee, Chao, Chiu, & Hong, 2007; Leung, Kim, Zhang, Tam, & Chiu, in press).

Another dimension of culture is its continuity, which can confer existential security to the individual. Awareness of one’s inevitable finitude creates existential anxiety, making people question the meaning of life. Seeing oneself as a good member of
one’s cultural community confers meaning in life and reduces existential anxiety (Greenberg, Pyszczynski, Solomon, Rosenblatt, Veeder, Kirkland, & Lyon, 1990). Consistent with this view, terror management research has found a greater tendency to defend the integrity and purity of one’s cultural tradition following situational induction of the need for existential security (Torelli, Chiu, Tam, Au, & Keh, in press; Greenberg et al., 1990). A recent study further confirms that the motivation to defend the integrity of one’s cultural tradition is particularly strong when individuals with a high need for epistemic security experience an existential crisis (Torelli et al., in press). Given the important psychological benefits culture confers, individuals should be motivated to preserve the vitality of their own culture. When they register an act of cultural intrusion that may undermine the vitality of their culture, they may react negatively to the intruder. Thus, I propose the following hypotheses:

**Hypothesis 3**: People in the local community would react more negatively to a symbolic element of a foreign culture when the foreign element is perceived (vs. not) as a representative of its culture entering (vs. staying away from) the sacred space of the local community.

**Hypothesis 4**: People in the local community would react more negatively to a symbolic element of a foreign culture when it enters (vs. stays away from) a space that is more strongly believed to be a scared place of the local community.

**Hypothesis 5**: Perceived cultural intrusion mediates the relationships described in Hypotheses 3 and 4.
Finally, because the cultural intruder is perceived to be a representative of its culture, people in the local community may also react negatively to the culture the intruder belongs to. This provides the motivation for Hypotheses 6-7.

**Hypothesis 6**: People in the local community would react more negatively to a culture when its symbolic element enters (vs. stays away from) a space that is more strongly believed to be a scared place of the local community.

**Hypothesis 7**: Perceived cultural intrusion mediates the relationships described in Hypotheses 6.

**Caveats**

Two caveats are in order. Negative reactions toward cultural intrusion are not necessarily “bad” reactions. These negative reactions can increase intercultural tension and discourage intercultural learning. Nonetheless, at times, these reactions can serve to preserve the integrity and vitality of heritage cultures by minimizing cultural erosion resulting from globalization and commercialization. Culturally motivated resistance also invites critical reflections on the cultural effects of globalization and leads to greater respect for cultural diversity.

Second, in my analysis, culture is not restricted to national culture. Exclusionary reactions may also take the form of motivated resistance to the contamination of a heritage culture by global culture, materialistic culture, capitalist culture, religious culture, or foreign political culture (e.g., communism).

**The Current Investigation**

In the next chapter, I report three experiments that tested the seven hypotheses presented in the last section in three different intercultural contexts: Chinese’s response to
the opening of a new McDonald’s shop at the Great Wall of China (Experiment 1); Americans’ responses to an image of Mao Zedong superimposed on that of the Statue of Liberty (Experiment 2); and Americans’ responses to the construction of a Muslim Mosque near Ground Zero in New York City (Experiment 3). Although my focal research interest is to test the proposed model in Figure 4, as mentioned earlier, social identity theory, political conservatism and realistic conflict theory may also explain some aspects of negative reactions to cultural intrusion. Therefore, I also measured cultural identification, political conservatism and perceived intercultural conflict in this research to clarify the role of these variables and their relationships with the proposed antecedents of negative reactions in my model.

Although I focus on culturally motivated negative reactions toward cultural intrusions, negative reactions toward spatial intrusion into sacred local space may also be value-driven. For example, some Americans may object to having a Starbucks at the Imperial Palace Museum out of their commitment to preserve and respect other cultural traditions. Individuals may also be motivated by their political ideology to welcome or resist foreign intrusion into sacred local space. I expect these motivations, which may be relatively less important when the individuals react to foreign intrusions into the sacred space of ingroup cultural community, would become more important when individuals react to foreign intrusions into the sacred space of outgroup cultural communities. In Chapter 3, I report two experiments (Experiments 4 and 5) that explored this possibility.

A major focus in cross-cultural and cultural psychology is to examine the effects of chronic socialization on human behaviors. The current investigation joins an emerging literature that focuses on the cultural and intercultural dynamics of cultures in action.
(Leung, Chiu, & Hong, 2010). Aside from its theoretical contributions, the current investigation will generate knowledge of when and how people in the local community would react to foreign cultural intrusions. This knowledge has important practical implications for managing intercultural and intergroup relations. I will return to these implications in Chapter 3.
CHAPTER 2: THE ROLE OF CULTURAL SYMBOLISM
AND INTRUSION OF CULTURAL SPACE

In this chapter, I report three experiments, one conducted in China and two in the United States, to test the seven hypotheses regarding the role of cultural symbolism in negative reactions to intrusion of a foreign element into the local community’s sacred space. My key hypothesis is that when people perceive a spatial intrusion of a foreign element into a sacred space of their community, they would react more negatively to the intrusion when they see the foreign element as a symbol of foreign culture than if they do not.

Experiment 1: McDonald’s and the Great Wall

To test the key hypothesis, in Experiment 1, I had Chinese participants evaluate a print ad of McDonald’s planning on opening a shop at the Great Wall. I chose the Great Wall to represent a sacred space in China because it is one of the UNESCO World Heritage Sites in China. The Great Wall, which consists of a series of stone and earthen fortifications, bears witness to over 2000 years of Chinese history and has acquired its modern status as the most celebrated symbol of China.

To manipulate Spatial Intrusion, I superimposed the logo of McDonald’s on a picture of the Great Wall (Spatial Intrusion Condition) or placing them side by side (Spatial Separation Condition). To manipulate the Cultural Symbolism of McDonald’s, I emphasized in the stimuli either the cultural symbolic aspects (Cultural Symbolism Condition) or the consumer benefits (Consumer Benefits Condition) of McDonald’s. In addition, I measured the participants’ identification with Chinese culture.
I predicted that when the cultural symbolic aspects of McDonald’s were emphasized and its logo being superimposed onto the image of the Great Wall, the Chinese participants would perceive the ad as more of cultural intrusion, which in turn would evoke more negative reactions toward the McDonald’s.

**Method**

*Participants*

The participants were Han Chinese ($N = 94$; 25 men) from Beijing. The mean age was 22.04 years. About half of them (54%) were undergraduates, and the remaining ones were graduate students.

*Design, Procedure and Materials*

There were two between-subjects factors: Cultural Symbolism (Cultural Symbolism Condition vs. Consumer Benefits Condition) and Spatial Intrusion (Spatial Intrusion Condition vs. Spatial Separation Condition). The participants were randomly assigned to one of the four experimental conditions.

Participants arrived at the laboratory, provided informed consent, and learned that the “purpose” of the study was to evaluate an advertisement. To minimize the effect of prior knowledge, we created a novel but plausible advertisement, titled “McDonald’s is scheduled to open a new shop at the Great Wall”.

Participants examined one of four versions of the ad (see Appendix A). To manipulate cultural intrusion, in the Spatial Intrusion Condition, McDonald’s logo (the Golden Arches) was superimposed onto the image of the Great Wall, whereas in the Spatial Separation Condition, the logo was placed separate from the picture of the Great Wall. The perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s was manipulated by adding a
slogan below the ad that either explicitly framed it as a symbol of American culture or emphasized its consumer benefits (the appeals of its food and service).

Immediately following the presentation of the ad, participants were instructed to write down three thoughts they had about the ad. Later, two coders who were blind to the participants’ experimental conditions used a 7-point scale to rate each participant’s responses on the extent to which they expressed cultural intrusion (inter-rater $r = .75$, $p < .0001$). I took the average of the two coders’ ratings to create a measure of cultural intrusion perception.

Next, to measure exclusionary reaction toward the McDonald’s at the Great Wall, I measured the participants’ behavioral, cognitive, and affective responses toward the new shop (see also Shavitt, Swan, Lowrey, & Wänke, 1994). For the behavioral component, participants were asked to indicate how likely they would eat at this McDonald's if they traveled to the Great Wall on a 6-point scale (1 = definitely won't, 6 = definitely will; $M = 3.30$, $SD = 1.24$). For the cognitive component, they were asked to indicate their appraisals of the McDonald’s on three 9-point scales (bad-good, undesirable-desirable, and unfavorable-favorable; from -4 to 4; $M = -0.59$, $SD = 2.19$; $\alpha = .95$). Third, for the affective component, they were asked to rate on 5-point scales (1 = not at all, 5 = very much) how intensely they experienced three positive emotions (liking, happiness, admiration; $M = 2.00$, $SD = 1.00$; $\alpha = .92$) and three negative emotions (hatred, anger, contempt; $M = 2.38$, $SD = 1.23$; $\alpha = .89$) toward the McDonald’s.

