This is to certify that the

dissertation entitled

A Comparison of Japanese
and North American
Compliance-Gaining Styles

presented by
Milton J. Shatzer

has been accepted towards fulfillment
of the requirements for

Ph.D. degree in Communication

Judee K. Burgoon
Major professor

Date 4/14/87

A COMPARISON OF JAPANESE AND NORTH AMERICAN COMPLIANCE-GAINING STYLES

By

Milton Jeremiah Shatzer

A DISSERTATION

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

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

Department of Communication

1987

Accepted by the faculty of the Department of Communication, College of Communication Arts, Michigan State University, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Doctor of Philosophy degree.

Director of Thesis

Guidance Committee: _____, Chair

ABSTRACT

A COMPARISON OF JAPANESE AND NORTH AMERICAN COMPLIANCE-GAINING STYLES

By

Milton J. Shatzer

The main purposes of this research were twofold: (a) to compare Japanese and North Americans in terms of their use of compliance-gaining strategies, and (b) to assess the effects of language of administration in cross-cultural research materials. The research design permitted an examination of how culture, language, and context of persuasion influence compliance-gaining strategy use.

Nine hypotheses and four research questions were presented using the 24 compliance-gaining strategies from the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) and Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) typologies. It was hypothesized that the Japanese would use Positive Expertise, Liking, Pre-giving, Ingratiation, Explanation, and Hinting strategies more than North Americans. The North Americans were hypothesized to use Threat, Aversive Stimulation, and Altruism more than the Japanese. Questions were posed for Debt, Moral Appeal, Positive Esteem, and Negative Esteem.

The sample consisted of 41 Japanese and 40 North Americans. Data was collected using a Q sort. Subjects sorted 76 messages (derived from the 24 strategies) on a continuum from definitely would use to definitely would not use. Approximately half of the Japanese participated in Japanese, and half in English. The hypotheses and research questions were tested using MANOVA. Supplementary analyses were done using traditional Q methodology.

The Japanese were found to use Explanation, Positive Esteem, Moral Appeal, and Negative Altercasting strategies significantly more than North Americans. The North Americans used Positive Self-feeling, Allurement, Bargaining, and Direct Request strategies more than the Japanese. Significant cultural group by context of persuasion interactions were found for 7 of the 24 strategies. Slight effects were found due to language, but these were limited and unsystematic.

In general, cultural differences as well as similarities were found. Japanese use strategies that concern saving face, proper conduct, and moral obligation to society. North Americans use strategies emphasizing personal gain and satisfaction, negotiation, and bargaining. The power relationship between persuader and target was an important determinant of strategy use. Cultural differences were apparent in this power differential.

This dissertation is dedicated to

the loving memory of my father

Milton Leonard Shatzer

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am deeply grateful to the chair of my dissertation committee, Professor Judee K. Burgoon, for her guidance and patience. In addition, I would like to thank my committee members, Professors Michael Burgoon, Felipe Korzenny, Michael D. Miller, Gerald R. Miller, and Frederick Erickson.

I am forever indebted to Tomoko Tanaka, Takehiko Saiki, Naohiko Saeki, and Mrs. Lillian Kumata for their assistance in data collection. Moreover, I want to thank two good friends and colleagues, Professors James B. Stiff and Katherine I. Miller for their assistance. Without these individuals, this dissertation would not have been possible.

I want to thank Professor G. Norman Van Tubergen for his advice in performing Q analysis; and Professor Robert N. Bostrom for his guidance in statistical analyses. I also want to thank my colleagues Professors Joseph M. Ripley, Thomas R. Lindlof, James B. Weaver III, and Steven R. Levitt for their encouragement.

Finally, and most important, I want to express my gratitude to my family. Especially, I am thankful to my wife Nancy and children, Christin and Jeremy, for allowing me the long hours away from them to accomplish this task. I

also want to thank my mother, Genevieve Shatzer, for her generosity and encouragement during this project.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter One

Introduction

As the globe becomes smaller in the Age of Telecommunications, the study of cross-cultural communication becomes increasingly important. From a theoretical standpoint, human communication must be studied and understood as it is found in all cultural contexts so that resultant theories are universal in both space and time. From a practical standpoint, effective cross cultural communication requires learning to speak using the communicative patterns of other cultures. As Oliver has stated, "If we would communicate across cultural barriers, we must learn what to say and how to say it in terms of the expectations and predispositions of those we want to listen" (1962, p. 154). Thus, the goal of this study is to provide additional knowledge to use in developing universal communication theories and to enable more effective intercultural communication in practice.

In particular this dissertation presents an investigation of cross-cultural differences between Japanese and North American compliance-gaining strategies. More specifically this research probes differences in verbal strategies utilized by the Japanese and North Americans in attempting to gain compliance in interpersonal settings.

One major limitation of prior compliance-gaining research is that a great deal of it has been conducted in Western cultures, by Western researchers, using Western participants. Consequently many of the conclusions that have been reached may be generalizable only to Western cultures. The present study builds upon an impressive interdisciplinary history of persuasion and compliance-gaining research in the areas of communication, psychology, and sociology (e.g., Etzioni, 1961; French & Raven, 1960; Kelman, 1961; Parsons, 1963; Thibaut & Kelly, 1950, etc.). However, it goes beyond these studies by investigating cross-cultural variations in persuasion that are exhibited by two very divergent cultures--the Japanese and North Americans.

The Japanese and North Americans as Comparison Groups

The Japanese were selected as a comparison group with North Americans because their culture is strikingly different from North American culture. Cathcart and Cathcart (1976) have commented on how the Japanese social experience and concept of groups affects their communicative behavior:

> If we were to place Japanese concepts of self and group at one end of a continuum it would be possible to produce an almost perfect paradigm by placing American concepts at the other. This remarkable polarity in cultural variation makes the study of Japanese groups useful to those interested in

> intercultural communication. In both cultures we find a similar social phenomenon, highly developed group activity, but the contrasting perceptions of group dynamics are so disparate they bring into sharp focus the divergent social values of Japanese and Americans. Understanding these cultural variances in perception and values can help us cross communication barriers, and more importantly, help us understand how our American concepts of group are cultural variants rather than universal theories. In other words, the ethnocentrism of American theories of group dynamics may emerge more clearly as we examine Japanese concepts standing in polar opposition to our own (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976, p. 58).

Thus the compliance-gaining repertoire of the Japanese would be expected to differ markedly in certain areas because of different cultural norms and values.

Japanese Cultural Norms and Values

To begin to understand the influence of Japanese culture on communicative style, five interrelated concepts need to be understood. These are: ie, on, giri and gimu, and amae.

The Japanese word ie literally means "the family," "the house," or "the household" (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). The concept of ie encompasses, however, a deeper and more extensive meaning than "family" carries with it in the West. The term ie emphasizes the organizational and

functional aspects of family where each household consists of the head of the house and all persons (whether related by blood or not) who share in the social and economic life of the family (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). As Nakane (1974, p. 158) has written:

> The ie comprises household members (in most cases the family members of the household head, but others in addition to family members may be included), who thus make up the units of a distinguishable social group. In other words, the ie is a social group constructed on the basis of an established frame of reference and often of a management organization. What is important here is that the human relationships within this household group are thought of as more important than all other human relationships.

The fact that ie is based on institutional or organizational bonds and not on kinship bonds is exemplified by the fact that in traditional Japanese society if there is no son to take over as the head of the house, "a family adopts a suitable 'son' and immediately he takes on the role of the eldest son, with all the rights and privileges entailed and with all the duties and obligations that a son born to the position would have" (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). After adoption, the newly acquired son would cease to exist as a son in the family that he left and he never could return to or make claims on his blood family again (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). Even

though this practice is not as common in modern Japan, it still emphasizes the broader institutional concept of ie.

Some scholars trace the roots of the concept of ie back to the ancient feudal system in Japan when the household which consisted of the lord, his family, peasants, warriors, and craftsmen were all considered ie (Nakane, 1974; Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). In modern Japanese society, the place of work, organization, office or school to which one belongs has replaced the feudal ie. In fact, the modern colloquial expression uchi (my house) is used to refer to one's place of work, office, school, or organization and otaku (your house) to mean another's place of work, etc. (Nakane, 1974). Hence, the essence of Japanese latent group consciousness found in modern society in Japan is firmly rooted in the traditional and ubiquitous concept of ie that permeates the Japanese psyche (Nakane, 1974).

The second cultural concept to consider is on. On refers in contemporary Japanese society to both a favor granted by person A to person B and the resultant debt owed by B to A (Lebra, 1974). In the language of reciprocity on can be thought of as debt and repayment (Nakane, 1974)--although the concept means more than merely this. On should not be viewed as a relationship between two people only, but rather as part of a group structure (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). Everyone in a group is both on-giver and on-receiver (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). Each

member of a group is indebted to all those above him or her on whom the person must depend; and, in turn, the person must repay this indebtedness by giving assistance to those below who are dependent upon that person (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976).

Like ie, the origins of on go back to earlier times in Japan when on was characterized as a contractual relationship between a master and his subordinate bound by the double contingency of expectations (Lebra, 1974). That is, the master would bestow an on provided the subordinate provided loyal service. In turn the subordinate attempted to repay the on (and anticipated future on) by fulfilling the obligation of loyalty. In contemporary Japanese society, on works to bind people within the group because they are indebted to those above in the hierarchy and are bestowing on to those dependent upon them (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976).

A companion relationship that exists along with on is that of the oyabun-kobun. The oyabun is the "father, boss, or patron who protects and provides for the son, employee, or student in turn for service and loyalty" (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976, p. 62). Each oyabun has one or more kobun that is looked after much like a father looks after his children. Consequently, each member of a group has a direct personal relationship with the person above (the oyabun) and the person below (kobun) (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976).

Two bipolar dimensions of the concept of on are represented by the concepts of gimu and giri--both categories of obligation (Lebra, 1974). Both gimu and giri refer to the obligation to return an on--gimu corresponds to a limitless on, and giri with a limited, payable on (Lebra, 1974). Cathcart and Cathcart (1976) have remarked that whereas on giving and receiving is primarily found within a vertical, chain-like relationship (i.e., gimu); giri controls the horizontal relationships in the vertically organized Japanese society.

Giri may be seen as the blanket term for obligation between persons in actual situations as opposed to a universal ethic of duty; or it may be envisioned as the form of obligation to the group without superiority on one side or inferiority on the other as in the (gimu) relationship (Hall & Beardsley, 1965). Giri pertains to what one must do or avoid doing because of status or group membership (Hall & Beardsley, 1965). It implies the self-discipline that must be used to repress or channel personal desires and feelings (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). One must always show affection and humbleness toward older group members (even though they may be thought incompetent or even unwise) and in this way the selfish desires of an individual or faction are held in check (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). This is not out of a desire to be polite or noncombative, but rather out of obligation to the group not to embarrass the group by causing a member to lose face

(Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976).

Gimu refers to the limitless, immeasurable on which each Japanese owes to parents, ancestors, country, and countless fellow human beings (alive and deceased, known and unknown) for one's life and for what the person has become (Lebra, 1974). In this regard, Lebra (1974, p.196) has remarked:

> Given such an asymmetric ethic of on permeating Japanese culture, it is easy to understand why the highly conventionalized daily speech of Japanese is rich in expressing the feelings of a permanent debtor toward omnipresent creditors. Particularly to be noted is how often the Japanese express their humility and embarrassment, how they acknowledge their being helpless or a nuisance thrust upon others, indebted and unable to repay fully, and how they solicit forgiveness. It is another characteristic of the Japanese to present themselves as bound by obligations and duties rather than as motivated by rights and choice.

According to Lebra (1974) gimu is the asymmetrical aspect of on (i.e., it can never truly be repaid); and giri is the symmetrical aspect (i.e., the individual tries to repay favors and kindness). In the words of Lebra (1974, p. 198) gimu and giri "can be viewed as mutually balancing, one neutralizing or controlling the other within a dynamic whole. . . ."

The final Japanese cultural concept to be considered is that of amae. Doi (1976) has written that the concept of amae (i.e., "to depend and presume upon another's love") permeates the patterns of communication of the Japanese. That is, the Japanese longing for dependency and belonging which is felt as a child is carried over into adult social relationships as well. According to DeVos and Wagatsuma (1974, p. 47):

> Hovering nurturance which persists in a child's life to a far later age in Japanese than in American culture, tends to impede aggressive independence. The child is disciplined by threats of isolation rather than by the inhibition of free movement. He learns to rely upon ready access to gratifications afforded by his mother. He is not encouraged to physically separate himself from the mother or to seek independent means of coping with his environment as he is in Western socialization. He is encouraged to be sunao, or obedient. In this context of dependency the Japanese also develop a capacity, by passive means, to induce nurturant behavior toward themselves by others. The inductive manipulation of others to secure care of oneself is expressed in the Japanese word amae.

Concerning the concept of amae, Naotsuka et al. (1981) have stated:

> The Japanese view of human society is in terms of mutual dependence--mutual help is taken for granted,

> not seen as something which can be refused. Therefore, emphasis is put on acknowledging help received and expressing thanks not only for specific and limited favors, but for the whole mutual dependence relationship in general (1981, p. 57).

The Japanese are very sensitive to the atmosphere pervading human relationships--either they try to soften the atmosphere or they are afraid to spoil it altogether (Doi, 1976). According to Doi (1976), amae may also be a major reason for the well-known Japanese fondness for hesitation and/or ambiguities, and their fondness for unanimous agreement. One can see that Japanese persuasive strategies will probably reflect the concepts of ie, on, giri (and gimu) and amae due to the ethos of Japanese culture. These messages would likely differ to a great extent from the more direct, individualistic, power-laden strategies used frequently in North American culture.

Naotsuka et al. (1981) have mentioned that the Japanese normally look behind the polite facade of words to discover the message in what was politely left unsaid. Because the Japanese identify directness with rudeness, and politeness with indirectness, for them it seems impossible to be both polite and direct (Naotsuka et al., 1981). Consequently, Japanese verbal communication contains a great deal of indirectness, hints, and implied meanings rather than explicit statements. In English, however, verbal messages must be spelled out explicitly in order to

avoid misunderstanding. Naotsuka et al. (1981) have commented on this Japanese norm of indirectness by stating that for a Japanese "to spell out the message . . . would seem rude and insulting, implying that the other person is not sensitive enough to get the message unless it is explained in very simple, elementary terms as if to a small child" (pp. 77-78). As one Japanese person has commented:

> Avoiding harsh conflict and creating a soothing atmosphere by indirection doesn't mean that Japanese are treating others as spoiled children. That is the way Japanese adults treat each other--only children of the immature employ direct confrontation (Naotsuka et al., 1981, p. 90).

For the Japanese, time in interpersonal relationships can be regained at a later stage if human relations are smooth. They feel that prompt, definite verbalized communication should be avoided, especially when one has to convey negative opinions (Naotsuka et al., 1981).

