Research Article

# Evaluation of the Psychometric Properties of the Ethnocentrism Scale

Asena ALBAYRAK[1] , Özkan TÜTÜNCÜ[2]

## ABSTRACT

Ethnocentrism is the evaluation of different cultures in various societies according to the preconceptions of one's own culture and with one's own culture at the center. It has some distinct features compared to tourism, since one of the main motivations of tourism is to know different cultures. The purpose of this study was to adapt "the ethnocentrism scale," which was developed by Neuliep and McCroskey, into Turkish and to test the validity and reliability analysis of the scale. The study was conducted through a self-administered questionnaire and distributed to 422 residents of Alaçatı, Izmir (Turkiye). As a result of Robust Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (RDWLS) analysis, it was concluded that the adapted ethnocentrism scale was three-dimensional rather than one-dimensional as in its original structure. None of the items were excluded from the study. Results showed that scale is valid and reliable with some limitations for the Turkish version. The ethnocentrism scale was found in the literature for the first time in three dimensions, and the names of the dimensions were determined for the first time in this study.

**Jel Codes:** D31, D10, D33, D12
**Keywords:** Ethnocentrism Scale, Validity, Reliability, Alaçatı

[1]Ph.D., Dokuz Eylul University, Departman of Tourism, İzmir, Turkiye

[2]Prof. Dr., Dokuz Eylul University, Necat Hepkon Faculty of Sports Sciences, İzmir, Turkiye

**ORCID:** A.A. 0000-0003-0021-1417; Ö.T. 0000-0002-2482-0893

**Corresponding author:**
Asena ALBAYRAK,
Dokuz Eylul University, Departman of Tourism, İzmir, Turkiye
**E-mail:** asenaalbayrak91@gmail.com

## 1. Introduction

A sense of discrimination by societies and groups toward their peers has come to the fore with the rise of nationalism in the world in recent years (Antonsich, 2020; Bieber, 2018). This leads to the strengthening of policies that marginalize those who are different from "us." The marginalizing attitudes against minorities in many countries can result in crimes. Although all these developments have been examined in by many different disciplines, there is no research that examines them in a tourism context (Kock et al., 2019). It is important to be able to measure the extent to which tourists or local people are ethnocentric, especially when there is a tendency towards nationalism around the world, as is the case now.

Ethnocentrism can be described as a person's overall evaluation of other cultures based on her/his own culture. A person who evaluates other cultures by assuming that her/his own culture is "normal" will have an ethnocentric attitude by centering his own culture (Bizumic, 2015, p. 536). This ethnic centralism is a phenomenon that contradicts tourism practices because the most important thing that drives tourism is people's curiosity. This sense of wonder is an emotion that can develop about different cultures, lifestyles, languages, religions, and architecture. Curiosity is one of the most important motivations for traveling (Doğan, 2004; Faubert, 2018, p. 7). Further to this, local people living in a touristic destination may also have ethnocentric attitudes towards tourists in the region. This situation may be caused by reasons such as income inequality, lifestyle differences, jealousy, stereotypes, etc. The ethnocentric attitudes and feelings of local people in Alaçatı towards tourists coming to Alaçatı is an issue discussed in the context of this research. The reason for choosing Alaçatı is that it has become a very popular and crowded destination in recent years (Alkan, 2015, p. 6695). This density and crowd causes more interaction between local people and tourists.

The aim of this study is to analyze the validity and reliability of the ethnocentrism scale. If the scale is found valid and reliable as a result of the research, it will be suitable for use by researchers who want to do research in the field of ethnocentrism in tourism. There is no validity and reliability study of the revised version of the ethnocentrism scale, which consists of 22 statements in English. The purpose of this study is to examine the validity and reliability of the ethnocentrism scale in Turkish, as well as to test the usability of the scale in tourism research by focusing on the attitude of local people in a touristic destination towards tourists.

## 2. The Concept of Ethnocentrism

Ethnocentrism, which means ethnic centralism, is people's perception and interpretation of another culture's features according to their own culture. These cultural features can be tangible or intangible. People from all cultures think that the moral understanding, way of dressing, understanding of beauty, and marriage and other customs of their own culture are the most correct, and they have a bias against different cultures (Kock et al., 2019). Ethnocentric ideas are more common in traditional and isolated societies. Ethnocentric ideas are less common in modern societies. Instead of "not," the word "less" is used in this observation because according to Hofstede (1991), every individual in every societyhas a slightly ethnocentric attitude since he/she comes to the world as belonging to and within a certain culture.