To create a composite measure of reaction to the McDonald’s, I (a) subtracted the scale midpoint (3.5) from the behavioral item; (b) computed an affect balance score by subtracting the mean of the negative emotion items from that of the positive emotion
items; (c) standardized the adjusted behavioral item, the affect balance score, and the mean cognitive appraisal score without altering their means, so that each component score had a standard deviation of 1.00; and (d) took the mean of the three component scores to form a reaction score ($\alpha = .91$). The value of 0 on the reaction score indicated neutral reaction (neither positive nor negative), whereas positive (negative) values indicated positive (negative) reaction. The average reaction score was -0.39, which was significantly lower than 0, $t(93) = -4.11, p < .0001$. This result indicated that on average, the Chinese negatively reacted to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall.

Identification with Chinese culture was measured with two items taken from Wan et al. (2007): “Chinese culture is important to my identity” and “I identify with Chinese culture”. Participants indicated their extent of agreement with each item on a 7-point scale, with 1 = *strongly disagree* and 7 = *strongly agree*. The mean of the two items was used to form the cultural identification measure. The mean level of cultural identification was high ($M = 6.20, SD = 0.83$).

I also used a 6-item scale of cultural symbolism (Wan, Torelli, & Chiu, 2010) to measure the extent to which the Great Wall was perceived to be a symbol of Chinese culture. Two sample items are “the Great Wall is an icon of Chinese culture” and “the Great Wall embodies Chinese values.” The participants rated their extent of agreement to each item on a scale from 1 (*not at all*) to 7 (*very much*). The mean of the 6 items was used to form the cultural symbolism measure ($\alpha = .90$). The participants consensually perceived the Great Wall to be a symbol of Chinese culture ($M = 5.92, SD = 0.96$), which provided support for the rationale of my choice of the Great Wall as a sacred space of Chinese culture. All the materials were presented in simplified Chinese.
Results

As shown in the inter-correlations of the measured variables in Table 1, participants who perceived stronger cultural symbolism of the Great Wall also identified more strongly with Chinese culture \((r = .55, p < .001)\) and exhibited non-significant trends to view the McDonald’s at the Great Wall as a cultural intrusion \((r = .17, p = .09)\) and react more negatively to it \((r = -.18, p = .08)\). This pattern of correlations attests to the validity of the measured variables. In the analysis reported below, I controlled for the effect of perceived cultural symbolism, although the results did not change when this control variable was not included in the analyses.

Table 1
Inter-correlations among the measured variables (Experiment 1, Chinese, \(N = 94\)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Cultural symbolism of McDonald’s ((1 = \text{cultural symbolism}, 0 = \text{consumer benefits}))</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial intrusion ((1 = \text{intrusion}, 0 = \text{separation}))</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification with Chinese culture</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaction toward the McDonald’s branch</td>
<td>-.32**</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural intrusion perception</td>
<td>.35***</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.72***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of the Great Wall as a symbol of Chinese culture</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.55***</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>0.49</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>6.20</td>
<td>-0.39</td>
<td>4.33</td>
<td>5.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.96</td>
<td>0.96</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(* *p < .01. \ ***p < .001.\)

Cultural Intrusion Perception

To test Hypothesis 1, I performed a Cultural Symbolism \(\times\) Spatial Intrusion analysis of variance (ANOVA) on cultural intrusion perception. As seen in Figure 5 and indicated by the main effect of perceived cultural symbolism \([F(1, 88) = 12.50, p < .001, \eta^2 = .12]\), participants found the McDonald’s at the Great Wall to be more culturally
intrusive when the cultural symbolic aspects (vs. consumer benefits) of McDonald’s was emphasized ($M_s = 5.10$ vs. $3.76$). Furthermore, the significant interaction of perceived cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion ($F = 4.05, p = .047, \eta^2 = .04$) indicated that when McDonald’s was framed as a symbol of American culture, McDonald’s venture was viewed as marginally more culturally intrusive in the Spatial Intrusion Condition ($M = 5.62$) than in the Spatial Separation Condition ($M = 4.58$), $t = 1.93, p = .06, \eta^2 = .03$. The simple main effect of spatial intrusion in the Consumer Benefits Condition was not significant ($M_s = 3.52$ vs. $3.99$, $t = -0.90, p = .37$). This result supported Hypothesis 1: Intrusion of a foreign business into a country’s sacred space would evoke stronger perception of cultural intrusion only when the foreign business was seen as a symbol of foreign culture.

![Figure 5](image)

*Figure 5.* Cultural intrusion perception as a function of cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and spatial intrusion, controlling for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall (Experiment 1). Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.
**Reaction to McDonald’s Venture**

Next, to test Hypothesis 3, I performed a Cultural Symbolism × Spatial Intrusion ANOVA on reaction to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall. The results mirrored the cultural intrusion perception results. As seen in Figure 6, participants reacted to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall more negatively when its cultural symbolic aspects versus consumer benefits aspects were emphasized ($M_{s} = -0.69 \text{ vs. } -0.10$), $F(1, 88) = 11.64, p = .001, \eta^2 = .10$, for the main effect of perceived cultural symbolism. Furthermore, the interaction of perceived cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion was significant, $F = 7.98, p = .006, \eta^2 = .07$. When McDonald’s was framed as a symbol of American culture, participants reacted to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall more negatively in the Spatial Intrusion Condition ($M = -1.06$) than in the Spatial Separate Condition ($M = -0.33$), $t = -2.92, p = .004, \eta^2 = .08$. The simple main effect of Spatial Intrusion in the Consumer Benefits Condition was not significant ($M_{s} = 0.03 \text{ vs. } -0.22, t = 1.05, p = .29$). This result support Hypothesis 3: Intrusion of a foreign business into a country’s sacred space would evoke stronger negative reactions only when the foreign business was seen as a symbol of foreign culture.
Figure 6. Reaction to McDonald’s venture as a function of cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and spatial intrusion, controlling for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall (Experiment 1). Positive (negative) values indicate positive (negative) reaction. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.

Mediation Analysis

The parallel findings for cultural intrusion perception and reaction to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall and the strong correlation between these two measures ($r = -0.72, p < .001$) together suggest that cultural intrusion perception mediates the interaction of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on negative reaction toward the McDonald’s at the Great Wall. To test this mediation hypothesis (Hypothesis 5), I performed an analysis of mediated moderation (Muller, Judd, & Yzerbyt, 2005). As shown in Figure 7, when I added cultural intrusion perception as a mediator to the original model predicting reaction, (a) cultural intrusion perception was significantly associated with reaction, $F(1,$

---

1 I tested the mediated moderation model with the equation: $Y = C + X + Mo + XMo + Me + MeMo$, where $Y = \text{Reaction}$, $C = \text{Cultural Symbolism of the Great Wall}$, $X = \text{Cultural Symbolism of McDonald’s}$, $Mo = \text{Spatial Intrusion}$, and $Me = \text{Cultural intrusion perception}$. 

---
86) = 64.64, \( p < .001, \eta^2 = .33 \); and (b) the main effect of cultural symbolism (\( F = 1.23, \ p = .27 \)) and the interaction of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion (\( F = 2.32, \ p = .13 \)) became non-significant. This result indicated that cultural intrusion perception fully mediated the main effect of cultural symbolism and the interaction of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on reaction (Baron & Kenny, 1986; Muller et al., 2005). The Sobel test results (Preacher & Hayes, 2008) provided further evidence for the main effect of cultural symbolism on reaction being mediated by cultural intrusion perception, \( z = 3.17, \ p = .002 \). Likewise, when McDonald’s was framed as a symbol of American culture, the Sobel test result indicated that cultural intrusion perception partially mediated the effect of spatial intrusion on reaction, \( z = 2.16, \ p = .03 \). Hypothesis 5 was supported.

**Figure 7.** Cultural intrusion perception mediates (a) the relationship between cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and reaction (upper part of the figure), and (b) the relationship between the interaction of cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and spatial intrusion on reaction (lower part of the figure) (Experiment 1). I controlled for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall in all analyses. The \( p \)-values inside the parentheses were obtained before cultural intrusion perception was added.
The Role of Cultural Identification

Cultural identification did not moderate the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on cultural intrusion perception, $F(1, 84) = 0.36, p = .55$, or on reaction, $F = 0.23, p = .64$. This result did not support the social identity theory, which predicts stronger negative reactions to spatial intrusion of foreign elements in local space.