The Japanese feel that verbalized communication is like the tip of the iceberg. For them, too much outspokenness or eloquence is not trustworthy or too facile. As Doi (1976) has mentioned, for the Japanese verbal communication is something that accompanies nonverbal communication and not the other way around. For westerners, overly long pauses between utterances are awkward and uncomfortable. For the Japanese, long pauses allow time for feedback and for planning future verbal

strategies based upon that feedback.

In summary, the cultural concepts of ie, on, giri and gimu, and amae, shape and constrain Japanese communicative patterns. First of all, in Japanese culture there is a greater striving for mutual dependence and mutual help. In their verbal communication, the Japanese rely more heavily on indirectness, hints, implicit statements rather than those that are more direct, explicit, and oftentimes more confrontational. The Japanese try to create a soothing atmosphere in their interpersonal relationships, trying to avoid harsh conflict at all costs. There is great respect for age in the vertical, hierarchically arranged Japanese society--even persons older by one day are treated with greater respect.

In addition to these factors, the Japanese are much more group oriented. They abhor the type of individualism that is familiar to westerners. A commonly heard Japanese proverb can be paraphrased as "the nail that sticks up gets hit" (Cathcart & Cathcart, 1976). While most non-Japanese tend to think of themselves as individuals, the Japanese tend to think of themselves as members of groups (Naotsuka, 1981). A parallel expression to the previous proverb says, "to hold an opinion is one thing, to express it another" (Naotsuka et al., 1981, p. 121). How the opinion or idea is presented is more important than what one's opinion or idea is (Naotsuka et al., 1981). Note the following statement:

> Even though a Japanese may have an original idea, he is seldom outspoken because he knows that if he is, the other Japanese will think him too forward and conspicuous and so will be unsympathetic towards him and his idea. Instead of pushing his idea forcefully in public, he talks with each member of the group informally, down-playing the fact that it is his idea, and thus elicits their voluntary agreement and support, so that at this stage the idea is no longer his personally but belongs to the "individual whole" (Naotsuka et al., 1981, p. 121).

Because of this cultural virtue of selfless blending into the group, when someone attempts to promote a plan, one attempts to arrive at informal consensus in advance from the people concerned. This "ground work" which is laid is called nemawashi (often translated: "root binding" or "spadework"). Personal relationships take precedence over the merits of a plan in Japan, so great care is taken not to cause someone to lose face in public (Naotsuka et al., 1981). Instead of having an open confrontation at a meeting, one tries to remove any possible opposition quietly and privately before the meeting begins (Naotsuka et al., 1981). If opposition does exist, repeated revisions and discussions with the people concerned are carried on with the interested parties as part of nemawashi (Naotsuka et al., 1981). In this way, nemawashi is seen as a pre-extension to a meeting in which it is "an informal

chance to adjust to differing opinions before they harden into publicly-taken positions" (Naotsuka et al., 1981, p. 161).

The Japanese cultural values, norms, and ideals mentioned above suggest a variety of communication patterns typical of the Japanese, yet different from non-Japanese. We now turn to a discussion of how this research is an improvement over previous research.

The Unique Contribution of This Research

The importance of this research is primarily three-fold. One, it investigates the cross-cultural variants and similarities in compliance-gaining techniques that exist among these two culturally diverse groups. G. R. Miller and Burgoon (1978) have stated that in order to understand the substantive aspects of persuasive message exchanges, a more exhaustive set of strategies is necessary. This is true not only for persuasive messages that are produced in Western cultural contexts but for persuasive messages constructed in other cultures (with different world-views) as well. As mentioned above, the lion's share of previous research in compliance-gaining has been done in Western Europe or North America. Past research has been valid for reaching general conclusions in Western cultures, but the question remains as to whether these paradigms can be supported as universal and invariant across cultures. The present research examines culturally specific characteristics of compliance-gaining that differ

between Japanese and North American cultures. The degree of similarity or difference between these two cultures will contribute to more valid theorizing about compliance-gaining.

A note must be made here as to what is meant by cross-cultural "variants". One might expect that all communication processes are universal and that it is simply the way the same process manifests itself in various cultural contexts that differs. This would be the notion of cross-cultural variation--communication being essentially the same process yet manifested through superficial cultural differences. However, some communication phenomena may not be as "universal" as we have been lead to believe.

One example that may elucidate this point comes from research in brain lateralization and the processing of verbal and nonverbal communication. For several years the apparent consensus of scholars in this area was that the left hemisphere of the human brain is dominant, or has been specialized, for processing speech functions. The right hemisphere of the brain had been thought to be dominant (or specialized) for, among other things, nonverbal communication. This was thought to be a universal phenomenon. These conclusions were based on the findings of research primarily conducted in the West with Western subjects. Recent research, however, conducted in Japan by Tadanobu Tsunoda suggests that the Japanese may use their

brains differently than westerners in processing language and nonverbal communication (Restak, 1984). Although this research has been criticized and is inaccessible to non-Japanese except through translation, it may point to the fact that there are cross-cultural variants in communication phenomena of which Western communicologists are as yet unaware. Tsunoda posits that while westerners allocate both their language and logical functions to the left hemisphere, with the nonverbal aspect of communication to the right hemisphere, the Japanese brain, in contrast, processes sounds and experiences relevant to emotion in the left hemisphere (Restak, 1984). Tsunoda believes, in fact, that the Japanese brain is organized differently (Restak, 1984). He goes on to state that the difference is due to the Japanese language, demonstrating the importance of language to the unique culture and mentality of each ethnic group (Restak, 1984). This example illustrates how phenomena that are thought to be "universal" may in fact not be invariant across cultures. This further emphasizes the need for additional cross-cultural research.

The second important aspect of this research is that it investigates the role of language as a critical variable in the research process. Ervin-Tripp (1967) has reported research conducted with Japanese wives of American servicemen living on the west coast of the United States. She found that when the Japanese women were asked to respond to questions in English, their responses were more

typical of American cultural norms (e.g., they responded that they were equal partners in the marriage relationship, etc.). When the same women were interviewed in Japanese, their responses were more typical of Japanese cultural values (e.g., they responded that they attempted to achieve harmony in the home, etc.).

Consequently, the question arises whether the language of administration of experimental or research materials has a systematic effect upon the responses elicited from participants which may confound the results. Stated in another way, subjects may give responses more representative of a particular culture if asked in the main language of that culture than if queried in their own native tongue. If this is the case, particular effects produced may be due more to the language of administration than the experimental variable of interest.

A third improvement provided by this research is that it incorporates persuasive situations or contexts that are culturally appropriate when used as stimulus situations for generating compliance-gaining messages. As mentioned above, one of the shortcomings of previous research has been the usage of persuasive situations in stimulus materials that are highly bound to Western cultures and thus salient mainly to westerners. For example, situations or scenarios that have been used in previous studies have involved intimate romantic relationships (see, for example, McLaughlin, Cody & Robey, 1980). These situations

are culturally relevant to individuals from the United States but may not produce the same or similar effects in terms of the generation of compliance-gaining messages for individuals from other cultures. Respondents who come from cultures in which young people do not date or have romantic relationships before marriage may have difficulty responding to items which ask how frequently they would use a particular message in that situation.

In like fashion, norms and values in other cultures may dictate different modes than are normative in the United States for dealing with neighbors, used car salespeople, members of the opposite sex, etc.--all examples of scenarios used in earlier research. Thus, previous research may have been handicapped by attempting cross-cultural comparisons with stimulus situations that may not be culturally comparable. Even fairly recent research has been guilty of this oversight. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984), for example, did a cross-cultural comparison of Japanese and American persuasive strategy selection. However, the persuasive situations they used as scenarios (in which persuasion was imagined to occur) were the same situations used in past research that is highly restricted to Western cultural contexts. They reported using the "move to the southwest" scenario and the "post-poned [sic] date" situations previously used by G. R. Miller, Boster, Roloff and Siebold (1977). Both of these

situations require the subject to imagine that he or she has been "carrying on a close relationship with a woman (man) for the past two years" (Neuliep & Hazelton, 1984, p. 7). Although Japan can be considered becoming more Western in thought and culture, especially over the last few years, the question remains as to the appropriateness of using situations that are fairly relevant to Americans, or Western cultures, but may not be dynamically eqivalent to the Japanese. To circumvent this morass, the present research uses persuasive situations that are culturally specific and appropriate for the respondents, e.g., using persuasive situations that are typical of those occurring in Japan.

Cultural differences or uniformities demonstrated by these two cultures will enlarge the existing body of knowledge in the area of cross-cultural communication, and will aid in casting grand theories in persuasion and compliance-gaining that are universally applicable. It is not anticipated that cultural differences between the Japanese and North Americans detected in this research will encompass all possible variants in persuasive styles. Instead, this research is a first step in discovering possible factors in the persuasion process that differ cross-culturally.

The Conceptual Framework

In terms of theoretical development, early models of communication depicted the process of communication as

unidirectional, with the emphasis placed on the sender of messages (e.g., Berlo's early SMCR model, 1960; or that of Shannon & Weaver, 1949). More recent paradigms envision the communication process as being transactional with the sender, receiver, context, and prior experiences of the participants being holistically important to the process (G. R. Miller & Steinberg, 1975). Therefore, the process of persuasion will be examined in this research by considering factors involving the persuader, the persuadee, and the context of the persuasion.

At this juncture, three important concepts involved in this research need to be defined. Because this study is investigating differences in the persuasive styles of two cultural groups (i.e., the Japanese and Americans) when communicators are attempting to gain compliance from others, it is important to define what is meant by: (a) persuasion, (b) compliance-gaining, and (c) culture.

Persuasion

A number of authors have attempted to define the concept of persuasion. From these definitions emerge five primary criteria that help to conceptually envision persuasion. First of all, some authors point out that persuasion is a transactional process (Bettinghaus, 1980; G. R. Miller, 1980; G. R. Miller & Burgoon, 1978; Scheidel, 1967). Second, a number of writers define persuasion as necessitating conscious intent on the part of the persuader (Andersen, 1971; Bettinghaus, 1980; Burgoon, Burgoon,

G. R. Miller & Sunnafrank, n.d.; Clark, 1984; G. R. Miller & Burgoon, 1973; Petty & Cacioppo, 1981; Scheidel, 1967). A third criterion is that persuasion results from the manipulation of symbols or symbolic messages (Cronkite, 1969; G. R. Miller & Burgoon, 1973; Scheidel, 1967). G. R. Miller (1980) has remarked that these messages appeal to the reason and emotions of the person being persuaded. In fact, G. R. Miller and Burgoon (1973) have noted that "persuasive communication" cannot be said to have taken place unless behavioral and attitudinal modifications result primarily from the effects of symbolization. Fourth, Bostrom (1983) has commented that persuasion per se calls for a response on the part of the receiver. In terms of the response to persuasion, G. R. Miller (1980) has stated that persuasion has three possible behavioral outcomes: (a) response-shaping, (b) response-reinforcing, or (c) response-changing functions.

In addition to these four criteria that define persuasion, two other facets of persuasion should be mentioned. First, G. R. Miller and Burgoon (1973) have written that the persuader may be the active agent in the process of persuasion or perhaps the persuadee may actively be involved in "self-persuasion" (as occurs in role-playing or in counter-attitudinal advocacy). Second, others have noted the close linkage and/or overlap with coercive force or power (Bostrom, 1983; G. R. Miller, 1980; Wheeless, Barraclough, & Stewart, 1983). Wheeless and associates

(1983) have observed that "persuasion is not the same as coercion, although they are overlapping concepts" (p. 118). According to these authors persuasion may utilize elements of coercion (e.g., when persuasion involves force or the threat of force) and milder elements of coercion may involve more intense modes of persuasion (Wheeless et al., 1983). That is, at times it is difficult to know where coercion leaves off and persuasion begins.

In summary, persuasion can be thought of as a transactional process in which a persuader consciously intends to shape, change, reinforce or intensify another's attitudes, motives, values, and/or behavior through the use of symbolic messages. The persuader may be actively involved as the agent of persuasion, or may structure the situation in such a way that the targets of the persuasion actually persuade themselves. Persuasion may involve the threat of coercive force. Successful persuasion can only be detected in the behavioral outcomes of the target of persuasion.

Compliance-Gaining

Kelman (1961) has identified "compliance" as one of the three processes of social influence. The other two are: (a) "identification"--adopting behavior derived from another because the behavior is associated with a satisfying, self-defining relationship to person or group, and (b) "internalization"--adopting behavior or accepting influence because the behavior is congruent with one's

internalized value system. Kelman's (1961) definition is as follows:

> Compliance can be said to occur when an individual accepts influence from another person or from a group because he hopes to achieve a favorable reaction from the other. He may be interested in attaining certain specific rewards or in avoiding certain specific punishments that the influencing agent controls. . . . Or, the individual may be concerned with gaining approval or avoiding disapproval from the influencing agent in a more general way (p.266).

The person complies or adopts the induced behavior not because he or she believes in its content but because "it is instrumental in the production of a satisfying social effect" (Kelman, 1961, p. 267). Compliance occurs when a source has means-control over a receiver and when the person complying believes that the source has the power to dispense rewards or punishments (G. R. Miller & Steinberg, 1975).

G. R. Miller and Steinberg (1975) have conceptualized compliance-gaining as that which "occurs when the behavior of one or more individuals corresponds with the desires of another" (p. 68). They have written that the basic function of all communication is to control the environment so as to realize certain physical, economic, and social rewards from it (G. R. Miller & Steinberg, 1975). That is,

when one communicates with others, one is aiming for one of two levels of control: (a) compliance, which occurs when there is an exact correspondence between one's desired and obtained outcomes; or (b) conflict resolution, which occurs when the obtained outcomes reflect some compromise of the competing parties' originally desired outcomes (G. R. Miller & Steinberg, 1975). In other words, compliance-gaining appears not to be involved with "negotiation" according to G. R. Miller & Steinberg's (1975) definition. Negotiation, in this case, would be the means toward an end (the end being either compliance or conflict resolution). Concerning compliance-gaining, these authors have also written:

> The compliance function aims at inducing someone to behave consistently with the desires of the communicator; it seeks an exact match between the communicator's desired and obtained outcomes. A compliance attempt may be either noninterpersonally or interpersonally grounded. If the attempt occurs interpersonally, the communicator bases predictions about his message outcomes primarily on psychological data; he seeks to identify differences that may influence the response of a particular receiver, or receivers, to his message decisions (G. R. Miller & Steinberg, 1975, p. 73).