The concept of ethnocentrism was first used by Sumner in 1906. According to Sumner, ethnocentrism is the glorification of people's own culture and all kinds of features about themselves and the underestimation of the cultures and characteristics of others (Sumner, 1906). Although there are many definitions and uses of ethnocentrism, its main focus is demographic differences

such as cultural, linguistic, ethnic origin, and population differences (Myers, 2015, p. 204). At the same time, there is a distinction between inner group and outer group within ethnocentrism. Even if they are from the same culture, members of the inner group may tend to belittle the outer group while glorifying their own group (LeVine & Campbell, 1972). There are researchers who argue that ethnocentrism has positive and negative features (Nagel, 1994, p. 154). For example, according to Hammond and Axelrod (2006), ethnocentrism focuses on unity and commitment in the inner group rather than underestimating the outer group. Even though the concept of ethnocentrism emerged in the early 1900s, the first scientific study on this subject was conducted by Adorno et al. (1950). According to this study, ethnocentrism is a type of racism and is based on the distinction between inner group and outer group. The factors feeding this distinction are stereotypes, negative images and hostile behaviors (Adorno et al., 1950). According to Tung et al. (2019), stereotypes are produced by the reflex of uncertainty that occurs when we do not have any information about the outer group. These stereotypes, produced by both locals and tourists, are information that can be passed on from generation to generation. Stereotypes are learned by means of accessing secondary data, such as mass media, that may affect the relations between tourists and local people negatively (Tung et al., 2019, p. 40). Similar to stereotypes, bias affects intercultural relations. According to the study by Taylor and Jaggi (1974), which is the first study in which the phrase "ethnocentric bias" was used, while individuals have positive bias against the groups they belong to, they have negative bias against outer groups. For example, while the success of one of the inner groups is regarded as a huge event, the same success of one of the outer groups may be met by downplaying the success as simply "good luck."

Grant and Brown's (1995) work also brought a new dimension to ethnocentrism. According to their studies, people start to show ethnocentric behavior when they feel their social and cultural identity is under threat. This situation causes them to place themselves in the outer group position by developing a defense mechanism against the threatening element (Grant, 1992-1993; Grant & Brown, 1995). Neuliep, Chaudoir, and McCroskey (2001) illuminated the communication dimension of ethnocentrism in their studies. They found that high ethnocentric behavior would negatively affect intercultural communication. In a study by Neuliep and McCroskey in 2005, the trust dimension of ethnocentrism was revealed. According to this research, internal groups tend to feel insecure towards the communities they consider to be outgroups (Neuliep & McCroskey, 2005, p. 45). Marginalization is another dimension of ethnocentrism. People who display ethnocentric behaviors have a sense of marginalizing outgroups. The ingroup members think that the outer group is less successful, less virtuous, less valid, etc., than themselves and they see the outer group in an "other" and "lower" position; this creates a dangerous dimension of ethnocentrism (Swartz, 1961, p. 76–77). Finally, respect and tolerance constitute the final dimension of ethnocentrism. When it comes to intercultural differences, tolerance and respect are values that are emphasized in the context of developing and strengthening communication. The realization of healthy, unbiased, developed communication is possible with the presence of tolerance and respect (Verkuyten et al., 2019, p. 8).

UNESCO (1994) defines ethnocentrism, gender discrimination, racism, fascism, imperialism, abuse, religious oppression, and exploitation as intolerance. The key point is the level of ethnocentrism. Neuliep and McCroskey (1997) state that ethnocentric behavior is functional in terms of increasing group loyalty, patriotism, and group belonging (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997, p. 389). The reflections of ethnocentric behavior in the tourism discipline also show themselves in the necessity of supporting the domestic tourism economy. Both local people and tourists feel the

obligation and internal pressure to support domestic tourism morally, and they can show favoritism toward the ingroup (Kock et al., 2019, p. 2). In addition, the ethnocentric attitudes of local people towards tourists gain importance in the tourism context.

### 3. Method

### 3.1. Research setting and sampling

The reason for selecting the destination of Alaçatı for research is the fact that it has become a popular tourist destination in Turkey in recent years, its culture has drawn attention,and Çeşme has some characteristics of snob tourism. The population of the Alaçatı region is 9,745, so the number of participants included in the study had to be at least 370 (Krejcie & Morgan, 1970). However, the participants who qualified to be the sample of the research were people who have lived in Alaçatı for at least two years. The sample of the study is 422 Alaçatı residents who were selected according to the convenience and snowball sampling methods. Non-probability sampling technics were chosen and some of the data were collected online due to pandemic (Covid-19) conditions. Based on the snowball sampling method in the data collected online, people who reside in Alaçatı were included in this study. Also, a face-to-face questionnaire was applied; selection was made according to the convenience sampling method. Data were collected from the local participants in cafeterias and shops. A total of 430 questionnaires were administered initially, but only 422 of them were found suitable for analysis. Before giving the questionnaire to the participants, the question "Are you from Alaçatı?" was asked. A questionnaire was administered to those who had lived in Alaçatı for at least 2 years and only to those who defined themselves as being from Alaçatı. Although reaching 370 participants was sufficient, a larger number of data collection processes were applied, considering that there might be missing values due to the Covid-19 pandemic. With 422 participants in the study, this requirement was met.