Discussion

The results supported Hypotheses 1, 3, and 5. When a foreign company (e.g., McDonald’s) moves into the sacred space of a local community, if the local community perceives the company to be a symbol of foreign culture, the local community is particularly likely to perceive the company’s entry into the sacred space as an act of cultural intrusion and exhibit negative reaction toward the company. In contrast, when a foreign company entering the sacred space of a local community is not seen as a representative of its culture, the local community tends not to perceive the company as a cultural intruder and hence tends not to exhibit negative reaction toward the company. Furthermore, the level of cultural identification does not magnify the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on exclusionary reactions.

Although the results from the current experiment supported my hypotheses, the current experiment has limitations. First, I tested my hypotheses with Chinese participants’ responses to the intrusion of an American company into a sacred space in China only. The generality of the results to other intercultural contexts is unclear. Second, the cultural symbolism of the foreign company was experimentally manipulated in the current experiment. Although the experimental manipulation allowed me to draw conclusion regarding the causal effect of the cultural symbolism of a foreign company on
negative reactions, individuals may differ in the extent to which they perceive the foreign company to be a representative of its culture. Conceptually, the effect of this individual difference on negative reactions should mirror that of the manipulated cultural symbolism. However, whether this is the case is an empirical question. Third, the current experiment focused exclusively on the spatial intrusion of American capitalist culture into the sacred space of Chinese culture, although my model predicts that spatial intrusion of other forms of culture (e.g., political culture, religious culture) into the sacred space of the local culture would produce the same effect on negative reactions. The next experiment was designed to address these issues.

**Experiment 2: Mao Zedong and the Statue of Liberty**

To address the issues raised in the Discussion of Experiment 1, in the current Experiment, I investigated Americans’ reaction toward a print ad of an exhibition of Mao Zedong memorabilia in America, in which a head and shoulder picture of Mao Zedong was superimposed on or placed next to a picture of the Statue of Liberty. I chose the Statue of Liberty because most Americans regard it as a scared space and a celebrated icon of America. I chose Mao Zedong because he remains a controversial figure in modern Chinese history. On the one hand, he was the architect and founding father of the People's Republic of China. On the other hand, the nationwide political campaigns led by Mao had caused severe damage to the culture of China. The varied associations of Mao with China make him a suitable stimulus for the present study. In the current experiment, I am interested in the effects of individual differences in the perceived cultural symbolism of a scared space intruder. Instead of manipulating the cultural symbolism of Mao, I measured the perception of him as a symbol of China.
Note that the design of the current experiment differs from that of Experiment 1 in several aspects. First, in the current experiment, a Chinese politician (instead of an American business) intruded into a sacred space in America (instead of China). Second, the participants were Americans (rather than Chinese). Third, perceived cultural symbolism of the intruder was measured as an individual difference (instead of being manipulated). Nonetheless, I hypothesize the same joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on negative reactions. That is, Americans were predicted to exhibit more negative reactions to the spatial intrusion of Mao into the sacred space of America (the Statue of Liberty) only when Americans perceived Mao to be a symbol of China. Should this hypothesis be borne out, this would provide strong support for the generality of the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on negative reactions. As in Experiment 1, I also measured cultural identification in the current study. Finally, to clarify the role of realistic conflict in negative reactions to cultural intrusions, I also measure perceived realistic conflict between China and the US.

Method

Participants and design

One hundred and twelve American undergraduate students\(^2\) from a Midwestern public university in the United States (52 men, 60 women; mean age = 19.40 years) participated in exchange for course requirement credits. All of them were European Americans. Participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: the Spatial Intrusion Condition or Spatial Separation Condition.

\(^2\) There were 117 participants, but four participants doubted that Mao culture is flourishing in the U.S., and one indicated no knowledge of Mao Zedong. Data from these five participants were excluded from further analysis.
Procedure and materials

The procedure in the current experiment was similar to that in Experiment 1, with the following exceptions. First, the McDonald’s ad was replaced by one titled “Exhibition of Mao Zedong Memorabilia: Mao culture is flourishing in the U.S.” Second, in the Spatial Intrusion Condition, an image of Mao Zedong was superimposed on an image of the Statue of Liberty. In the Spatial Separation Condition, the two images were placed side by side (see Appendix B). Third, the slogan that was used to manipulate cultural symbolism was removed from the experimental stimuli; instead, with a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much), I measured the extent to which Mao Zedong was perceived to be a symbol of China, and the extent to which the Statue of Liberty was perceived to be a symbol of American culture. As expected, the participants consensually perceived the Statue of Liberty to be a symbol of American culture ($M = 6.00, SD = 1.20$). In contrast, although the perceived cultural symbolism of Mao was above the mid-point of the scale ($M = 4.93, SD = 1.43$), he was not uniformly perceived to be a highly representative symbol of China. These results supported the rationale for the choice of the stimuli.

The dependent measure was identical to the one used in Experiment 1, except that the attitude object (previously the McDonald’s) was replaced by the exhibition ($\alpha = .73$). For example, the behavioral component now measured how likely the participants would go to see the exhibition if it would be held at their university. As in Experiment 1, the value of the reaction score is meaningful in that positive (negative) values of the reaction score indicate positive (negative) reactions and the value of 0 indicates neutral reaction. The average reaction was -1.25, indicating that on average, Americans reacted negatively to the exhibition, $t(111) = -16.40, p < .001$. 
The participants also indicated their identification with American culture with two items (Wan et al., 2007): “American culture is important to my identity” and “I identify with American culture.” (α = .92). The participants indicated their extent of agreement with these items on scale from 1 (strongly disagree) to 7 (strongly agree). The mean level of cultural identification was moderately high (M = 5.62, SD = 1.38).

Finally, to clarify the role of realistic conflict in negative response to foreign culture, an additional established measure (Gries & Crowson, 2010) was included to measure realistic conflict between China and the US (M = 4.24, SD = 0.81, α = .65). A sample item is “Chinese economic growth undermines U.S. economic prosperity.” All the materials were presented in English.

Results

Table 2 shows the correlations among the major research variables. Perceived cultural symbolism of the Statue of Liberty was positively correlated with perceived symbolism of Mao Zedong (r = .29, p = .002). Mirroring the results from Experiment 1, participants who perceived stronger cultural symbolism of the Statue of Liberty identified more strongly with American culture (r = .30, p = .001). This pattern of correlations attests to the validity of the measured variables. I controlled for the effect of perceived cultural symbolism of the Statue of Liberty in all analyses, although the results remained the same without including this control variable. For the spatial intrusion conditions, I dummy coded them as 1 = Spatial Intrusion Condition, and 0 = Spatial Separation Condition.
Table 2
*Inter-correlations among the research variables (Experiment 2, Americans, N = 112).*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception of Mao Zedong as symbol of China</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial intrusion (1 = intrusion, 0 = separation)</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification with American culture</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaction toward the Mao Zedong exhibition</td>
<td>-.32***</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perception of the Statue of Liberty as a symbol of American culture</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.30**</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perceived realistic conflict between China and US</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>4.93</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td>5.62</td>
<td>-1.25</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>4.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>0.80</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\*\*\*p < .01. \*\*\*p < .001.

**Reaction To the Mao Zedong Exhibition**

To test Hypothesis 3, I performed a Cultural Symbolism × Spatial Intrusion General Linear Model (GLM) on reaction to the Mao Zedong exhibition. As seen in Figure 8, participants reacted to the exhibition more negatively when they perceived Mao Zedong to be more of a representative symbol of China, $F(1, 106) = 17.03, p < .001, \eta^2 = .13$, for the main effect of cultural symbolism. Furthermore, the interaction of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion was significant, $F = 8.60, p = .004, \eta^2 = .06$. When the perceived cultural symbolism of Mao Zedong was high (one standard deviation above the mean), participants reacted to the exhibition more negatively in the Spatial Intrusion Condition ($M = -1.89$) than in the Spatial Separate Condition ($M = -1.22$), $t = 3.35, p = .001$. In contrast, when the perceived symbolism of Mao Zedong was low (one standard deviation below the mean), the simple main effect of spatial intrusion was not significant ($Ms = -0.87$ vs. $-1.03, t = -0.81, p = .42$).
Figure 8. Reaction to the Mao Zedong exhibition as a function of the perceived cultural symbolism of Mao Zedong ($M \pm 1SD$) and spatial intrusion, controlling for perceived cultural symbolism of the Statue of Liberty (Experiment 2). Positive (negative) values indicate positive (negative) reaction. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.

