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Abstract

Present study has adopted Ng, Yam, and Lai’s (2007) model to test several theoretical predictions that the bicultural self identity (Chinese self and Western self) of Hong Kong Chinese would affect their ingroup inclusiveness (inclusion of Chinese Mainlanders as ingroup members), implicit attitude (Implicit Association Test of attitude toward Chinese Mainlanders) and explicit attitude (willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders). It also examined the mechanism behind these effects. Participants were first asked to complete the Implicit Association Test on the computer, and then to answer a paper-and-pencil questionnaire that measured the remaining three constructs (bicultural self identity, ingroup inclusiveness and explicit attitude) and other demographic data. Based on a sample of 61 Hong Kong Chinese undergraduate students, results showed significant effects of bicultural self identity on both ingroup inclusiveness and explicit attitude but not on implicit attitude. To study the mechanism behind the effect of bicultural self identity on explicit attitude, mediation analysis was conducted and results showed that ingroup inclusiveness was the mediator. Overall, this study has contributed to the understanding of cultural influence on ingroup inclusiveness and attitude in an intergroup context.
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Figure 1  Predicted mediating effect of ingroup inclusiveness on the effect of bicultural self identity and willingness to contact
1. Introduction

Social psychologists and researchers have long been interested in exploring how the self is construed in relation to a person’s cultural background. Such interests on cultural influence have typically been reflected by researchers that compare social cognitions and self between cultures (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). To continue examining cultural influence, researchers have gone beyond studies on monocultural individuals to bicultural people who have an identity that consists of both a root in original culture and the acquisition of values in another culture (Chen, Benet-Martinez, & Bond, 2008).

Hong Kong Context

Hong Kong was a British colony for more than a century since 1842. During this period, the British government administered the law and regulation of Hong Kong. Under the influence of British governance, most of the systems and policies in Hong Kong were directly adopted from the western society. Before the return of sovereignty over Hong Kong to China, Hong Kong employed the common law system that is practiced in most Commonwealth countries. Moreover, English has become the main medium of instruction in most schools within the period as a British colony. Therefore, western cultures and values have long been exposed to Hong Kong Chinese for over a century. Meanwhile, traditional Chinese culture and values that are strongly influenced by Confucianism have also been preserved by Hong Kong Chinese. For instance, they emphasize on filial piety and also celebrate traditional
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Chinese Festivals such as Chinese Lunar New Year or the Dragon Boat Festival. With this preservation of Chinese culture and values together with the exposure of Western culture, Hong Kong has become an interesting place for biculturalism to develop.

Subsequent to the political reunion of Hong Kong with Mainland China, the psychological reunification of Hong Kong Chinese to Mainland China has been put in focus. Research on social identities of Hong Kong Chinese after the return of sovereignty has been conducted. According to Lam’s (2007) study on the social identification of Hong Kong teenagers before and after 1997, it has found out that the number of Hong Kong teenagers declaring dual identities has increased after ten years of reunion. Moreover, result from this study has also shown a positive correlation between identification as a Chinese and attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders (Lam, 2007). Despite the relationship of social identity with attitude, it is also believed that people’s culture can affect their attitude towards others through ingroup inclusiveness (Toomey, 1999).

As mentioned above, Hong Kong citizens in today’s society were grown up with a co-exposure of Chinese and Western cultures. Having considered this bicultural background of Hong Kong Chinese and the effects of culture on attitude and ingroup inclusiveness, it would be interesting for the present study to answer the research question of how the bicultural self identity of Hong Kong Chinese influence their ingroup inclusiveness and attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders.
2. Literature Review

A large number of cross-cultural studies have demonstrated that people in different cultures differ in their self-construal which correspondingly affects their inner psychological processes. For instance, the self-construal of Asians was found to be based on the relatedness between self and others while in contrast, individuals from Western cultures were found to be less emphasized on the connection with others but more on maintaining their independent self through the possession and description of their unique attributes (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Within this type of study, there is a common idea that people acquire and possess culturally specific meaning systems that consist of a group of values, ideas, knowledge and beliefs shared by members within a culture (D’Andrade, 1984). It is also believed that such culturally specific meaning systems influence or guide human behavior, emotion, and cognition (Benet-Martinez, Leu, Lee, & Morris, 2002). Early studies on cultural influences were all comparing people from different cultures across countries. However, in recent decades, studies have found that people who have dual cultural identities can alternate between culturally specific meaning systems in respond to environmental cues and to behave in culturally specific ways after being primed culturally (Benet-Martinez et al, 2002; Verplankan, Travimow, Khusid, Holland, & Steentjes, 2009). Such finding has stimulated further studies on social identity, cognition and attributes of individuals with dual cultural identities which are also known as Biculturals. For instance, a local study by Ng and Lai (in
press) has revealed that bicultural with both strong Chinese and Western selves are more psychologically integrated and is the only category to affirm multiple social identities when compared to individuals with weaker selves.

Ingroup Inclusiveness

Ingroup inclusiveness is defined as the extent of regarding one’s self as a member of a particular group and it reflects pride, personal significance and attachment to that specific group (Tropp & Wright, 2001). People classify objects or events base on the criterion of perceived similarities between a particular object with a prototype of the category. Implying such rule to ingroup inclusiveness, an individual categorizes his or her own self through the assimilation of self to the prototype of ingroup category and thus promote similarity among exemplars of that category (Ashmore, Jussim, & Wilder, 2001).

