



145
825
THS

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR IN POTENTIAL CONFLICT
SITUATIONS:

A COMPARISON OF STORY COMPLETIONS BY
SCHOOLCHILDREN OF GERMANY, BRAZIL AND THE
UNITED STATES

Thesis for the Degree of M. A.
MICHIGAN STATE UNIVERSITY
Leticia M. Smith

THESIS



ROOM USE ONLY

~~106~~ 147

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR IN POTENTIAL CONFLICT SITUATIONS:

A COMPARISON OF STORY COMPLETIONS BY

SCHOOLCHILDREN OF GERMANY, BRAZIL

AND THE UNITED STATES

By

Leticia M. Smith

A THESIS

Submitted to
Michigan State University
in partial fulfillment of the requirements
for the degree of

MASTER OF ARTS

Department of Communication

1966

631514
6-1-66

ABSTRACT

COMMUNICATION BEHAVIOR IN POTENTIAL CONFLICT SITUATIONS: A COMPARISON OF STORY COMPLETIONS BY SCHOOLCHILDREN OF GERMANY, BRAZIL AND THE UNITED STATES

by Leticia M. Smith

The present study explores the empirical significance of the concept of "national character," which is broadly conceived as "a set of characteristics specific for a given nation as compared with others."* More specifically, it examines whether countries differ in some dimensions of national character, such as trust, empathy and respect for generational status, and whether such differences coincide with variation in the extent of mass media development.

The data are derived from 211 story completions of three Anderson Incomplete Stories by schoolchildren from Germany, Brazil and the United States. All stories involve what may be called "violation of the sense of property," where one party is the cause of the damage of the property of another without any apparent malicious intent. Two of the stories involve siblings (older sibling as offended, younger sibling as offender), and one involve father (as offender) and son (as offended). The protocols were content analyzed. It was assumed that the completions reflect the communication pattern in similar potential tension situations in the countries where the children are from.

The following traits can be inferred from the pattern and content of communication in the protocols on potential conflict situations:

1. There is less respect for generational status in Brazil and Germany than in the United States.
2. Empathy is present to a greater extent in Brazil than in either the United States and Germany.
3. In Brazil, the United States and Germany alike, trust is more likely to be forthcoming to the offender the higher he is in the generational hierarchy with respect to the offended party.

These findings may be explained better empirically rather than theoretically. The towns from which the protocols were taken are not equal in their position as urban and mass media centers. Rio de Janeiro from which all the Brazilian data were gathered enjoys the position of a cultural center which is not even equalled by any of the towns from the United States and Germany studied here.

*H.C.J. Duijker and N.H. Frijda, National Character and National Stereotypes, Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1960. 36p.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was possible through the generosity of Dr. Harold H. Anderson of the Department of Psychology in giving me access to his story completion protocols, in providing me an exhaustive background on the process of gathering these protocols and studies that have been done on them, as well as in supplying me a quiet room to work on this paper.

I also feel indebted to my husband, Huron M. Smith, Jr., for relieving me of a lot of important detail work; to Mary Susan Faaborg, for helping me check the reliability of my coding system; and to Dr. Hideya Kumata, for assuming the innumerable tasks advising me entails.

Dr. Bradley S. Greenberg and Dr. Everett M. Rogers have given me very indispensable suggestions, and I am very grateful.

To Ruth Langenbacher, I give special thanks for typing this paper.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I THEORETICAL BACKGROUND	1
II METHODOLOGY	8
Story 1 - Broken Bicycle	8
Story 2 - Broken Axe	9
Story 3 - Soiled Dress	9
Classification of Countries	11
Coding Procedure	13
Reliability Check	18
Analysis Scheme	19
III FINDINGS	25
Correlation Between Measures of Trust	27
Results of the Tests of Hypotheses	27
IV SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: A TRAIT PROFILE OF BRAZIL, GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES	42
Conclusion	44
APPENDIX: Code Book	46
BIBLIOGRAPHY	55

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1 Mass media statistics for Brazil, United States and Federal Republic of Germany, 1964	12
2 Correlation between offended party's definition of the situation in the two sibling stories	26
3 Correlation between offended party's affective response to the situation in the two sibling stories	26
4 Correlation between offended party's behavior response to situation in the two sibling stories	27
5 Correlation between the offender's behavior response in the two sibling stories	27
6 Correlation between direction of initial communication in the two sibling stories	28
7 Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 2	29
8 Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 3	29
9 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2	30
10 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3	30
11 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2	30
12 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3	30
13 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2	31

Table	Page
14 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3	31
15 Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 2	32
16 Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 3	32
17 Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 2	34
18 Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 3	34
19 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2	35
20 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3	36
21 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2	36
22 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3	37
23 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2	37
24 Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3	38
25 Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 2	38
26 Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 3	39
27 Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 1	40
28 Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2	40
29 Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3	40
30 Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 1	40

Table	Page
31 Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2	41
32 Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3	41
33 Offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2	41
34 Offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3	41

CHAPTER I

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND

Considerable interest has been registered by social science researchers in setting up a descriptive framework within which to compare human groups across cultural or national boundaries. One area being explored is that of "national character." Essentially, studies on national character try to determine "a set of characteristics specific for a given nation as compared with others."¹ Part of the reasoning behind this search is the assumption that since human beings have common biological endowments, a culture, impinging upon these uniform constitutions will produce relatively homogeneous effects upon these humans. If in fact people within political boundaries are found more alike than people between political boundaries, then the hypothesis of the existence of "national character" is deemed supported. More specifically, two criteria must be used to test whether it is valid to assume that "national character" exists: 1) some degree of homogeneity within the group with respect to the characteristics involved is required, and 2) the characteristics with respect to which there is homogeneity should vary from group to group.²

¹H.C.J. Duijker and N.H. Frijda. National Character and National Stereotypes. Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing, 1960. p.36.

²Bert Kaplan. "Personality and Social Structure." (In J.B. Gittler, ed., Review of Sociology, N.Y., John Wiley, c1957, pp. 87-126). p. 116.

The present study aims to explore the possibility that cultural boundaries and political boundaries do coincide and that peoples of different nations exhibit significantly different response patterns. At the same time, it aims to give meaning to such differential responses when they occur on the basis of variation in status criteria and extent of mass media development.

If societies are classified according to whether "ascribed" characteristics, such as age, sex, or position in a kinship structure, or "achieved" characteristics such as education, technical or athletic or aesthetic skills are the bases for classifying people into the hierarchical structure of the society, these bases will be reflected in the deference patterns that emerge in the communication process between members of the society in an interpersonal conflict situation. In a society where ascribed characteristics are the bases for deference behavior, these characteristics are pertinent in the entire life of the individual. We will call this type of society traditional. On the other hand, in the case of societies where "achieved" characteristics are the most important bases for deference, these characteristics are pertinent only in the later life of the individual, at which time he has had ample time to acquire status requirements. During childhood and adolescence, the individual in this society is responded to and responds solely on his merit as a human being. We will call this type of society modern.

Deference patterns that prevail in a society will be reflected in potential conflict situations such as one which involves what may be called "violation of the sense of property." Property is that which the individual himself has the right to control.

It is presumed that individuals attach some degree of positive value to their property such that when this positively-valued property is either taken away or damaged by an identifiable person, a negative emotional state is aroused in him. The negative emotional state may or may not induce overt action. If and when such emotional state does give rise to overt action, the latter may take the form of verbal or physical hostility, or may be sublimated to pleasant, rational interaction with the "offender," depending upon the cultural upbringing of the individual. Tension arises when the individual's hostile or aggressive impulses are contradictory to the values of respect and charity which have been inculcated in him. The tension potential is especially high when family members are involved. The consummation of negative impulses may either be inhibited or facilitated by the relative positions of the offended (one whose property was taken away or damaged by another; one whose "sense of property" is violated) and the offender (one who takes away or damages the property of another; one who violates somebody else's "sense of property") in the age, sex, and generational hierarchy of the family.