Wheeless et al. (1983) have defined "compliance" as "the performance by one person, the target, of specific

behaviors desired of the target by another person, the agent" (p. 110). The agent determines what actions are desirable for the target to perform and then seeks the conformity or obedience of the target (Wheeless et al., 1983). Thus compliance is a behavioral rather than an attitudinal, result of communication (Wheeless et al., 1983). The notion of "gaining" in "compliance-gaining" is synonymous with "eliciting" (Wheeless et al., 1983). To these authors, the sought-after compliance would not have occurred without the stimulus or stimuli of the agent. In general, the agent seeks to secure a change in the target's behavior or seeks to elicit a new behavior. In sum, to Wheeless et al. (1983), compliance-gaining behavior "refers to the communicative behavior in which an agent engages so as to elicit from a target some agent-selected behavior" (p. 111) which may be thought of as an inducement to behavioral conformity. Wheeless and associates consider compliance-gaining as the implementation of power under the umbrella term of persuasion. As they have stated:

> We suggest, then, that compliance-gaining is most productively conceptualized as the implementation or operationalization of interpersonal or social power. As power use seems to be of three broad kinds (the previewing of expectancies/consequences, the invoking of relationships/identification, and the summoning of values/obligations), specific compliance-gaining techniques will tend to fall into three broad

> classifications, depending on the interpersonal power base each technique taps into or relies on. It is suggested that the effectiveness of any given compliance-gaining attempt can be predicted given the power base that is involved and the locus of control of the target of the attempt. Locus of control may also prove predictive of message choices or decisions on the part of the agent (Wheeless et al., 1983, pp. 141-142).

These authors have given the analogy of the trunk and branches of a tree to the relationship of power and compliance-gaining. As the trunk exists toward the end of supporting a branch, and as a branch does not grow except from a trunk, the gaining of compliance does not happen in the absence of power (Wheeless et al., 1983).

Wheeless et al. (1983) exclude the absolute use of force and conditioning from the province of compliance-gaining. G. R. Miller and Steinberg (1975) use the term "forced compliance" rather than compliance-gaining to refer to the special cases where behavioral conformity results mainly from the coercive power of the communicator.

In summary, compliance-gaining can be conceptualized for the present purposes as the achievement of behavioral compliance to a communicator's desire, demand, or proposal based on a communicated wish, appeal to a rule, or appeal to the necessity of the situation. Compliance-gaining creates conformity between the agent's desired and obtained

outcomes on behalf of the target through interpersonal or social power. As such it is a subset of persuasion. Compliance-gaining does not include the absolute use of force or coercive power of the communicator. Although compliance-gaining may be part of the negotiation process (G. R. Miller and Steinberg, 1975, notwithstanding), it is only tangentially related to conflict resolution or management (Wheeless et al., 1983).

Strategies versus Messages

At this point a distinction must be made between compliance-gaining strategies and compliance-gaining messages. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) have defined a strategy as "a group of techniques towards which potential actors tend to respond similarly" (p. 351). To Marwell and Schmitt (1967), a strategy is a meaningful cluster of possible behaviors. People who perceive themselves as likely to perform one of the techniques from a cluster will tend to see themselves as likely to perform others, and vice versa (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967). Therefore, a compliance-gaining strategy is made up of a number of compliance-gaining techniques. These techniques may alternatively be called messages. Wheeless et al. (1983) have noted that the terms "tactic," "technique," "message," "behavior," and "attempt" have all been used interchangeably by various authors in the past, albeit erroneously. They point out that a compliance-gaining "tactic" is "a verbal message unit (when referring to

verbal communication) that explicitly or implicitly proposes a behavior and provides a reason or inducement through using a power basis that has potential control over behavior that would not otherwise occur" (Wheeless et al., 1983, p. 114). A compliance-gaining "strategy", on the other hand, is the principle or policy underlying the use of tactics. Thus, "a person's strategy usage may result from habit and less conscious processes or from more deliberate choice" (Wheeless et al., 1983, p. 114). In sum, a strategy is a category made up of a number of selected messages (which may also be referred to as techniques, tactics, behaviors, etc.). Each individual statement or verbal behavior would be a single message. As Wheeless et al. (1983) have stated "tactics are specific verbal acts used in support of an overarching strategy" (p. 114). Similar messages or tactics can all be grouped within one category or strategy.

In sum, a compliance-gaining strategy can be conceptualized as a category of related messages. Similar messages should all cluster within one particular strategy category. The strategy represents an overlying principle or policy which is represented by the individual messages. Thus, when considering verbal communication, a compliance-gaining message can be conceptualized as each individual statement used to elicit compliance from a particular target. The strategy represents a category of an unlimited number of possible messages; the message represents each

individual verbal unit within the larger category of a strategy.

Culture

The final construct that needs to be explicated is culture. Culture can be thought of as the accepted, patterned ways of behavior for a particular people (Brown, 1963; Kluckhohn, 1967). It is the total way of life of a people (Kluckhohn, 1967). It is learned and therefore the legacy of people long since dead; it is the accumulation of solutions to various problems given by individuals of a society throughout their history (Ember & Ember, 1973; Kluckhohn, 1967). Culture is the total creation of humankind; it is the way of thinking, feeling, and believing of members of the culture that results in specific attitudes, values, and behaviors (Brown, 1963; Ember & Ember, 1973; Kluckhohn, 1967; Sarbaugh, 1979). It is the group's knowledge stored in people's memories, books, objects, and other artifacts (Kluckhohn, 1967). As Sarbaugh (1979) has written:

> When we say that persons belong to a given culture, we are grouping them with others who share common psychological, sociological, and technological trappings. . . . The psychological aspects of culture would include one's values, beliefs, attitudes, and concept of self; one's view of time and space; and one's relation to the cosmos and persons. The sociological aspect would encompass the geographic

> arrangements which are developed by two or more persons; and the positions, roles, and norms which have developed and are adhered to in relating to one another and meeting one's survival needs. The technological aspect includes all the artifacts which are used in providing shelter, food, water, ornamentation, recreation, health care, waste disposal, transmission of messages, etc. It should be noted that the three aspects of culture listed above are interdependent (p. 2).

Culture is in essence an abstraction (Kluckhohn, 1967). It is like a map in that it is an abstract representation of a specific territory and yet does not consist of that territory (Kluckhorn, 1967). It allows individuals to live an orderly existence and to satisfy the basic biological needs (Kluckhohn, 1967). Through enculturation, behavior becomes unthinking, automatic, and almost instinctive (Kluckhohn, 1967).

Culture is inseparable from language since it is transmitted via language (Brown, 1963; Ember & Ember, 1973; Kluckhohn, 1967). The origin of human culture seems to have first appeared when language first appeared in the history of humankind. Language plays a crucial role in the transactional, tripartite relationship it shares with culture and the mind of the individual. Culture shapes language, but language in turn shapes culture through the mental activity of the members of the specific culture.

Culture needs to be differentiated from society. A society is composed of people; a culture is the way these people behave (Brown, 1963). In other words, "a society is not a culture; it has a culture [italics added]" (Brown, 1963). A society may be defined as "a group of people who interact more with each other than they do with other individuals--who cooperate with each other for the attainment of certain ends" (Kluckhohn, 1967, p. 81). A culture, on the other hand, "refers to the distinctive ways of life of such a group of people" (Kluckhohn, 1967, p. 81). Ember and Ember (1973) make the distinction that societies are differentiated from one another by the intelligibility of the language of the respective group, but this may not always be the case as the boundaries may be more geographical or political than linguistic.

Finally, culture can be conceptualized as a set of systematically interrelated implicit themes (Kluckhohn, 1967). These themes are out of awareness for many of the members of the culture and no participant of the culture knows all the details of the themes (Kluckhohn, 1967). If there is one main theme of the culture it is often referred to as the ethos or the Zeitgeist (Kluckhohn, 1967).

More recent thought has focused upon the inherent diversity among individuals in a cultural grouping (Wallace, 1972; Goodenough, 1981). Wallace (1972) has argued that the socialization process is not the replication of uniformity of individuals, but the

organization of diversity among persons.

Goodenough (1981) depicts "culture" as a hierarchically arranged construct in which there are many "cultures" to which an individual may ascribe. For example there is: (a) culture in the general sense of systems of standards for perceiving, believing, evaluating, and acting; (b) the culture of a group, seen subjectively as the system of standards a person attributes to a set of others; (c) a person's operating culture, being the particular system of standards in the individual's repertoire that is used to interpret and guide behavior; (d) the group's public culture, that is the system of standards that a group's members expect from one another; (e) various subcultural variations (like dialects within a language), and finally (f) the society's Culture (with a capital C) being the overall system of mutually ordered public cultures within the society.

Goodenough (1981) describes culture as being analogous to language. That is, in the same way that a particular person may know many languages, he or she is generally most competent in one. In like manner, even though a person is most competent in one language he or she will demonstrate individual variations within that language. As he has noted:

> Out of this own experience each individual develops his private, subjective view of the world and its contents--his personal outlook. It embraces both his

> cognitive and his affective orderings of his experience. For technical purposes we shall call it his propriospect. Included in a person's propriospect and, indeed, largely dominating its content are the various standards for perceiving, evaluating, believing, and doing that he attributes to other persons as a result of his experience of their actions and admonitions. By attributing standards to others, he makes sense of their behavior and is able to predict it to a significant degree. By using what he believes to be their standards for him as a guide for his own behavior, he makes himself intelligible to them and can thereby influence their behavior--well enough, at least, to permit him to accomplish many of his purposes through them (Goodenough, 1981).

Therefore, even though we may speak of a society's Culture, we still must be aware of the individual variance around the normative mean.

For the present study, culture will be operationalized by the Japanese and American societal Cultures. Even though "North American Culture" is made up of many sub-cultures, and in turn individual variations, it still presents a unifying theme that differentiates it from other cultures, e.g., the Canadians. The focus of this study will be upon the cultural patterns of behavior manifested in verbal communication used in persuasive situations that go beyond individual variations. These verbal behaviors

will be interrelated aspects of the respective cultures reflecting the ways of thinking, feeling, and believing within the cultures (i.e., interdependent with the attitudes, beliefs, and normative behaviors of the individual members of that culture).

Conclusion

This chapter began by outlining the important value of doing cross-cultural research and studying cultural differences in communication. That is, the goal of arriving at universal theories in communication can only be arrived at by examining the universal variations in communication. Not only will cross-cultural research in communication yield a more thorough understanding of human communication, but it will also provide a practical and pragmatic approach to facilitating effective communication across cultural barriers. If one is interested in studying broad variation in communicative styles, this variation should be most prominent when comparatively studying the Japanese and North Americans (i.e., two very divergent cultural groups).

Chapter Two

Review of the Literature

An important first step in understanding and evaluating research in the area of compliance-gaining is comprehending the distinction between oral discourse and written discourse. This is due to the fact that these two processes for presenting language are different on a number of dimensions. Past researchers in the area of compliance-gaining message selection, however, have appeared to imply equivalence between these two forms of discourse or at least have not differentiated the two. Most research to date has dealt with respondents writing down what they would imagine themselves saying in a particular persuasive situation rather than transcribing from actual recordings what actually was said in verbal interaction. A notable exception to this is the work of Tracy et al. (1984).

Taking note of differences in oral versus written language is also important for researchers who transcribe oral discourse to compare what is spoken to prepared lists of written compliance-gaining messages. Oral discourse does not have the same "logical coherence" that written language has because spoken language depends to a great extent on the context for meaning and understanding, rather

tha

are

spo

cor

rea

lar

fea

wri

inf

to

spe

bus

gre

en

au

di

si

st

(w

va

pa

fo

wr

(Ta

than on the words or word patterns themselves. Listeners are able to make sense out of sentence fragments, spoonerisms, mumbled speech, etc., because the linguistic context provides the missing elements needed to augment the meaning provided by only what is said.

Chafe (1982) has noted that spoken and written language differ in regard to two different sets of features. First, spoken language is more fragmented; written language is more integrated in terms of more information being included into idea units. This appears to be a consequence of differences in the use of time in speaking and writing, i.e., speaking is faster than writing but slower than reading. Second, spoken language entails greater involvement with one's audience; written language entails, on the other hand, greater detachment from the audience. Scollon and Scollon (in press) refer to this dichotomy as involving "focused" versus "nonfocused" situations. That is, in focused situations there are strong limitations on the negotiations between participants (written discourse). In unfocused situations the highest value is placed upon <u>mutual sense making</u> by the participants. Hence, in spoken discourse there is greater focus on the communicator/audience interaction; but, in written discourse there is greater focus on context (Tannen, 1982).

The implications of these distinctions for the present research are that even though respondents may write what they imagine themselves saying to gain compliance in specific situations, these messages will vary to a degree from what may actually be said in an interaction. This, however, is more a function of the distinctions between oral and written discourse than differences in the actual make-up of the compliance-gaining strategies themselves. Written messages will contain more information and be more integrated than messages that might actually be uttered. Therefore, written messages may be more important in examining underlying strategies than actual conversational utterances since they are better representations of the logic underlying the messages. Actual recordings and transcriptions will capture what is said, but production or selection of written messages (or strategies) will provide a better approximation of the logic behind the specific choices--i.e., <u>why</u> something was said.

Past research in the area of compliance-gaining strategy selection has traveled two (often parallel) routes. Along one of these routes (the longer avenue historically), researchers have examined compliance-gaining message preferences based on a typology of strategies that has been deductively generated. These have been generated from a review of the relevant literature in the areas of social control and power, and subsequent empirical

research. The other route (the shorter path historically) has been used by researchers who have attempted to inductively generate as many compliance-gaining messages as possible in order to find an underlying, universal typology. Oftentimes the researchers traveling these routes have been at loggerheads with each other over which is the best route to travel. It is to this argument that we now turn.

Deductively Generated Compliance-Gaining Strategies

In a seminal work in 1967, Marwell and Schmitt proposed a typology for categorizing compliance-gaining messages. These researchers constructed their typology after reviewing the related work of scholars from a variety of disciplines in the area of power and social control. Their goal was to systematically reduce the multiplicity of possible behaviors in social control into meaningful clusters or strategies. From their synthesis of the literature and their own reasoning they deductively constructed a typology that contained 16 compliance-gaining strategies. These were: (a) promise, (b) threat, (c) expertise (positive and negative), (d) liking, (e) pre-giving, (f) aversive stimulation, (g) debt, (h) moral appeal, (i) self-feeling (positive and negative), (j) altercasting (positive and negative), (k) altruism, and (l) self-esteem (positive and negative). They specifically noted that their list of 16 strategies did not represent an exhaustive compilation of all the possible techniques found

in the literature.

In the part of their study which provided an empirical validation of their typology, Marwell and Schmitt (1967) used a questionnaire designed to elicit a respondent's likelihood of using compliance-gaining strategies in four different situations. This was done to reveal any underlying dimensions in their typology. Their focus was solely on short-run compliance techniques (as opposed to long-term compliance). The authority structure of the actor-target (i.e., persuader-persuadee) relationship was varied in the situations. Furthermore, they constructed situations with which their subjects could empathize and conceive of themselves facing.