Two theories, social identity theory and optimal distinctiveness theory account for the motivation of ingroup inclusiveness. Tajfel and Turner’s (1981) social identity theory has suggested that a person strives to make sense of the self according to group membership and to fulfill the need for including in a group so as to bolster self-esteem through the engagement in ingroup favoritism. However, it is not always true for a group image or outcomes to be favorable and ingroup inclusiveness often implies both success and failures of a group (Ashmore, et al., 2001). Therefore, it is not persuasive to conclude that the desire to enhance self-esteem motivates ingroup inclusiveness and this opens up another explanation from
optimal distinctiveness theory. Brewer’s (1991, cited in Ashmore, et al., 2001) optimal distinctiveness theory speculates that people have a need of inclusion in assimilating the self into social groups which accounts for ingroup inclusiveness as well as a need to differentiate the self from others and there is a strive for people to maintain balance between the two needs (Ashmore, et al., 2001). Despite those theories in explaining the motivation for including the self in a particular group, ingroup inclusiveness was found to play a role in influencing intergroup attitude. For instance, degree of ingroup inclusiveness can moderate the extent of ingroup favoritism. Crisp and Beck’s (2005) study has demonstrated that when asking participants to think of similarities between ingroup and outgroup, ingroup favoritism of those who have low level of ingroup inclusiveness can be reduced to a greater extent than those with high level of ingroup inclusiveness.

Toomey (1999) suggested in his book that, culture is an important factor for satisfying peoples’ affiliation needs and to let them experience sense of ingroup inclusiveness. However, limited study has been carried out to study cultural influence on ingroup inclusiveness. Therefore, the present study is innovative in studying ingroup inclusiveness on Hong Kong Chinese and its effects on attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders.

Attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders

After the political reunification of Hong Kong with China, lots of studies have been conducted to measure attitudes of Hong Kong citizens towards Chinese Mainlanders based on
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theories in social identity and intergroup attitudes. For instance, Hong and his colleagues’ (2006) longitudinal study conducted before and after the reunification have revealed that participants’ social identity can strongly predict their attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders only before the reunification (stronger identification with Chinese identity leads to more favorable attitudes towards Mainlanders) rather than after the reunification, as attitudes between period of reunification may lead to subsequent changes in social identity.

The current study is also going to measure attitudes of Hong Kong undergraduate students towards Chinese Mainlanders twelve years after the reunification. However, unlike Hong and his colleagues’ (2006) study which focus on measuring explicit attitudes, this study differs in measuring both implicit and explicit attitude of Hong Kong Chinese undergraduate students towards Chinese Mainlanders.

Attitude is defined as the evaluation of human on different aspects of the social world including people, objects or events (Baron, Byrne, & Branscombe, 2006). There are two types of attitude, implicit attitude and explicit attitude. According to the associative-propositional evaluation (APE) model proposed by Gawronski and Bodenhausen (2006), implicit attitude represents associative processes that involve generating an automatic response based on certain associations that are automatically actuated when meeting pertinent stimulus. Such associative evaluation does not depend on personal judgment as correct or incorrect, but rather on immediate affection towards the stimulus (Gawronski & Bodenhausen, ...
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2006). An advantage of measuring implicit attitude instead of explicit attitude is that it reduces the effect of social desirability that is often found in self report measures of explicit attitude (Sassenberg & Wieber, 2005). Therefore, current study uses the measure of implicit attitude with Implicit Association Test developed by Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz (1998). As for explicit attitude, it would be measured in terms of orientation towards other group which would be discussed in the following paragraphs.

Orientation towards a group as explicit attitude

Orientation towards a group represents the degree of eagerness for an individual to interact or contact with members of a particular group (Lee, 2003). Allport’s (1954; cited in Brown, Eller, Leeds, & Stace, 2007) contact hypothesis suggested that prejudice can be reduced under situations in which members between groups contact with each other. Within such circumstance as mentioned in contact hypothesis, orientation towards a group has been proven empirically as a factor related to intergroup contact (Tynes, Giang, & Thompson, 2008). Because of such relevance with the behavioral concept of intergroup contact, researchers have measured intergroup explicit attitudes in terms of orientation towards other group or willingness to contact other group. For instance, a study on Hispanic students that measures explicit attitude in terms of orientation towards other group, has found out that school racial proportion and level of perceived comfort with cross-race friends were significantly correlated with orientation towards other group (Carlson, Wilson, & Hargrave,
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2003). Such finding has supported contact hypothesis, and thus has provided
empirically-based evidence in proofing that intergroup explicit attitude can be measured in
terms of orientation towards other group or willingness to contact. In the remaining sessions
of this report, explicit attitudes in terms of orientation towards other group would be referred
as willingness to contact for simplicity and convenience.

Bicultural Self Identity

Theories and studies have lent support to the belief that the self is constructed from the
person’s culture (Heine, 2001; Markus & Kitayama, 1991). There are two aspects of self,
independent and interdependent self-construal. Independent self-construal emphasizes on
maintaining independence from others and to perceive uniqueness in one’s own attributes,
whereas the interdependent self-construal focus on achieving interdependence or
connectedness with other individuals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). Studies have revealed
consistent results on higher salience of independent self among Westerners and higher
salience of interdependent self among Asians (Gardner, Gabriel, & Lee, 1999; Markus &
Kitayama, 1991; Toru, & Cameron, 1999). However, this doesn’t mean that the two
self-construal are of opposite directions, in fact, findings have revealed that they are
uncorrelated (Kwan, Bond, & Singelis, 1997; Singelis, 1994). Such fact is supported and best
demonstrated from studies on bicultural individuals in which they were found to have high
salience on both independent and interdependent self-construal (Yamada & Singelis, 1999).
Under the confluence of both Chinese and Western culture, Hong Kong has become an interesting place to study biculturalism. The model of bicultural self proposed by Ng, Yam, and Lai (2007) can classify Hong Kong Chinese into four groups based on the strength of Chinese and Western self. Those categories are, high on both selves namely Biculturals; high in Western self but low in Chinese self namely Western-centrics; high in Chinese self but low in Western self namely Sino-centrics, and low on both selves namely Marginals.