### 3.2. Measurement and Data Analysis

Within the scope of the research, the data were obtained through a survey form created with the ethnocentrism scale revised by Neuliep and McCroskey (2013). Some data were collected online between March 16 and June 13, 2020, and some were collected by the researcher face-to-face at the destination. Twenty-five percent of the data was collected face-to-face. The reason for collecting data online initially is the legal restrictions that arose due to the Covid-19 disease reaching a pandemic dimension. After the lifting of restrictions (such as the curfew), the researchers went to Alaçatı and continued the data collection process. SPSS for Windows (version 22) was used for demographic dispersions and reliability analysis. The Factor program was conducted for the analysis of Robust Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (RDWLS) (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando; 2019a).

### 3.3. The Ethnocentrism Scale (Translating into Turkish)

The Ethnocentrism Scale developed by Neuliep and McCroskey in 1997 and revised in 2013 consists of 22 statements. It was designed as a 5-point Likert-type scale (5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Neither Agree nor Disagree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Strongly Disagree). There is no reverse expression in the scale. The Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be .88 as a result of the 16-item reliability analysis of the ethnocentrism scale, while the Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found to be .92 as a result of the 24-item reliability analysis (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). After the scale was translated into Turkish, it was reconsidered in accordance with the destination, Alaçatı. In line with the opinions of eight academicians who are experts in their fields, the

statements that referred to "my culture" were changed to "the culture of Alaçatı" The reason for this is that the study measures ethnocentrism on the basis of people who live in Alaçatı and its culture. This translation and adaptation phase was carried out in accordance with the opinions and suggestions of four faculty members from the Tourism Management Department of Dokuz Eylül University, whose English levels are sufficient and who are experts in their fields. The original version of the scale was determined to be one-dimensional by Neuliep and McCroskey (2013). A study of the ethnocentrism scale's adaptation into Turkish was previously conducted by Üstün (2011); however, this study did not give the results of total variance explained and internal consistent reliability.  For these reasons, and in line with the opinions of four lecturers and the researcher, it was decided to adapt the scale again in order to demonstrate its validity and reliability.

**Table 1: Ethnocentrism Scale**

| *Original Version of Ethnocentrism Scale* | *English Version of Ethnocentrism Scale that was Adapted to Alaçatı* |
|---|---|
| 1. I respect the values and customs of other cultures. | 1. I respect the values and customs of other cultures. |
| 2. My culture should be the role model for other cultures. | 2. Alaçatı culture should be a role model for other cultures. |
| 3. I see people who are similar to me as virtuous. | 3. I see people who are similar to me as virtuous. |
| 4. Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in my culture. | 4. Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in Alaçatı culture. |
| 5. Most people would be happier if they lived like people in my culture. | 5. Most people would be happier if they lived like people in Alaçatı culture. |
| 6. I have many friends from different cultures. | 6. I have many friends from different cultures. |
| 7. People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures. | 7. People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures. |
| 8. Most people from other cultures just don't know what's good for them. | 8. Most people from other cultures just don't know what's good for them. |
| 9. Most other cultures are backward compared to my culture. | 9. Most other cultures are backward compared to Alaçatı culture. |
| 10. Other cultures are smart to look up to our culture. | 10. Other cultures are smart to look up to Alaçatı culture. |
| 11. Other cultures should try to be more like my culture. | 11. Other cultures should try to be more like the culture of Alaçatı. |
| 12. I am not interested in the values and customs of other cultures. | 12. I am not interested in the values and customs of other cultures. |
| 13. People in my culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere. | 13. People in Alaçatı culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere. |
| 14. Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture. | 14. Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture. |
| 15. I am very interested in the values and customs of other cultures. | 15. I am very interested in the values and customs of other cultures. |
| 16. I apply my values when judging people who are different. | 16. I apply my values when judging people who are different. |
| 17. People from other cultures act strange when they come to my culture. | 17. People from other cultures act strange when they come to Alaçatı culture. |
| 18. I do not cooperate with people who are different. | 18. I do not cooperate with people who are different. |
| 19. Most people in my culture just don't know what is good for them. | 19. Most people in my culture just don't know what is good for them. |
| 20. I do not trust people who are different. | 20. I do not trust people who are different. |
| 21. I dislike interacting with people from different cultures. | 21. I dislike interacting with people from different cultures. |
| 22. I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures. | 22. I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures. |

