

IJoC #3883-ks
**Mediated Contact, Intergroup Attitudes, and Ingroup Members' Basic Values:
South Koreans and migrant workers**

Reviewer A

There are a number of things I like about this paper, and a couple of things that could be fixed.

#1.

Essentially, it feels like two papers to me -- one a paper about mediated contact, and another about values and attitudes. The former is an experimental study, the latter ends up as a report of correlations between variables measured after a manipulation. I found the reports of correlations fairly uninspiring. The fact that they were measured after the experimental manipulation makes them not just dull but also questionable -- some of the variation in those variables is a function of the manipulation, and so interpreting their interrelations without considering the manipulation is a perilous business. But most important, the rationale for examining the correlations is both undeveloped and unrelated to the rationale for the experiment (they don't have to do with contact or media exposure). As a result, I would recommend dropping the correlation analysis and focusing on the experiment. The experiment is simple, cleanly designed, and yields significant findings. With a little development, the findings could be made even more interesting and be a substantive contribution to the literature. And by dropping the correlations, the paper will seem more like a coherent entity rather than a general exploration of a data set. The values measures might perhaps have made decent moderators to explore here, but since (at least as I understand it) they were measured after the manipulation, that won't work. To develop your ideas using the measures you have, you could explore whether the effects on perceptions of migrant workers offer an indirect pathway to broader values... e.g.,

positive contact -> positive perceptions of migrants -> universalism values

This would reflect Pettigrew's ideas about deprovincialization nicely... the mediated model is easy to test and doesn't depend on there being a direct effect of contact on universalism. This would be a truly novel contribution to the literature.

In the revised manuscript, we dropped the correlation analysis and any references related to the analysis. Instead, as the review suggested, we added two indirect effect models encompassing positive contact/negative contact (IV), perception of migrant workers (M), and power/universalism values (DV) and reported the analysis results. See the hypotheses 4 & 5.

#2.

With the space saved by dropping the correlation analysis (and writing more efficiently -- see below), you have room to explore at least one other interesting question. As you note, Paolini's recent work suggests that negative effects are stronger than positive; you could explore this in your data, comparing the size of the positive-control effect against the size of the negative-control effect... (assuming you can make some case that the positive condition is "as" positive as the negative condition is negative). It looks like you would NOT find the difference Paolini

predicts... at least in terms of eyeballing the means, the positive and negative effects look roughly equal in size; this would be a contribution to the literature allowing you to discuss perhaps when and where Paolini's predictions might work or not work.

With the pace saved by eliminating the correlation analysis, we created a new hypothesis (H3) comparing the size of positive and negative mediated contact. Accordingly, the literature review regarding the positive and negative effect asymmetry became central to the whole manuscript. In the previous version, it was an afterthought.

As you predicted, the increased emphasis on the positive and negative effect asymmetry made the manuscript a lot more interesting (at least in our opinion). It also made the revision process far more enjoyable and rewarding. We thank you for that.

Other comments, roughly in order...

#3

You cite (Author, 2012) on page 3. This is a bit frustrating -- citations provide support for arguments, but with citations like this it is impossible to judge the quality of the support. Why not just cite the piece in full -- in this context there is no way for me to know that the person being cited is you, so no harm is done to blind review. Globally, I don't see how a review can determine the optimal NAME for a concept, but at least if I knew the cite I could judge for myself. Overall, I think the parasocial - vicarious distinction is a useful one that we should retain; in parasocial contact we are exposed to outgroup members via media. In vicarious contact we are exposed to intergroup contact via media (i.e., outgroup AND ingroup members interacting). Different theoretical processes explain why those different forms of media contact might have effects.

Ironically, we do share the reviewer's frustration with the way the paper was cited. In spite of our private apprehension about citing the work as "author, year" rather than providing the full citation, we had to follow the submission guideline of the International Journal of Communication. Under the heading, "Submission Preparation Checklist," on the journal website (<http://ijoc.org/index.php/ijoc/about/submissions#authorGuidelines>), the item #6 states, "The text has had the authors' names removed. If an author is cited, "Author" and year are used in the bibliography and footnotes, instead of author's name, paper title, etc."