With the effort of biculturalism study in examining individual variations in the construction of dual cultural identities, a model of Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) was proposed by Benet-Martinez and colleagues in 2002. It refers to a dimension of individual differences in experiencing the degree of intersection versus counteraction between the original culture and mainstream culture. From this continuum of BII, people with high BII generally perceive their dual cultural identities as more integrated. Later investigation of bicultural identity integration among Chinese American Bicultural by Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005) have found that individual differences in BII are resulted from variations in the psychological constructs of cultural conflict and cultural distance in which each refers to an independent form of overlap between the two cultural identities.

Numerous studies have investigated on the psychological constructs of ingroup inclusiveness and intergroup attitudes (Brown & Hewstone, 2005; Carlson, et al., 2003; Hong et al., 2006; Lee, 2003; Waldzus & Mummendey, 2004). Central to this line of research is the
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focus on comparing cross-cultural or cross-ethnic groups’ variations in ingroup inclusiveness and attitudes. The issue of individual differences within an ethnic group has seldom been taken into account and therefore, a componential approach to bicultural self identity that emphasizes individual variations was adopted in this study. Based on the model of bicultural self identity proposed by Ng, Yam, and Lai (2007), the present study is going to examine the effects of bicultural self identity of Hong Kong Chinese on ingroup inclusiveness, implicit attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders and willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders.
3. Hypotheses

In the present study, bicultural self identity serves as the independent variable. The effects of bicultural self identity on three dependent variables: ingroup inclusiveness (DV$_1$), explicit attitude measured as willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders (DV$_2$), and implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders (DV$_3$) will be examined.

According to the literature that has been reviewed in the previous session and studies, culture can affect a person’s behavior, cognitions and emotions (Brislin, 2000). It is expected that the three dependent variables would be positively affected by the strength of Chinese self but negatively affected by the strength of Western self. Base on this rationale, the following hypotheses were made:

**Hypothesis 1**

Sino-centric, who have strong level of Chinese self but low level of Western self would have the most positive implicit attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centric.

**Hypothesis 2**

Sino-centric, who have high level of Chinese self but low level of Western self would have the highest ingroup inclusiveness, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centric.
Hypothesis 3

*Sino-centric*, who have high level of Chinese self but low level of Western self would have the highest willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centric.

Hypothesis 4

Base on previous study conducted by Ng and Lai (in press), significant implications of bicultural self on social identities among Hong Kong citizens were found (e.g. Sino-centric strongly endorse Chinese identity). Moreover, with the implication of social identity theory, people are more willing to contact with ingroup members and have high tendency in expressing favorable attitudes towards them after they have identified with a group. With these rationales and predictions in Hypotheses 2 and 3, it is proposed that ingroup inclusiveness is the mediator of the effect of bicultural self identity on explicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders. According to Baron and Kenny (1986, cited in Preacher & Hayes, 2004), a mediator refers to a variable that has a certain degree of influence on the relationship between the independent and dependent variables. Therefore, the fourth Hypothesis is:

*Ingroup inclusiveness has a mediating effect between bicultural self identity and willingness to contact.*
Figure 1. Predicted mediating effect of ingroup inclusiveness on the effect of bicultural self identity and willingness to contact.
4. Methodology

Participants

A convenient sample of 61 university students, including 31 males and 30 females have participated in this study. Within this sample, all of them are ethnic Chinese who are local citizens living in Hong Kong. The average number of years staying in Hong Kong is 21 years.

Measures

The questionnaire for current study is typewritten in both Chinese and English. Questions in the original scales are initially written in English, back translation was carried out for translating them into Chinese. In addition to the personal information section, all participants were required to complete four other sections in the questionnaires that are used to measure the following:

Ingroup Inclusiveness

For measuring the strength of ingroup inclusiveness of participants, two scales were adopted. The first scale is Tropp and Weight’s (2001) 7-point Inclusion of Ingroup in Self scale, which makes use of Venn Diagrams to represent and measure participants’ perceived closeness of themselves with Mainland China. The scale contains seven pairs of circles in which a circle of each pair represents the individual self while the other represents Mainland China. The greater the overlapping between the two circles in each pair, the larger degree of
perceiving self identity as more tied to the identity of Chinese. The second scale for measuring ingroup inclusiveness was a 3-item scale adopted from Comeau (2007). Each item is assessed on a 7-point scale ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree, in which higher points represent higher ingroup inclusiveness.

Bicultural Self Identity

To measure participants’ subjective integration of Chinese self and Western self, a four item scale developed by Ng, Yam and Lai (2007) was adopted. This scale aims to classify each participant into one of the four groups: Biculturals, Sino-centrics, Western-centrics and Marginals. Every item is assessed on a 7-point scale towards the positive direction from weak (1) to strong (7). Generally, higher scores represent stronger integration of Chinese self and/or Western self. In addition to the measurement of participants’ level of Chinese and Western selves; two items were adopted from Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005) for the measure of bicultural integration in terms of cultural distance and cultural conflict. Both items are assessed on a 4-point scale ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (4), in which higher scores represent higher integration of both cultures.

Willingness to Contact

The Other-group Orientation Scale developed by Phinney (1992) was used to assess participants’ willingness to contact with Chinese Mainlanders. This scale includes six items in which each of the item is assessed on a 4-point scale from strongly disagree (1) to strongly
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agree (4). Higher scores represent higher willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders.