Previously, a study was carried out in which two scales were used together: the short, 16-item, American adapted version of the Ethnocentrism scale (A United States ethnocentrism scale (USE)) and the General Ethnocentrism Scale (A generalized ethnocentrism scale (GENE)), consisting of 21 statements (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). In the study, which was conducted in 1997, many expressions in the GENE scale were changed and/or removed. New expressions were added to the scale in place of the removed items. For example, the word "My country" was changed to "My culture" in all statements, and statements such as "My country is a poor example of how to run a country" and "A lot of other countries are primitive compared to my country" were completely omitted from the scale. There are many studies using the GENE scale (Nameni, 2020; Mortazavi Ganji Ketab, 2019; Logan et al., 2016). However, in both Neuliep and McCroskey's study and in those of other researchers who did their research using this scale later, it was determined that they did not share the findings regarding the validity and reliability analysis of this scale. Therefore, in this study, the validity and reliability analysis of the ethnocentrism scale developed by Neuliep and McCroskey, which was revised and finalized in 2013, will be conducted.

## 4. Results

### 4.1. Demographics of the Participants

One hundred eighty-one (42.9%) of the participants were female and 226 (57.1%) were male. Of the participants, 193 (45.7%) were married, 226 (53.6%) were single, and the mean age was 36 years. 196 (46.4%) of the participants were undergraduate, 84 (19.9%) were high school graduates, 54 (12.8%) were postgraduate, 53 (12.6%) were associate degree graduates, and 35 (8.3%) were primary school graduates. Of the participants, 272 (64.5%) were employees, 106 (25.1%) were unemployed, 40 (9.5%) were retired, and 2 (0.5%) were "other."

### 4.2. Findings Related to Validity Studies of Ethnocentrism Scale

The aim of this study was to perform the validity and reliability analysis of the ethnocentrism scale developed by Neuliep and McCroskey (2013) and applied to Alaçatı, a touristic destination. Explanatory factor analysis for the ethnocentrism scale was conducted in order to check the validity.

#### 4.2.1. Explanatory Factor Analysis

When the scale was examined for the validity analysis, it was seen that the structure of the scale was in the form of a polychoric scale rather than an interval scale. Analysis of Mardia's (1970) multivariate asymmetry skewness and kurtosis revealed a significant kurtosis level at $P < 0.001$. Polychoric correlation is suggested when the distribution of ordinal items has excess kurtosis (Muthen & Kaplan, 1985-1992). In polychoric scales, Diagonally Weighted Least Squares (DWLS) estimators generally use the full weight matrix noted in the Weighted Least Squares (WLS) equation (i.e., asymptotic covariance matrix) to more accurately estimate standard errors of parameter estimates and the overall model chi-square index. RDWLS estimators have been determined to perform better than full WLS estimation in conditions problematic for WLS, such as small sample sizes and larger model sizes (Flora & Curran, 2004). In addition, robust techniques that might be applied to the WLS formula contain the weighted least squares mean and variance adjusted estimator, the weighted least squares-mean adjusted estimator, and DWLS (Muthen & Kaplan, 1985). Robust estimation techniques could prove helpful when data are categorized or follow nonnormal distributions (Finney & DiStefano, 2006). Therefore, RDWLS analysis was conducted for the sample of this research. Before the DWLS analyses, Cattell's (1966) scree plot test, Horn's parallel analysis (1965), and Loren-

zo-Seva et al.'s Hull method (2019a) were used on the data set to determine the number of factors. As a result of these analyses, it was found that the Ethnocentrism scale was three-dimensional, unlike its original one-dimensional structure.

Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant ($\chi$2 (231) = 4752.9, P < 0.001) and the Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure of sampling adequacy value was .87, which was above the suggested value of .60 (Hair et al., 2010). The RMSEA value for the measurement model in the parallel test was calculated as .04. Therefore, it is possible to say that this measurement model is a model with good fit. It has emerged as Good Fit Index = 1.00, Adjusted Good Fit Index (AGFI)= 1.00, and Schwarz's Bayesian Information Criterion = 868.439. Kelley's criterion was found to be .048. Since this number is expected to be below .6, the scale provided the required condition (Kelley, 1935, p. 146; Harman, 1962, p. 21). The root mean square of residuals (RMSR) was .051. Therefore, it can be said to have a good fit criterion (Hair et al., 2010; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2001). Weighted RMSR was .046; values under 1.0 are recommended for good fit (Yu & Muthen, 2002). Therefore, it has been revealed that the ethnocentrism scale has a valid structure.

Factors explained .56 of common (shared) variance in RDWLS. In this study, the robust diagonal rotation promin technique was used. Oblique rotation computes a perfectly simple matrix and uses this matrix as a target pattern in the rotation. There are examples of this rotation such as promax (Hendrickson & White, 1964), simplimax (Kiers, 1994) and promin (Lorenzo-Seva, 1999). The promin technique focuses on maximizing the simplicity of the rotated solution, even if some of the variables are complex (Lorenzo-Seva & Ferrando, 2019b, p. 101). Therefore, promin is to be a simple-to-use rotation method.