It is expected that in the traditional type of society, the older family member and those higher in the generational hierarchy will receive more deference than they give when they interact with younger family members and those who are in the lower kinship positions. The greater the age difference, the more the situations where deference is accorded them. In an interpersonal conflict situation where the offender is older and higher in the generational structure than the offended party, the offender's self-esteem is at stake if the offended younger person perceives him as an offender. The older person is supposed to be the embodiment of wisdom and virtue, which "naturally"

accompanies age and high position in the generational hierarchy. The offender will have to present himself as a person consistent with these characteristics ascribed to him in his role as an older person. If the offender is younger than the offended person, self-esteem maintenance is less dependent on the older person's perception of him as an offender.

The offended person in a traditional society will be limited in his overt reaction to the offender depending upon their age and generational position differences. If the offender is younger and lower in generational position, the offended can confront the former with the offense and administer punitive action if he wants. If the offender is older and higher in the generational hierarchy, then the offended person will be breaking norms if he confronts the offender and especially if he tries administering retributive justice.

To a family with a secular outlook, that is, a family in a modern society, such variables as age, sex and generational position may not have any import at all in a similar interpersonal conflict situation. The offender in the modern society will not feel the same pressure as the offender in the traditional society does to present himself as one of "wisdom and virtue" because errors are expected, though not desired, to be committed by anyone.

The primary determinant of action on the part of the offended party in the modern society is whether he perceives his rights as an individual as either purposely or inadvertently violated.

Since the perception of motives does not entirely depend upon the objective characteristics of the external situation because motives cannot be directly observed, it can be expected that perception of the same will be dependent on the amount of trust the perceiver has toward

the other person before the offense was committed, as well as on the empathic ability of the perceiver.

The minimum requirement for trust is the belief that the action of the other person does not arise from ill-motives. Empathy, on the other hand, is the ability to imagine oneself in another situation, to role-play and to be "psychically mobile."³ It has a more developmental connotation than trust, that is, empathy develops not only through a long history of varied social interaction, but also along with the intellectual and emotional maturation of the individual. Trust depends on the relative frequency of positive compared to negative results of social interaction (in the sense of fulfillment or non-fulfillment of expectations) and does not require maturity. Empathy connotes adequacy in reality-testing, while trust does not. Trust involves minimizing cognitively the risks in the prediction of outcomes, while empathy does not.

Trust can be an outcome of empathy when a person's understanding of another's roles leads him to conclude that alter's history of acts arising from good intentions, or at least with the absence of bad intentions, is significantly greater than alter's history of acts arising from ill intentions. All the offenses in the three stories used in this study were committed without any apparent malicious intent on the part of the offender. If the offended person is empathic, then he or she will be able to condone the act of the offender. This act of condonation takes the same behavioral manifestations whether it is by

³Daniel Lerner. The Passing of Traditional Society. Glencoe, Ill., Free Press, 1958. p. 49.

virtue of trust alone, or by virtue of both empathy and trust.

If we add another variable to our classification of societies into "traditional" or "modern," we will be able to discriminate between these societies better. This variable is the extent of development of mass media in the society. On the basis of Lerner's model,⁴ the society we call "traditional" will have a less developed mass media system and the society we call "modern" will have a more completely developed mass media system. According to Lerner, the development of mass media brings with it the cultivation of the empathic ability of people. People in a "traditional" society will have a lower level of empathy, and people in a "modern" society will have a higher level of empathy.

The stages in mass media development can be placed along a continuum. We will call the "zero point" the stage where absolutely no technological mass medium (e.g., radio, television, movies, newspapers, other printed materials) are available to the people. This is the point where we start labeling societies as "traditional." As we move along to the farthest point in the continuum, we have the stage where people have unlimited access to technological mass media. Deference patterns change along with the level of empathy of a people as one moves from societies at the zero point of mass media development to societies in the unlimited access stage. The change is from a stage where deference is on the basis of ascribed characteristics and where the level of empathy is low to a stage where deference is on the basis of achieved characteristics and where the level of empathy is high.

It is hypothesized here that:

1. In a potential interpersonal conflict situation, the direction of initial communication about the offense is affected

⁴Lerner, op. cit.

by the generational status of the offended party with respect to the offender.

2. In a potential interpersonal conflict situation between an older sibling and a younger sibling where the former is the offended, and the latter the offender, the older sibling will perceive himself as being more empathic than the younger sibling will perceive him to be.
3. In a potential interpersonal conflict situation, the offended party's level of trust is affected by his relative status to the offender in the generational hierarchy.
4. There are significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the relationship between generational status and the direction of initial communication about offense between offender and offended in a potential interpersonal conflict situation.
5. There are significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the degree of empathy the older sibling as the offended party will ascribe to himself as against the degree of empathy the younger sibling as offender will ascribe to him in a potential interpersonal conflict situation.
6. There will be significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the relationship between generational status and the level of trust of the offended for the offender in a potential interpersonal conflict situation.
7. The extent of mass media development in a country affects the level of empathy of its people.

Confrontation is defined here as the offended party's act of talking to the offender about the offense.

CHAPTER II

METHODOLOGY

This study attempts to identify patterns in the communication process involved in potential tension situations as perceived by school children from age 9 to age 18 in Germany, Brazil and the United States. These situations all involve "violation of the sense of property" with the family members as exclusive characters in the stories. Both verbal communication and communication through bodily movements are considered as communication behavior in this study.

The data used are part of the 6,615 protocols from the Psychology-Creativity Research conducted by Harold and Gladys Anderson of the Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, from 1952 to 1962. The Andersons devised eleven incomplete stories as projective tests, and administered them in two series, Series A and Series B. Series A consists of six brief incomplete stories, while Series B consists of five.

Three of the Anderson Incomplete Stories from Series B were chosen for the present study. These stories appeared to be adequate to test the hypotheses outlined here.

The following are the three incomplete stories used in this study:

Story 1 - Broken Bicycle

John worked hard and bought a new bicycle with his money. One Saturday, while John is playing with friends, John's father decides to ride this bicycle to the store to buy cigarettes. He leaves the bicycle in the street. When he comes out of the store he finds the front wheel

bent and some of the paint on the frame badly scraped. No one is around. The father could still ride the bicycle home.

What does the father do?

What does John do?

How do they both feel about it?

Think about these questions and finish the story quickly with a few sentences.

Story 2 - Broken Axe

Herbert received for his thirteenth birthday a handsome camping axe. It is sharp and has a strong leather case. While Herbert is at school his four-year old brother, Billy, sees the axe, looks at it a long time, picks it up, puts it back, and finally takes it outdoors with him to play. Billy does not take the case off. He sings to himself as he walks about the garden, tapping the axe gently against a tree, a post, and the pavement. Herbert comes home from school, finds the axe in its leather case and the blade is chipped and blunted.

What does Herbert do?

How does Herbert feel about it?

Think about these questions and finish the story quickly with a few sentences.

Story 3 - Soiled Dress

Kate, aged 13 years, has a little four-year old sister, Clara. When Kate comes home from school Clara often wants to play with her and follows her and her older girl friends around. One day Clara took a very pretty new dress from Kate's wardrobe, put it on herself, and looked in the mirror. It was too long and hung to the floor. She gathered up the skirt in her arms and went out of the house for a walk. Kate came home from school, found her new dress crumpled on a chair. The skirt had been stepped on and dragged in the dirt.

Clara said, "I wore your dress."

What does Kate do?

What do Kate and Clara think about it and how do they feel?

Finish the story in a few sentences.

Two hundred eleven protocols which have all three stories completed, and which constitute five per cent of the total 4,141 protocols with Series B completions in the U.S., Germany and Brazil were randomly drawn for this study. It should be noted, however, that the original sample from which this subsample was drawn did not involve any randomizing procedure, although the number of schoolrooms of children were "about equally divided between boys and girls, contain children from high, middle and low socioeconomic levels as determined by school authorities."⁵ This implies that it is hazardous to infer from the Anderson and Anderson sample to the countries, or even to the entire towns where the respondents were located. With this consideration, this study is limited to generating workable hypotheses for future research.

The Anderson Incomplete Stories were administered in the locations used in this study in the following dates:

Germany	
Hamburg	1954
Braunschweig	1953
Munich	1954
Brazil (Rio de Janeiro)	
	1959
United States	
Benton Harbor, Michigan	1957
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	1960

⁵Harold Anderson and Gladys L. Anderson. "A Cross-National Study of Children: A Study in Creativity and Mental Health." Paper presented at the Sixth International Congress on Mental Health, Technical Session, Sorbonne, France, Aug. 31, 1961.