Implicit Attitude towards Chinese Mainlanders

The Implicit Association Test (IAT) developed by Greenwald, McGhee and Schwartz (1998) was used to assess participants’ implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders. The standard procedure of a computer-administered Implicit Association Test involves seven blocks which are made up of practice and test sessions (Blocks 1-3, 5-6, are practice sessions; Block 4 & 7 are test sessions). There are three main tasks for completion of an Implicit Association Test. The first task involves the classification of exemplars from two comparison groups (e.g. people’s photo from two ethnic groups) using two keys in a keyboard (e for ethnic A and i for ethnic B) the second task involves the classification of exemplars from two opposite concepts (e.g. words that associate with either positive or negative feelings) using the same two keys; and the third task involves a classification of all four groups where two groups correspond to one key and the other two groups correspond to the other key (e.g. e key for ethnic A group and positive, i key for ethnic B group and negative) (Greenwald, Uhlmann, Poehlman, & Banaji, 2009). The Implicit Association Test measures implicit attitude through the assessment of association strengths between groups and concepts in terms of response latencies in each trial.

The two comparison groups obtained in this study are Chinese Mainlanders and Westerners. Six photos of Chinese Mainlanders and six photos of Westerners were used as
stimuli (see Appendix 1). These photos were rated by 20 volunteers who were excluded from
the main study but have same background as participants; this is to guarantee that each of the
photos truly represents the group that they are supposed to belong to. In addition, six
adjectives that reflect positive meaning and six adjectives that reflect negative meaning were
used as the contrasted concepts in the second classification task (See Appendix 1). These
adjectives were also checked by those 20 volunteers in order to guarantee that they reflect the
same type of meaning as they suppose to.

Procedures

This study was carried out in a quiet study room and the estimated time for completing
the whole procedure is expected to be 15 to 20 minutes. Participants are required to finish the
Implicit Association Test before filling out the questionnaire.

As summarized in Table 1, there are seven blocks of trials in an IAT and participants
have to complete three main tasks. First, they have to classify images of Chinese Mainlanders
and Westerners shown on a computer screen into respective groups of Chinese Mainlanders
versus Westerners using two response keys on the keyboard of the computer, i.e. D and K.
They then classify adjectives into their respective groups of positive versus negative using the
two same response keys. They then have to classify images and adjectives into their
respective groups using the same response keys, i.e. D for Chinese Mainlanders or positive
and K for Westerners or negative. Response keys representing each group or concept would
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alternate between blocks to reduce order effects. Each participant has to go through five practice and two test sessions for the Implicit Association Test and then answers the 22-item questionnaire.

Table 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Block</th>
<th>Number of trials</th>
<th>Session</th>
<th>Instructions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1     | 21               | Practice| D: Chinese Mainlanders  
|       |                  |         | K: Westerners |
| 2     | 21               | Practice| D: positive  
|       |                  |         | K: negative |
| 3     | 25               | Practice| D: positive + Chinese Mainlanders  
|       |                  |         | K: negative + Westerners |
| 4     | 41               | Test    | D: positive + Chinese Mainlanders  
|       |                  |         | K: negative + Westerners |
| 5     | 31               | Practice| D: Westerner  
|       |                  |         | K: Chinese Mainlanders |
| 6     | 25               | Practice| D: positive + Westerner  
|       |                  |         | K: negative + Chinese Mainlanders |
| 7     | 41               | Test    | D: positive + Westerner  
|       |                  |         | K: negative + Chinese Mainlanders |

Note:
30 participants completed the test in the following sequence so as to counteract the order effect between tasks: Blocks 5, 2, 6, 7, 1, 3, 4.
5. Results

Data were collected from a sample of 61 participants. Table 2 summarizes the descriptive statistics.

Table 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Value/Range</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>51% Male, 49% Female</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of years living in Hong Kong</td>
<td>17-28</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language medium in Primary School</td>
<td>95% Chinese, 5% English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Language medium in Secondary School</td>
<td>36% Chinese, 64% English</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

All statistical analyses in this study were conducted with the use of the SPSS software, version 17.0. In ensuring internal consistency, reliability of scales used and correlation analyses were performed and were summarized in Table 3.

As shown in Table 3, internal reliabilities for most scales used in this study are satisfactory as Cronbach’s alphas are higher than .70 ($\alpha > .70$), except the measure of Chinese self in bicultural self integration ($\alpha = .63$). In addition, one item is deleted from the original six items of the other-group orientation scale to improve reliability from $\alpha = .66$ to $\alpha = .73$. 
Table 3  
Scales and Variables Analyses (n = 61)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean (SD)</th>
<th>α</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 BISI</td>
<td>2.34 (.20)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.80**</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>-.36**</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>-.45**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 CS</td>
<td>4.71 (.08)</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.40</td>
<td>.30*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 WS</td>
<td>5.03 (.02)</td>
<td>.83</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.37**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 INGP</td>
<td>4.85 (.22)</td>
<td>.80</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.33**</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 WTC</td>
<td>2.49 (.37)</td>
<td>.73</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 IMPAT</td>
<td>-.24 (.46)</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 CD</td>
<td>3.26 (.48)</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>.47**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 CC</td>
<td>2.93 (.60)</td>
<td></td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>--</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes

α = Cronbach’s alpha

*correlation is significant at p<.05 level (2-tailed)

**correlation is significant at p<.01 level (2-tailed)

BISI = Bicultural self identity  CS = Chinese self  WS = Western self

INGP = Ingroup inclusiveness  IMPAT = Implicit attitudes  WTC = Willingness to contact

CD = Cultural distance  CC = Cultural conflict

For the measure of bicultural self identity, there are two items each for measuring both the Western self and Chinese self. Correlations between the two items in measuring Chinese self ($r = .46$, $p < .01$) and Western self ($r = .71$, $p < .01$) are significant. According to the result in Table 3, correlation between Chinese self and Western self was insignificant.

This insignificant correlation is consistent with the study of Ng, Yam and Lai (2007) in
demonstrating that Chinese self and Western self are independent of each other. As a result, four groups of bicultural self identity (Bicultural, Sino-centric, Western-centric and Marginal) can be established and classified based on the strength of Western self and Chinese self.