**Table 2: Factor Analysis for RDWLS**

| Statements/Dimensions | Cultural Intolerance F1 | Cultural Superiority F2 | Cultural Tolerance F3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| Most people from other cultures just don't know what's good for them. | .48 | | |
| I am not interested in the values and customs of other cultures. | .67 | | |
| Lifestyles in other cultures are not as valid as those in my culture. | .48 | | |
| People from other cultures act strange when they come to Alaçatı culture. | .73 | | |
| I do not cooperate with people who are different. | .52 | | |
| Most people in my culture just don't know what is good for them. | .74 | | |
| I do not trust people who are different. | .56 | | |
| I dislike interacting with people from different cultures. | .79 | | |
| I have little respect for the values and customs of other cultures. | .82 | | |
| Alaçatı culture should be a role model for other cultures. | | .68 | |
| I see people who are similar to me as virtuous. | | .61 | |
| Most people would be happier if they lived like people in Alaçatı culture. | | .79 | |
| Most other cultures are backward compared to Alaçatı culture. | | .73 | |
| Other cultures are smart to look up to Alaçatı culture. | | .73 | |
| Other cultures should try to be more like the culture of Alaçatı. | .34 | .49 | |
| People in Alaçatı culture have just about the best lifestyles of anywhere. | | .84 | |
| I apply my values when judging people who are different. | | .40 | |
| I respect the values and customs of other cultures. | | | .67 |
| Lifestyles in other cultures are just as valid as those in Alaçatı culture. | | | .48 |
| I have many friends from different cultures. | | | .67 |
| People in my culture could learn a lot from people in other cultures. | | | .61 |
| I am very interested in the values and customs of other cultures. | | | .47 |

As a result of the rotation technique of the Robust Diagonal Promin, it was concluded that the ethnocentrism scale creates a 3-factor structure. This 3-factor structure explains .56 of the total variances. The factor consisting of items 8, 12, 14, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, and 22 was defined as "cultural intolerance," the factor consisting of items 2, 3, 5, 9, 10, 11, 13, and 16 was defined as "cultural superiority," and the factor consisting of items 1, 4, 6, 7, and 15 was defined as "cultural tolerance." No items were excluded from the study. The minimum factor loading was calculated using Norman and Streiner's formula (1994) and found to be .25. The minimum factor loading in rotation was .40 and this was above the value recommended by Norman and Streiner.

### 4.3. Findings Related to the Reliability Studies of the Ethnocentrism Scale

The Cronbach's alpha value calculated for the internal consistency reliability analysis was determined to be .87 for all items. In cases where Cronbach's alpha value is .70 and above, the scale is considered to be reliable (Nunnally, 1967).

**Table 3: Factor determinacy index for RDWLS**

| Factors | Sensitivity Ratio | Expected Percentage of True Differences | ORION | Factor Determinacy Index |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | 4.093 | .95 | .94 | .97 |
| 2 | 3.185 | .93 | .91 | .95 |
| 3 | 2.038 | .89 | .80 | .90 |

Factor determinacy index values were above .90 (minimum = .90; maximum = .97), marginal reliabilities were above .80 (minimum = .80; maximum = .94), the sensitivity ratios were above 2 (minimum = 2; maximum = 4), and the expected percentage of true differences was above .90, except for the third factor (minimum = .89; maximum = .95).

Although Cronbach's alpha is a good reliability measurement method, it may be insufficient on its own, especially in research on communication between cultures. For this reason, it is recommended to use other reliability methods besides Cronbach's alpha (Wigley III, 2011, p. 284). The concept of ethnocentrism, which focuses on the relationship between different cultures and the marginal reliability value of ORION was also examined in addition to the Cronbach's alpha value. If the ORION value is above .80, the research is considered reliable. It is seen that this situation is provided for all three dimensions [Table 3].

**Table 4: Intercorrelations of Factors for RDWLS**

| Factors | 1 | 2 | 3 |
|---|---|---|---|
| 1- Cultural Intolerance | 1.00 | | |
| 2- Cultural Superiority | .44* | 1.00 | |
| 3- Cultural Tolerance | -.26* | -.80* | 1.00 |

*P<0.001. SD: Standard deviation

According to the results of the correlation analysis, a significant positive correlation was found between the first and second factors with .44, and a significant negative correlation was found between second and third factors with -.80. The third factor (Cultural Tolerance) indicates conceptually opposite judgments with the items of the second factors. That's why this result was expected. On the other hand, weak and negative significant correlation was found between the first and third factors with -.26.