Marwell and Schmitt (1967) performed a principal components factor analysis with oblique rotation on their data and selected a five factor solution. These factors were: Rewarding Activity, Punishing Activity, Expertise, Activation of Impersonal Commitments, and Activation of Personal Commitments. Because the rotation of the factors was oblique and correlated, second-order effects were grouped. Two second order factors resulted. The first second-order factor called Tendency to Use Socially Acceptable Techniques was defined by Factors I, III, and IV (i.e., Rewarding Activity, Expertise, and Activation of Impersonal Commitments). The other second-order factor called Tendency to Use Socially Unacceptable Techniques was defined by Factor II and V, (i.e., Punishing Activity and

Activation of Personal Commitments). Commenting on their findings the authors wrote:

> As a final note we might emphasize again that the above results must be viewed as only a first, tentative step toward the specification of the dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior. As we have previously noted additional research incorporating additional types of compliance-gaining techniques, additional types of respondents and concrete behavior instead of verbal reports is needed before the results may be viewed as firm and established. Nevertheless, one might expect that the oblique factors found here should reappear in repeated factorizations or in analyses of extended lists of techniques. Whether additional factors emerge or some shifts in the interpretations of the factors become necessary, we at least have a starting point with which to compare future results and an empirically-grounded taxonomy which may prove useful for a variety of research purposes (Marwell & Schmitt, 1967, p. 364).

Even though Marwell and Schmitt (1967) qualified any claim of exhaustiveness in their scheme, their typology has been adequately used by a number of communication researchers (Boster & Stiff, 1982; M. Burgoon, Dillard, Doran and M. D. Miller, 1982; Kaminiski et al., 1977; Lustig & King, 1980; G. R. Miller et al., 1977; G. R. Miller, 1981; M. D. Miller, 1982; M. D. Miller & Cambra, 1981;

M. D. Miller, Reynolds & Cambra, 1982; Roloff & Barnicott, 1978; 1979; Sillars, 1980; Williams & Boster, 1981).

Criticisms of Deductively Generated Strategies

Despite the fact that the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology has been used widely, a number of criticisms have been directed at this scheme. Clark (1979) has stated that even though deductively generated compliance-gaining strategies are useful for identifying factors which affect message choices, "they do not enrich our understanding of the potential strategies themselves, for subjects are restricted to approaches formulated by the experimenter" (p. 257). She has suggested that allowing subjects to compose messages themselves will broaden our understanding of the approaches they may use. This reflects an additional criticism offered by Clark and Delia (1979), which faults the deductively generated strategy approach for failing to describe the underlying relationships among the strategies.

In a second criticism, Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) have argued that the Marwell and Schmitt typology is not representative of all persuasive strategies nor exhaustive in including all possible strategies in the typology (a fact that Marwell and Schmitt admitted in the disclaimer in their original article--see above). Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin have brought into question doubts as to the representational validity of the typology. Poole and Folger (1981) define representational validity as referring

to categorizations which reflect the meaning of utterances in cultural studies. That is, representational validity should demonstrate that particular constructs or functions identified by a coding scheme are part of the common meanings ascribed to the interactions by participants. They question whether the identified strategies are socially meaningful, or whether respondents are restricted to the approaches formulated by the experimenter (as Clark [1979] has claimed). This argument appears somewhat analogous to the "etic" versus "emic" distinction drawn by Pike (1967) in the area of anthropology. The Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology would be more "etic" in nature since it has been devised by scholars and "imposed" upon the messages. Inductively generated strategies would be more "emic" in nature since they are allowed to emerge from the messages collected from the respondents.

A third critique has come from Siebold (1977). He criticized the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology by stating that few strategies are relevant to individuals of low status. That is, he has claimed that few strategies are relevant to people who have been socialized to be less assertive in persuasive situations.

Cody, McLaughlin and Jordan (1981) have provided some empirical support for these arguments. They found that when subjects wrote out strategies that they would use in each of three persuasive situations, 44% to 72% of the messages that were written could not be categorized

according to the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology. These investigators noted that the most glaring omissions from the Marwell and Schmitt typology are indirect strategies (e.g., hinting, flattery, and deceit) and direct-rational strategies (e.g., a simple statement given by the persuader as the reasons for the request). Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) have also found in their cross-cultural research that the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology accounted for a greater percentage of messages produced by both Japanese and North Americans respondents in compliance-gaining research than the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology.

Boster, Stiff and Reynolds (1983) have investigated another criticism of the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology, i.e., that responses are affected by a social desirablility bias. Boster et al. (1983) found in their research that the use of messages from the Marwell and Schmitt typology was not highly correlated with social desirability as measured by the Crowne-Marlowe scale.

Inductively Generated Compliance-Gaining Strategies

The second approach of compliance-gaining investigation has produced research in which strategies have been inductively or empirically generated (Baxter, 1984; Cody, McLaughlin & Jordan, 1980; Cody, McLaughlin & Scheider, 1981; Craig, Tracy & Spisak, 1984; Clark, 1979; Falbo, 1977; Falbo & Peplau, 1980; Schenck-Hamlin et al., 1980, 1982; Tracy et al., 1984; Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin,

1981). This line of research has tried to address the criticisms of deductively generated typologies and has also attempted to provide greater representational validity. Using a slightly different approach, McLaughlin, Cody and Robey (1980) have attempted to inductively generate strategies used in resisting compliance-gaining attempts.

Falbo (1977) was one of the first researchers to report inductively generated power strategies in persuasion. In one experiment she had subjects write a paragraph about "How I get my way" (1977, p. 539). From the respondents' essays, coders decided upon 16 power strategies which represented most of the messages found in the essays. These were: (a) assertion, (b) bargaining, (c) compromise, (d) deceit, (e) emotion-agent, (f) emotion-target, (g) evasion, (h) expertise, (i) fait accompli, (j) hinting, (k) persistence, (l) persuasion, (m) reason, (n) simple statement, (o) thought manipulation, and (p) threat. Using Metric Multidimensional Scaling (MDS), Falbo concluded that the sixteen strategies had two basic underlying dimensions based upon the subjects' ratings of the strategies, i.e., Rational/Nonrational and Direct/Indirect.

In 1980, Falbo and Peplau reported the results of a study similar to the earlier one by Falbo (1977). Their goal was to investigate the possible effect of the target of influence on the individual's choice of power strategy. In the earlier study by Falbo (1977), subjects did not have

a specific target in mind when they wrote their open-ended essays on how they get their way. Falbo and Peplau (1980), therefore, wanted to generate a model of power strategies in intimate relationships when a target is specified, and to compare the new model with the two-dimensional model that was devised in the earlier study (Falbo, 1977). In addition, these researchers wanted to investigate the impact of gender and egalitarianism on power strategies used in intimate relationships.

Their sample consisted of heterosexual males and females and homosexual males and females (Falbo & Peplau, 1980). The procedure for generating power strategies was similar to that of Falbo's earlier research (Falbo, 1977) except that the subjects were asked to respond (in open-ended essays) to how they get a particular target to do what they want them to do. The essays were then coded by six coders. In developing a coding scheme, the coders used the earlier schemes for power strategies of French and Raven (1960) and Falbo (1977). The net result was the production of 13 power strategy categories that accounted for 98% of the total strategies that appeared in the essays. The amount of agreement between coders was above .80 for all agreement scores. These strategy categories were: (a) asking, (b) bargaining, (c) laissez-faire (i.e., agent takes independent action; does what he/she wants on own), (d) negative affect, (e) persistence, (f) persuasion, (g) positive affect, (h) reasoning, (i) stating importance,

(j) suggesting, (k) talking, (l) telling, and (m) withdrawal. The categories differed somewhat from the earlier categories of Falbo (1977). Falbo and Peplau (1980) concluded that these differences were due to the differences in the content of the essays as a direct result of specific, intimate partners being the target of the strategies.

As a result of this research, Falbo and Peplau (1980) again proposed a two-dimensional model along which their thirteen strategies could be aligned. Their model is composed of Direct/Indirect and Bilateral/Unilateral dimensions. The first dimension refers to ways of influence (e.g., positive and negative affect, hinting, withdrawing at one end of the vector; and asking, telling, and talking at the other). The second dimension refers to interactive strategies (with persuasion, bargaining, reasoning, and positive affect at one end of a vector; and laissez-faire, withdrawing, and telling at the other).

In the earlier research by Falbo (1977), the two dimensions that emerged were Rational/Nonrational and Direct/Indirect. Falbo and Peplau (1980) have pointed out that their Bilaterality dimension is similar in respect to a number of categories to the Rationality dimension in the earlier work (Falbo, 1977). The differences are said to have reflected the different targets of the persuasion. The experimenters stated that similar changes in the model would take place whenever the target of the strategy is

changed. In conclusion, the authors reported that the model developed in Falbo's (1977) earlier work is not completely descriptive of all power strategies used in specific intimate relationships, i.e., the model will change depending on the target (Falbo & Peplau, 1980). These researchers have noted that this is a strength, not a weakness, of the model.

Clark (1979) has reported two studies dealing with inductively generated compliance-gaining messages. In the first study, she had subjects generate messages in response to two situations. In one situation, self-interest (either high or low) was manipulated. In the other, desire for the communicator to be liked was manipulated. Subjects were told to "write out exactly what you would say to this person (these people), just as though you were engaged in actual conversation" (Clark, 1979, p. 265). Two hierarchial coding schemes were used to code: (a) the statement calling for action in the message, and (b) the justification for the action. Based on the conceptual framework of Clark and Delia (1979), Clark used objectives in communication situations as an a priori classification system to "anticipate the kinds of strategies which potentially may vary as a function of the variables involved" (1979, p. 266). The three-part category scheme involved: (a) instrumental objectives (pressure for action, justification for action), (b) interpersonal objectives (favorable or unfavorable to the interpersonal

relationship), and (c) identity objectives (maintaining a positive image of the persuader, maintaining a positive image of the target). She found that high self-interest produced strong pressure for compliance. In addition, the desire for liking was manifested primarily in efforts to preserve a positive image of the recipient and through increased use of strategies directed to the interpersonal relationship.

In the second study, Clark (1979) partially replicated the procedure of the first study. The same conditions (high and low self-interest and high and low desire for liking) were presented to four different groups of subjects. This time, however, subjects received lists of messages and were asked to indicate (either yes or no) which ones they would use in the situation. There were a number of differences between the subjects generating messages themselves or choosing from a prepared list. The overall pattern that emerged was that subjects selected a strategy from the list that relied on less pressure than the strategies they composed themselves. In terms of the justification for action, subjects chose messages from the prepared list which stressed advantages to the unique recipient. In contrast, when they generated their own messages, the primary justification was advantages to the message recipient that were shared with all those in similar circumstances.

Concerning interpersonal objectives, subjects

selecting from a prepared list chose significantly more messages that would improve feelings between the participants than when they composed the messages. However, compliance-gaining messages relevant to the positive image of the communicator were not dramatically influenced by the method of eliciting responses. Therefore, according to Clark (1979), the two methods of studying the selection of message strategies yielded markedly different results. That is:

> When subjects chose from an array of strategies provided for them rather than actually composing messages, they chose strategies showing greater accommodation to the message recipient's perspective. They used less pressure in stating the need for action, more individually adapted appeals, more strategies designed to enhance the relationship between the participants, fewer tactics which might damage the interpersonal relationship, and more approaches which presented both the communicator and message recipient in a favorable light. The single deviation from this pattern was more frequent use of strategies placing responsibility on the receiver for the problem . . . (1979,p. 273).

Clark (1979) concluded that even though it is difficult to say unequivocally which method more nearly approximates what would occur naturally in a persuasion situation, it appears that the method of composing messages is closer to

that which occurs naturally. Moreover, the generation of messages permits a refinement of our understanding of the repertoire of persuasive strategies available.

Schenck-Hamlin, Wiseman and Georgacarakos (1980, Schenck-Hamlin, Georgacarakos & Wiseman, 1982) also have inductively generated compliance-gaining strategies. Their method involved three steps. First, they generated 10 situations in which one person was required to influence another. These situations were generated through a pilot questionnaire. The responses were categorized and tabulated, and then persuasive situations were written about the most frequently cited experiences. These were put in another questionnaire and given to different subjects who were asked to rate which situations were most believable. The 10 most believable were selected for the second step.

In step two, the 10 persuasive situations were presented to an additional set of subjects. These subjects were asked to select and respond to three out of the ten in which they could most easily imagine themselves. The subjects were then asked to write a paragraph about how they get others to do what they want them to do (modeled after Falbo, 1977).

The final step (that the authors reported was most time consuming and difficult) involved reading all messages and drawing up a list of strategies that reflected the messages in the sampled essays. After considerable

inspection and revision the authors arrived at 14 strategies that composed their classification scheme. These strategies were: (a) ingratiation, (b) bargaining, (c) debt, (d) esteem, (e) allurement, (f) aversive stimulation, (g) threat, (h) guilt, (i) warning, (j) altruism, (k) direct request, (l) explanation, (m) hinting, and (n) deceit. They categorized all of the strategies into one of four groups. These groups were: sanctionative, altruistic, instructional, and circumlocutionary.

At this point, three coders read the definitions given earlier to the strategies, discussed the categories in reference to the same material, and then independently coded 402 randomly selected messages in terms of their category scheme. Then they calculated reliabilities between the coders to assess their ability to identify the strategies in the same messages. These authors reported that the reliabilities compared favorably with other category schemes devised in other research. They concluded that all of the compliance-gaining strategies generated in their study could be classified into three basic types: Sanctionative, Instructional, and Altruistic. Other factors which underlie the strategies are <u>locus of control</u> (in the target, the actor, or the context), and a temporal sequencing between the inducement and response desired by the actor.

Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1980) also reported a number of important properties of compliance-gaining strategies

developed using symbolic logic. They posited four properties: (a) whether the persuader's intent is revealed in the message, (b) whether the persuader is manipulating some reward (or punishment), (c) whether the persuader controls that reward (or punishment), and (d) whether a rationale for the persuader's desired compliance is given. These authors remarked in the conclusion of their report that one problem arose from the fact that on occasion responses did not contain enough information to clearly classify their messages and this should be taken into consideration in future research. Moreover, power is an important construct that should be considered in any theoretical model dealing with compliance-gaining.

In 1981, Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin reported a validation of their inductively-derived set of 14 compliance-gaining strategies by using MDS techniques. In this study they chose two problematic persuasive situations that required compliance-gaining strategies for their resolution. Both of these came from the 10 situations of the earlier Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1980) study. They were chosen because: (a) all of the strategies in the Schenck-Hamlin et al. taxonomy were represented, (b) both situations involved the persuasion of an intimate, (c) a pilot study found that both situations were believable, and (d) the pilot study disclosed that the two situations differed in importance to the persuader and in terms of the appropriateness of the request. Fourteen persuasive

messages following the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1980) typology were constructed and tested to see if they actually represented the 14 categories. Subjects were then asked to make paired-comparisons of all 14 messages in each situation to be used in the MDS analysis.

In order to help these researchers interpret the MDS representations of the subjects' perceptions, two unidimensional scales were constructed for each of the four properties reported in the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1980) study (i.e., (a) the explicitedness of the persuader's intent, (b) the manipulation of rewards or punishments, (c) the locus of control for these rewards or punishments, and (d) the explicitness of a rationale for compliance). The researchers found a correspondence between each of the posited properties and the four dimensions extracted by MDS. These four dimensions were labelled: (a) Directness of the Strategy, (b) Manipulation of Sanctions, (c) Locus of Control, and (d) Explicitness of the Rationale for the Compliance.

Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) reported that after comparing the multidimensional scaling of subjects' perceptions of compliance-gaining strategies in both persuasive situations, subjects used the same criteria in making discriminations among the strategies. Situational differences, however, affected how the subjects weighted the four dimensions in the persuasive situation. For example, if a persuasive situation is important to the

persuader and if the problem is not an infringement of the rights of the persuader, then the persuader may emphasize reasoning rather than the manipulation of sanctions. These authors have noted that future research should focus on how aspects of the situation influence the subject's weighting of the four dimensions they found in their study.

Cody, McLaughlin and Jordan (1980) have also conducted research in which they inductively generated compliance-gaining messages. They used cluster analysis and MDS to develop a working typology of compliance-gaining strategies. Subjects were asked to construct and then sort strategies they reported using in three compliance-gaining situations. The situations were selected from earlier research because they varied considerably on a number of relevant situational factors (Cody & Jordan, 1979; and Cody & McLaughlin, 1980). These were: level of intimacy and rights, level of resistance to persuasion, level of situation apprehension and, long-term consequences.

The respondents reported that the following 16 compliance-gaining strategies were generated: (a) threat, (b) hinting, (c) simple statement-question, (d) altruism, (e) deceit, (f) disclaimer, (g) simple-statement, (i) negative esteem, (j) negative alternative, (k) cooperation, (l) coercion, (m) inaction, (n) expertise claim, (o) negotiate, (p) flattery and (q) negative alternatives.

Based on these strategies, Cody, McLaughlin and Jordan (1980) developed a typology that included the following

categories: (a) a Direct-Rational category (which included justifying the request and/or providing a supporting argument for it), (b) Manipulation (which includes hinting, deceit, and flattery), (c) Exchange (which includes question, cooperation and negotiation), (c) Threat (which involves some punishment contigent upon non-compliance, and (d) Expertise Claims (which were generally created in negotiation situations).

In a later study, Cody, McLaughlin and Schneider (1981) reported using the following 16 compliance-gaining strategies that they had gleaned from earlier studies: (a) negative altercasting, (b) negative self-feeling, (c) threat, (d) negative esteem, (e) simple statement, (f) reason, (g) disclaimer, (h) altruism, (i) promise, (j) debt, (k) compromise, (l) flattery, (m) deceit, (n) hinting, (o) extended expertise, and (p) audience-use. These authors suggested at least four broad areas of compliance-gaining activity encompass these strategies: (a) Personal Rejection (strategies a through d above), (b) Justification (strategies e through h above), (c) Exchange (strategies i through l above) and (d) Manipulation (strategies m through p above).

In a more recent study, Tracy et al.(1984) used the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) compliance-gaining strategies in studying the making of requests. In their investigation they suggested four research questions: (a) Does an empirically-derived system of compliance-gaining

message strategies provide a good description of the discourse of requests?, (b) Can the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) scheme of compliance-gaining message strategies be used reliably for coding requests?, (c) Are there systematic differences among individuals in their use of compliance-gaining strategies in request situations?, and d) Does usage of compliance-gaining strategies in requests vary systematically as a function of situational dimensions such as status of requestee, familiarity of the requestee, and size of the request?

Tracy et al. (1984) initially wrote descriptions of 24 request situations. The situations were designed to vary systematically along three dimensions: (a) status of the requestee (high, equal, or low), (b) familiarity of the requestee (high or low), and (c) size of the request (large or small). After the dimensions were validated in a pretest, the 24 experimental situations were given to subjects. Each individual subject was asked to audio record messages for each of the situations. The third and fourth authors coded the messages using the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) scheme. Intercoder reliablility was calculated using Cohen's kappa (its eventual interpretation was clouded by uneven distribution of the data in most categories). The data were analyzed using log-linear analysis.

In answering their research questions, Tracy et al. (1984) stated that the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981)

category scheme was used without difficulty but it did create some ambiguities. That is, most coding disagreements involved ingratiation, promise, altruism, and explanation. Second, the authors concluded that subjects do have identifiable styles in request situations but little would be gained by attempts to correlate the use of compliance-gaining strategies in favor-asking situations with personality variables like cognitive complexity or Machiavellianism. Third, in response to systematic variation due to situational dimensions their answer was complex. That is, there were situational dimensions other than the three dimensions of status, familiarity, and size of request that influenced strategy selection that were not identified in their research.

Hunter and Boster (1979, n.d.) have posited in their empathy model that all persuaders arrange compliance-gaining messages along a single dimension based on the probable emotional impact of the message upon the listener (Hunter & Boster, n.d.). That is, compliance-gaining messages could be scaled along a continuum that is composed of all possible messages ranging from all messages that a persuader would prefer to use at one end and all messages that a persuader would <u>not</u> use at the other. Hunter and Boster suggest that for any persuader there will be a point on this affective impact continuum which divides the continuum between most preferable messages and least preferable messages. This imaginary point is called the

ethical threshold. The threshold will vary from person to person, and from situation to situation. In the process of deciding which compliance-gaining messages to use, a persuader compares the strength (i.e., perceived affective impact) of the message with the ethical threshold. If a message has an affective impact which is more positive than a persuader's ethical threshold, then the persuader will use the message, if equal to or more negative than the threshold, the persuader will reject the message (Hunter & Boster, n. d.).

A Comparison of Inductively and Deductively Generated Compliance-Gaining Strategies

Boster, Stiff and Reynolds (1983) examined whether people respond differently to inductively derived lists of compliance-gaining message strategies rather than deductively derived typologies. They specifically wanted to test one criticism of the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology, i.e., that it may be affected by a social desirability bias (as mentioned above). In this study, subjects were presented the two compliance-gaining situations used by Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981). The subjects were given 30 compliance-gaining messages per situation [14 strategies from the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1981) scheme and 16 strategies derived by the authors from the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology]. The Crowne-Marlowe social desirability scale was used to measure the subjects' need for social approval. From past

research (Hunter & Boster, n. d., 1979, 1983), the Marwell and Schmitt typology was found to be unidimensional and not multidimensional as reported in earlier investigations (see Kaminiski et al., 1977; G. R. Miller et al., 1977; Roloff & Barnicott, 1978, 1979). Consequently, the ratings for each subject were summed across all sixteen categories to create a single index. Boster et al. (1983) found the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin (1967) category scheme to be unidimensional as well. Hence, the use rating frequencies were summed across strategies for these fourteen categories for each subject.

Both the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) frequency of use ratings and the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin use ratings were correlated with the need for social approval. The correlations for the use ratings for both sets of compliance-gaining strategies with the need for social approval were nonsignificant and about equal to each other. The correlation between the two category schemes was $\underline{r} = .75$ ($\underline{r} = .90$ when corrected for attenuation due to error of measurement). These researchers concluded that both category schemes are measuring the same underlying factor and suggested combining the lists in future research on compliance-gaining into 24 nonoverlapping strategies.

Summary

A major impetus in the study of messages used to gain compliance was provided by Marwell and Schmitt in 1967. They deductively devised a typology of compliance-gaining

strategies from the literature in the areas of social power and control. Since their pioneer work, a number of other scholars have offered additional typologies. Many of these have been developed inductively using reports of what people would say in compliance-gaining situations.

All the typologies of compliance-gaining strategies that have been proposed do not seem to be exhaustive in containing all of the possible strategies available, nor does this seem a likely possibility. This has been likened to Lubarsky's Law of Cybernetic Entomology; i.e., "there is always one more bug" (Boster et al., 1983). There always seems to be one more compliance-gaining strategy. However, all of the possible strategies seem to be aligned along a dimension or continuum from pro-social strategies at one end to anti-social strategies at the other. That is, individuals appear to use more pro-social strategies in initial compliance-gaining attempts. They then proceed through more mixed or neutral messages. Finally, as more or less a last resort, they use more anti-social strategies. Specific messages and/or strategies may vary from situation to situation but all possible messages or strategies should be arrayed along this continuum.

Because the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) and Wiseman and Schenk-Hamlin (1981) strategies have been found to be complementary and measures of the same underlying factor (Boster et al., 1983), a combined typology incorporating strategies from both schemata would provide a

classification scheme that should represent the majority of all strategies found in the research to date. Because eight of the strategies in both typologies have the same label, the reduced typology scheme arrived at without obvious overlap would contain 24 strategies. This combined list of 24 strategies should not be obviously redundant, yet it should allow for slight nuances of difference among similar categories. This would ensure that messages classified within this combined typology would be representative of all messages in the population of all possible compliance-gaining messages. It would also ensure that sample messages are arrayed along the prosocial/antisocial continuum.

Shatzer, Funkhouser and Hesse (1983) have made the claim that one of the main reservations for using the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology in cross-cultural research is that it was devised from observations and research that appear restricted to North American and/or Western European cultures. Therefore the strategies may reflect the more individualistic norms and values of western society and culture. This same criticism could be levied against the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) and Wiseman & Schenck-Hamlin (1981) typology as well. What is needed, then, is a representative sample of messages from all cultures being investigated so that these can have representational validity (cf., Poole & Folger, 1981), and can produce strategy typologies that are exhaustive in

scope.

Situational Determinants of Compliance-Gaining Strategies

A number of situational determinants that influence compliance-gaining message selection have been proposed by various investigators. Based on an empirical approach to discovering situational determinants, Cody and McLaughlin (1980) have selected six situational variables and Cody, Woefel and Jordan (1983), seven. Cody and McLaughlin (1980) explicated: (a) personal benefits from the persuasion for the persuader (b) relational intimacy between persuader and target, (c) resistance to the persuasion and perceived level of unfriendliness on the part of the target, (d) dominance versus equal power in the relationship, (e) consequences to the relationship due to the persuasion, and (f) perceived rights of the persuader to ask for compliance. Cody, Woefel and Jordan (1983) added an additional variable, i.e., situation apprehension of the persuasive situation. Although these factors have been isolated as significant predictors of compliance-gaining message selection, they have not been found to replicate consistently in the research.

Perhaps the most consistently examined situational determinants of compliance-gaining message selection have been whether (a) the communicator's relationship with the target was interpersonal or noninterpersonal (i.e., degree of intimacy), and (b) whether the results of compliance had long term or short term consequences for the relationship

between persuader and target (Cody & Mclaughlin, 1980; Cody, Mclaughlin & Jordan, 1980; Cody, McLaughlin & Schneider, 1981; Kaminski et al., 1977; G. R. Miller et al., 1977; Roloff & Barnicott, 1978, 1979; and Sillars, 1980). Statistically significant differences have been found in terms of likelihood of use of compliance-gaining messages based on these situational variables. However, the effect sizes for these differences have tended to be small and there has been no consistent directionality for the differences (Williams & Boster, 1981). When Hunter and Boster (1979) reanalyzed data from the earlier studies by G. R. Miller et al. (1977) and Marwell and Schmitt (1967), they found very small effects for the interpersonal/ noninterpersonal situational variable, the duration of consequences variable, and the interaction between these two variables.

Two other situational variables have been researched as well. These are whether the benefit of the persuasion has been for the persuader (Clark, 1979; Williams & Boster, 1981) or whether the benefit of the persuasion is for the persuadee (Hunter & Boster, 1979; Williams & Boster, 1981). Hunter and Boster (1979) have found that the extent to which compliance is perceived by the persuader to ultimately benefit the persuadee is an important situational variable. If the situation is such that the subject perceives the target's compliance to be in the best interest of the persuadee, then the persuader is more

likely to use ratings for the representative messages (Williams & Boster, 1981). Williams and Boster (1981) have reported that perceived benefit of the persuasion for the target was the only significant situational predictor of message use. In a later study by Boster and Stiff (1984), it was found that persuadee benefit was again an important predictor of compliance-gaining message choice. Persuader benefit was found to be a stronger influence on choice than in previous research probably as a result of clarity of the manipulation and design of the experiment (Boster & Stiff, 1984).

In conclusion, a number of situational determinants have been proposed to affect compliance-gaining message selection but only one has proven to be a consistent influence--the resultant benefit of the persuasion being for the persuadee. Conceptually this makes sense because in the process of persuasion, most persuaders want to couch their requests in such a way that it appears in the best interests of the persuadee to comply. Stated in another way, if one is trying to get a target to comply with a substantial request, the persuader wants to make the results of the compliance appear ultimately to be in the best interests of the persuadee. It may be a moot question as to whether a persuasive situation appears to benefit the persuader or persuadee to an outside observer. Most persuasive attempts will be presented in such a way that the consequences of the persuasion will appear ultimately

advantageous to the persuadee. In most cases, the persuader will try to structure the situation through the use of various messages such that it appears that ultimately the persuadee has as much to gain or more in the long run as the persuader.

Individual Difference Variables

Individual differences in compliance-gaining message selection have also been investigated in addition to situational variables. Kaminiski et al. (1977) explored the relationship between Machiavellianism and compliance-gaining message selection. They reported no relationship between Machiavellianism and a person's reported likelihood of use of compliance-gaining messages. On the other hand, Roloff and Barnicott (1978) found Machiavellianism to be significantly correlated with reported likelihood of use of compliance-gaining messages. Williams and Boster (1981) reanalyzed the data of Kaminski et al. (1977) and found a significant relationship with one dimension of Machiavellianism, i.e. negativism.

Roloff and Barnicott (1979) also investigated dogmatism and its relationship to compliance-gaining message selection. They found dogmatism to be significantly related to reports of likelihood of message use. Moreover, they found that highly dogmatic individuals were more willing to use more messages in order to gain compliance than low dogmatics. Wheeless, Barracough and Stewart (1983), following Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1980),

proposed that locus of control may also be an important predictor due to its relationship with social power and control.

A number of investigators have examined the relationship between gender of the persuader and compliance-gaining message selection (M. Burgoon, Dillard, Koper & Doran, 1984; Dillard, Hunter, M. Burgoon, Boster & Stiff, 1985; Michener & Schwertfeger, 1975; Riccollo & Trenholm, 1983). Even though gender differences have been hypothesized, they have been found only a few times (e.g., Riccollo & Trenholm, 1983); and when they have occurred they were generally very weak (Dillard et al., 1985). Dillard and associates (Dillard et al., 1985) have suggested that gender differences in the selection of compliance-gaining messages are in fact mediated by one or more psychological trait variables such as caring.

In cross-cultural research, M. D. Miller et al. (1983) investigated cultural and gender influences on the use of intense language in persuasive messages. Their sample was composed of ethnic Chinese, ethnic Japanese, and Caucasian students at the University of Hawaii. They reasoned that Caucasian-Americans (especially males) should produce more intense messages in trying to gain compliance due to the importance placed on independence and assertiveness in American society. Moreover, they posited that people holding more Japanese values should use less intense language because any value placed on assertion should be

secondary to norms governing the need for group consensus and cohesiveness. They also proposed that among groups of people whose ethnic identity is tied to cultural groups that differentiate sharply between the genders, one would expect to find that the differences in the language intensity of men and women should be even more readily apparent than among Caucasian-Americans. They also predicted that there would be a gender by culture interaction among the ethnic Chinese and ethnic Japanese.