In this study, both Chinese self and Western self were recorded as either weak or strong based on a cutoff point of 4.0, i.e. the mid-point of the 7-point scale. A score of 4.5 or below is regarded as weak, whereas scores above 4.5 were regarded as strong for present purposes. Based on this criterion, 22 participants were identified as Bicultural (both selves are strong), 10 participants as Sino-centric (strong on Chinese self but low on Western self), 15 participants as Western-centric (strong on Western self but low on Chinese self), and 14 participants as Marginal (low on both selves).

With the use of bicultural self identity as a factor, a one-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effect of bicultural self identity on bicultural integration in terms of cultural conflict and cultural distance. The result was shown in Table 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>dfs</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cultural distance</td>
<td>3, 57</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>13.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cultural conflict</td>
<td>3, 57</td>
<td>.77</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
As shown in Table 4, current study has revealed a significant relationship among the four groups of bicultural self identity on cultural distance, $F (3, 57) = 13.99, p = .00$.

However, the relationship among the four groups of bicultural self identity on cultural conflict is insignificant, $F (3, 57) = .31, p = .82$. Table 5 contains the means and standard deviations on both cultural distance and cultural conflicts for the four groups of bicultural self identity.

### Table 5

*Means and Standard Deviations of Bicultural Self Identity on Cultural Distance and Cultural Conflict*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bicultural self identity</th>
<th>Cultural distance</th>
<th>Cultural conflict</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Western-centrics</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginals</td>
<td>2.93</td>
<td>.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Biculturals</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sino-centrics</td>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Analyses of variances (ANOVA) on both cultural distance and cultural conflict were conducted as follow-up tests to the MANOVA. The ANOVA on cultural distance was significant, $F (3, 57) = 6.67, p = .001, \eta^2 = .26$. However, the ANOVA on cultural conflict was insignificant, $F (3, 57) = .77, p = .092, \eta^2 = .11$. Post hoc analyses to the one way ANOVA for the cultural distance was conducted to examine which group of bicultural self identity was the most bicultural integrated in terms of cultural distance. Using the Bonferroni method, results are shown on Table 6.
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Table 6

| Bonferroni Comparisons among Means of Bicultural Self Identity on Cultural Distance |
|----------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------|-----------------|
| (I)                              | (J)             | Mean Diff (I-J) | Std. Error      | 95% Confidence Interval |
| Western-centric                  | Marginal        | .34             | .157            | -.21               |
|                                  | Bicultural      | -.28            | .142            | -.77               |
|                                  | Sinocentric     | .17             | .173            | -.43               |
| Marginal                         | Western-centric | -.34            | .157            | -.88               |
|                                  | Bicultural      | -.62*           | .145            | -1.12              |
|                                  | Sinocentric     | -.17            | .175            | -.78               |
| Bicultural                        | Western-centric | .28             | .142            | -.21               |
|                                  | Marginal        | .62*            | .145            | .12                |
|                                  | Sinocentric     | .44*            | .161            | -.11               |
| Sinocentric                       | Western-centric | -.17            | .173            | -.76               |
|                                  | Marginal        | .17             | .175            | -.43               |
|                                  | Bicultural      | -.44*           | .161            | -1.00              |

*Mean difference is significant at p < .05 level

According to Table 6, Biculturals were significantly more psychologically integrated on cultural distance in comparison with Sino-centric and Marginals but not with Western-centics. In sum, this study is consistent with previous studies (Benet-Martinez, et al., 2002; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005) in revealing a significant relationship between bicultural self identity and cultural distance. Furthermore, current study has showed that Biculturals were more integrated in terms of cultural distance than the other three groups, but differences were only significant with respect to the Sino-centric category and the Marginal category. Overall, results show a strong though incomplete validation for the model of bicultural self identity used in current study.
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Before the analysis and testing of hypotheses, groups of bicultural self identity were coded in a way that is consistent with the hypothesized trend (i.e. Sino-centric = 4, Bicultural = 3, Marginal = 2, Western-centric = 1) so that interval between groups is the same.

Hypothesis 1

The Improved Scoring Algorithm recommended by Greenwald, Nosek, and Banaji (2003) was used in scoring implicit attitude from the Implicit Association Test. Data collected from Block 3, 4, 6 and 7 in each participant were used for calculating the IAT scores (D measure). Participants whose response time was longer than 10 000 ms (N = 0) and/or less than 300 ms (N = 0) have to be excluded. No log transformation was carried out and response latencies of the occurrence of eventual correct response upon errors (built-in error penalty) were recorded. A positive D measure indicates more positive implicit attitudes towards Westerners whereas a negative D measure indicates more positive implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders. Participants in this sample show a more positive implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders (M= -.24, SD= .46).

A one-way ANOVA was conducted to test the effect of bicultural self identity on implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders. The effect was not strong enough to be statistically significant, $F(3, 57) = 1.64, p = .19$. Since the effect was insignificant, no further analysis on multiple comparisons was conducted to investigate the difference between groups of bicultural self identity on implicit attitudes towards Chinese Mainlanders. Therefore,
Hypothesis 1 was not supported.

Hypothesis 2

In analyzing the relationship between bicultural self identity and ingroup inclusiveness, one-way ANOVA was conducted. The ANOVA was significant, $F(3, 57) = 4.83, p = .005, \eta^2 = .20$. Means and standard deviations of groups of bicultural self identity on ingroup inclusiveness were summarized in Table 7.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western-centric</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.57</td>
<td>.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.21</td>
<td>.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sino-centric</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to analyze the hypothesized trend of bicultural self identity on ingroup inclusiveness, i.e. Sino-centrics would have the highest significant ingroup inclusiveness, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centrics, a LSD (least significant difference) test was conducted for this planned comparison. Results were listed in Table 8.
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Table 8
LSD Comparison among Means of Bicultural Self Identity on Ingroup Inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sino-centric</td>
<td>Western-centric</td>
<td>.98*</td>
<td>.342</td>
<td>.29 - 1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>.70*</td>
<td>.347</td>
<td>.01 - 1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.320</td>
<td>-.57 - .71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean difference is significant at the.05 level.