## 5. Discussion and Conclusions

As a result of the analysis, the ethnocentrism scale has turned out to be three-dimensional, as opposed to the one-dimensional original form (which Neuliep and McCroskey revised and finalized in 2013) as well as the two-dimensional GENE Scale version (which Neuliep and McCroskey put forward in 1997). Based on the conceptual framework and the variables that the concept of ethnocentrism contains, the expressions in the ethnocentrism scale can be grouped under the following three factors: cultural intolerance, cultural superiority, and cultural tolerance. Unlike in previous studies (Logan et al., 2016; Mortazavi Ganji Ketab, 2019), the ethnocentrism scale was found to be three-dimensional and no items were excluded from the scale in this study. No previous research found a three-dimensional solution. In the literature, the concept of ethnocentrism often focused on the distinction between inner group and outer group. Previous studies showed mixed results with two dimensions and deleted items. Many researchers have studied ethnocentrism only with its good and bad sides (Taylor & Jaggi, 1974; Neuliep & McCroskey 1997, 2001; Michailova et al., 2017). The results showed that, with the emergence of the three-dimensional scale of ethnocentrism, the cultural intolerance dimension, which is generally ignored in the literature, should actually be taken into account. Our research fills the gap in the literature and expands the perspective of ethnocentrism critique.

The first dimension (*Cultural Intolerance*) revealed that there was an indifferent attitude stemming from prejudice against different cultures. This can be interpreted as follows: this factor indicated that some people ignore other cultures in a sense by avoiding cooperation and communication with people from different cultures. Although the cultural intolerance dimension generally defines indifference towards different cultures, it is possible to say that it basically includes it as an indifference caused by the person seeing other cultures as lower, and that it is apathy resulting from not knowing other cultures. In both cases, there is a prejudice against different cultures. According to Duckitt (2010), prejudices negatively affect the relationship between cultures. The second dimension *(Cultural Superiority)* has items that indicate the negative sides of ethnocentric attitudes. There are statements that other cultures are inferior to one's own culture, less valid, and less normal. The cultural superiority dimension indicates people's negative viewpoints, feelings, and attitudes towards different cultures. As stated in Grant and Brown's (1995) studies, it is possible to see different cultures as a threat. On the other hand, this dimension consists of expressions about people seeing their culture and things belonging to their culture as superior and more normal by favoring them. The downsides of ethnocentrism are compounded under its cultural superiority dimension. The last dimension emerging as a result of the explanatory factor analysis is *Cultural Tolerance*. The expressions included in this dimension aim to have positive thoughts and attitudes towards different cultures. It shows that other cultures are as valid, respectable, and important as one's own culture. There are positive feelings, attitudes, and behaviors towards different cultures in the cultural tolerance dimension of ethnocentrism. As Neuliep and McCroskey (2005) emphasized, ethnocentrism also has its advantages, and these aspects include trusting both people from one's own culture and people from different cultures, without discrimination. In addition, as Verkuyten (2019) points out, respect for different cultures is one of the prominent elements of this dimension.

Another point on which these studies differ from previous studies is the sampling groups. Previous studies focused on students for samplings (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997; Demir and Üstün, 2017). However, the sample in this study is that of local people living in a touristic destination. In other words, these observations were obtained from real life conditions and practices.

However, there are some interesting results raised by the analysis of current research. The weak and significant correlation between the first and the third factor is one of them. In addition, EPTD value for the third factor was found to be .89 [Table 3] and it is lower than the suggested value of .90. Results revealed that there was no linear relationship for the cultural tolerance and cultural intolerance dimensions. On the other hand, the relationship is significant with cultural superiority and these dimensions. This can be the nature of ethnocentrism.

The last important point is that the 11th statement of the scale has a high cross loadings [Table 2]. This statement has been placed under the cultural superiority dimension in this study, because what the statement means is a negative ethnocentric attitude. However, this item may force participants into a dilemma.

## 6. Limitations and Future Research

The main limitation of this study is that the data were collected while the Covid-19 pandemic was ongoing. One reason for this limitation is the collection of data from participants through a questionnaire form created on the internet. Another reason is the question of whether there was a decrease in the ethnocentric attitudes of participants during the pandemic; this is controversial. Despite all the limitations, the scale is valid and reliable as a result of the analysis. Although this version is better than the existing Turkish version of the Ethnocentrism Scale, the results of this study indicate that this scale needs to be repeatedly tested for different populations in different destinations. The use of the scale in different cultures will be beneficial for future research on this issue, especially when intercultural differences are taken into account and considering that ethnocentrism can emerge at different degrees in different cultures. In this study, both the validity and reliability study of the ethnocentrism scale revised by Neuliep and McCroskey in 2013 was conducted and it was demonstrated that it is generally valid and reliable when adapted to Turkish. This scale can be used in the context of the measuring locals' and tourists' satisfaction in future studies in the tourism discipline. In addition, this scale will be useful in determining macro policies by local governments and improving behavior towards tourists coming to a touristic destination.