In 1960, Theodore and Judyth Anderson administered the incomplete stories to the same classrooms in Munich, Germany where Harold and Gladys Anderson obtained their data in 1954. After a content analysis of three of the story completions, it was concluded that "there was high stability in the fantasy productions of children in the same school grade and same neighborhoods in Munich in 1954 and in 1960."⁶

It will be noted that the date of administration of the incomplete stories differ within and between the countries involved in this study. It is assumed here, however, that the finding in the Munich replication study is also true for Hamburg and Braunschweig, as well as for the U.S. and Brazil.

The Anderson Incomplete Stories were completed by the children in their local language. These completions were translated into English, which translations the author used. Geierhaas⁷ studied the reliability of translation. He coded the German protocols independently from another coder who worked on the English translations of the same protocols. The inter-coder index of reliability was 97.2 per cent.

Classification of Countries

On the basis of the data in the following page (Table 1), we shall arbitrarily call Brazil from the mass media development point of

⁶Harold H. Anderson and Gladys L. Anderson. "Creativity and Cross-National Research: A Comparison of Children's Values in Munich, Germany in 1954 and 1960." Paper presented to the Society for Research in Child Development, Pennsylvania State University, March 17, 1961.

⁷F.G. Geierhaas. Problems of Reliability in Evaluating Story Completions About Social Conflict by German Adolescent Children. M.A. thesis. East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1955.

Table 1. Mass media statistics for Brazil, United States and Federal Republic of Germany, 1964

	Brazil	U.S.	Germany
Population	70,799,000	180,670,000	55,577,000
Illiteracy	51%	2.2%	1-2% ^a
Press			
Daily newsp.	291	1,763 ^d	473
Total daily circ.	3,837,000	59,211,464	17,388,135
Copies/100 people	5.4	32.6	30.7
Radio			
Transmitters	870 AM, 54 FM	3,624 AM, 931 FM	83 AM 155 FM
Receivers	4,700,000	183,800,000	16,332 w ^f 100,000 w ^f
Receivers/100 people	6.6	100	29.6
Television			
Transmitters	28 main 14 aux.	607	45 main 280 aux.
Receivers	1,430,000	60,000,000 ^b	7,800,000 ^f
Receivers/100 people	2.0	33.2	13.9
Film			
Cinemas	3,284-35MM & 16MM FC ^c	12,300-35MM FC 4,700-35MM DrI ^e	6,667-35MM FC 403-35MM MU ^g 1-35MM DrI
Total seating capacity	1,899,100	10,000,000	2,764,600
Seats/100 people	2.7	5.6	4.9

^aAround 1950^eDrI = Drive-In^bEstimated no. in use^fBased on the no. of licenses^cFC = Fixed Cinemas^gMU = Mobile Units^dEnglish language dailies onlySource: UNESCO. World Communications: Press, Radio, Television, Film. N.Y. and Paris, 1964.

view alone as "traditional," and U.S. and Germany as "modern." This dichotomy is perhaps more applicable during the time when the data for this study were gathered than it is today, although even today, Brazil still lags behind the U.S. on a per capita availability of the various media. We do not have mass media statistics for the period when our protocols were obtained, nor for the specific towns involved in the present study for whatever period. Since Rio de Janeiro, the only place in Brazil in this study, is the "cultural capital" of the country, the mass media data for Brazil surely underrepresent the availability of mass media facilities in Rio. The German and American statistics in Table 1 can be assumed to represent the extent of mass media development in the towns included in this study.

Coding Procedure

A coding manual was set up after scanning the original set of protocols from which our sample was drawn.

The three story completions were content analyzed in terms of the following variables:

I. Deference pattern

- Category 1: Direction of communication regarding the offense, i.e., who initiates the communication, the offender, the offended party, or a third party.
- Category 4: Content of offender's communication to offended party after the latter learns of property damage.- Coded here are the responses indicating whether the offender 1) asks forgiveness or expresses regret, 2) promises repair or replacement of the damaged property, 3) attempts to evade

responsibility by accusing offended party of guilt, or 4) merely tells reason for doing the act that led to the damage of the property. This category, however, cannot be used for hypothesis testing because of very small or no frequencies in many cells of the matrix.

II. Trust

Category 3: Offender's behavioral response to the situation (damage of somebody else's property).- This category overlaps with Category 1 in that the behavioral response involved in this Category 3 is whether the offender tells the offended of the offense with or without the questioning from the offended party. However, it allows for coding lying and attempts at deception on the part of the offender with or without questioning from the offended party, which kind of coding is not provided for by Category 1.

III. Empathy

Category 2: Definition of the situation by the offended party or by the respondent himself.- In this category, subcategories ranged from responses attributing no ill-motive to the offender, to responses attributing ill-motive to the offender.

Category 5: Offended party's affective response toward the offender after the former learns of property damage.- Positive responses toward the situation, such as "happiness" and "joy," and negative responses such as "depression," "shock" and "anger" are coded here.

Category 6: Offended party's behavioral response to the situation after learning of the damage of his/her property.- The responses involved here ranged from constructive acts on the part of the offended party toward the offender, such as 1) laughing it off, 2) attempting to placate offender's feelings by promises of material or companionship reward, 3) advises offended party about the inappropriateness of the act, and/or future desirable action, or 4) repairing or replacing the damaged property; to punitive acts such as 1) seeking third party to help in punishing offender and 2) punishing offender by himself/herself.

Story 1 was content analyzed for Categories 1-5, while Stories 2 and 3, for Categories 1-6. It was not possible to make a parallel between the actions of the offended party in Story 1 (father-son story) with the ones in Stories 2 and 3 (sibling stories) for Category 6 because of the difference in relative status and probably physical size between the offender and the offended parties in the three stories. To illustrate, the offended parties (older siblings) punished the offenders (younger siblings), or asked their parents to administer punishment in most cases in Stories 2 and 3. Another mode of response was to attempt to please the offender by verbal or material reward. In the case of Story 1, the offended party (the son) was not in a position to administer punishment to the offender (the father), nor was there any logical need to please the offender based on the plot of the story.

The level of empathy of the respondent is to be inferred from Categories 2, 5, and 6, while the level of trust, from Category 3. As we defined empathy earlier, and as we explained that the "offenses"

involved were presented in the incomplete stories without any apparent malicious intent on the part of the offender, we expect that 1) the respondent or the offended party will define the situation as to acknowledge lack of ill-intent on the part of the offender (Category 2) and that the offended party will respond with positive affect toward the offender since the "offense" was perceived as without ill-intent (Category 5) and 3) the offender will act constructively (e.g., replace property, advise offender on future desirable action, etc.) toward the offender since he/she acknowledged that the "offense" was of no ill-intent. All these conditions should obtain if the respondent is empathic, or is able to grasp the situation of the offender.

Trust will be inferred from Category 3 because it codes the action initiated by the offender himself. The alternatives open to the offender in this category is 1) tell the truth to the offended party without being questioned by the latter 2) tell the truth after being questioned by the latter 3) lie or deceive offended party without being questioned by the same 4) lie or deceive offended party after being questioned by the latter. If the respondent made the offender choose either Alternative 1 or Alternative 2, he is deemed to be indicating trust toward that character in the story. If on the other hand the respondent made the offender choose Alternative 3 or Alternative 4, he is deemed to be indicating distrust toward that character in the story.

The coding manual for all three story completions contains twenty-two categories:

All Protocols

- 1- Home Country of Respondent
- 2- Year of Administration (of incomplete stories)
- 3- Age
- 4- Sex
- 5- Grade Level of Respondent

Story 1 Protocols (The Bicycle Story)

- 6- Direction of Communication (regarding property damage)
- 7- Son's or Respondent's Definition of Situation (re: damage of bike)
- 8- Father's Behavioral Response to the Situation (re: damage of bike)
- 9- Content of Father's Communication to Son (after son learns of property damage)
- 10- Son's Affective Response Toward Father (after learning of bike damage)

Story 4 (The Broken Knife) and Story 5 (The Soiled Dress) Protocols

- 11/17- Direction of Communication (regarding property damage)
- 12/18- Older Sibling's (or Respondent's) Definition of the Situation (re: damage of property)
- 13/19- Younger Sibling's Behavioral Response to the Situation (re: damage of older sibling's property)
- 14/20- Content of Younger Sibling's Communication (after older sibling learns of property damage)
- 15/21- Older Sibling's Behavioral Response to the Situation (after learning of damage of property)
- 16/22- Older Sibling's Affective Response to the Situation (after learning of damage of property)

It is in terms of these categories that the hypotheses of this study will be tested.