As indicated in Table 8, besides of the mean differences between Sino-centric and Bicultural was insignificant, the other two mean differences were significant. Therefore, results of LSD (least significant difference) test have indicated that Sino-centric had the highest ingroup inclusiveness than the other three groups but this superiority is significant when comparing to Western-centric and Marginal only. Therefore, Hypothesis 2 was partially supported.

Hypotheses 3

A one-way ANOVA was conducted for measuring the effect of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact. Result of this analysis has shown a significant effect, $F(3, 57) = 5.13$, $p = .003$, $\eta^2 = .21$. Means and standard deviations of groups of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact were summarized in Table 9.
Table 9  
*Means and Standard Deviations of Bicultural Self Identity on Willingness to Contact*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Western-centric</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2.23</td>
<td>.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2.46</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2.61</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sino-centric</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For analyzing the hypothesized trend of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact, i.e. Sino-centrics have the highest significant willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centrics, LSD (least significant difference) test was used for this planned comparison. Significant findings were found in the mean difference between Sino-centric and Western-centric at $p = .001$, as well as the mean difference between Bicultural and Western-centric at $p = .002$ (See Table 10). Overall, results indicate that Sino-centrics have the highest willingness to contact than the other three groups, but this superiority is only significant with respect to Western-centric. Therefore, results provide an incomplete support to Hypothesis 3.
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Table 10

LSD Comparison among Means of Bicultural Self Identity in Willingness to Contact

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>(I)</th>
<th>(J)</th>
<th>Mean Diff (I-J)</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sino-centric</td>
<td>Western-centric</td>
<td>.45*</td>
<td>.137</td>
<td>.18 -.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marginal</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.139</td>
<td>-.05 .50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bicultural</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.128</td>
<td>-.19 .33</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mean difference is significant at the .05 level.

Hypothesis 4

Baron and Kenny (1986, cited in Preacher, & Hayes, 2004) suggested that there are three conditions to fulfill for a variable to be claimed as a mediator: i) there is a significant effect of independent variable on dependent variable, ii) there is a significant effect of independent variable on the mediator and iii) there is a significant effect of the mediator on dependent variable after controlling for the independent variable. In testing the mediation effect of ingroup inclusiveness between bicultural self identity and willingness to contact, regression analysis and Sobel Test were used as the statistical analyses. In addition, groups of bicultural self identity are coded in a way that is consistent with the hypothesized trend (i.e. Sino-centric = 4, Bicultural = 3, Marginal = 2, Western-centric = 1) so that interval between groups is the same. A linear regression analysis was used to test the prediction of ingroup inclusiveness (mediator) from the bicultural self identity (IV). The regression equation for predicting the ingroup inclusiveness is:

\[ \text{Predicted ingroup inclusiveness} = .378 \text{ bicultural self identity} + 3.925 \]
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The 95% confidence interval for the slope is from .171 to .585, note that the range doesn’t contain the value of zero, and thus bicultural self identity is significantly related to ingroup inclusiveness at \( p = .001 \). The correlation between bicultural self identity and ingroup inclusiveness was .43. Sino-centrics who have higher scores ( 1= Western-centric; 2 = Marginal, 3 = Bicultural, 4 = Sino-centrics ) in bicultural self identity tended to have higher scores in ingroup inclusiveness.

Another linear regression analysis was used to test the prediction of willingness to contact from ingroup inclusiveness. The regression equation for predicting the willingness to contact is:

\[
\text{Predicted willingness to contact} = .134 \text{ ingroup inclusiveness} + 1.841
\]

The 95% confidence interval for the slope is from .036 to .233, which also doesn’t contain the value of zero. Therefore, ingroup inclusiveness is significantly related to willingness to contact at \( p = .009 \). The correlation between ingroup inclusiveness and willingness to contact was .33.

After these linear regression analyses, a Sobel test was used for analyzing the significance of the mediating effect of ingroup inclusiveness between the effect of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact. Unstandardized coefficient and standard error of the direct effect of bicultural self identity on ingroup inclusiveness, \( \beta = .378, \text{ S.E.} = .103 \), as well as those from the direct effect of ingroup inclusiveness on willingness to contact ( \( \beta \) is
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=.134, S.E. = .049) were included for the calculation and analysis of the Sobel Test. Results of Sobel Test were listed in Table 11.

Table 11
Sobel Test on the Mediation Effect of Ingroup Inclusiveness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>S.E.</th>
<th>p =</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.19</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In order to prove ingroup inclusiveness is a mediator, a comparison on the strength of the indirect effect of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact through ingroup inclusiveness, to an extent that the null hypothesis equals to zero is provided by the Sobel Test (Preacher & Hayes, 2004). As shown in Table 11, such indirect effect is significant. This has proven that ingroup inclusiveness is the mediator in the effect of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact. Therefore, Hypothesis 4 was supported.
6. Discussion

With the combination of long-standing theories in social psychology and concepts from cross-cultural psychology, the present study first adopted the componential approach to bicultural self identity in examining its effect on ingroup inclusiveness, implicit attitudes and willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders. It then later analyzed the mediating role of ingroup inclusiveness in the influence of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact.