The Role of Cultural Identification and Realistic Conflict

As in Experiment 1, cultural identification did not moderate the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on reaction to the exhibition, $F(1, 102) = 0.32, p = .57$. In addition, participants who perceived more intense realistic conflict between the US and China evaluated the exhibition more negatively ($r = -.21, p = .03$). To test whether the realistic conflict mediated the Cultural Symbolism $\times$ Spatial Intrusion effect on reaction, I performed a Cultural Symbolism $\times$ Spatial Intrusion GLM on realistic conflict. The main effects and the interaction effect were non-significant, $ps > .17$, which failed to meet the criteria for establishing mediated moderation effect (Muller et al., 2005). Thus, this result indicated that realistic conflict did not mediate the culturally motivated negative reaction to foreign intrusion of local space.

Discussion
Despite the surface differences in the design of Experiment 1 and the current experiment, I replicated the basic results in Experiment 1. Consistent with Hypothesis 3, Americans also reacted more negatively toward the Mao Exhibition when the image of Mao was superimposed on that of the Statue of Liberty (a sacred space in the U.S.) and when Mao was perceived to be a symbol of China. Among participants who did not perceive Mao as a symbol of China, the symbolic intrusion of Mao into the Statue of Liberty did not evoke stronger negative reaction toward the Statue of Liberty.

As in Experiment 1, identification with American culture did not magnify the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion on exclusionary reactions. It seems that cultural identification does not play a moderation role in the joint effect of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion, as the social identity theory would predict. Because the sacred space of a culture symbolizes the dignity of the culture, most members of the community, irrespective of their level of identification with the culture, feel responsible for protecting the space from being contaminated by the erosive effects of foreign cultural intrusion.

Finally, the Cultural Symbolism × Spatial Intrusion effect on reaction toward the exhibition did not run through perceived realistic conflict between China and the US, indicating that the culturally motivated negative reaction to foreign intrusion into local sacred space is not driven by concerns over realistic intercultural conflicts.

**Experiment 3: Mosque and Ground Zero**

Thus far, my results show that intrusion of a foreign cultural symbol into a sacred space of the local culture could evoke negative reactions. However, it can be argued that the assumption of intrusion into a *sacred* space is not a necessary condition in accounting
for the obtained results, because intrusion of a foreign cultural symbol into any space in the local culture could also evoke negative reactions. Furthermore, it could also be argued that politically conservative individuals are particularly likely to perceive anything from a foreign culture (e.g., Mao for Americans; American company for the Chinese) as representative of the foreign culture and to resist cultural inflow from other cultures and thus that my findings are merely different manifestations of political conservatism.

To address these issues, I held the cultural symbolism of the foreign intruder constant and allowed the perceived cultural symbolism or sacredness of the local heritage space to vary across perceivers. Specifically, I examined Americans’ reaction toward the construction of a Muslim mosque near or far away from Ground Zero in the New York City. While Americans seem to generally agree that a Muslim mosque is an iconic symbol of Islam, Imam Fiesal Abdul Rauf’s campaign to construct of a Muslim mosque near Ground Zero has evoked negative reactions among some Americans, who viewed the construction as symbolizing a triumph of Islam over America. For example, the netizen described at the beginning of Chapter 1 wrote the following message in his/her blog: “This Ground Zero Mosque is an affront to the American people, a symbol of Islam scoffing at us as they take over our sacred ground.” Yet, opinions on this issue remain divided in the United States (MediaCurves.com, 2010), rendering this issue particularly relevant to my analysis. I hypothesize that because the construction of the mosque near Ground Zero would be construed as a spatial intrusion from an iconic symbol of Islam into Ground Zero, Americans who believe more strongly Ground Zero to be a sacred symbol of the US would react more negatively to the construction of the mosque; however, if the mosque would be built at a long distance from Ground Zero, the
perception of Ground Zero as a sacred symbol of the US would have little effect on Americans’ evaluation of the construction of the mosque (Hypothesis 4). Furthermore, the perception of cultural intrusion when a mosque is built near Ground Zero is hypothesized to fully mediate the joint effect of perceived cultural symbolism of Ground Zero and distance (or the inverse of spatial intrusion) on evaluation of the mosque (Hypotheses 2, 5).

If the results support these hypotheses, this would suggest that the perceived sacredness or cultural symbolism of the local space is a necessary condition for the evocation of exclusionary reaction to spatial intrusion from foreign culture. Furthermore, by investigating my hypotheses in the context of constructing a mosque near Ground Zero, the current experiment allows me to extend the generality of my hypotheses to exclusionary reactions from the mainstream US culture to a minority religious culture.

To clarify the role of political conservatism in exclusionary reactions toward spatial intrusion of foreign cultural symbols into a sacred local space, I included in the current study a direct and an indirect measure of political conservatism. If political conservatism mediates the effects of cultural symbolism on spatial intrusion, the effect of political conservatism should be significant, whereas the interaction of cultural symbolism and spatial intrusion should become non-significant after including political conservatism in the prediction model. If political conservatism moderates the effects of cultural symbolism on spatial intrusion, the three-way interaction involving political conservatism, spatial intrusion, and cultural symbolism should be significant.

In Experiments 1 and 2, I focused on evaluation of the cultural representative (McDonald’s, Mao) who intruded into the sacred space of the local culture. In the current
experiment, I further extended my analysis to evaluation of the culture (Islam) associated with the intruder (the mosque), expecting that negative reactions would be directed to be the intruder as well as the culture to which the intruder belongs, because the cultural intruder is perceived not as a lone actor, but a representative of its affiliated cultural group. Thus, an act performed by a cultural intruder may be perceived as an act performed by the cultural group as well. In the message from the blogger described above, the construction of a mosque near Ground Zero is perceived to be an attempt by Islam to triumph over America. The extension of the cultural symbolism effect on negative reaction toward the culture associated with the intruder, aside from further confirming my conceptualization of the nature of exclusionary reactions, also have broader implications for understanding intercultural relations.

Method

Participants and design

One hundred twenty-six American undergraduate students from a Midwestern public university in the United States (65 men, 61 women) participated in exchange for course requirement credits. They consisted of White (79%), South Asian (3%), Asian (9%), Latino (5%), and Black (4%). In a repeated-measures design, participants responded to two experimental conditions: Close Condition and Distant Condition. The order of the two conditions was counterbalanced.

Procedure and materials

At the beginning of the experiment, participants completed the identification with American culture measure used in Experiment 2 (\( M = 3.93, SD = 0.98; \alpha = .88 \)). In addition, they also indicated how strongly they identified with Christian religion on a 5-
point scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very strongly, M = 3.40, SD = 1.43), as well as their political ideology.

I used the one-item political conservatism scale (Jost, Napier, Thorisdottir et al., 2007) to measure explicit political conservatism. The participants were asked to locate themselves on an 11-point scale of political orientation ranging from -5 (extremely liberal) to 5 (extremely conservative). The mean response to this item was -0.40 (SD = 2.61) but was not significantly different from zero, p = .09. The large standard deviation on this measure indicated the presence of considerable individual differences in political ideology among the participants.

In addition, political conservatism was measured in a more implicit way by using a short form of the Partially Structured (PS) Attitude Measures (Vargas, Von Hippel, & Petty, 2004). In the PS measure, participants read three vignettes. One vignette is as the following:

Johnny was speaking to his father about the need for a well-equipped and well-prepared army. He said, “It's really important that the U.S. have an army that is ready to defend the nation and I think the government should commit money to having effective armed forces. But, I also think that no more money should be allocated to defense spending.”

After reading the vignette, participants responded to two critical questions: “How politically conservative/liberal was the behavior Johnny performed?” and “How politically conservative/liberal do you think Johnny is, in general?” using 11-point scales (-5 = very liberal, 5 = very conservative; α = .57). Assume that the participants would project their political attitude onto these ambiguous vignettes, if the participant is
relatively liberal (conservative), s/he would more likely see Johnny’s attitude to be conservative (liberal). The participants’ responses were reversed-coded so that higher scores indicated higher levels of conservatism. The mean level of PS-measured convertism in the sample was -0.91 ($SD = 1.30$), indicating that the sample on average was slightly more liberal than conservative, $t(125) = -7.88$, $p < .001$. As in Vargas et al. (2004), the PS measure was uncorrelated with the explicit measure of conservatism, $p = .12$.