Reliability Check

Two coders, an M.A. candidate in Psychology and the author, independently coded 15 protocols from each country (a total of 45) to check on inter-coder reliability. This resulted in 92 per cent agreement. The formula used to determine per cent of agreement was the following:

$$\frac{\text{Number of Agreements}}{\text{Total No. of Categories Coded}} \times 100$$

A proportionate stratified random sample of 70 protocols each were drawn randomly for the U.S. and Brazil, and 71 for Germany. Proportionate drawing was deemed necessary because of the several towns involved in the German and U.S. samples. Thus, a total of 211 protocols were used in this study, distributed as follows:

Germany	71
Hamburg	
Braunschweig	
Munich	
Brazil (Rio de Janeiro)	70
United States	70
Benton Harbor, Michigan	45
Cedar Rapids, Iowa	25
Total	<u>211</u>

All of these 211 protocols were coded by the author.

A frequency count of all the codebook subcategories by country served as the guide for collapsing some of these subcategories. The reason for collapsing is that some of the subcategories did not occur frequently enough (less than five per cent) to justify using them for

cross-tabulation.

Analysis Scheme

The operational statement of our theoretic hypotheses and the manner in which these operational hypotheses will be tested are as follows:

Hypothesis 1: The respondent's perception of confrontation between offended party and offender is affected by the generational status of the former with respect to the latter in the situation (story); that is, the elder child is more likely to be made to confront the younger sibling (Stories 2 and 3) than the son to confront the father (Story 1).

This hypothesis will be tested by obtaining a correlation measure (phi) for Categories 11 and 17 which are the responses to the sibling stories on the direction of communication, and correlating Category 6 which is the response to the Broken Bicycle story on direction of communication to Category 11 and also to Category 17. It is expected that responses to Categories 11 and 17 will be highly consistent; in other words, positively correlated.

If the hypothesized relationship is equally true to all three countries in this study, then the deference pattern is no basis for classifying them into "modern" and "traditional" societies. If, however, there are significant differences in the proportion of responses to the direction of initial communication regarding the offense between the sibling stories and the father-son story, then it might be useful to make the classification.

Hypothesis 2: The age of the respondent affects the perception of the degree of empathy of the older sibling for the younger sibling; that is, the older respondents will have a greater tendency to ascribe empathy to the older sibling than will the younger respondents.

The ages of the respondents range from age 9 to age 18. The "Older" group consists of ages 12 to 18, while the "Younger" group consists of ages 9 to 11. It is expected that this age grouping represents significant differences in maturational development, though no more than an "educated" guess was used to distribute the respondents into such groups. The "Older" group is expected to be more mature than the "Younger" group.

There are three measures of empathy in this study which are not mutually independent. One measure is the offended party's or the respondent's definition of the situation (damage of property and younger sibling), which is Category 12 for Story 2, and Category 18 for Story 3. The second measure is the offended party's affective response toward the offender which is Category 16 for Story 2, Category 22 for Story 3. The third measure is the offended party's behavioral response to the situation (after learning of damage of property), which is Category 15 for Story 2 and Category 21 for Story 3.

A measure of correlation (phi) will be taken for all three measures, and responses to Categories 12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 22 will be correlated with Category 3 (age group of the respondent). It is expected that if in fact the three empathy measures are positively correlated with each other, then there will be a high correlation between results of correlating Category 3 with 12, 15, 16, 18 and 22. In other words, each of the three measures serve as a check on the relationship

between empathy and age.

Hypothesis 3: The respondent's level of trust (empathy) is affected by the generational status of the characters in the situation (story); that is, respondents are more likely to make the father lie or deceive his son in the "Broken Bicycle" than make the younger sibling lie or deceive the older sibling in the "Broken Knife" and "Soiled Dress" stories.

The reason for this expectation is that even families in "modern" societies carry over a certain amount of the traits in the "traditional" society with respect to deference.

Category 8, the father's behavioral response to the situation (damage of bike) for Story 1 will be correlated with Categories 13 and 19, which are the behavioral responses of the younger sibling to the damage of property in Story 2 and Story 3 respectively. A measure of correlation between Categories 13 and 19 will be taken, and it is expected that the correlation will be high, and a positive one.

Hypothesis 4: There are significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the respondent's perception of the effect of generational status on the direction of initial communication about the offense between the offender and the offended in all three stories illustrating potential tension situations.

In Brazil, the father (offender) will be perceived as being more likely to initiate communication about the offense than the son (offended) is. In Germany and the U.S., the son will be perceived as more likely to initiate communication about the offense than the father will.

In Brazil, the older sibling (offended) will be perceived as more likely to initiate the communication than the younger sibling

(offender) will be. In Germany and the U.S., the younger sibling (offender) will be perceived to be just as likely to initiate the communication as the older sibling.

The correlations (phi) obtained for each country for variables 6 and 11, and for variables 6 and 17 will be compared with each other.

Hypothesis 5: There are significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the relation between the respondent's age and their perception of the degree of empathy of the older sibling for the younger sibling in the stories illustrating potential tension situations.

In Brazil, more older respondents than younger respondents will ascribe empathy to the older sibling in both sibling stories. The proportion of the older respondents ascribing empathy to those not ascribing empathy will be smaller for Brazil than for the U.S. and Germany. Furthermore, there will be a greater proportion of younger respondents who will ascribe empathy to the older sibling as against those who will not in the U.S. and Germany than in Brazil.

This hypothesis involves only Stories 2 and 3, and not Story 1. Again, the correlations (phi) obtained for each country between variable 3 and variables 12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 22 will be compared with each other.

Hypothesis 6: There are significant differences between nationality groups with respect to the effect of generational status of characters in the stories and the level of trust respondents show through these characters.

In Brazil, more respondents will show distrust toward the father (offender) than toward the younger sibling (offender). In the U.S. and

Germany, there will be an equal proportion of respondents who show distrust toward either father or younger sibling, to respondents who show trust toward either characters.

This hypothesis involves all three stories, and the correlation between variables 8 and 13 will be compared with the correlation between variables 8 and 19 for each country.

Hypothesis 7: The extent of mass media development of a country affects the level of empathy of its people; that is, the higher the level of development of mass media, the more empathic people are, and vice versa.

It is expected that there will be a significant difference between Brazil on the one hand, and Germany-U.S. combined on the other. More precisely, it is expected that there will be more empathic responses in Germany-U.S. combined which we have called "modern" on the basis of the extent of mass media development as contrasted with Brazil which we have called "traditional."

This hypothesis will be tested by pooling the data for the U.S. and Germany and comparing them with those of Brazil, on the three measures of empathy which are contained in Categories 7, 10, 12, 15, 16, 18, 21 and 22.

In using a projective measure to test the above hypotheses, the following assumptions were made:

1. The respondents, as individual personalities, are controlled to a large extent by the culture in which they live. Conversely, the individual personalities, idiomatically using the prescribed social and cultural patterns, themselves create the social and cultural milieu.

2. The respondent shares meanings with the society to which he belongs.
3. The story completions represent what the situations presented in the stories mean to the individual.
4. The story completions reflect the pattern of interpersonal relations arising in potential tension situations in the culture where the respondent has been reared.
5. Younger respondents will identify with the younger sibling in the story, while older respondents will identify with the older sibling in the story.

CHAPTER III

FINDINGS

Not all the story completions had responses for each category in the code book that was set up for this study. The net result of this is that the frequencies for a number of subcategories were very low, and made it necessary that the subcategories be collapsed so that the data could be analyzed by appropriate statistical means. Most of the variables were dichotomized into "positive" and "negative" values, indicating the presence (positive) or absence (negative) of the particular trait being measured. This is particularly true of the three measures of empathy and the measure for trust. As to the category "Direction of Communication," the dichotomy consists of 1) offender initiates communication and 2) offended party initiates communication. Responses indicating that either offender or offended party approached a third person about the offense were eliminated in the correlational analysis as they are not necessary in the testing of the hypotheses.