M. D. Miller et al. (1983) found that, as expected, there was a main effect for gender in the intensity of messages used in compliance-gaining. However, there was a two-way interaction between ethnic identity and gender. Thus, the interaction overrode the main effect for gender. When this overriding interaction was probed, it was found that ethnic Japanese men used significantly higher levels of intensity in messages than did ethnic Japanese women. In turn, ethnic Chinese males used significantly more intense messages than ethnic Chinese females. No significant difference was found between Caucasian males and females.

In summary, a few individual difference variables have been investigated as predictors of compliance-gaining message selection. Negativism and dogmatism have been found to be significant predictors of message use. Gender differences have not been found consistently among North American subjects possibly because of the mediating

influences of variables such as caring, and also possibly due to more equality of the sexes in North American society. However, gender differences have been found in cultures where there is a greater role distinction between the genders, such as in Chinese and Japanese cultures.

The Empathy Model

To explain the integrated relationship among situational variables, message variables, and individual difference variables, Hunter and Boster (1979, n.d.) have proposed an Empathy Model as a theoretical approach to understanding compliance-gaining message selection and use. From their research these investigators have formulated a model based upon the following four assumptions: (a) attempts at persuasion produce affective reactions in listeners, (b) the persuader is sensitive to these affective reactions (i.e., empathic), (c) all compliance-gaining messages can be scaled on a continuum which ranges from those messages that produce a positive affective response in listeners to those messages that produce a negative affective response in the targets of persuasion, and (d) if persuaders are presented with two messages, they will prefer to use the more positive of the two (Boster, 1977; Hunter & Boster, 1979, n.d.; Williams & Boster, 1981).

Recent research by Dillard, Hunter, M. Burgoon, Boster and Stiff (1985) failed in two attempts to find support for the empathy model as it has been proposed. These

researchers reported that empathy is not a major determinant of compliance-gaining message choice. They offer an alternative model based upon their empirical evidence that suggests that caring and need for achievement may be two important causal antecedents of message selection.

Even though Dillard et al. (1985) failed to find empathy per se as an important predictor of compliance-gaining message selection, the assumption that all messages are aligned along a unidimensional continuum still appears sound. A fairly persistent finding in the compliance-gaining research has been that people report favoring more pro-social strategies and messages in initial attempts at compliance and resort to more anti-social strategies and messages if these fail. Therefore, all messages that are used are aligned along this continuum from pro-social to anti-social. The relationship that this continuum takes in terms of likelihood of use ratings for the strategies is nonlinear (Hunter & Boster, 1979). That is, it takes the form of an ogival curve in which the prosocial strategies receive higher ratings (in terms of likelihood of use) in the initial stages of trying to gain compliance, descending to lower ratings for anti-social strategies in later attempts. The strategies themselves have been found in a number of instances to fit the Guttman simplex pattern (Hunter & Boster, 1979; Dillard et al., 1985). Therefore,

1985). Therefore, in future research it might be predicted (at least in western cultures) that compliance-gaining strategies would fall within three broad categories, i.e., those that are more positive and used initially, a group of mixed strategies that are used next, and finally a group of more negative strategies.

Cross-Cultural Compliance-Gaining Research

Within recent years there have been a number of studies involving empirical research in the area of persuasion as it varies across cultures. M. Burgoon, M. D. Miller, Dillard, and Doran (1982) were some of the first researchers to investigate cultural differences in the selection of persuasive strategies. These investigators examined the use of the 16 strategies of the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology among either Asian or North American cultural groups in Hawaii. Their sample was composed of two large groups of subjects--one North American and one Asiatic. The Asiatic sample came from undergraduate students enrolled at the University of Hawaii. They combined respondents who reported that they were from Chinese (16%), Filipino (7%), Hawaiian (8%), Japanese (57%), and Korean (2%) cultural descent into what they called the Asian group. Of these, 90% were born as native U.S. citizens.

In their study, M. Burgoon et al. (1982) constructed 12 hypothetical situations developed around four topics. The situations were constructed to differ in terms of

dyadic, public speaking, and mass media contexts. The situations also differed as to who was to benefit from the persuasion, i.e., either self or other benefit. Respondents were asked to rate the likelihood of using a particular strategy from the 16 Marwell and Schmitt (1967) strategies for the particular situations (M. Burgoon et al., 1982).

These researchers found significant differences in compliance-gaining strategy use based on cultural differences (i.e., whether the respondents were of North American or of Asiatic background) for eight of the sixteen strategies. In each significant case the Asians were more likely to use the specific strategies of promise, positive expertise, liking, pregiving, positive self-feeling, positive altercasting, negative altercasting, and positive esteem than were the North Americans. Significant context by culture interactions were found for the strategies of debt, moral appeal, and positive altercasting.

In conclusion, M. Burgoon et al. (1982) remarked that there was a tendency for the Asians to have a higher likelihood of using virtually all of the persuasive strategies, particularly the positively oriented ones. They surmised that this might be due to a propensity within Asian cultures to engage in persuasive acts. These researchers stated, in summation, that because significant effects for the context of communication and the locus of benefit in the persuasion were found, this indicates that

strategy selection is influenced by situational as well as cultural variables. However, they noted that the lack of any interaction between culture and locus of benefit suggests that the latter variable operates in like fashion in both cultures. Specifically they pointed out that benefit produced significant main effects for six persuasive strategies; however, the lack of consistency with which benefit influences the strategies makes generalization difficult.

M. Burgoon et al. (1982) were not able to produce the Guttman simplex pattern when the likelihood of use ratings of the strategies were factor analyzed for the North American repondents [as would be predicted according to Hunter and Boster (1978, 1979)]. However, the two factors produced by strategy selection ratings of the Asian sample did exhibit the Guttman simplex pattern indicating possible nonlinear unidimensionality. These researchers suggested that the lack of a cleanly loaded factor structure for either sample, and the existence of support for the Guttman simplex pattern for only the second sample, implies that other situational variables are operating "to degrade the universality of Marwell and Schmitt's structure across varied situations" (M. Burgoon et al., 1982, p. 92).

In a later study, M. D. Miller et al. (1982) examined specific differences among the four major ethnic groups that made up the Asian sample represented in the M. Burgoon et al. (1982) research. Their total sample was composed of

Caucasians (14%), ethnic Chinese (17%), Hawaiian (8%), and ethnic Japanese (41%), blacks (1%), Filipino (4%), Korean (1%), mixed heritage (7%), and others (7%). One aspect that differentiated this study from the earlier one of M. Burgoon et al. (1982) was that the investigation used real, as opposed to hypothetical, targets of persuasion. That is, the subjects responded to targets with whom they actually interacted during the experiment. M. D. Miller et al. (1982) have suggested that this methodological enhancement increased the validity of the responses of the subjects. Another differentiating factor was that this investigation took the ethnic identity of the persuadee into account as well as that of the persuader.

M. D. Miller and associates (1982), like M. Burgoon et al. (1982), found significant differences among Caucasian, Chinese, Hawaiian, and Japanese subjects in terms of probable selection of particular strategies (again using the Marwell and Schmitt typology). They found that whether the target of persuasion was of the same or different cultural group influenced strategy selection by the source. More specifically, they found that Caucasians use more negative strategies (e.g., threat, aversive stimulation, negative expertise, and negative self-feeling) than the Japanese-Americans (the ethnic Chinese did not differ from either of these groups on threat, negative expertise, and negative self-feeling). Conversely, Caucasians were more likely to use altruism than ethnic

Japanese. In addition (after performing post hoc comparisons), they found that Hawaiian and ethnic Japanese sources were less likely to engage in persuasion than Caucasians or the ethnic Chinese. In general, these researchers concluded that persuaders were less willing to select a variety of strategies for use with members of their own ethnic group than for use on members of different ethnic groups.

Lustig and Myers (1983) also used the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) strategies to compare six countries in terms of compliance-gaining strategy selection. Japanese subjects were found to be unlikely users of threat, altruism, promise, and pre-giving (i.e., contingency strategies). On the other hand they were found likely to use dispositional strategies such as positive self-feeling, positive expertise, and positive altercasting.

Following this general line of research, Shatzer et al. (1984) conducted a study examining the probability of the compliance-gaining strategy use among four culturally diverse groups (i.e., Latinos, Japanese, Arabs, and North Americans). Respondents composing these four groups were college students from the various cultures studying at a large midwestern university. The four groups differed as to the probability of use of the strategies contained in the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology. The groups also differed when the proposed target of the persuasion was either an individual of higher, equal, or lower power or

status. Counter to initial expectations, the Arabs were similar to the North American group in reporting higher probabilities of use of the strategies overall. The Latino and Japanese groups were more alike in reported message use and reported lower probabilities of usage in general.

Shatzer et al. (1984) reported that they were well aware of the difficulties in trying to superimpose the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology upon responses from subjects from non-western cultures. They reasoned, however, that differences among the groups would be differences due to ethnic identity and not due to differences in the strategies themselves. They also reasoned that it is of value to know how frequently individuals of other cultures report using strategies common in North American culture (Shatzer et al., 1984).

In their study, Shatzer et al. (1984) found North Americans consistently to give higher likelihood of use ratings than the Japanese for all of the strategies of the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology. In fact, the Japanese group reported the lowest probability of usage of the sixteen strategies among all four ethnic groups, and was lower in probability of usage than the North Americans on all sixteen strategies across all three levels of social power or status.

These findings are similar to those of M. D. Miller et al. (1982). They found that when comparing a Caucasian group to a group of ethnic Japanese, the Caucasians

reported a higher probability of use for all strategies except liking [although this difference did not appear to be significant (M. D. Miller et al., 1982)]. The M. D. Miller et al. (1982) and Shatzer et al. (1984) findings differ from the findings of M. Burgoon et al. (1982). M. Burgoon and his colleagues noted that their Asian sample reported significantly higher usage than the North Americans on 8 of the 16 strategies, i.e., promise, positive expertise, liking, pregiving, positive self-feeling, positive altercasting, negative altercasting, and positive esteem (M. Burgoon et al., 1982). This discrepancy is somewhat surprising since the Asiatic sample in the M. Burgoon et al. (1982) study was 57% ethnic Japanese. One reason for this discrepancy may be that the persuasive situations that were used by M. Burgoon et al. (1982) may have been very western (e.g., selling smoke alarms, running for political office, advocating the use of airbags in automobiles, and presenting an appeal for church attendance) and therefore elicited responses that were typically more western. Another explanation may be that the ethnic Japanese are cultually more Hawaiian (due to the fact that the subjects were 90% native born U.S. citizens) than representative of true Japanese culture.

In 1984, Neuliep and Hazelton reported a study in which they compared Japanese and American subjects in terms of compliance-gaining communication. The American subjects were university students at a large midwestern university.

The Japanese subjects were students attending two Japanese universities. The Japanese subjects were reported by the researchers to be bi-lingual.

During the study subjects wrote down exactly what they would say if they were the persuader for each of two compliance-gaining situations. The situations were the "move to the Southwest" situation and the "postponed date" situation used earlier by G. R. Miller et al. (1977). The "move to the Southwest" situation was altered to make it relevant to the Japanese, i.e., someone was going to move "a great distance." The targets of persuasion in both situations were members of the opposite sex with whom the persuader had been carrying on a close relationship for the past two years. English was used by both groups for elicitation and response procedures.

Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported that all completed responses were coded using either the analytic scheme of Marwell and Schmitt (1967) or Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982). This was done to assess which typology possesses greater representational validity for the coding of responses of Japanese and North Americans.

When the responses were coded for the postponed date situation using the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology, no significant cellwise comparisons were found between the Japanese and American groups. Over 67% of the messages from the American respondents were coded as promise and over 71% of the messages from the Japanese respondents were

coded as promise.

After the responses for the postponed date situation were coded using the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology, significant differences were found for promise, explanation, and deceit (Neuliep & Hazelton, 1984). The Americans made greater use of promise, but the Japanese made significantly greater use of deceit. The most preferred strategy for both Americans and Japanese was explanation. However, the Japanese used this message category significantly more than the Americans.

For the "move" situation, when responses were coded using the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology the strategy of positive expertise was the only strategy to differ significantly between the Japanese and Americans with the Americans responding much more frequently with this strategy than the Japanese. The Americans responded frequently with promise strategies and the Japanese with altruistic strategies but the differences between the groups were not significant.

The results for the move situation using the Schneck-Hamlin et al. (1982) coding scheme revealed that the Japanese used direct request significantly more than the Americans (Neuliep & Hazelton, 1984). The Americans, on the other hand, responded more frequently by using promise strategies significantly more than the Japanese. Both the Japanese (47.4% of the responses) and the Americans (52.1%) responded by using explanation strategies

more frequently than any others. However the frequency of use of this strategy type did not differ significantly between the two cultural groups.

Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) remarked in conclusion to their study that the Japanese showed a preference for explanation and direct request strategies--both of which are based on rationale. These researchers commented that this is not surprising since many obligations in Japan are usually fulfilled voluntarily without a great deal of need for interpersonal requests for compliance. They attempted to explain the American preference for promise and positive expertise strategies as being logical manifestations of American culture. This may be a valid argument for promise strategies, but the argument becomes tenuous for the other two. The Japanese appear to be culturally more inclined to believe that the target of persuasion will be rewarded due to "the nature of things."

In general, Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported greater compliance-gaining message representation using the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology scheme [as opposed to the Marwell & Schmitt (1967) scheme]. They concluded that the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin typology was preferable to the deductively generated typology of Marwell and Schmitt because it allows for the greater percentage of classification of the compliance-gaining messages. That is, when compliance-gaining messages were categorized using both the typologies, a greater number of messages could be

categorized using the Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin scheme.

Overall, their results did not correspond to either those of M. Burgoon et al. (1982) or of Lustig and Myers (1983)--both of which used check-list procedures in soliciting responses. Therefore, the results of Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) provide more equivocality rather than consensus as to cultural differences in compliance-gaining communication styles between Japanese and North Americans.

Although Neulip and Hazelton (1984) need to be commended for eliciting responses from the Japanese subjects in Japan to increase cultural validity, there are at least two possible confounds in their results. One is due to using English rather than Japanese as the language of administration for the Japanese subjects. The Japanese subjects might have demonstrated larger differences, or differences in the use of more strategies (in terms of probability of use) if the questionnaire had been administered in Japanese. Second, because the Japanese subjects were asked to imagine themselves in two persuasive situations with a person of the opposite sex with whom they had been intimate for two years, such situations may not have been salient to the Japanese, who are not as "sexually liberated" as Westerners. That is, the persuasive situations may have lacked representational validity.

An additional problem with this research of Neuliep and Hazelton (1982) appears to revolve around interpreting which messages should be coded as particular strategies

using the two different typologies. For example, when the three judges that coded messages according to the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology coded messages created for a particular situation, a high percentage of the messages were coded as promise (i.e., 71.6%). However, when the same messages were coded according to the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) scheme by three other judges, the percentage of promise messages produced dropped (for the Japanese) from 71.6% to 4.7%. In the latter case, the differences between the percent of messages created by the Japanese and North Americans for the promise strategy became significant (in the former case the differences were not significant). Intercoder reliabilities were not reported.