Next, the participants were asked about their perceptions of a mosque and Ground Zero in New York City. They rated on a 5-point scale (1 = not at all, 5 = very much) (a) the extent to which they perceived Ground Zero to be a symbol of American culture, (b) the extent to which they perceived Ground Zero to be a sacred space, and (c) the extent to which they perceived a mosque to be a symbol of Islam. The mean response to the cultural symbolism of Ground Zero item was 4.00 ($SD = 0.96$), and that to the perceived sacredness of ground zero was 3.61 ($SD = 1.17$). The moderately high mean ratings indicated that Ground Zero was perceived to be a representative symbol of American culture and to a lesser extent a sacred space as well, although there were considerable individual differences in this perception. These two items were positively associated ($r = .39$, $p < .001$): Participants who perceived Ground Zero to be a symbol of American culture also perceived Ground Zero as a sacred space. I took the average of these two items to form an index measure of the perception of Ground Zero as a sacred icon of American culture. The cultural symbolism of the mosque was 4.56 ($SD = 0.66$), indicating that the participants generally agreed that the mosque was a representative symbol of Islam.
Following this, I assessed the participants’ reactions to building a mosque in the vicinity of the Ground Zero. To remind the participants of the historical significance of Ground Zero, I showed participants three images of the September 11 attacks, and asked them to think about the event as if it happened yesterday for about 30 seconds. Next, participants were told to evaluate two possible locations of a mosque that the American Society for Muslim Advancement (ASMA) proposed to build in New York City, one being very close to Ground Zero (the Close Condition) and one being far away from it (the Distant Condition). Half of the participants ($n = 63$) responded to the Close Condition first and the remaining half ($n = 63$) responded to the Distant Condition first.

For each possible location, the participants read a map depicting the location of the mosque (Appendix C) and responded to the measures that captured their behavioral, affective and cognitive evaluation of the location. For the behavioral responses, participants were asked to indicate on a 4-item measure how much they would act favorably (“I want to protect it from being attacked”, “I want to be associated with it”) or unfavorably (“I want to attack it”, “I want to protest against it”) toward the mosque at the specified location. They rated each item on a 5-point scale ($1 = not at all, 5 = very much$). For the cognitive responses, the participants were asked to indicate their appraisals of the mosque at the specified location on three 7-point scales (bad-good, undesirable-desirable, and unfavorable-favorable; from -3 to 3). For the affective responses, the participants were asked to rate on 5-point scales ($1 = not at all, 5 = very much$) how much of three positive emotions (liking, admiration, happy) and five negative emotions (hatred, contempt, anger, fear, disgust) the participants felt toward the mosque at the specified location.
To create a composite measure of reaction to the mosque, I (a) computed the behavioral evaluations by subtracting the mean of the unfavorable responses from that of favorable responses, (b) computed the affective responses by subtracting the mean of the negative emotions from that of the positive emotions; (c) computed the mean of the cognitive appraisals by taking the mean of the cognitive appraisal items; (d) standardized the three measures (behavior, affective, cognitive) without altering the means so that their standard deviations all equal 1.00; and (c) took the mean of the three standardized measures to form a reaction score. The value of 0 on the reaction score indicated neutral reaction (neither positive nor negative). The positive (negative) values of the reaction score indicated positive (negative) reactions. The mean reaction score to the mosque at the close location was significantly negative ($M = -0.27$, $SD = 0.92$, $\alpha = .91$), $t = -3.23$, $p = .002$, and that to the distant location was significantly positive ($M = 0.55$, $SD = 0.85$, $\alpha = .81$), $t = 7.33$, $p < .001$.

To measure the extent to which the participants generalized their evaluation of the mosque to the American Society for Muslim Advancement and the Muslim world, after evaluating the mosque at each designated location, I asked the participants to rate 5 evaluation items on 7-point scales ($-3 = \text{very negative}$, $3 = \text{very positive}$): (a) “If the mosque were to be built at this location, how would you feel toward the American Society for Muslim Advancement?”; (b) If the mosque were to be built at this location, how would you feel toward the Muslim world?”; (c) “If the mosque were to be built at this location, how would Americans in general feel toward the Muslim world?”; (d) “Assume the American Society for Muslim Advancement (ASMA) wants to build the mosque at this location, how do you think ASMA feels toward Americans?”; and (e)
“Assume the general view in the Muslim world approves of building the mosque at this location, how do you think the Muslim world in general feels toward Americans’?”. In both the Close and Distant Conditions, these five items were highly correlated. I took the mean of the five items in each condition to form an index measure of generalized reactions toward Islam in that condition ($\alpha$s > .80).

Finally, two items, measured on 7-point scales (1 = strongly disagree, 7 = strongly agree), were included to measure for each location of the mosque, the extent to which the mosque would violate the sacredness of Ground Zero and represent a cultural intrusion to American culture: “The mosque at this location violates the sacredness of Ground Zero” and “The mosque at this location is an invasion of American culture.” The correlation between these two items was .82 in the Close Condition and .89 in the Distant Condition, indicating that the participants considered the violation of the sacredness of the space to be about cultural intrusion.

Results

Reaction toward the Mosque and Islam

The inter-correlations of the measured variables were shown in Table 3. Given that the participants agreed that mosque is a symbol of Islam, according to my model, they should prefer the mosque to be built farther away from Ground Zero, and this was indeed the case. The reactions toward the mosque were more unfavorable when it was built close to Ground Zero ($M = -0.27$) than it was built farther away from Ground Zero ($M = 0.55$), $t(125) = -10.73$, $p < .001$. The reactions toward Islam were also more unfavorable when the mosque was built in the vicinity of Ground Zero ($M = -0.78$) than when it was built farther away from Ground Zero ($M = 0.05$), $t(125) = -13.84$, $p < .001$. 
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Indeed, participants who reacted more negatively toward the mosque also reacted more negatively toward the Muslim world ($r = .77$ in the Close Condition and .61 in the Distant Condition, $p < .001$).

Table 3

*Inter-correlations among the measured variables (Experiment 3, Americans, $N = 126$)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. American cultural identification</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Christian identification</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Conservatism (explicit)</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Conservatism (PS measure)</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Ground Zero sacred iconicity</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Mosque cultural symbolism</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Reaction (close)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.19*</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Generalized reaction (close)</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.12</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.18*</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.77***</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultural intrusion (close)</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.32***</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.71***</td>
<td>-.57***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reaction (distant)</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.53***</td>
<td>.35***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Generalized reaction (distant)</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.33***</td>
<td>.36***</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cultural intrusion (distant)</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td>-.40***</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.93</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>-.40</td>
<td>-.91</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>-.27</td>
<td>-.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>1.30</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>1.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>9</th>
<th>10</th>
<th>11</th>
<th>12</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Cultural intrusion (close)</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Reaction (distant)</td>
<td>-.33**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Generalized reaction (distant)</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td>.61***</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Cultural intrusion (distant)</td>
<td>.50***</td>
<td>-.59***</td>
<td>-.50***</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>2.97</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>1.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>2.17</td>
<td>0.85</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>1.55</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.
I hypothesized that the negative reaction toward the close (vs. distant) mosque would be stronger among participants who perceived Ground Zero to be sacred icon of the US (Hypothesis 4). To test this hypothesis, I performed a Distance (close or distant) × Perceived Sacred Iconicity (continuous, mean-centered) GLM on the reaction toward the mosque in the Close and Distant Conditions. The main effect of distance was significant, $F(1, 124) = 118.92, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .490$, and so was the main effect of perceived sacred iconicity, $F(1, 124) = 6.05, p = .01, \eta^2_p = .05$. I interpreted these two main effects in light of the significant interaction of distance and perceived sacred iconicity, $F(1, 124) = 5.19, p = .02, \eta^2_p = .04$. When the mosque would be built far away from Ground Zero, perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero was unrelated to reaction toward the mosque ($r = -.10, p = .25$). However, as seen in Table 3, when the mosque would be built in the vicinity of Ground Zero, the more the participants perceived Ground Zero to be a sacred icon of the US, the more negatively they evaluated the mosque ($r = -.28, p = .001$). This result supported Hypothesis 5.

The same pattern of results was found for reaction toward Islam. A Distance (close or distant) × Perceived Sacred Iconicity (continuous, mean-centered) GLM on the reaction toward Islam in the Close and Distant Conditions revealed a significant main effect of distance, $F(1, 124) = 69.25, p < .001, \eta^2_p = .359$; and a significant interaction of distance and perceived sacred iconicity, $F(1, 124) = 5.05, p = .03, \eta^2_p = .039$. Follow-up analysis on the interaction shows that when the mosque would be built far away from Ground Zero, perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero was unrelated to reaction toward Islam ($r = .04, p = .69$). However, as seen in Table 3, when the mosque would be built in the vicinity of Ground Zero, the more the participants perceived Ground Zero to be a
sacred icon of the US, the more negatively they evaluated Islam ($r = -.18$, $p = .04$). This result is consistent with Hypothesis 6.