For Hypotheses 1, 3, 4, 6 and 7, the X^2 test is used here.

The fourfold point correlation coefficient, or the phi coefficient is the statistic used here to test Hypotheses 2 and 5.

Correlation Between the Measures of Empathy

The three measures of empathy for the two sibling stories were correlated, as shown in Tables 2, 3 and 4.

Two of the three ("Definition of Situation" and "Behavioral Response") measures of empathy are positively correlated across the two stories. "Affective Response," though indicating possible negative correlation, did not attain significance.

It should be remembered that the correlation is between the responses of the same individual to the two incomplete stories. As mentioned earlier, not all of the story completions could be coded on all the categories in the code book. Some of the protocols were coded on a measure of empathy in Story 2, but could not be coded on the same measure in Story 3, which accounts for the zero frequency and consequently for the negative correlation obtained in Table 3.

Table 2. Correlation between offended party's definition of the situation in the two sibling stories ($\phi = .400$, $p < .05$)

		Story 2	
		Non-empathic	Empathic
Story 1	Empathic	2	13
	Non-empathic	10	9

Table 3. Correlation between offended party's affective response to the situation in the two sibling stories ($\phi = -.036$, N.S.)

		Story 2	
		Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)
Story 1	Positive (Empathic)	2	0
	Negative (Non-empathic)	53	2

Table 4. Correlation between offended party's behavior response to the situation in the two sibling stories ($\emptyset = .332$, $p < .01$)

	Story 2	
	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)
Positive (Empathic)	13	21
Negative (Non-empathic)	44	17

Correlation Between Measures of Trust

The same problem encountered in correlating the three measures of empathy across the two sibling stories was present in correlating the one measure of trust ("Offender's Behavior Response") across the two sibling stories.

As shown in Table 5. There were only six protocols which were coded for trust on both Stories 2 and 3. It is not surprising therefore that a negative correlation is indicated for trust responses across the two stories.

Table 5. Correlation between the offender's behavior response in the two sibling stories ($\emptyset = .500$, N.S.)

	Story 2	
	Lie/deception	Truth
Story 1 Truth	2	2
Story 1 Lie/deception	0	2

Results of the Tests of Hypotheses

Hypothesis 1 is a prediction that generational status will make a difference in the direction of initial communication about the offense. More specifically, it was expected that the character who is higher in

the generational hierarchy will initiate the communication, whether he or she is the offender or the offended party.

Table 6 shows an indication that if there is a correlation between the direction of communication in the two sibling stories, it may be a negative one. The obtained correlation, however, is very small ($\emptyset = -.064$) and is not significant. The negative direction it took can be explained by the fact that in Story 3, the incomplete story specifically states that the younger sibling (offender) initiated the communication. It was deemed important to code Story 3 on the "Direction of Communication" because a number of respondents altered the direction of communication as if they could not believe that the younger sibling could indeed initiate the communication about the offense.

Table 6. Correlation between direction of initial communication in the two sibling stories ($\emptyset = -.064$, N.S.)

		Story 2	
		Younger sibling-to-older sibling	Older sibling-to-younger sibling
Story 1	Older sibling-to-younger sibling	6	52
	Younger sibling-to-older sibling	0	2

Hypothesis 1 is confirmed by the data, as shown in Tables 7 and 8. In Story 1, the offender (father) initiated the communication in 74 out of 141 or 53 per cent of the protocols coded for this category. In Story 2, 91 out of 95, or 92 per cent of the protocols coded for this category had the offended (older sibling) initiate the communication. In Story 3, 93 out of 104, or 90 per cent of the protocols coded for this category had the offended (older sibling) initiate

the communication too.

Table 7. Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 2

Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	Offender-to- offended	Offended-to- offender	χ^2
	74	67	57.38943
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 2)	4	91	df = 1, $p < .001$

Table 8. Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 3

Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	Offender-to- offended	Offended-to- offender	χ^2
	74	67	4.4440
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 3)	11	93	df = 1, $p < .05$

Hypothesis 2 is a statement of expectation that the older respondents will tend to ascribe a higher degree of empathy to the older sibling than will the younger respondents. This is based on the assumption that the older respondents will identify with the older sibling in Stories 2 and 3. Since empathy is developmental, a self-insight that they do have a capacity to understand the role of the younger sibling in the stories, will make the older respondents attribute more empathy to the older sibling than the younger respondents will.

The data does not support Hypothesis 2, as shown in Tables 9, 10, 11, 12, 13 and 14. Moreover, there is a slight indication that the relationship between age and empathy may even be negative, though the negative correlations obtained for both stories are very small and non-significant. It is more likely that in such potential conflict

situations, the offended party will perceive the offender as having no ill motive regardless of the age of the offended party.

Table 9. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2

	Non-empathic	Empathic	$\emptyset$
Total			
Older	11	22	-.279
Younger	0	7	N.S.

Table 10. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3

	Non-empathic	Empathic	$\emptyset$
Total			
Older	13	16	-.027
Younger	5	7	N.S.

Table 11. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	$\emptyset$
Total			
Older	63	1	-.033
Younger	23	1	N.S.

Table 12. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	$\emptyset$
Total			
Older	53	3	-.024
Younger	24	2	N.S.

situations, the offended party will perceive the offender as having an ill motive regardless of the age of the offended party.

Table 9. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2

	Non-empathic	Empathic	
Total			.03
Older	11	22	
Younger	0	7	ended 3

Table 10. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 1

	Non-empathic	Empathic	
Total			.031 N.S.
Older	13		
Younger	5		

Table 11. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	
Total			of Hypothesis 3, as shown
Older	63		2 (Table 15), it can be
Younger	23		toward the father than toward

Table 12. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	
Total			$p < .05$) by making the father
Older			ended) more often than the
Younger			to the older sibling (offended).

(Table 16) did not yield any

Table 13. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	ϕ
Total			
Older	58	16	-.143
Younger	29	5	N.S.

Table 14. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	ϕ
Total			
Older	53	34	.031
Younger	32	18	N.S.

Hypothesis 3 states that the respondent's level of trust is affected by the generational status of the characters in the potential conflict situation; that is, the respondents are more likely to make the father lie or deceive his son in the "Broken Bicycle" than make the younger sibling in the "Broken Knife" and "Soiled Dress" stories.

The data partly supports the opposite of Hypothesis 3, as shown in Tables 15 and 16. Comparing Stories 1 and 2 (Table 15), it can be seen that the respondents show more trust toward the father than toward the younger sibling ($X^2 = 4.2509$, $df = 1$, $p < .05$) by making the father (offender) tell the truth to his son (offended) more often than the younger sibling (offender) tell the truth to the older sibling (offended). The comparison between Stories 1 and 3 (Table 16) did not yield any significant difference.

Table 15. Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 2

	Truth (Trust)	Lie/deception (Distrust)	χ^2
Total			
Father	91	17	4.2509
Younger sibling	35	16	df = 1, p < .05

Table 16. Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 3

	Truth (Trust)	Lie/deception (Distrust)	χ^2
Total			
Father	91	17	.1281
Younger sibling	12	1	df = 1, N.S.

Hypothesis 4 is a prediction that in Brazil, which we have arbitrarily called "traditional," the character involved in a dyadic potential conflict situation who is higher in the generational hierarchy will initiate the communication about the offense, regardless of his role in the conflict (i.e., whether he is the offender or the offended). Conversely, in Germany, as well as in the United States, both of which we have called "modern," it is predicted that the offended party will be the one to initiate the communication, regardless of his generational position relative to the offender.

The data partly supports the opposite of the prediction for Brazil and the United States as shown in Tables 17 and 18. In Brazil, the offended party is more likely to initiate the communication, regardless of his relative generational position to the offender. The likelihood that the offended party will initiate the communication is increased

by the decrease in generational distance between offender and offended, however. In Story 1, the offender (father) initiated the communication in 57 per cent of the cases, while in Story 2, the offended (older sibling) initiated the communication in 100 per cent of the cases.