## References

Adorno, T. W., Frenkel-Brunswik, K., Levinson, D., & Sanford, R. N. (1950). *The Authoritarian Personality*. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Alkan, C. (2015). Sürdürülebilir turizm: Alaçatı destinasyonuna yönelik bir uygulama. *Journal of Yasar University*, *10*(40), 6692–6710.

Antonsich, M. (2020). Everyday nation in times of rising nationalism. *Sociology, 54*(6), 1230–1237.

Bieber, F. (2018). Is nationalism on the rise? Assessing global trends. *Ethnopolitics*, *17*(5), 519–540.

Bizumic, B. (2015). *Ethnocentrism.* Vocabulary for the Study of Religion (Vol. 1), 533–539. Leiden, Netherlands: Brill Academic Publishers.

Cattell, R. B. (1966). The scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *1*, 245-76.

Demir, S., & Üstün, E. (2017). An analysis of intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of teacher candidates. *İnönü University Journal of the Faculty of Education, 18*(3), 01– 11. Doi:10.17679/inuefd.354129

Doğan, H. Z. (2004). *Socio-cultural basics of tourism. (*2. Ed.) Ankara, Turkey: Detay Publishers. (In Turkish).

Duckitt, J. H. (2010). *Historical overview.* (Edited by: John F. Dovidio, Miles Hewstone, Peter Glick and Victoria M. Esses), The SAGE Handbook of Prejudice, Stereotyping and Discrimination, 29–44. London, UK: Sage.

Foubert, L. (2018). Men and women tourists' desire to see the world: 'Curiosity' and 'A longing to learn' as (self-) fashioning motifs (first–fifth centuries C.E.). *Journal of Tourism History*, *10*(1), 5–20.

Finney, S. J., & DiStefano, C. (2006). *Nonnormal and categorical data in structural equation modeling.* In G. R. Hancock & R. O. Mueller (Eds.), Structural equation modeling: A second course, 269–314. Greenwich, CT: Information Age.

Flora, D. B., & Curran, P. J. (2004). An empirical evaluation of alternative methods of estimation for confirmatory factor analysis with ordinal data. *Psychological Methods*, *9*, 466–491.

Grant, P. R. (1992). Ethnocentrism between group of unequal power in response to perceived threat to social identity and valued resources. *Canadian Journal of Behavioral Science*, *24*, 348–370.

Grant, P. R. (1993). Ethnocentrism in response to a threat to social identity. In J. W. Neuliep (Ed.), replication research in the social sciences. *Journal of Social Behavior and Personality, 8*, 143–154.

Grant, P. R., & Brown, R. (1995). From ethnocentrism to collective protest: responses to relative deprivation and threat to social identity. *Social Psychology Quarterly*, *58*, 195–211.

Hair, J. F., Black, W. C., Barry, J. B., & Rolf, E. A. (2010). *Multivariate data analysis: A global perspective* (7. Ed.). London, UK: Pearson Prentice Hall.

Hammond, R. A., & Axelrod, R. (2006). The evolution of ethnocentrism. *Journal Of Conflict Resolution, 50*(6), 926–936.

Harman, H. H. (1962). *Modern factor analysis* (2. Ed.). Chicago, USA: University of Chicago Press.

Hendrickson, A. E., & White, P. O. (1964). PROMAX: A quick method for rotation to oblique simple structure. *British Journal of Statistical Psychology*, *17*, 65–70.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Culture and organizations: Software of the mind.* London, UK: McGraw-Hill.

Horn, J. L. (1965). A rationale and test for the number of factors in factor analysis. *Psychometrika, 30*,179–85.

Kelley, T. L. (1935). Essential traits of mental life. *Harvard Studies in Education* (Vol. 26). Cambridge, USA: Harvard University Press.

Kiers, H. A. L. (1994). Simplimax: oblique rotation to an optimal target with simple structure. *Psychometrika*, *59*, 567–579.

Kock, F., Josiassen, A., Assaf, A. G., Karpen, I., & Farrelly, F. (2019). Tourism ethnocentrism and its effects on tourist and resident behavior. *Journal of Travel Research*: 1–13.

Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 30*, 607–610.

LeVine, R. A., & Campbell, D. T. (1972). *Ethnocentrism*. New York: John Wiley.

Logan, S., Steel, Z., & Hunt, C. (2016). Intercultural willingness to communicate within health services: Investigating anxiety, uncertainty, ethnocentrism and help seeking behaviour. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 54*, 77–86.

Lorenzo-Seva, U. (1999). Promin: A method for oblique factor rotation. *Multivariate Behavioral Research*, *34*, 347–365.