**Perceived Cultural Intrusion**

I also hypothesized that building a mosque close to (vs. far away from) Ground Zero would more likely be perceived to be a cultural intrusion among participants who believed more strongly that Ground Zero was a sacred icon of the US (Hypothesis 2). To test this hypothesis, I performed a Distance (close or distant) $\times$ Perceived Sacred Iconicity (continuous, mean-centered) GLM on perceived cultural intrusion in the Close and Distant Conditions. The main effect of distance was significant, $F(1, 124) = 32.87$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2_p = .21$, and so was the main effect of perceived sacred iconicity, $F(1, 124) = 10.08$, $p = .002$, $\eta^2_p = .075$. I interpreted these main effects in the context of the significant interaction of perceived sacred iconicity and distance, $F(1, 124) = 6.82$, $p = .01$, $\eta^2_p = .052$. As seen in Table 3, when the mosque would be built far away from Ground Zero, the perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero was unrelated to perception of the mosque as a cultural intruder ($r = .14$, $p = .11$). However, when the mosque would be built in the vicinity of Ground Zero, the more the participants perceived Ground Zero to be a sacred icon of the US, the more negatively they evaluated the mosque ($r = .32$, $p < .001$). This result is consistent with Hypothesis 2.

**Mediation Analysis**

I hypothesized that the interaction of distance and perceived sacred iconicity on the evaluation of the mosque is mediated the perceived cultural intrusion of the mosque (Hypothesis 5). To test this mediation hypothesis, I subtracted the evaluation of the close mosque from the evaluation of the distant mosque. I also
subtracted the perceived cultural intrusion of the close mosque from the distant mosque. Participants who believed more strongly that Ground Zero was a sacred icon exhibited more favorable reaction toward the distant (vs. close) mosque \((r = .20, p = .02)\) and would less likely perceive the distant (vs. close) to be a cultural intruder \((r = -.23, p = .01)\). Participants who were less inclined to perceive the distant (vs. close) mosque to be a cultural intruder also exhibited more negative evaluation of the close (vs. distant) mosque \((r = -.63, p < .001)\). Perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero was a significant predictor of the difference in the perceived cultural intrusion of the distant (vs. close) mosque, \(b = -0.47, t(124) = -2.61, p = .01\). When the difference in the reaction toward the distant (vs. close) mosque was regressed on perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero and the perceived cultural intrusion of the distant (vs. close) mosque, perceived cultural intrusion (the hypothesized mediator) was significant, \(b = -0.26, t(123) = -8.59, p < .001\), but perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero (the hypothesized antecedent) was not, \(b = 0.05, t(123) = 0.83, p = .41\). Sobel’s \(z\) for the hypothesized mediation was 2.50, \(p = .01\). This result indicates that consistent with Hypothesis 5, difference in the perceived cultural intrusion of the distant (vs. close) mosque fully mediated the effect of perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero on the reaction toward the distant (vs. close) mosque.

I repeated the same analysis with reaction toward Islam. First, I subtracted reaction toward Islam in the Close Condition from that in the Distant Condition. Participants who believed more strongly that Ground Zero was a sacred icon exhibited more favorable reaction toward Islam if the mosque would be constructed a long distance away (vs. close to) Ground Zero \((r = .20, p = .02)\). Participants who were less inclined to perceive the distant (vs. close) mosque to be a cultural intruder also exhibited more
negative evaluation of Islam if the mosque would be constructed near (vs. far away) from Ground Zero \( (r = -0.58, p < .001) \). When the difference in the reaction toward Islam in the Distant (vs. Close) Condition was regressed on perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero and the perceived cultural intrusion of the distant (vs. close) mosque, perceived cultural intrusion (the hypothesized mediator) was significant, \( b = -0.31, t(123) = -7.57, p < .001 \), but perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero (the hypothesized antecedent) was not, \( b = 0.08, t(123) = 0.91, p = .36 \). Sobel’s \( z \) for the hypothesized mediation was 2.47, \( p = .01 \). This result indicates that consistent with Hypothesis 7, difference in the perceived cultural intrusion of the distant (vs. close) mosque fully mediated the joint effect of perceived sacred iconicity of Ground Zero and the distance of the mosque from Ground Zero on the reaction toward Islam.

**Moderation Effects of Identification and Political Conservatism**

Next, to test whether cultural identification and political conservatism moderated the interaction of distance and perceived scared iconicity of Ground Zero, I performed a series of GLM, with distance, perceived scared iconicity of Ground Zero, and one of the four moderators (American identification, Christian identification, explicit conservatism, PS-conservatism, continuous, mean-centered) and their interactions as predictors of reaction toward the mosque in the Distant and Close Conditions. None of the three-way interactions in the four GLM were significant, \( F_{s}(1, 122) < 1 \). These results showed that cultural identification did not moderate the effect of cultural symbolism and evaluation of spatial intrusion of foreign culture in sacred space of the local culture. In addition, none of the effects (main effects or interactions) involving explicit conservatism \( [F_{s} < 1.85, ps > .18] \) and PS conservatism were significant \( [F_{s} < 2.33, ps > .15] \), and the interaction of
sacred iconicity of Ground Zero and distance remained significant after controlling for the effect of political conservatism ($F_s > 4.80, ps < .05$). Thus, political conservatism did not mediate or moderate the effect of cultural symbolism on exclusionary reaction toward spatial intrusion of sacred local space.

**Discussion**

The present experiment replicated and extended the results from Experiments 1 and 2. The results showed that when a representative from a foreign culture made an intrusion into the space of a community, individuals in the community are more likely to exhibit negative reactions not only toward the intruder but toward the cultural group to which the intruder belongs as well, when these individuals believe more strongly that the space the foreign cultural representative contemplating entry is a sacred space in the local community. Thus, negative reactions toward spatial intrusion do not occur indiscriminately in all local spaces, but are particularly likely to emerge in spaces regarded by the locals with reverence and respect.

The results also clarified the role of political conservatism, showing that the negative reactions toward spatial intrusion are not manifestations of political conservatism, because political conservatism does not mediate or moderate these reactions.
CHAPTER 3: GENERAL DISCUSSION

Basic Findings and Implications

The results of the three experiments presented in the current chapter provided consistent support for the theoretical understanding of the negative reactions to foreign cultural intrusions advanced in my thesis. As summarized in Figure 9, intrusion into the space of the people in the local community could evoke negative reactions toward the intruder (Experiments 1, 2, and 3), provided that the space is regarded by the local community with respect and reverence (Experiment 3), and the intruder is considered to be a representative of the culture to which it belongs (Experiments 1 and 2). These effects were observed across three different contexts: when an American food chain enters a sacred space in China (Experiment 1), when image of a political figure in China is superimposed onto the image of a sacred space in the U.S. (Experiment 2), and when a minority religion in the US contemplates putting its iconic house of prayer near a sacred space of mainstream American culture (Experiment 3). The observed negative reaction seems to be mediated through the perceived cultural intrusion of the intruder (Experiments 1 and 3) and is directed toward both the intruder and the cultural group it symbolizes (Experiment 3). These findings explain the basic phenomena I discussed in Chapter 1:

a) The intrusion of a foreign element into the physical space of the local community could evoke negative, exclusionary reactions; this element could be a person, a building, a business or an organization from a foreign culture;
b) Such reactions do not always surface, but typically emerge in physical space that is regarded by the local community as a sacred space that symbolizes the dignity of the local culture;

c) When these reactions occur, the intruder is seen as a representative of its culture;

d) When these reactions occur, the intruder is perceived to have the intention to dominate the local culture; and

e) The negative reactions are directed toward both the intruder and the cultural group to which it belongs.

Figure 9. Summary of the findings in relation to proposed model of negative evaluation of cultural intrusion.

The proposed model, as depicted in Figure 9, provides a theoretical lens to understand when and how intrusion of a foreign element into the physical space of the local community could lead to hostile intercultural reactions and has important implications for managing intercultural relations. When introducing a foreign business,
event, or project into the local space of the community, intercultural conflicts can be avoided if it will take place in a space far away from the sacred space of the local community instead of happening inside or close to this space (as in the case of Starbucks in the Imperial Palace Museum in China or the Muslim Mosque near Ground Zero). If a foreign business, event, or project has to take place inside or close to the sacred space of the local community, the organizer should deemphasize the foreign cultural symbolism of the undertaking. Consistent with this idea, in Experiment 1, I found that emphasizing the consumer benefits of the McDonald’s in the Great Wall mitigated the Chinese’s negative reactions toward the McDonald’s in a sacred space in China. Tong et al. (in press) also reported that while activating a categorization mindset (e.g., by asking individuals to classify people into different professions) prior to the evaluation of an acquisition increases perceivers’ negative emotional responses to a foreign acquisition of an iconic brand in the local culture relative to a no activation condition, whereas activating an economic transaction mindset (e.g., by asking individuals to decide whether a large or small package of a beverage has higher value for the money) decreases these emotional responses.