($X = 14.9333$, $df = 1$, $p < .001$)

In the United States, the character higher in the generational hierarchy is more likely to initiate the communication about the offense, regardless of his role in the conflict.

The prediction for Germany is confirmed by the data, for Stories 1 and 2 (Table 17), but the data for Stories 1 and 3 (Table 18) did not reach significance. Comparing Stories 1, it can be seen that the offended party is more likely to initiate communication, regardless of his relative generational position to the offender. As in Brazil, the likelihood that this will happen is increased by a decrease in generational distance between the two parties in the conflict situation. In Story 1, the offended party initiated communication in 59 per cent of the cases, while in Story 2, the offended party initiated communication in 93 per cent of the cases.

Hypothesis 5 is an expectation that in Brazil, more older respondents than younger respondents will ascribe empathy to the older sibling in both sibling stories. However, it is expected that this proportion of the older respondents ascribing empathy will be smaller for Brazil than for the U.S. and Germany.

As shown in Tables 19, 20, 21, 22, 23 and 24, no conclusive statement can be said about Hypothesis 5 no significant direction of relationship between the age group of the respondent and the offended party's empathy toward the offender is indicated. Two exceptions may

Table 17. Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 2

	Offender-to-offended	Offended-to-offender	χ^2
Germany: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	22	29	16.2068
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 2)	2	41	df = 1, p < .001
Brazil: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	18	24	14.9333
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 2)	0	30	df = 1, p < .001
U.S: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	34	14	20.6169
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 2)	2	20	df = 1, p < .001

Table 18. Relationship between direction of initial communication and generational hierarchy, Stories 1 and 3

	Offender-to-offended	Offended-to-offender	
Germany: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	22	29	2.2149
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 3)	7	34	df = 1, N.S.
Brazil: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	18	24	1.18381
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 3)	2	33	df = 1, N.S.
U.S: Offender higher in generational hierarchy (Story 1)	34	14	26.2759
Offender lower in generational hierarchy (Story 3)	2	26	df = 1, p < .001

be noted here. In Table 19, it is shown that in the United States, the relationship between age and one measure of empathy for Story 2 is negative ($\phi = -.490$, $p < .05$). (The measure is "Definition of Situation") This means that the older the respondent, the lower the likelihood that he will register empathy for the offender. Since this finding cannot be compared with that for Brazil because of the insignificant negative

correlation obtained on the same measure of empathy there, no determinate statement can be made about it.

In Table 22, it is indicated that the relationship between age and one measure of empathy ("Affective Response to the Situation") is negative ($\emptyset = -.336$, $p < .05$). This is opposite the expectation that more older respondents than younger respondents will attribute empathy to the older sibling. However, since this finding cannot be compared with the insignificant results for the U.S. and Germany on the same measure of empathy, again, no statement can be made on Hypothesis 5 on the basis of this finding.

Table 19. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2

	Non-empathic	Empathic	$\emptyset$
Germany			
Older	2	6	No
Younger	0	0	
Brazil			
Older	1	13	-.002
Younger	0	5	N.S.
U.S.			
Older	8	3	-.490
Younger	0	2	$p < .05$

According to Hypothesis 6, it can be expected that there will be significant differences between the nationality groups as to the effect of generational status on the level of trust the respondents show through the characters in the potential conflict situations. Specifically, Hypothesis 6 is a prediction that in Brazil, more respondents will show distrust toward the father (offender) than toward

Table 20. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3

	Non-empathic	Empathic	ϕ
Germany			
Older	2	2	.040
Younger	2	1	N.S.
Brazil			
Older	1	10	.372
Younger	2	4	N.S.
U.S.			
Older	10	4	-.304
Younger	1	2	N.S.

Table 21. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	ϕ
Germany			
Older	17	0	-.225
Younger	11	1	N.S.
Brazil			
Older	29	1	-.080
Younger	7	0	N.S.
U.S.			
Older	17	0	No
Younger	5	0	

the younger sibling (offender). Furthermore, for the U.S. and Germany, the prediction is that there will be an equal proportion of respondents who show distrust toward either father or younger sibling to the respondents who show trust toward either characters.

On the basis of the data comparing Stories 1 and 2 (Table 25), it appears that generational hierarchy is important in determining the

Table 22. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	$\emptyset$
Germany			
Older	11	0	No
Younger	12	0	
Brazil			
Older	33	1	-.336
Younger	6	2	p .05
U.S.			
Older	9	2	.034
Younger	6	0	N.S.

Table 23. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	$\emptyset$
Germany			
Older	16	4	.175
Younger	19	1	N.S.
Brazil			
Older	12	8	.057
Younger	4	2	N.S.
U.S.			
Older	30	4	-.148
Younger	6	2	N.S.

likelihood that the respondents will trust the offender in a potential conflict situation, and that no differences between Brazil, Germany and the United States occur in the predicted direction. In all three countries, the father and the younger sibling are both trusted but more respondents showed trust toward the father than toward the younger sibling. Since no differences in the direction predicted occur, it can

Table 24. Correlation between age group of respondent and offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3

	Negative (Non-empathic)	Positive (Empathic)	ϕ
Germany			
Older	14	5	-.064
Younger	19	9	
Brazil			
Older	13	15	.141
Younger	8	5	N.S.
U.S.			
Older	26	14	-.076
Younger	5	4	N.S.

be said that the data do not support Hypothesis 6.

Table 25. Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 2

	Truth (Trust)	Lie/deception (Distrust)	ϕ
Germany			
Father	27	8	.0041
Younger sibling	19	7	df = 1, N.S.
Brazil			
Father	24	9	.9818
Younger sibling	8	7	df = 1, N.S.
U.S.			
Father	40	0	.1281
Younger sibling	8	2	df = 1, N.S.

No X^2 for proportions can be computed for comparing Stories 1 and 3, as shown in Table 26.

Hypothesis 7 is a prediction that more respondents in Germany-United States combined will show empathy than in Brazil.

Table 26. Relationship between generational hierarchy and behavioral response of offender, Stories 1 and 3

	Truth (Trust)	Lie/deception (Distrust)	χ^2
Germany			
Father	27	8	No
Younger sibling	7	0	
Brazil			
Father	24	9	No
Younger sibling	3	1	
U.S.			
Father	40	0	No
Younger sibling	2	0	

Tables 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33 and 34 show the results of testing this hypothesis.

On one measure of empathy ("Definition of Situation,") for the two sibling stories, it appears that Brazil has more respondents showing empathy than Germany-United States together. (Tables 6 and 7) This difference between Brazil versus Germany-United States is opposite the predicted direction hypothesized here. On another measure of empathy, "Behavioral Response to the Situation," for Story 2, in both Brazil and the Germany-United States combination, more respondents show empathy than those who show absence of empathy (Table 3). However, Brazil has a higher proportion of empathic responses to non-empathic responses, compared with the proportion for Germany-United States combined. No χ^2 for proportions can be computed on the measure "Affective Response to the Situation" for all three stories and on "Definition of Situation" for Story 1 because of expected values less than 5 in the fourfold tables.

Table 27. Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 1

	Empathic	Non-empathic	χ^2
Brazil	5	5	No
Germany-U.S.	2	7	

Table 28. Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 2

	Empathic	Non-empathic	χ^2
Brazil	19	1	7.4315
Germany-U.S.	11	10	df = 1, $p < .01$

Table 29. Offended party's definition of the situation, Story 3

	Empathic	Non-empathic	χ^2
Brazil	15	3	7.0506
Germany-U.S.	9	15	df = 1, $p < .01$

Table 30. Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 1

	Positive (Empathic)	Negative (Non-empathic)	χ^2
Brazil	7	21	.49633
Germany-U.S.	10	52	df = 1, N.S.

Table 31. Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 2

	Positive (Empathic)	Negative (Non-empathic)	χ^2
Brazil	0	34	No
Germany-U.S.	2	72	

Table 32. Offended party's affective response to the situation, Story 3

	Positive (Empathic)	Negative (Non-empathic)	χ^2
Brazil	4	25	No
Germany-U.S.	4	44	

Table 33. Offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 2

	Positive (Empathic)	Negative (Non-empathic)	χ^2
Brazil	15	19	14.6982
Germany-U.S.	14	31	df = 1, p < .001

Table 34. Offended party's behavioral response to the situation, Story 3

	Positive (Empathic)	Negative (Non-empathic)	χ^2
Brazil	25	26	2.55381
Germany-U.S.	15	35	df = 1, N.S.