Summation

The study of compliance-gaining strategy use and selection is important because it reveals the logic behind particular tactics of persuasion. This logic is manifested in the written messages that are examples of compliance-gaining strategies. There have been two dominant approaches to arriving at exactly what kind of messages, or strategies, people actually use when trying to gain compliance. One approach (the more deductive approach) has followed the work of Marwell and Schmitt (1967). The second approach (the more inductive approach) has followed the work of Schenk-Hamlin, Wiseman and Georgacarakos (1980). Both of these approaches have led to fruitful and productive avenues of research. In fact, the approaches

approaches overlap at times, and supplement or augment each other at others.

For the purposes of this research, both compliance-gaining typologies of Marwell and Schmitt (1967) and Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982, Wiseman & Schenk-Hamlin, 1981) will be combined. The resultant typology contains 24 compliance-gaining strategies. As has been demonstrated in the review of the literature, the combined strategy scheme accounts for the highest percentage of messages that have been generated in response to persuasive situations. No claims are made that this typology or scheme is totally complete or that it is exhaustive. There may be other strategies that, as yet, have not been uncovered. However, since all compliance-gaining messages appear to be able to be located along a strategy continuum that ranges from pro-social strategies to anti-social strategies, this typology, in all probability, does represent the entire range of the unidimensional continuum.

Prior research in the area of compliance-gaining has investigated a number of situational determinants that influence compliance-gaining message selection. Most of these situational variables have not proven to be either strong or consistent predictors of compliance-gaining strategy selection. Only the variable of who benefits most by the persuasion (i.e., either the persuader or the persuadee) has been found to be a consistent influence on the compliance-gaining strategy selection process.

However, it seems that the issue of who benefits from the results of persuasion may be a moot question. That is, it may not ultimately matter who benefits most in a situation in terms of the selection of compliance-gaining strategies because one major aim of the persuader is to structure the situation such that the persuadee appears to gain. This gain may be some type of inherent rewards (such as altruism) or the deterrent of negative consequences (as in threats). Therefore, in the present research, persuasive situations representing both persuader benefit and persuadee benefit are used to stimulate the generation of messages, and in the selection of message strategies in terms of likelihood of use.

Individual difference variables have also been investigated in past research. Negativism and dogmatism have been demonstrated to be important predictors in compliance-gaining message selection. Cultural differences have also been demonstrated. Some gender differences have been found, but these have been weak and inconsistent among subjects from western cultures. However, gender differences have been reported to be fairly strong among subjects from cultures that have strong role differentiation between the genders. Because of the need to limit the scope of this present study, cultural differences will be the main variables examined. Specifically, the Japanese and North American cultures will be examined. These two cultures have been selected because

of their extreme cultural differences.

Due to the complexity and discrepancies of the cross-cultural findings, a summary of this research is found in the next chapter. The summary will be contained in the rationale for the hypotheses and research questions concerning the predicted relationships between the Japanese and North Americans in terms of compliance-gaining strategy selection.

Chapter Three

Hypotheses and Rationale

Compliance-Gaining Strategy Selection

Based upon the norms and values of Japanese culture as outlined in chapter one, and based upon the prior empirical research reviewed in chapter two, the following relationships are hypothesized. In general, cultural differences between the Japanese and North Americans will influence the likelihood of using a particular compliance-gaining strategy. More specifically, the Japanese will report a higher likelihood of use for some compliance-gaining messages than North Americans. In turn, North Americans will report a higher likelihood of use rating than the Japanese for particular strategies due to cultural appropriateness.

As was mentioned in chapter one, the most frequently employed Japanese compliance-gaining strategies should be more indirect, less individualistic (i.e., focusing less upon the persuader as well as the persuadee as individuals apart from the group), more suggestive of mutual obligation, involve one's duty to society, suggest the individual's debt to others, and so on. Japanese compliance-gaining strategies should be less confrontational, employing more the process of hinting,

allusion, and indirection. It would be expected that Japanese would more frequently use compliance-gaining strategies which show affection and humbleness in making the request.

Following this rationale, the Japanese would be predicted to report using the compliance-gaining strategies listed below more frequently than North Americans. These strategies come from the combined list of twenty-four strategies found in the typologies of Marwell and Schmitt (1967) and Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982). This combined category scheme is used because of its thoroughness and completeness in categorizing the most commonly produced messages. Thus, the Japanese should report using the following six strategies more frequently than North Americans: (a) Positive Expertise, (b) Liking, (c) Pre-giving, (d) Ingratiation, (e) Explanation, and (f) Hinting. North Americans are predicted to use three strategies significantly more than the Japanese: (a) Threat, (b) Aversive Stimulation and (c) Altruism.

Hypothesized Preferences for the Japanese

In this section individual hypotheses and the rationale for predicting each of these relationships will be provided. The Positive Expertise strategy should be used more frequently by the Japanese than North Americans.

Positive Expertise has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) as "if you comply you will be rewarded because of 'the nature of things'" (p. 357). Because the Japanese depend more upon holistic social relationships rather than upon individual effort and accomplishment, this strategy should fit the Japanese ethos. That is, one will not be rewarded due one's personal accomplishments but because of "the nature of things."

The limited empirical evidence of the cross-cultural research in compliance-gaining strategy use has indicated that this seems to be the case. M. Burgoon et al. (1982) found their Asiatic sample (which was 57% ethnic Japanese) to use Positive Expertise significantly more than Caucasians in Hawaii. Its likelihood of use rating was reported to be higher than all other strategies of the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology (M. Burgoon et al., 1982). Lustig and Myers (1983) also found the Japanese to rate this strategy higher in likelihood of use than North Americans. Even though M. D. Miller et al. (1982) did not find a significant difference between ethnic Japanese and North Americans in terms of likelihood of using this strategy, Positive Expertise was still the most frequently reported strategy. In addition, Shatzer et al. (1984) found that when cell means for likelihood of use ratings were ranked Positive Expertise was ranked number one by the Japanese respondents (when the ratings were collapsed across all targets of the compliance). Contrary to these

findings, however, Neulielp and Hazelton (1984) found a significantly higher reported use of Positive Expertise by North Americans when compared to the Japanese. In spite of this fact, Positive Expertise was still the second highest ranked strategy for the Japanese in terms of reported percentage of use. Therefore hypothesis one is as follows:

H_1: The Japanese are more likely to use Positive Expertise messages than North Americans.

Liking should also be a strategy that the Japanese would report using more frequently than North Americans. Liking has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt as, "actor is friendly and helpful to get target in 'good frame of mind' so that he will comply with request" (1967, p. 357). As reported earlier the Japanese prefer to use affection and humbleness in their interpersonal interactions. Liking would also appear to be an important strategy in nemawashi or the "spade work" so often found in Japanese group relations. The Japanese place a great deal of importance on getting people into the right mood or frame of mind in their interpersonal relations.

In reviewing the empirical research, Liking was found to be rated significantly more frequently by Asians in Hawaii than Caucasians by M. Burgoon et al. (1982). M. D. Miller and his associates (1982) found that Liking was the second most popular strategy with ethnic Japanese. However, these researchers did not find a significant difference in likelihood of use of this strategy between

the Japanese and Caucasian groups. Even though Shatzer et al. (1984) did not report post hoc comparisons looking at specific differences between the Japanese portion of their sample and the North American portion, they still reported that Liking received the highest ratings in terms of its frequency of use for the Japanese. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) found the Japanese to provide a higher percentage of Liking messages in terms of overall messages produced than the North Americans in both of their persuasive situations, although these differences were not significant. Therefore hypothesis two states:

H_2: The Japanese are more likely to use Liking messages than North Americans.

Pre-giving should also be a compliance-gaining strategy used more frequently by the Japanese than the North Americans. Pre-giving has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) as "actor rewards before requesting compliance" (p. 357). The giving of gifts, and the creation of the right mood, are common methods used in the spadework of nemawashi. Therefore, the notion of Pre-giving should conceptually fit as being culturally appropriate in Japanese society.

The empirical evidence for Pre-giving has been mixed, however. M. Burgoon et al. (1982) found their Asiatic sample to report using this strategy more than the Caucasians. M. D. Miller et al. (1982) did not find any significant differences between the ethnic Chinese, ethnic

Japanese, and Caucasians in terms of this strategy. In fact, the ethnic Japanese group was found to have ranked Pre-giving as 12th in terms of likelihood of use (out of 16 strategies). However, Shatzer et al. (1984) found Pre-giving ranked as third in terms of likelihood of use by Japanese respondents. Lustig and Myers (1983) found that the Japanese were significantly less likely to use this strategy. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) did not report Pre-giving to be a message provided by the Japanese in either of their persuasive situations (any strategies with less than 5% of the total messages produced were not reported). To reiterate, theoretically Pre-giving should be a compliance-gaining strategy appropriate to Japanese culture even though empirical support of this reasoning has been mixed. Therefore, hypothesis three is as follows:

H_3: The Japanese are more likely to use Pre-giving messages than North Americans.

Debt is a fourth strategy that appears to be culturally more appropriate for the Japanese than the North Americans. Debt has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) as "you owe me compliance because of past favors" (p. 357). Stated in this way there is a great deal of emphasis placed upon the individual. However, if the emphasis is placed upon the individual's debt to others in one's group this strategy is isomorphic with Japanese thinking. As stated earlier, debt and repayment are concepts represented in Japanese by on, giri and

gimu--i.e., the obligations and duties owed to specific others and all others in society (both living and dead). The sense of indebtedness to others is strong in the Japanese psyche, thus Debt should be a frequently used strategy.

Empirical support for finding Debt used as a strategy significantly more by the Japanese or ethnic Japanese when compared with other cultural groups (particularly North Americans) has been weak. This may be due to where the emphasis has been placed by the respondent (i.e., whether the emphasis is interpreted to be upon the individual or the individual in society). M. Burgoon et al. (1982) found Debt to be reported as used more frequently by Asiatic Hawaiians than Caucasians. According to M. D. Miller et al. (1982), Debt was ranked as the 14th strategy (out of 16 strategies) by the ethnic Japanese. In the study by Shatzer et al. (1984), Debt was ranked 10th for use overall by the Japanese, and 11th for use with a co-worker. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported only a very low percentage of Japanese messages coded as this strategy in their study. One problem with stating a directional hypothesis in this case is that indebtedness and reciprocity are common to North American culture as well. Therefore, in this instance a research search question will be posed:

Q_1: Are the Japanese more likely to use Debt messages than North Americans?

Moral Appeal is a fifth compliance-gaining strategy that seems to fit Japanese cultural norms and values more than for North Americans. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) have defined Moral Appeal as "you are immoral if you don't comply" (p. 357). Due to the fact that the Japanese are bound to mutual obligations and duties, as opposed to having individual rights and freedom of choice, moral appeals would seem to have a great deal of force in compliance-gaining situations. In like manner, the emphasis placed on shame and bringing shame upon one's family, provides an impetus for appealing to morality.

The empirical evidence for Moral Appeal has also been weak. This may be due to problems with operationalizing the concept rather than the conceptualization itself. As stated above, undue focus upon the individual within the strategy may negate possible selection for use by the Japanese. M. Burgoon et al. (1982) found this strategy to be used significantly more by Asians than Caucasians. M. D. Miller et al. (1982) found no significant differences in likelihood of use among the ethnic groups they investigated. For the ethnic Japanese, Moral Appeal was ranked 8th (out of 16) in terms of likelihood of use. Shatzer et al. (1984) found that the Japanese ranking for the use of Moral Appeal was 14th (out of 16) for their sample. This strategy was not reported as being provided by the Japanese in the investigation by Neuliep and Hazelton (1984). Because of the weak empirical support a

research question must be posited:

Q_2: Are the Japanese more likely to use Moral Appeal messages than North Americans?

Positive Esteem is also a strategy that would be predicted to be used more frequently by the Japanese to gain compliance. Positive esteem has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt (1967) as "people you value will think better of you if you comply" (p. 358). Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) did not divide esteem strategies into positive and negative components as did Marwell and Schmitt (1967). Instead, they defined Esteem as "target's compliance will result in automatic increase of self-worth" (Schenck-Hamlin et al., 1982). Because of the Japanese value of blending into the group and maintaining harmonious relations, the Japanese should not want to be held in low esteem by others. Specifically they should not want to bring shame and reproach upon themselves or their reference group.

The empirical evidence for Positive Esteem has been mixed. M. Burgoon et al. (1982) found that it was reported as being used significantly more frequently by Asians than Caucasians. M. D. Miller et al. (1982) did not report any significant differences in terms of likelihood of use among the groups they investigated, but they did report that this strategy ranked fourth in terms of likelihood of use by the Japanese (out of 16 strategies). Similarly, Shatzer et al. (1984) found this strategy to be ranked by the Japanese as

fifth (when collapsing across all targets of persuasion) and fourth when used with a co-worker (out of 16 strategies). Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported only a very small percentage of the messsages produced by the Japanese in one of their situations (i.e., the "move" situation) as being coded as Positive Esteem. In this case, again, the empirical evidence has not unequivocally supported the theory. Therefore, a third research question will be asked:

Q_3: Are the Japanese more likely to use Positive Esteem messages than North Americans?

Negative Esteem is also predicted to be a strategy that the Japanese would frequently use. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) have defined Negative Esteem as "people you value will think worse of you if you don't comply" (p. 358). Due to the importance of avoiding shame in Japanese society, the Japanese would not want to lose face. This is particularly so since this would bring shame upon one's immediate reference group. In addition, because of mutual dependence and obligations, the Japanese would want to be held in high esteem and honored by others around them.

Unfortunately empirical support for this position has not been found. M. Burgoon et al. (1982) did not find their Asiatic sample to differ significantly from the North Americans in terms of frequency of use of Positive Esteem. M. D. Miller et al. (1982) found it ranked 10th out of 16th. Shatzer et al. (1983) found it ranked 9th out of

16th by their Japanese respondents. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) did not report any negative esteem messages in their study either among the Japanese or the North Americans. Thus, a fifth research question will be presented.

Q_4: Are the Japanese more likely to use Negative Esteem messages than North Americans?

Ingratiation can be suggested as a strategy that the Japanese would frequently use because of its similarity to Liking and Pre-giving. Ingratiation has been defined by Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) as "actor's proffered goods, sentiments, or services precede the request for compliance (p. 257)." In essence, the strategy of ingratiation according to Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) would encompass the strategies of liking and pre-giving from the Marwell & Schmitt (1967) typology. Ingratiation appears to be an integral part of good "spade work" (nemawashi) and very important for creating the appropriate mood for persuasion.