Possible Theoretical Mechanisms

The current investigation contributes to the understanding of when and why people from local community would infer cultural intrusion intention from intrusions of foreign cultural elements into the sacred space of the local community. Nonetheless, the current research has not yet identified why perceived cultural intrusions would lead to negative, exclusionary reactions toward the cultural intruder and the cultural group it represents.
The results from my three experiments have ruled out several possibilities. Specifically, cultural identification, and political conservatism do not mediate or moderate these exclusionary reactions, suggesting that these reactions are not expressions of one’s cultural identities or political ideologies. Rather, these reactions seem to be culturally motivated; they are motivated by the need to protect the sacred space of one’s culture from foreign contamination.

However, what are the cultural motivations behind the attempts to protect the sacred space of one’s culture? As explained in Chapter 1, two defining dimensions of culture are its sharedness and continuity (Chiu et al., 2010). The sharedness of a culture confers epistemic security to the individuals; people can rely on widely accepted cultural norms as behavioral guides when they encounter uncertainty in behavioral decision making. The continuity of culture can confer existential security to the individuals: Seeing oneself as a good member of one’s cultural community confers meaning in life and helps to reduce existential anxiety. Given these psychological functions of culture, individuals may be motivated to protect the sacred space of their culture, which symbolizes the dignity and vitality of their culture. Future research can test whether the epistemic and existential concerns mediate the relationship between perceived cultural intrusion and negative reactions to the intruder.

**Future Research Directions**

Although the current research focuses on intrusion into sacred physical space of the local community, my proposed model can be extended to understand reactions to intrusion into restricted ideological and political space of a culture. Aside from sacred
physical space, many countries also have restricted ideological and political space. Intrusion of foreign opinions into this space, particularly by iconic representatives from foreign countries, could also evoke massive negative reactions from the local community. An example is the Chinese’s boycott of Carrefour because of its French roots in April 2008, following the disruption of the 2008 Olympic torch relay by Tibetan independence advocates in Paris. Protests occurred in and around a number of Carrefour outlets throughout China, and the angry Chinese campaigned for a one-day boycott of Carrefour on May Day, a public holiday in China. In response, Carrefour made a public announcing assuring the Chinese that Carrefour will never do anything to harm the feelings of the Chinese people. These reactions surfaced possibly because in China, territorial integrity is considered to be a restricted political space, where negative opinions on the issue are generally not welcome, particularly opinions from iconic representatives of foreign countries. Similarly, a religious culture may also have its restricted ideological space that does not welcome unsolicited opinions from representatives of other religions. Future research that examines negative reactions to foreign intrusions in restricted political and ideological space from my proposed theoretical perspective may shed new light on international and intergroup relations.

Other Bases of Negative Reactions to Foreign Cultural Intrusions

*Experiment 4: Value-Driven Negative Reactions*

This dissertation so far has focused on when local communities are most likely to react negatively towards foreign intrusion of local cultural space. Nonetheless, as proposed in Chapter 1, under some circumstances, perceivers may also be motivated by their perceivers’ values, cultural identity concerns, and political ideology to dislike or
welcome intrusions of foreign elements into celebrated cultural and historical sites in local cultures. For example, people may be motivated by their values to preserve the integrity and show their respect for ethnic cultures to dislike foreign intrusions in sacred space of their own and other cultures. For example, Americans may be motivated by their respect for heritage cultures to dislike the presence of touristic commercial activities in the heritage sites of these cultures. Others may feel morally committed to protect heritage cultures from the erosive effects of cultural intrusion, regardless of whether the heritage cultures are their own culture. That is, irrespective of how strongly these individuals identify with a certain heritage culture, they may feel a need to protect it by resisting the foreign cultural influences that may threaten its vitality.

In Experiment 4, I tested whether the commitment to the protection of heritage cultures is the reason for some Americans’ negative responses to the intrusion of sacred space by a foreign business at the Great Wall of China, using the same stimuli I developed for Experiment 1 (i.e., McDonald’s and the Great Wall). Specifically, I measured European Americans’ reactions to an ad of McDonald’s opening a new shop at the Great Wall. I also measured the perception of McDonald’s as a symbol of American culture and the identification with American culture. Moreover, I measured the extent of perceived cultural intrusion. Because the proposed process is about protecting heritage cultures, I also measured the perception of the Great Wall as a world heritage site, in addition to that the perception of it as a symbol of Chinese culture.

Method

Participants and design. One hundred and fifty-two European American undergraduate students from a Midwestern public university in the United States (70 men,
82 women; mean age = 19.38 years) participated in exchange for course requirement credits. As in Experiments 2, participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: Spatial Intrusion Condition or Spatial Separation Condition.

Procedure and materials. The cover and procedure were the same as those in Experiment 1, with the following exceptions. First, the slogan that was used to manipulate the cultural symbolism of McDonald’s was removed from the experimental stimuli (see Appendix D). Instead, with a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much), I measured the extent to which McDonald’s was perceived as a symbol of American culture ($M = 5.57$). I also used the same scale to measure the participants’ perceptions of the extent to which the Great Wall was a symbol of Chinese culture ($M = 6.45$) and a World Heritage Site ($M = 6.20$).

Identification with American culture was measured in the same way as in Experiment 2 ($\alpha = .91$, $M = 5.27$, $SD = 1.55$). In addition, I used the same measure used in Experiment 1 to measure reaction toward McDonald’s venture at the Great Wall. The mean reaction score was -1.21, which was significantly different from zero, $t = -17.25$, $p < .001$, indicating that like their Chinese counterparts, Americans also tended to dislike McDonald’s venture at the Great Wall. Finally, I measured the perceived cultural intrusion by asking the participants to indicate how much the ad contained an element of cultural threat, and how much it contained an element of cultural invasion on 7-point scales (1 = not at all, 7 = very much; $\alpha = .93$, $M = 5.19$, $SD = 1.81$). All the materials were presented in English.

Results and Discussion
For the spatial intrusion conditions, I dummy coded them as 1 = Spatial Intrusion Condition, 0 = Spatial Separation Condition. The inter-correlations of the measured variables are shown in Table 4.

Table 4
Inter-Correlations Among the Measured Variables (Experiment 4, Americans, N = 152).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception of McDonald’s as a symbol of American culture</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial Intrusion (1 = Spatial Intrusion, 0 = Spatial Separation)</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification with American culture</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaction toward the McDonald’s branch</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Cultural intrusion perception</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.49***</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Perception of the Great Wall as a symbol of Chinese culture</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-.17*</td>
<td>.18*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Perception of the Great Wall as a world heritage site</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.29***</td>
<td>.30***</td>
<td>.62***</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>5.57</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>5.27</td>
<td>-1.21</td>
<td>5.19</td>
<td>6.45</td>
<td>6.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.55</td>
<td>0.87</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td>0.95</td>
<td>1.13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05.  **p < .01.  ***p < .001.

As in Experiment 2, I performed a Cultural Symbolism of McDonald’s (mean-centered) × Spatial Intrusion GLM on the composite score of perceived cultural intrusion, while controlling for the perception of the Great Wall as a symbol of Chinese culture and as a World Heritage Site. The only significant effect was the main effect of the covariate: the perception of the Great Wall as a world heritage site, $F(1, 145) = 8.80$, $p = .004$, $\eta^2 = .05$. As seen in Table 4, the more strongly the participants believed the Great Wall to be a world heritage site, the more they thought the McDonald’s at the Great Wall was a cultural intrusion ($r = .30$, $p < .001$).

Next, I performed a Great Wall as World Heritage (mean-centered) × Spatial Intrusion GLM on the composite score of perceived cultural intrusion, while controlling for the perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and the Great Wall. The main effect of Great Wall as World Heritage remained significant, $F(1, 145) = 11.99$, $p = .001$, $\eta^2$...
The Great Wall as World Heritage × Spatial Intrusion also approached significance, $F(1, 145) = 3.59, p = .06, \eta^2 = .02$. In the Spatial Separation Condition, perception of the Great Wall as a World Heritage site was unrelated to the perceived cultural intrusion of the McDonald’s ($r = .16, p = .17$). In the Spatial Intrusion Condition, the more strongly the participants believed the Great Wall was a world heritage site, the more they perceived the McDonald’s at the Great Wall to be a cultural intrusion ($r = .45, p < .001$). This finding indicated that Americans who perceived the Great Wall to be a World Heritage site, the more they thought the McDonald’s at the Great Wall was a cultural intruder.

I also performed a Cultural Symbolism of McDonald’s (mean-centered) × Spatial Intrusion GLM on reaction to the McDonald’s, controlling for the perception of the Great Wall as a symbol of Chinese culture and as a World Heritage Site. Again, the only significant effect was the main effect of the perception of the Great Wall as a world heritage site, $F(1, 145) = 9.36, p = .003, \eta^2 = .06$. As seen in Table 4, participants who more strongly believed the Great Wall was a world heritage site, reacted more negatively to the McDonald’s at the Great Wall ($r = -.29, p < .001$).