Hypotheses 1

There was no significant finding obtained in supporting Hypothesis 1. Although some of the participants have reported difficulties in responding to the stimuli during the Implicit Association Test, the possibility of making high percentage of errors in reducing the reliability and validity of the IAT was ruled out. This is because error latencies are included in the calculation of the final IAT score (D measures) and no participant has more than 10% errors in those test sessions. One reason for the insignificant effect between implicit attitudes and bicultural self identity was provided by the associative evaluation nature of IAT in which responses can be made no matter others agree with them or not. Lam, Chiu, and Lau (2007) suggested that the inconsistency between the associative evaluation nature (affective reactions with no truth value) of IAT and the propositional evaluation nature (validation process with truth value) of other variable such as bicultural self identity can lead to insignificant relationship between the two variables. In other words, only self-report
measures of explicit attitude could be coherent with variables that are of propositional
evaluation in nature (Lam et al., 2007). Results in current study seem to support such claim
by Lam and his colleagues (2007) as significant effects could only be found between
bicultural self identity and explicit attitude (i.e. Hypothesis 2) instead of implicit attitude.
However, this claim remains critical as few studies have been carried out to investigate on the
issue of coherence between implicit attitude and propositional implication of ingroup
inclusiveness or social identity. Another reason comes from the criticism of Implicit
Association Test which questions its validity. Fiedler, Messner and Bluemke (2006) suggested
that the D measures of IAT reflect stimuli-valence associations but these associations do not
necessarily equal to attitudes. Moreover, it was suggested that IAT is susceptible to
intentional faking response and voluntary control (Fiedler, et al, 2006). For instance, in the
study of Fiedler and Bluemke (2005) in which a German versus Turk IAT was used, German
participants who were asked to produce fake responses knew that they could do so by
slowing down their response speed in compatible trials (i.e. Chinese Mainlanders positive
versus Westerners negative) even though they have not been informed of this strategy. This
has illustrated a problem that purpose of IAT may not be well concealed and participants can
have conscious influence in responding an IAT task if they could discover the IAT theme. To
avoid this possibility of influence due to improper conceal of purpose, experimenters could
ask participants to write down their guesses of the purpose of IAT or the study, those who
knew the purpose could then be eliminated from data analysis.

Hypotheses 2

Significant results in the analysis of Hypothesis 2 has confirmed that Sino-centric was the group that has the highest ingroup inclusiveness among four groups of bicultural self identity, but this superiority was significant with respect to Western-centrics and Marginals only. Such finding has partially supported the initial prediction in which level of Chinese self integration has a positive effect in ingroup inclusiveness whereas level of Western self integration has an adverse effect in ingroup inclusiveness. The insignificant finding between Sino-centric and Bicultural can be explained by the alternation model of second-culture acquisition. According to this model, bicultural individuals can switch their manner of behaviors or thoughts that are consistent with one of the two integrated cultures according to situational cues or during the process of acculturation (LaFromboise, Coleman, & Gerton, 1993). Such model has been supported by culture priming studies in recent decades (Benet-Martinez & Lee, 2002; Ng & Lai, 2009; Sui, Zhu, & Chiu, 2007; Wong & Hong, 2005). Applying the alternation model in the explanation of such insignificant finding, participants who are bicultural have switched to their strong level of Chinese self and behave or think in a way that is consistent with Sino-centrics. Consequently, levels of Western self in these bicultural participants have little effects on their thoughts only and therefore, ingroup inclusiveness of Biculturals has no significant difference with that of Sino-centrics.
Hypotheses 3

It was confirmed by the analysis of Hypothesis 3 that Sino-centric have the highest willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders as compared to the other three groups of bicultural self identity. However, this superiority is only significant when compared to Western-centric only. So, Sino-centric were not significantly higher than Biculturals and Marginals on the willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders. As a result, Hypothesis 3 and the initial prediction of Chinese and Western selves influence on individual were only partially supported. Nevertheless, the significant difference between Sino-centric and Western-centric on willingness to contact has proven that Chinese self has a positive effect while Western self has an adverse effect on willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders. This is because Sino-centric have high levels of Chinese self and thus have higher level of willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders than Western-centric who have high levels of Western self. Furthermore, the effects of Chinese self and Western self in Biculturals and Marginals may be less powerful and thus there was no significant difference between Sino-centric and these two groups of bicultural self identity. Although significant difference was only found between Sino-centric and Western-centric, it should be noticed that the sequence of means in each group follows the hypothesized trend, i.e. Sino-centric have the highest willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders, followed by Biculturals, Marginals and Western-centric (See Table 9).
Hypothesis 4

From the analysis of the Sobel Test, it has proven that ingroup inclusiveness is the mediator between bicultural self identity and willingness to contact with Chinese Mainlanders. In other words, bicultural self identity has effect on willingness to contact through ingroup inclusiveness. This finding has given a strong support of Tajfel and Turner’s (1981) social identity theory which states that people who identified with a group have more favorable attitudes towards ingroup members, this phenomenon is also called ingroup favoritism. Therefore, people’s willingness to contact Chinese Mainlanders who are regarded as ingroup members depends on their extent of ingroup inclusiveness, which is in turn influenced by their bicultural self identities.
7. Limitations and Conclusions

Limitations

In spite of those significant findings listed and discussed in previous sessions, it is important to be aware of the limitations in current study. Firstly, participants are only limited to university students which can not represent all Hong Kong Chinese. Secondly, the sample size (N=61) is not big enough, so that results found in this study cannot be generalized and the effect size is also lower. Thirdly, the Implicit Association Test may be inaccurate in measuring implicit attitudes of participants because it requires participants’ concentration and response speed during the task. So, results can easily be affected if participants’ levels of arousal during the task are too low. Fourthly, the self report measure of attitudes in terms of willingness to contact may be too explicit for participants to know what the study measures and may intentionally respond in a manner that impress others. Such social desirability bias found in self report measure of attitude may contaminate research findings.