At this point, we cannot provide the full citation of the paper. All we can say is that the paper was published in a decent journal that adheres to the standard process of double-blind peer review by experts. We do not insist on everyone sharing the view that "mediated intergroup contact" is the optimal term for the concept. But, we certainly would like to contribute the view to the theoretical discussion about the theory--no matter what it might be called--and hence included the reference in this manuscript. With these stipulations, we have modified the sentence as follows: "A comprehensive review and synthesis of relevant literature closely examined these terms and offered a typology of intergroup contact via media consumption (Author, 2012)."

#4

method: I would like to know more about the messages. They sound sensible, but can you provide information about specific content, or perhaps even translations of each of them. With messages like these, it is possible for all manner of other factors to vary along with the

independent variable itself -- it would be nice to be a little more comfortable that that is not occurring. If there are concerns about equivalence you might consider treating your manipulation checks as mediators to demonstrate that it is the thing you suggest causes the effects that actually transmits the effect to the DV (see, e.g., Tao and Bucy, HCR, 2005ish, for discussion of this procedure).

In the revised manuscript, we provide a lot more details about the six news stories, three positive and three negative, in terms of how they depicted migrant workers and their relationships with South Korean citizens/authorities. All six of them were written in a short news article format comprising 72-100 units (equivalent to words in English) or seven to ten sentences. Due to their short length, there was no room for anything else to be included in the stories other than the intended manipulations. The manipulation check scores also suggest that the two sets (three positive stories or three negative stories) of stimuli were comparable in the strength of positivity or negativity they elicited (please see the manipulation check results in the method section).

Direct contact measure -- I was surprised that you asked about contact with "foreigners" given that the target outgroup in the paper is "migrant workers." Later you acknowledge this as a limitation, but you never explain why this decision was made in the first place. Having a measure of direct contact with migrant workers would have been a much better choice and would have contributed greatly to the paper. It is fairly useless as it was in fact measured, I don't think you use it for anything in the analysis, so you should probably just delete reference to it.

Obviously, "foreigners" is a much larger category than "migrant workers," as we elaborated in the first section of our literature review. With the unprecedented increase in the number of migrant workers in the country, however, "foreigners" and "migrant workers" are used almost interchangeably in South Korea. Colloquially, the word "foreigner" has been ghettoized and foreigners who are not migrant workers are often called by a different name (e.g., native speaker English teacher, company men stationed in Korea) than "foreigners." Still, it was an oversight to use "foreigners" instead of "migrant workers" in the direct contact measure. Also, inclusion of the direct contact did not add any value to the current study. Hence, as you suggested, the references to direct contact measure are now deleted throughout the manuscript.

Procedure -- did each subject read all three articles in a given condition, or just one of the three?

Each participant read all three articles in a given condition. In other words, participants in the positive contact condition read three articles all of which were about good deeds of migrant workers; participants in the negative contact condition read three articles all of which were reporting on their negative behaviors. Hence, this statement is added at the beginning of the "Experimental Design & Stimuli" section: "Participants in the positive contact condition read three positive newspaper articles about migrant workers whereas those in the negative contact condition read three negative articles. People in the control condition were not exposed to any news article and asked to complete post-treatment measures only."

Preliminary analysis. Be more explicit -- e.g., "comparison of the three groups on the dependent measures..." -- I'm not sure I know what either the three groups or the dependent measures are in this sentence. In the next sentence, I don't know what t1, t2, t3, and t4 represent... and I don't know what the "two sets of experimental stimuli" were. There were three articles in each of two conditions... are the two sets the two conditions?

The first sentence in the preliminary analysis section was reporting on the differences across three groups (positive contact condition, negative contact condition, and control condition) in their prior contact with migrant workers. Since we decided to eliminate all references to the variable, the first sentence is also eliminated. The second sentence was concerned with the manipulation check. In light of this comment, we added a lot more information about the manipulation check and reported the results of manipulation check immediately before the "Results" section.