Finally, I performed a Great Wall as World Heritage (mean-centered) × Spatial Intrusion GLM on reaction toward the McDonald’s at the Great Wall, while controlling for the perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and the Great Wall. As seen in Figure 10, the only significant effect was the main effect of the Great Wall as a world heritage site, $F(1, 145) = 10.52, p = .002, \eta^2 = .06$. 
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Figure 10. Reaction to the McDonald’s branch opening at the Great Wall as a function of the perception of the Great Wall as a World Heritage Site ($M \pm 1SD$) and Spatial Intrusion conditions, controlling for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall and of McDonald’s (Experiment 4). Positive (negative) values indicate positive (negative) reaction. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.

Identification with American culture did not interact with perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and/or with spatial intrusion on cultural intrusion perception or reaction ($ps > .38$). Taken together, the results show that when Americans are not responding to spatial intrusion of the sacred space in the U.S., they could be motivated by the value of preserving world cultural heritage to react negatively to the presence of global business in the heritage sites in other cultures.

**Experiment 5: Politically Motivated Reactions**

Sometimes, people may be motivated by their political ideology to welcome cultural intrusion, particularly intrusions that would compromise the integrity and vitality of an outgroup culture. This prediction can be derived from social identity theory (Turner et al., 1987) and the realistic conflict theory (Sherif, 1966); both theories assume that
people favor events that would undermine the vitality of a competing outgroup. I examined this possibility in the current experiment, which was an exact replication of Experiment 4 in Taiwan. I chose Taiwan because of its unique political context. Some Taiwanese, particularly those who support the Pan-Green Coalition (Saunders, 2005), want to pursue the independence of Taiwan from China against the strong opposition from the Beijing government (Lieberthal, 2005). To these Taiwanese, the Mainland Chinese culture was an outgroup culture. Under the premise that the enemy of my enemy is my friend (Heider, 1946), supporters of the Pan-Green Coalition may favor foreign intrusion into the cultural space of Mainland China. In this experiment, I measured Taiwanese’s reaction toward the McDonald’s at the Great Wall ad used in Experiment 4. Again, I measured perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s as well as the participants’ levels of identification with the Pan-Green Coalition.

**Method**

*Participants and design.* Sixty-two undergraduate students from a university in northern Taiwan (30 men, 32 women; mean age = 19.90 years) participated in exchange for course requirement credits. The participants identified themselves as Minnanese (63%), Hakka (9%), or Waishengren (people who came from mainland China to Taiwan with the Nationalists since 1945 and their descendants born in Taiwan; 28%). As in Experiment 4, participants were randomly assigned to one of two experimental conditions: Spatial Intrusion Condition or Spatial Separation Condition.

*Procedure and materials.* The procedure was identical to that in Experiment 4 with the following exceptions. Instead of measuring identification with Chinese culture, I measured participants’ identification with the Pan-Green Coalition. The participants
indicated their level of identification with the Pan-Green Coalition on a scale that ranged from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much); $M = 2.81$. The composite reaction score (the dependent measure) has a mean of -0.34, which indicated that Taiwanese’s reaction to McDonald’s at the Great Wall was significantly negative, $t(61) = -3.16$, $p = .003$. The means of perceived cultural symbolism of McDonald’s and the Great Wall were 6.05 and 6.17, respectively, on a scale from 1 (not at all) to 7 (very much). All the materials were presented in traditional Chinese.

**Results and Discussion**

The inter-correlations of the measured variables are shown in Table 5. The Taiwanese agreed that McDonald’s is a symbol of American culture. I performed a Spatial Intrusion $\times$ Identification with the Pan-Green Coalition GLM on reaction, while controlling for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall and McDonald’s. The analysis results revealed a significant interaction of identification with the Pan-Green Coalition and spatial intrusion, $F(51) = 4.54$, $p = .04$, $\eta^2 = .07$. As seen in Figure 1, when the identification with the Pan-Green Coalition was low (one standard deviation below the mean), Taiwanese reacted equally negatively to the McDonald’s ad in the Spatial Intrusion condition ($M = -0.67$) and in the Spatial Separate Condition ($M = -0.41$), $t = 0.73$, $p = .46$. In contrast, when the identification with the Pan-Green Coalition was high (one standard deviation above the mean), Taiwanese reacted to the McDonald’s intrusion significantly more positive in the Spatial Intrusion Condition ($M = 0.35$) than in the Spatial Separate Condition ($M = -0.42$), $t = -2.34$, $p = .02$. Indeed, when the identification with the Pan-Green Coalition was very high (two standard deviations above the mean), the reaction was significantly positive ($M = 0.85$, $p = .03$). Thus, those
who identified more strongly with the Pan-Green Coalition’s agenda of pursuing the independence of Taiwan had more favorable evaluation of a foreign undertaking’s intrusion into the sacred cultural space of Mainland China.

Table 5
*Inter-Correlations Among the Measured Variables (Experiment 5, Taiwanese, N = 62)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perception of McDonald’s as a symbol of American culture</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Spatial Intrusion</td>
<td>-.39**</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Identification with the Pan-Green Coalition</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.16</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Reaction toward the McDonald’s branch</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.27*</td>
<td>---</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Perception of the Great Wall as a symbol of Chinese culture</td>
<td>.39**</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>0.55</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>-0.33</td>
<td>6.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standard Deviation</td>
<td>1.29</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>0.88</td>
<td>1.01</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .05. **p < .01.

*Figure 11.* The joint effect of identification with the Pan-Green Coalition (M±1SD) and spatial intrusion on reaction toward the McDonald’s at the Great Wall among Taiwanese (Experiment 5). I controlled for perceived cultural symbolism of the Great Wall and that of McDonald’s. Positive (negative) values indicate positive (negative) reaction. Error bars indicate standard errors of the mean.
In summary, when foreign intrusions of sacred cultural space occur outside one’s own country or in a competitive outgroup, reactions toward these may be motivated by the perceivers’ values and political ideology. Given that there are multiple causes for reactions toward foreign spatial intrusions into local cultures’ sacred space, future research is needed to systematically identify the determinants of the relative importance of the different causes for reactions toward foreign cultural intrusions.

**Conclusions**

The world is currently characterized by intensified intercultural contacts, which are accompanied by an increase in the number of instances of culturally motivated resistance to foreign cultural influence. The current investigation revealed some conditions that would increase or decrease likelihood of culturally motivated resistance. As mentioned in Chapter 1, such culturally motivated resistance could have both negative and positive consequences. One negative consequence is that it increases intercultural tension. Another negative consequence is that it discourages intercultural learning, which could have led to higher level of creativity (Leung et al., 2008). However, culturally motivated resistance to foreign cultural influence, particularly in sacred space of a heritage culture, also helps to preserve the integrity of the heritage culture by minimizing cultural erosion resulting from globalization and commercialization. Such culturally motivated resistance also invites critical reflections on the effect of globalization, which could deepen respect for cultural diversity. I believe that knowledge of the processes underlying culturally motivated resistance to foreign culture is important because such knowledge can be applied to reduce intercultural negativity and promote more intercultural positivity.
While cross-cultural and cultural psychology has focused primarily on the effects of chronic socialization on behaviors, the present investigation joins recent attempts to expand the scope of cultural psychology to understand dynamic interactions between cultures in an increasingly globalized world (Chiu & Cheng, 2007) – a research that is still relatively less travelled by cultural psychologists.
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## APPENDIX A

The stimuli of the McDonald’s advertisements used in Experiment 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Consumer Benefits Condition</th>
<th>Cultural Symbolism Condition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Intrusion Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Freedom, Independence, American Culture:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast, Convenient, Delicious:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(n = 24)</em></td>
<td><em>(n = 21)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Spatial Separation Condition</strong></td>
<td><strong>Freedom, Independence, American Culture:</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fast, Convenient, Delicious:</strong></td>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
<td><strong>All in McDonald’s</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>(n = 24)</em></td>
<td><em>(n = 25)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

The stimuli of the Mao Zedong advertisements used in Experiment 2.

Spatial Intrusion Condition
\( (n = 54) \)

Spatial Separation Condition
\( (n = 58) \)
APPENDIX C

The stimuli of the mosque proposal used in Experiment 3 (a repeated-measures design).

Spatial Intrusion Condition

Spatial Separation Condition
APPENDIX D

The stimuli of the McDonald’s advertisements used in Experiments 4 and 5.

Spatial Intrusion Condition
(n = 76; Expt. 4)
(n = 34; Expt. 5)

Spatial Separation Condition
(n = 76; Expt. 4)
(n = 28; Expt. 5)