Further Studies

Current study has found insignificant mean differences on both ingroup inclusiveness and explicit attitude in terms of willingness to contact between Sino-centric and Bicultural individuals. The alternation model is used to account for this insignificant result, in which Bicultural individuals were assumed to switch to their strong Chinese self and behave in a manner that is consistent or similar to Sino-centric individuals. Nevertheless, future study has
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to be conducted to further investigate this explanation. For instance, researchers can make use of culture priming on bicultural individuals so that some of them receive Chinese priming and others receive Western priming. Results on the dependent variable (e.g. ingroup inclusiveness) of Sino-centric and Biculturals can be compared, and observe if there is a mean difference between Sino-centric and Bicultural when Chinese primed and when Western primed.

To further examine psychological reunification of Hong Kong citizens to Mainland China, attitudes towards Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders can be compared. Contrary to the use of Westerners and Chinese Mainlanders in establishing reference groups of Implicit Association Test, future studies can use Hong Kongers and Chinese Mainlanders instead. Although it is more difficult to distinguish between photos of Chinese Mainlanders and Hong Kongers, photos of famous people such as artists or politicians in Hong Kong and China can be used. However, pre-existing preference towards these famous people may interrupt results obtained. Therefore, names written in simplified characters as representing Chinese Mainlanders and traditional characters as representing Hong Kongers can be used. In this way, results of participant from different groups of bicultural self identity can be compared.

Conclusions

To conclude, current study is innovative in investigating the influence of bicultural self identity on ingroup inclusiveness, implicit attitudes, and explicit attitudes in terms of willingness to contact. The componential approach to bicultural self identity undertaken in
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this study has reflected significant effects on ingroup inclusiveness and willingness to contact.

In examining the mechanism behind the effect of bicultural self identity on willingness to contact, mediation analysis has proven that ingroup inclusiveness is the mediator in such effect. This result has gained support for Tajfel and Turner’s (1981) social identity theory which emphasize the significance of including a group in the self on attitudes. In addition to the contribution of current study for exploring cultural influence on human cognition, behavior and emotions, future research on cross-cultural and social psychology would definitely help to gain more insights and understanding on the related issue.
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Appendix 1

Photos and adjectives used in IAT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chinese Mainlanders</th>
<th>Westerners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><img src="image1" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image2" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image3" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image4" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image5" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image6" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><img src="image7" alt="Photo" /></td>
<td><img src="image8" alt="Photo" /></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Positive</th>
<th>Negative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>喜悅</td>
<td>傷害</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>和平</td>
<td>糟糕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>歡笑</td>
<td>髒髒</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>愉快</td>
<td>可怕</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>愛</td>
<td>恐怖</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>美妙</td>
<td>邪惡</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 2

Questionnaire of this study.

Hi, I am a final year Psychology student from City University of Hong Kong. I sincerely invite you to participate in this research on biculturalism, and hope that you can spend about fifteen minutes to participate in this research.

This current research consists of two parts. The first part is an implicit association test, while the second part is a short questionnaire. You have the right to choose whether to participate in this research or not, and you can also quit at any time after the research has begun. Information collected will be anonymous and confidential. It will also be discarded after the research has completed.

If you have any questions or suggestions about this research, please ask the research immediately. I will reply you as soon as possible. Thanks for your participation!
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一. 請想一想你與中國人的連係，然後選出你認為最適合來形容你們的連係的一對圓形。
Please think about your relationship with the Chinese group. Choose one pair of circles that best describe your connection to the Chinese group.

二. 請細讀以下問題，然後圈出你認為合適的答案
Please read the following questions carefully and circle the most suitable answer.

1) 對我來說，身為中國人是認識自己是誰的一個重要部份.
   Being a member of Chinese is a very important part of who I am.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>中度不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>中度同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2) 身為中國人使我感到自豪.
   I am proud to be a Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>中度不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>中度同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3) 我與大部份中國人很相似.
   I am just like most Chinese.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>非常不同意</th>
<th>中度不同意</th>
<th>不同意</th>
<th>中立</th>
<th>同意</th>
<th>中度同意</th>
<th>非常同意</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Mildly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Neutral</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Mildly Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
三. 請細讀以下問題，然後圈出你認為合適的答案

Please read the following questions carefully and circle the most suitable answer.

1. 我喜愛認識或約會來自中國內地的朋友
   I like meeting and getting to know people from Mainland China.

   | 非常不同意 | 不同意 | 同意 | 非常同意 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

2. 有時，我會覺得如果中國內地人不會和香港人混在一起會更好
   I sometimes feel it would be better if Chinese Mainlanders and Hong Kongers didn’t try to mix together.

   | 非常不同意 | 不同意 | 同意 | 非常同意 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

3. 我經常花時間和中國內地人一起
   I often spend time with Chinese Mainlanders.

   | 非常不同意 | 不同意 | 同意 | 非常同意 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

4. 我不會嘗試跟中國內地人做朋友
   I don’t try to become friends with Chinese Mainlanders

   | 非常不同意 | 不同意 | 同意 | 非常同意 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |

5. 我十分投入與中國內地人一起參與的活動
   I am involved in activities with Chinese Mainlanders.

   | 非常不同意 | 不同意 | 同意 | 非常同意 |
   | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
   | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 |
6. 我喜愛與中國內地人一起
   I enjoy being around Chinese Mainlanders.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>強烈不同意（Strongly Disagree）</th>
<th>不同意（Disagree）</th>
<th>同意（Agree）</th>
<th>強烈同意（Strongly Agree）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

四. 請細讀以下問題，然後圈出你認為合適的答案

1. 我覺得我的中華文化認同感是…。
   I feel the Chinese identity in me is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>弱（weak）</th>
<th>強（strong）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. 我覺得我的西化文化認同感是…。
   I feel the Western identity in me is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>弱（weak）</th>
<th>強（strong）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. 我覺得中華文化對我的影響是…
   I feel the Chinese culture in me is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>弱（weak）</th>
<th>強（strong）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. 我覺得西方文化對我的影響是…
   I feel the Western culture in me is…

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>弱（weak）</th>
<th>強（strong）</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>