CHAPTER IV

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION: A TRAIT PROFILE OF BRAZIL, GERMANY AND THE UNITED STATES

The present study explored the empirical significance of the concept of "national character." More specifically, it examined whether countries differ in some dimensions of national character, such as trust, empathy, and respect for generational status, and whether such differences coincide with variation in the extent of mass media development.

The data are derived from 211 story completions of three Anderson Incomplete Stories by schoolchildren from Germany, Brazil and the United States. All stories involve what may be called "violation of the sense of property," where one party is the cause of the damage of the property of another without any apparent malicious intent. Two of the stories involved siblings (older sibling as offended, younger sibling as offender), and one involved father (as offender) and son(as offended). The protocols were content analyzed. It was assumed that the completions reflect the communication pattern in similar potential tension situations in the countries where the children are from.

On the basis of our findings, the following generalizations may be made about potential conflict situations between two family members involving "violation of the sense of property," and in which no malice on the part of the offender is apparent:

I. Deference pattern. In general, it can be expected that the character who is higher in the generational hierarchy will initiate

communication about the offense, regardless of his role (as offender or offended) in the situation.

In Brazil, the offended party is more likely to initiate the communication, regardless of his relative generational position to the offender. The same is true for Germany.

In the United States, the character higher in the generational structure is more likely to initiate the communication about the offense, regardless of his role in the situation.

The relative degree of urbanization may have affected our data. Rio de Janeiro, Hamburg, Braunschweig and Munich, may be more evenly urban than either Cedar Rapids (Iowa) or Benton Harbor (Michigan).

II. Empathy. It is likely that, in general, the offended party will perceive himself as being empathic regardless of his age. There are also indications that in Brazil, which has a less developed mass media system, empathy is present to a greater extent than in the United States and Germany, both of which have a highly developed mass media system. This difference might be due to the positions of the cities studied here relative to their respective countries. Rio de Janeiro is the cultural capital of Brazil, and none of the American and German towns included in this study can parallel that position. Presumably, Rio is the center of mass media activity in the country, unlike Benton Harbor and Cedar Rapids in the United States and Hamburg, Braunschweig and Munich in Germany.

III. Trust. In general, it can be expected that the offender's motives will be trusted by the offended party, regardless of whether the latter is younger or older, lower or higher in the generational hierarchy than the former. In all three countries, although the offender's motive

is generally trusted by the offended party, trust is more likely to be forthcoming the higher the offender is in the generational hierarchy with respect to the offended party.

Conclusion

The attempt has been made here to find out whether nationality groups differ in deference patterns, and in the extent of presence of empathy and trust. There are slight indications that such differences do exist. However, our data show some differences which can be explained better empirically rather than theoretically. In particular, the findings that cannot be explained by the theoretical framework of this study are that there is less respect for generational status in Brazil (represented here by Rio de Janeiro) than in the United States (represented by Cedar Rapids and Benton Harbor) and that empathy is present to a greater extent in Brazil than in either the United States or Germany. We have repeatedly called attention to the fact that our protocols for Brazil all come from Rio de Janeiro which is not representative of the median that our mass media statistics present. It was the hope here that there are characteristics that prevail in a nation which have a neutralizing action on the effect of mass media development if such a development is not at an equal rate, or more specifically, at a highly uneven pace and stage throughout the nation. This hope, however, is not encouraged by the data.

No conclusive statements can be made as to the relevance of our "traditional-modern" dichotomy on the basis of deference to the level of mass media development of a country from our data.

APPENDIX: Code Book

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
1-3	Project Number	
4-5	Deck Number	01
6	(Unused)	
7-9	Respondent Identification No.	(Consecutively assigned, 001-211)
10-11	Home Country of Respondent	10- Germany 11- Braunschweig, Germany 12- Hamburg, Germany 13- Munich, Germany 20- Brazil (Rio de Janeiro) 30- U.S.A. 31- Benton Harbor, Mich., U.S. 32- Cedar Rapids, Iowa, U.S.
12-15	Respondent Identification No.	(As indicated in protocol)
16-17	Year of Administration	(E.g., "58" for "1958")
18-19	Age	(If not indicated, put <u>00</u>)
20	Sex	1- Male 2- Female 0- Not indicated
21	Grade Level of Respondent	(E.g., "5" for Grade V; if not indicated, put <u>00</u>)

Story #2 - The Bicycle Story

Column	Variable Coded	Code
22	Direction of Communication	1- Father to son (if father initiates communication) 2- Son to father (if son initiates communication) 0- No direction indicated
23-24	Son's (or Respondent's Definition of the Situation (Re: Damage of His Bike) Note: Do not code definition of situation by other characters of the story.	10- Father had no malicious intent in taking bike and/or leaving it on the street 11- Expressed to father 12- Unexpressed; private thought 20- Damage of bike while in father's care is occasion for retribution for damages he had done to father's property in the past 21- Expressed to father 22- Unexpressed; private thought 30- Nothing can be done to the damage of the bike 31- Expressed to father 32- Unexpressed; private thought 40- Father was careless in leaving bike on the street 41- Expressed to father 42- Unexpressed; private thought 50- Father was wrong in taking bike without his permission 51- Expressed to father 52- Unexpressed; private thought (Note: Give priority to 50-52 over 40-42) 00- No definition of situation indicated

Column	Variable Coded	Code
25	Father's Behavioral Response to the Situation (Re: Damage of Bike)	1- Tells son before repair/ replacement of bike without being questioned 2- Tells son after repair/ replacement of bike without being questioned 3- Tells son after being questioned 4- Deceives/lies to son upon being questioned 5- Deceives/lies to son without being questioned 6- Sends bike for repair/ replacement without communica- tion with son 0- None of above
26	Content of Father's Communication to Son (After Son Learns of Bike Damage)	1- Asks forgiveness/expresses regret 2- Promises repair/replacement of bike 3- Both of above 4- Accuses son of guilt (Note: Code under this if father attempts to evade responsibility by turn- ing against son) 0- None of above
27-28	Son's Affective Response Toward Father (After Learning of Bike Damage)	10- Happiness (as indicated by words like "glad," "joyful," "happy" or other synonyms of "happy") 11- Happiness, before repair/ replacement of bike 12- Happiness, after promise of repair/replacement of bike 13- Happiness, after repair/ replacement of bike

Column	Variable Coded	Code
27-28		20- Ambivalent feelings (if son is said to feel both "sad" and "happy," or both "angry" and "happy")
		21- Ambivalent feelings, before repair/replacement of bike
		22- Ambivalent feelings, after promise of repair/replacement of bike
		23- Ambivalent feelings, after repair/replacement of bike
		30- Depression (as indicated by words like "depressed," "feels bad," "feels sad," "unhappy," or the like)
		31- Depression, before repair/replacement of bike
		32- Depression, after promise of repair/replacement of bike
		33- Depression, after repair/replacement of bike
		40- Shocked, surprised
		41- Shocked, surprised, before repair/replacement of bike
		42- Shocked, surprised, after promise of repair/replacement of bike
		43- Shocked, surprised, after repair, replacement of bike
		50- Anger (as indicated by words like "angry," "cross," "mad," "hate," "irritated," or other synonyms of "angry")
		51- Anger, before repair/replacement of bike
		52- Anger, after promise of repair/replacement of bike
		53- Anger, after repair/replacement of bike
		00- Passivity (no affective response)
		01- Passivity, before repair/replacement of bike
		02- Passivity, after promise of repair/replacement of bike
		03- Passivity, after repair/replacement of bike