Lorenzo-Seva U., & Ferrando P. J. (2019a). *Factor. Ver. 10.9.02.* [Windows]. Tarragona, Spain: Rovira i Virgili University.

Lorenzo-Seva U., & Ferrando P. J. (2019b). Robust promin: A method for diagonally weighted factor rotation. *Liberabit*, *25*(1), 99–106. Retrieved from: https:/ /doi.org/10.24265/liberabit.2019.v25n1.08

Mardia, K V. (1970). Measures of multivariate skewness and kurtosis with applications. *Biometrika*, *57*, 519–30.

Michailova, S., Piekkari, R., Storgaard M., & Tienari, J. (2017). Rethinking ethnocentrism in international business research. *Global Strategy Journal*, *7*(4), 335–353. Retrieved from: https://doi.org/10.1002/gsj.1159

Mortazavi Ganji Ketab, S., Pahlevan Sharif, S., Mehrabi, D., & Binti Abdul Rahman, N. A. (2019). Effects of ethnocentrism and online interethnic interactions on interethnic bridging social capital among university students: The moderating role of ethnicity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *71*, 48–59.

Muthén B., & Kaplan D. A (1985). Comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 38*, 171–89.

Muthén, B. & Kaplan D. (1992). A comparison of some methodologies for the factor analysis of non-normal Likert variables: A note on the size of the model. *British Journal of Mathematical and Statistical Psychology, 45*, 19–30.

Myers, M. B. (2015). Ethnocentrism: A literature overview and directions for future research. *Proceedings of the 1995 Academy of Marketing Science (AMS) Annual Conference*: 202–207.

Nagel, J. (1994). Constructing ethnicity: Creating and recreating ethnic identity and culture. *Social Problems. 41*(1), 152–176.

Nameni, A. (2020). Research into ethnocentrism and intercultural willingness to communicate of Iraqi and Iranian medical students in Iran. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 49*(1), 65–85.

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (1997). The development of a U.S. and generalized ethnocentrism scale. *Communication Research Reports*, *14*(4), 385–398.

Neuliep, J. W., Chaudoir, M., & McCroskey, J. C. (2001). A cross-cultural comparison of ethnocentrism among Japanese and United States college students. *Communication Research Reports*, *18*, 137–146.

Neuliep, J. W., Hintz, S. M., & McCroskey, J. C. (2005). The influence of ethnocentrism in organizational contexts: Perceptions on interviewee and managerial attractiveness, credibility, and effectiveness. *Communication Quarterly, 53*(1), 41–56.

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, J. C. (2013). *Ethnocentrism scale*. Measurement Instrument Database for the Social Science. Retrieved from: https://www.jamescmccroskey.com/measures/ethnocentrism_scale.htm

Norman, G. R., & Streiner, D.L. (1994). *Biostatistics: The Bare Essentials*. St. Louis MO: Mosby.

Nunnally, J. C. (1967). *Psychometric theory*. New York, USA: McGraw-Hill.

Sumner, W. G. (1906). *Folkways*. Boston, USA: Ginn.

Swartz, M. J. (1961). Negative ethnocentrism. *The Journal of Conflict Resolution*, *5*(1), 75–81.

Tabachnick, B. G., & Fidell, L. S. (2001). *Using multivariate statistics.* Boston, USA: Pearson.

Taylor, D. M., & Jaggi, V. (1974). Ethnocentrism and casual attribution in a South Indian context. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology, 5*, 162–171.

Ten Berge, J. M. F., & Kiers, H. A. L. (1991). A numerical approach to the exact and the approximate minimum rank of a covariance matrix. *Psychometrika*, *56*, 309–315.

Tung, V., King, B. E. M., & Tse, S. (2019). The tourist stereotype model: positive and negative dimensions. *Journal of Travel Research, 59*(1), 37–51.

UNESCO (1995). The declaration of principles on tolerance. Retrieved from: http://unesdoc.unesco.org/ images/0015/001518/151830eo.pdf  9 May 2020.

Üstün, E. (2011). The factors affecting the intercultural sensitivity and ethnocentrism levels of teacher candidates. *Unpublished Master Thesis.* Yıldız Teknik University. (In Turkish).

Verkuyten, M., Yogeeswaran, K., & Adelman, L. (2019). Intergroup toleration and its implications for culturally diverse societies. *Social Issues Policy Review, 13*(1), 5–35.

Wigley III, C. J. (2011). Cronbach's alpha versus components of variance approach (COVA): Dispelling three myths about alpha and suggesting an alternative reliability statistic for communication trait research. *Communication Research Reports, 28*(3), 281–286.

Yu, C., & Muthen, B. (2002). Evaluation of model fit indices for latent variable models with categorical and continuous outcomes. *Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association*, April. New Orleans, L.A.