Results -- page 9 verges on the absurd in terms of the length of the report. It's not reasonable to use a full single-space page and a table to report three one-way ANOVAs. You could easily report these effects with the table and 2 sentences of text: "As shown in Table 1, perceptions differed across all conditions in the predicted direction, with the positive contact condition resulting in more positive effects than the control, and the negative condition being more negative than the control. All effects were significant with the exception of the positive contact - control comparison for social distance." You don't need to report means and F statistics in text -- they are in the table. The only new thing you provide in the text is the eta-squareds, which could easily be incorporated in the table.

We followed this suggestion and replaced the existing text with the suggested, succinct sentences. The eta-squareds are added to Table 1.

I would drop the very weak presentation and discussion of the post-hoc positive-negative different on universalism; you're not supposed to do post hocs after a nonsignificant F, and the result adds very little... the discussion of it on page 12 is incorrect -- it offers no insight on the Barlow et al 2012 study... for that see the discussion above about comparing the SIZE of the positive vs. negative effects.

In the revised paper, we dropped the testing of the direct effects of mediated contact on universalism and power values and instead reported the mediation analysis results. As we mentioned earlier, we also conducted the tests directly comparing the size of the positive and negative contact effects and reported the findings. Accordingly, the discussion section reflected the changes as well.

The writing throughout isn't bad, although there are some missing articles and prepositions, etc. (TWO in the first sentence of the paper, which is a bad way to start!). At times the writing and overall presentation is very long and wordy. e.g., the first six hypotheses could be a single hypothesis that just predicts an effect whereby (a) perceptions, (b) negative affect, and (c) social distance will exhibit a linear pattern descending from the positive, through the control, to the negative contact conditions. As noted above, the results section could be massively consolidated.

We collapsed the first six hypotheses into two hypotheses, one examining the positive contact effects and the other negative contact effects. Indeed, we eliminated the whole section reporting the correlation analysis and massively reconsolidated the remaining tables and text. The eliminated texts and tables are marked by gray shade. Newly added texts are highlighted in yellow. We also had the paper edited closely before resubmission.

Check use of "et al." -- if there are only 2 authors you don't use et al (e.g., Ortiz & Harwood, not Ortiz et al.).

We checked the use of "et al." throughout the manuscript and made corrections, when misused.

We apologize for the extensive oversight.

Joyce and Harwood have a paper (Communication Research, 2014) examining positive and negative mediated contact between immigrants and natives in the US; this would be important to read -- it is almost identical to your experimental design, although with quite different materials, etc..

We really appreciate your suggestion to look up the study. We discussed the study at length in the text that provided rationales for H3, 4, and 5. Also, we followed their analysis strategy to test the hypotheses 4 and 5.

The discussion section includes some statements about the contribution of this paper. Some of these might usefully be placed up front... help your reader understand what's "new" here early on (e.g., the focus on nonfiction media, the Asian sample). Some of these are not entirely new (e.g., there is contact work on nonfiction media -- Joyce and Harwood for example, there is work on mediated contact among Asians (including Koreans -- see Shim et al., 2012, JIIC), and there is work on positive and negative contact -- including some you cite). But the combination makes a contribution, and exploring some of the mediated models suggested here would add to that.

Following this suggestion, we added in the introduction a sentence stating that our study also attempts to help our understanding of the differences between positive and negative contact. We decided to add the reference to Shim et al.'s study in the discussion section, rather than introduction, however. Although the study and current study both examined South Koreans, the outgroups are almost polar opposites in their status, at least in the minds of average South Koreans. Hope we can later investigate South Korean's relationships with the two very different outgroups, one underprivileged and one privileged, in one study.

Globally, I think this study deserves to be published somewhere at some point; it would be a much better paper if it focused like a laser on the experimental effects and dropped discussion of extraneous correlations.