Story #2 - The Broken KnifeStory #3 - The Soiled Dress

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
29 <u>37</u>	Direction of Communication	1- Younger sibling to older sibling (if younger sibling initiates communication) 2- Older sibling to younger sibling (if older sibling initiates communication) 3- Older sibling approaches parent, then parent approaches younger sibling 4- Older sibling approaches parent 5- Older sibling approaches unspecified person/persons, then approaches younger sibling 6- Younger sibling approaches parent who then approaches older sibling 0- No direction of communication indicated
30-31 <u>38-39</u>	Older Sibling's (or Respondent's) Definition of the Situation Note: Do not code definition of situation by other characters of the story.	10- Younger sibling is too young to understand what he/she is doing 11- Before confrontation (when intent to confront y.s. is specified) Note: <u>Confrontation</u> is the offended party's act of talking to offender about the offense 12- During confrontation 13- After confrontation 14- Without confrontation 20- Y.s. had no malicious intent 21- Before confrontation 22- During confrontation 23- After confrontation 24- Without confrontation

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
<u>30-31</u> <u>38-39</u>		30- Damage to property is older sibling's fault (due to his/her carelessness with the property and/or to his/her provoking younger sibling to commit the act 31- Before confrontation 32- During confrontation 33- After confrontation 34- Without confrontation 40- Nothing can be done about the damage 41- Before confrontation 42- During confrontation 43- After confrontation 44- Without confrontation 50- Younger sibling committed act out of jealousy 51- Before confrontation 52- During confrontation 53- After confrontation 54- Without confrontation 60- Y.s. committed act out of malice/mischievousness 61- Before confrontation 62- During confrontation 63- After confrontation 64- Without confrontation 00- No definition of situation indicated
<u>32</u> <u>40</u>	Younger Sibling's Behavioral Response to the Situation (Re: Damage of Older Sibling's Property)	1- Tells older sibling without being questioned 2- Tells o.s. upon being questioned 3- Lies to/deceives o.s. upon being questioned

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
<u>32</u> <u>40</u>		4- Lies to/deceives older sibling without being questioned Note: Under (3) and (4), code all attempts to lie or to deceive older sibling on the part of the younger sibling, whether the attempt is successful or unsuccessful, or whether the younger sibling told the truth later. Non-essential truth is considered here as a form of deceit. 5- Tells person other than offended party 0- None of above
<u>33</u> <u>41</u>	Content of Younger Sibling's Communication (After Older Sibling Learns of Property Damage)	1- Asks forgiveness; expresses regret 2- Promises repair/replacement of property 3- Tells reason for doing act Note: Give priority to (3) over (1) and (2) 0- None of above
<u>34</u> <u>42</u>	Older Sibling's Behavioral Response to the Situation (After Learning of Damage of Property)	1- Laughs it off 2- Attempts to placate younger sibling's feelings by words of affection, or by promises of material and companionship reward 3- Advises y.s. about inappropriateness of the act, future desirable action Note: Give priority to (2) over (1) 4- Repairs/replaces property

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
<u>34</u> <u>42</u>		5- Seeks parental/other help in restitution of property, advice 6- Punishes y.s. (physical punishment stated as "hitting," "hurting," "slapping," "whipping" or the like; verbal punishment stated as "scolding," "calling names," threat of telling on y.s., threat of social isolation; material deprivation; actual social isolation) 7- Seeks parental assistance in meting punishment (infer this when immediately upon o.s. telling on y.s., parent punishes y.s.) <u>Note:</u> Give priority to (5) over (6) 8- Cries over property damage 0- None of above
<u>35-36</u> <u>43-44</u>	Older Sibling's Affective Response to the Situation (After Learning of Damage of Property)	10- Happiness (as indicated by words like "glad," "joyful," "happy," or by other synonyms of the word "happy") 11- Happiness, before* punishment of y.s. and/or restitution (*specific statement of intent to punish y.s. later) 12- Happiness, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 13- Happiness, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 20- Ambivalent feelings (if older sibling is said to feel both "sad" and "happy," "angry" and "happy") 21- Ambivalent feelings, before punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 22- Ambivalent feelings, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 23- Ambivalent feelings, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution

<u>Column</u>	<u>Variable Coded</u>	<u>Code</u>
35-36 43-44		30- Depression (as indicated by words like "depressed," "feels bad," "feels sad," "unhappy," or the like; include feeling of "guilt") 31- Depression, before* punishment of y.s. and/or restitution (*specific statement of intent to punish later) 32- Depression, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 33- Depression, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 40- Surprised, shocked 41- Surprised, shocked, before punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 42- Surprised, shocked, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 43- Surprised, shocked, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 50- Anger (as indicated by words like "angry," "hate," "mad," "irritated" or by other synonyms of "angry") 51- Anger, before punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 52- Anger, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 53- Anger, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 00- Passivity (no emotional response) 01- Passivity, before punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 02- Passivity, after punishment of y.s. and/or restitution 03- Passivity, without punishment of y.s. and/or restitution

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. American Studies Association. American Perspectives; The National Self-Image in the Twentieth Century. Ed. by Robert E. Spiller and Eric Larrabee. Cambridge, Harvard Univ. Press, 1961. 216p.
2. Anderson, Harold and Gladys L. Anderson. "A Cross-National Study of Children: A Study in Creativity and Mental Health." Paper presented at the Sixth International Congress on Mental Health, Technical Session, Sorbonne, France, Aug. 31, 1961.
3. Anderson, Harold and Gladys L. Anderson. "Creativity and Cross-National Research: A Comparison of Children's Values in Munich, Germany in 1954 and 1960." Paper presented to the Society for Research in Child Development, Pennsylvania State University, March 17, 1961.
4. Duijker, Hubertus and N.H. Frijda. National Character and National Stereotypes; a trend report prepared for the International Union of Scientific Psychology. Amsterdam, North-Holland Publishing Co., 1960.
5. Frank, Lawrence K. Projective Methods. Springfield, Ill., Charles C. Thomas, c1948.
6. Geierhaas, F.G. Problems of Reliability in Evaluating Story Completions About Social Conflict by German Adolescent Children. M.A. Thesis, East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1955.
7. Gorer, Geoffrey. The American People; A Study in National Character. Rev. ed. N.Y., Norton, 1964. 267p.
8. Gould, Julius and William L. Kolb, eds. A Dictionary of the Social Sciences. Ill., Free Press of Glencoe, 1964.
9. Griffith, Thomas. The Waist-High Culture. N.Y., Harper, 1959. 275p.
10. Hague, John A., ed. American Character and Culture; Some Twentieth Century Perspectives. DeLand, Fla., 1964. 176p.
11. Kaplan, Bert. "Personality and Social Structure." (In J.B. Gittler, ed., Review of Sociology, N.Y., John Wiley, c1957, pp. 87-126).
12. Korner, Analise Friedsam. Some Aspects of Hostility in Young Children. New York, Grune & Stratton, 1949.

13. Lerner, Daniel. The Passing of Traditional Society: Modernization in the Middle East. N.Y., Free Press, 1958.
14. Levitov, Edith Sylvia. "The Broken Bicycle," A Comparative Study Completions by Adolescents in the United States and German Cities. M.A. Thesis. George Washington University, 1959. 59p.
15. Lindzey, Gardner. Projective Techniques and Cross-Cultural Research. N.Y., Appleton-Century-Crofts, c1961. 339p.
16. Mead, George Herbert. Mind, Self and Society. Chicago, University of Chicago, c1934.
17. Rabin, Albert I. and Mary R. Haworth, eds. Projective Techniques with Children. New York, Grune & Stratton, c1960. 392p.
18. Rainwater, Lee. Some Themes in the Personalities of German Men. (In Genetic Psychology Monographs, Provincetown, Mass., vol. 61, pp. 167-195.)
19. Riesman, David. The Lonely Crowd; A Study of the Changing American Character. New Haven, Yale Univ. Press, 1950. 386p.
20. Rovin, Joseph. Germany. Trans. by Margaret Crosland. London, E. Hulton; N.Y., Viking Press, 1959. 191p.
21. Tavares de Sa, Hernane. The Brazilians, People of Tomorrow. New York, J. Day Co., 1947. 248p.
22. Terhune, Kenneth W. A Comparison of Two Methods of Content Analysis on Story Completions from Three Countries. M.A. Thesis. East Lansing, Michigan State University, 1961. 87p.
23. UNESCO. World Communications: Press, Radio, Television, Film. N.Y., and Paris, 1964.
24. Wagley, Charles. An Introduction to Brazil. New York, Columbia University, 1963. 322p.