Reviewer H

This is a well-written and interesting article that contributes to our understanding of the mediated contact on attitudes towards outgroup members. The manuscript provides an extensive literature review and situates the South Korean case well within the literature. I think the manuscript fits well with the journal and is a good shape to be published. I just have a few minor suggestions.

- the experiment: It will be helpful if the author provides more detailed account on how the experiment was conducted. Were the experiment conducted in a classroom? Were participants presented with a printed version of the news articles and asked to read them? Did each participant get to read all three (either positive or negative)? Were the participants attitudes measured right after they finished reading news articles? How long did the entire experiment take? What kinds of measurement were taken so that participants took the experiment seriously? This information could be added on page 8 in the "portrayal of migrant workers in news articles"

In the "Participants" section of the originally submitted article, we stated earlier that "with the collaboration of instructors, the data collection was conducted in classrooms, using the pencil-and-paper method." Hence, we changed the heading from "Participants" to "Participants &

Procedure” and added the following information immediately after the sentence:

“The experiment was introduced to the participants as a ‘newspaper study.’ Participants in the two treatment conditions received a packet that included three printed newspaper articles and a questionnaire. A written instruction asked them to read the three articles first and then subsequently answer the questions. The packet for control group contained the questionnaire only and asked them to fill out the enclosed questionnaire. Once they received a packet, they were not allowed to talk to one another and asked to leave the classroom immediately after completing the questionnaire. This whole process took approximately 30 minutes.”

Regarding the question of whether each participant got to read all three articles (either positive or negative), the answer is provided at the beginning of the “Experimental Design & Stimuli” section:

“Participants in the positive contact condition read three positive newspaper articles about migrant workers whereas those in the negative contact condition read three negative articles. People in the control condition were not exposed to any news article and asked to complete post-treatment measures only.”

- limitations of using students as participants (on page 13): The author may want to explicitly state why using students may pose limits to the experiment. Is it because the participants do not reflect the entire South Korean population (which seems to be applied in the text) or is it because college students tend to be more subject to changing their attitudes via contacts? Or is it because students tend to have more positive attitudes toward migrants in general? I think clarifying the first two is important as they point to different types of limitations.

The concern regarding external validity is not so much about the student sample per se. Rather, it is applicable to any study that examines an understudied phenomenon and thus needs to be replicated with different populations in different settings. It is definitely worthwhile to entertain the one moderator reviewer suggested: pronounced vulnerability of college students to the media effect than other sub-populations of Koreans. However, there is very little to base the hypothesis. In South Korea, people with high education reportedly have less negative attitudes toward migrant workers. According to a 2014 OECD report, however, 42% of South Koreans have the education attainment of some college or higher, including bachelors, master’s, and Ph.D. The percentage of people with college degree or more is even higher among people under 40. Hence, college students are not particularly more educated than the general population, especially among young people. Also, the observed effects were more robust on the negative side than the positive side, meaning that the college students were not necessarily more likely to change their attitudes in favor of migrant workers. If ever, they became hostile toward the outgroup as a consequence of the mediated contact. For both the positive and negative effects, the mean of dependent variables ranged between 2-4 on a 1-5 scale, suggesting that their measurement did not create an artifact that produced the observed effects. To clarify this, the whole paragraph is revised as follows:

“One of them is concerned with the external validity of the findings. More specifically, the use of one particular group--college students in this case--as study participants can be considered a threat to the robustness of the findings. Because unit homogeneity is a critical assumption in causal inference (Rubin, 2005) and drawing a random sample for an experiment from a broadly defined population tends to be cost-prohibitive, this issue is typically addressed through replications with different samples in different settings (Brewer, 2000). Since this study established the effects of mediated contact with college students, the logical next step is to

replicate this study with different sub-populations of South Koreans. The replications may also reveal, if any, moderators of the observed effect related to the characteristics of the sub-populations examined.”

Brewer, M. B. (2000). Research design and issues of validity. In H. T. Reis & C. M. Judd (Eds.), *Handbook of research methods in social and personality psychology* (pp. 3-16), New York, NY: Cambridge University Press.