The empirical evidence for Ingratiation is fairly scant. The only researchers reviewed who used strategies from the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology in their cross-cultural investigation were Neuliep and Hazelton (1984). These investigators reported slightly higher percentages of Ingratiation messages among the Japanese than the North Americans, but these differences were not significant. The percentages themselves were very small (1.8% for the "move" situation and 1.4% for the "postponed date" situation). However, as reported above, the

strategies of Liking and Pre-giving were both found to be popular strategies among the Japanese. Inasmuch as they are similar to, or synonymous with, Ingratiation; these ratings should be comparable. Therefore hypothesis four states:

H_4: The Japanese will report higher likelihood of use ratings for Ingratiation messages than North Americans.

Explanation is the eighth strategy proposed as one that the Japanese would use more frequently than North Americans. Explanation has been defined by Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) as "one of several reasons are advanced for believing or doing something. Reason may include the following: (1) credibility, . . . (2) reference to a value system, . . . (3) inference from empirical evidence." (pp. 257-8). Because of the strong Japanese value system and the close cultural allegiance to this system, the Explanation strategy should be used more frequently by the Japanese.

Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported a high percentage of messages produced by the Japanese that were coded as Explanation messages for both of their stimulus situations. However, in both cases these percentages did not differ significantly from those produced by the North Americans. Since this was the only study which used the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology, and thus the only study providing evidence for the theoretical reasoning

concerning Explanation, the empirical evidence alone is too scant to influence any predictions. However, the theoretical reasoning is still quite strong thus enabling the following hypothesis:

H_5: The Japanese are more likely to use Explanation messages than North Americans.

Hinting is the final strategy proposed as being part of a typical Japanese repertoire of strategies. Hinting is defined by Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) as "actor represents the situational context in such a way that the target is lead to conclude the desired action or response" (p. 257). Theoretically, this strategy epitomizes the Japanese cultural values of hinting, allusion, and indirectness--values that are almost diametrically opposed to western values of directness and candor. As mentioned earlier, the Japanese believe that direct statements in communication are generally used only with small children who have not developed sufficient powers of inference. That is, hinting is the appropriate way to convey a suggestion or request in Japanese. To do otherwise would be to insult the target of the message by implying that he or she was immature.

The empirical evidence for Hinting, like the other strategies from the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology, comes solely from the study by Neuliep and Hazelton (1984). They found that their coders did not report any of the messages in the "postponed date" situation to be

hinting messages, and only 2.3% of the messages produced by the Japanese in the "move" situation to be of the Hinting variety. In the "move" situation there was no significant difference in terms of Hinting messages created between the Japanese and North American respondents. Even though the empirical evidence concerning the use of Hinting strategies for the Japanese is sparse, the conceptual evidence is quite compelling. Therefore hypothesis six can be stated as:

H_6: The Japanese are more likely to use Hinting messages than North Americans.

Hypothesized Preferences for North Americans

There are a number of compliance-gaining strategies that would be predicted to be used more frequently by North Americans (due to their cultural values) than the Japanese. Threat, for example, appears to be a strategy that might be more frequently used by North Americans than many other cultural groups (including the Japanese). North Americans do not report using this strategy very frequently (i.e., it generally is not used as an initial strategy); but their likelihood of use is generally higher than Asians, especially the Japanese. This may stem from North American cultural values that stress assertiveness, independence, individualism, and direct confrontation. Marwell and Schmitt (1967) define Threat as "if you do not comply I will punish you" (p. 357). Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) have defined it as "actor's proposed actions will

have negative consequences for the target if he or she does not comply" (p. 257). Both the Japanese and North American cultural groups should rank Threat low in terms of likelihood of use, but North Americans would probably resort to using this strategy with less restraint than the Japanese.

In the cross-cultural research in compliance-gaining Threat strategies were found to be used significantly more by North Americans than ethnic Chinese, ethnic Japanese and Japanese subjects (Burgoon et al. 1982; M. D. Miller et al., 1982; Lustig & Myers, 1983; Shatzer et al., 1984). Neuliep and Hazelton (1984), in contrast, reported finding only a small percentage of messages created for their two persuasive situations to be threats for both for North Americans and the Japanese. In the "move" situation the percentage of Threats created by the North Americans was 1.7%, for the Japanese it was 0.7%. In the postponed date" situation the Japanese were reported to have proposed 2.9% of all messages as Threats, for the North Americans no messages were coded as Threats. For both of these situations, the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) typology was used to code the messages. In neither case was the difference found to be significant. No messages were coded as Threats when the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology was used. Thus, hypothesis seven states:

H_7: North Americans are more likely to use Threat messages than the Japanese.

Aversive Stimulation is another strategy predicted to be used more frequently by North Americans than the Japanese. Aversive Stimulation has been defined by Marwell and Schmitt as "actor continuously punishes target making cessation contingent on compliance" (1967, p. 357). Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) used this same definition for the strategy they call Aversive Stimulation. Like Threat, Aversive Stimulation is not a strategy that would be used initally by North Americans because it is an anti-social strategy. However, like Threat, Aversive Stimulation would be predicted to be use more by North Americans than the Japanese.

M. D. Miller et al. (1982) reported that Caucasians were significantly more likely to report using Aversive Stimulation than either ethnic Chinese or ethnic Japanese. They reported that in their research there was a general trend for Caucasians to use the more negative strategies. Thus, the following hypothesis:

H_8: North Americans are more likely to use Aversive Stimulation messages than the Japanese.

On a more positive note, Altruism has been found to have higher likelihood of use ratings among North Americans than Japanese or (ethnic Japanese) (M. D. Miller et al., 1982; Lustig & Myers, 1983) Shatzer et al. (1984) found that Altruism ranked second out of 16 strategies for North Americans when considering all targets of perusasion (i.e.,

superior, co-worker, or subordinate) and first when the target was a co-worker. Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) reported higher percentages for messages coded as Altruism among North Americans in their two situations [using the Marwell and Schmitt (1967) coding scheme]; but neither of these differences was significant. Therefore hypothesis nine is stated as follows:

H_9: North Americans are more likely to use Altruistic messages than the Japanese.

To this point thirteen hypotheses or research questions have been proposed based on cultural differences in compliance-gaining strategy use. For the remaining eleven strategies from the combined typology of 24, it is difficult to posit hypotheses or questions based on either conceptual or empirical support. For example, Promise was reported as likely to be used significantly more by North Americans by both Lustig and Myers (1983) and Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) (in the "postponed date" situation). However, when the likelihood of use of this strategy is ranked, it is ranked consistently higher by the Japanese (M. D. Miller et al., 1982; Shatzer et al., 1984). Other strategies such as Positive Self-feeling, Negative Self-feeling, Positive Altercasting and Negative Altercasting received similar rankings when Japanese (or ethnic Japanese) were compared with North Americans. The reports of likelihood of use ratings between these two groups were not significantly different.

The remaining strategies (i.e., Allurement, Guilt, Warning, and Direct Request) come from the Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982) typology and have not been used extensively in cross-cultural compliance-gaining research [the sole exception being the Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) study.] Of these strategies, Neuliep and Hazelton (1984) did report that the percentage of messages that were coded as Direct Requests by the Japanese were significantly more than those generated by the North Americans in their "move" situation. Unfortunately this empirical evidence comes from only one study and without the needed conceptual basis is too weak to produce hypotheses or research questions.

Language of Administration

Language is an important variable to be considered in any cross-cultural investigation because of the close interrelationship between language and culture. It takes on significant importance in empirical research in cross-cultural studies because of the possible problem of confounding or attentuating effects produced by the language in which the research is conducted. The effects obtained in a study may be influenced in some way by "demand characteristics" inherent in the language used in the research. As an illustration, consider the following study.

In 1968, Ervin-Tripp reported the results of a bilingual experiment in the area of sociolinguistics. In her quasi-experimental study, Ervin-Tripp was interested in

the covariance of topic, audience, and language based on informant interviews of Japanese women living in the San Francisco area. Her first hypothesis stated that as language shifts (i.e., as speakers shift from using one language to another), the content of what is said will shift as well. She predicted that bilingual Japanese women will tend to show a content shift with the shift in language analogous to content differences manifested by monolingual American women and monolingual Japanese women (tested in Japan)--even though the context of communication is otherwise identical.

In the first part of her study, Ervin-Tripp (1968) had a Japanese interviewer visit each subject twice in the same setting and tape record the sessions. In the first interview only the Japanese language was spoken, in the second, only English. The verbal materials employed in the study were word associations, sentence completions, semantic differentials, problem stories, and Thematic Apperception Tests.

Ervin-Tripp (1968) reported that when the sentences that were spoken were weighted (by their frequency of occurence in the American and Japanese monolingual comparison groups), the bilingual women's sentences were significantly less "Japanese" in content when the women spoke in English. That is, when the same women's responses were given in different languages the responses <u>also</u> differed. The following example is a good illustration.

The informants heard and read the first half of the following sentence: "When my wishes conflict with my family. . .". The responses differed depending upon the language of the interview and interview materials. When one respondent completed the sentence in Japanese she said, "It is a time of great unhappiness." When the same woman responded in English, she said, "I do what I want." The former instance is more typical of Japanese culture, the latter of North American culture. This change in content could not be simulated by women who did not change language but were instructed to give "typically Japanese" or "typically American" answers at the two sessions. Ervin-Tripp commented that everything was held constant except language. She concluded that the change in the associations and the sentence completions were an effect of language and not of self-instruction or set. Ervin-Tripp had also reported similar findings when French bilinguals were studied (1964). Therefore, an additional hypothesis will be posited:

H_{10}: Japanese subjects who respond in the Japanese language will respond differently in terms of likelihood of use of compliance-gaining strategies than Japanese respondents who respond in English.

Implied in this hypothesis is the assumption that the pattern of differences will be analogous to the pattern of differences between the North Americans and Japanese in

general. That is, the Japanese responses in English will exemplify the same pattern as the North American responses in terms of comparative differences due to culture. The method for testing these hypotheses and research questions will now be discussed in Chapter Four.

Chapter Four

Method

This chapter contains three major sections. The first section describes the Japanese and North American subjects used in the study. The second section details the generation and utilization of research materials. The final section outlines the data collection and analysis procedures.

Description of the Sample

Japanese Subjects

There was a total of 41 Japanese subjects in the study. Twenty-three were males and seventeen females (one respondent did not indicate gender). The Japanese were all students at a large university in Michigan. Those used in the primary analysis had lived in the United States for less than three years. This criterion was established so the subjects would be less affected by enculturation into North American society than students who have lived in the United States for a longer period.

The actual amount of time each subject had been living in the United States ranged from one month to two years and two months, with a mean of 9.42 months (*SD* = 7.47), a median of 7 months, and a mode of 2 months. The ages of the Japanese ranged from 19 to 40, with a mean of 27.78 (*SD* = 4.69), a median of 27, and a mode of 25. Twenty-two of

the Japanese repondents grew up in an urban setting, fifteen grew up in a rural area, and four reported that they were from a suburban environment. Twenty-one of the Japanese were the first born in their families. The number of years that the respondents reported studying English ranged from 2 years to 20 years, with a mean of 9.71 (SD = 3.06), a mode of 9.4 years, and a median of 8 years.

Annual family income for the Japanese ranged from $15,000 to $73,000 per year. Income for the Japanese was reported in Japanese yen per annum and was converted into U.S. dollars at the exchange rate of $1.00 = 205 Japanese yen. The mean annual income was $36,920 (SD = 15,016) with a median of $34,167, and a mode of $49,000. The educational range for the Japanese varied from a high school diploma to PhD. The mean was a bachelors degree, with the median and the mode about equal to the mean. All Japanese subjects were volunteers. No extra credit was given for their participation.

North American Subjects

Forty students from a large university in Kentucky made up the North American sample. Their ages ranged from 20 years to 40, with a mean of 22.95 (SD = 4.10), a median of 21.61, and a mode of 21. Fifteen respondents grew up in an urban environment, 20 grew up in a rural setting, with the remaining 5 from suburban areas.

Half of the North Americans were males and half females. Fourteen were first-born children in their families. Annual income of their families ranged from $6,000 to over $100,000. Average family income per annum was $42,200 (SD = 25,595) with a median of $39,786, and a mode of $40,000. Education ranged from 2 years of college to a masters degree, with a mean of almost 4 years of college, a median close to 3 years of college, and a mode equal to 3 years of college. All of the North Americans were volunteers and either communication or telecommunication majors. No extra credit was given for their participation.

In summary, the Japanese and North American groups were fairly well matched. Minor differences did occur however. The Japanese had slightly more males than females (the North Americans had equal numbers). The Japanese were slightly older than the North Americans, and had a greater percentage from urban backgrounds. The North Americans reported a slightly higher annual income and education.

Research Materials

Research materials were generated in four stages. The first stage was designed to achieve persuasive situations high in representational validity (Folger & Poole, 1981). That is, the persuasive situations in which the respondents were to imagine themselves had to be culturally relevant to both the Japanese as well as the North Americans. One criticism of prior research is that most studies have used

persuasive situations that might be culturally relevant only to individuals from western culture. Therefore, in the first part of the generation of materials, six descriptions of persuasive situations typical of compliance-gaining scenarios in contemporary Japan were created.

Typical situations were collected from personal conversations with Japanese adults by a Japanese graduate student who traveled home to Japan from the United States. The Japanese adults were asked to provide examples of persuasive situations in which one person was trying to gain compliance of another. The situations were solicited in the Japanese language and written down in Japanese by the student. People were asked to imagine situations that varied in terms of: (a) the power relationship between the persuader and the target (higher/lower), (b) gender of the persuader and target, and (c) the perception of who would benefit from the persuasion. The Japanese student and his wife then took the scenarios and elaborated on them (in Japanese) to provide more information. The following are the English translations of six situations that were selected as best representative stimulus situations:

> Situation 1: Mr. Tanaka and his family were planning to visit his parents during the weekend. On Friday afternoon at Mr. Tanaka's work place, Mr. Yamada (a colleague of Mr. Tanaka) asks him to play golf together over the weekend. Rather reluctantly, Mr. Tanaka accepts Mr. Yamada's idea of playing golf in order to socialize with him. Now Mr. Tanaka is going to try and persuade his wife, Setsuko, to cancel their

original plans. Setsuko has already done all the necessary arrangements for the trip to the parents.

Situation 2: A local community is going to hold a meeting in which a new chairperson is to be elected for the coming term. Before the meeting has actually taken place, Mr. Komori, who represents the majority of the community members, is supposed to persuade Mr. Okada to be the chairperson. Mr. Komori knows that Mr. Okada will probably reject the offer by saying that, "I'm not the right person for such a task." What Mr. Okada says is not taken at face value since he is merely being humble. On the contrary, Mr. Okada is just the right person for the job. However, what bothers Mr. Okada is that the things he will do as chairperson will take up much of his time. How should Mr. Komori persuade Mr. Okada to be chairperson?

Situation 3: Mrs. Kida found out that her husband had been fickle and unfaithful. She was overly shocked by the fact because she believed that her husband was faithful in love. She became almost beside herself with grief and anger. Despite the fact that Mr. Kida apologized to his wife and swore an oath that he would be true to her, Mrs. Kida started thinking of divorcing her husband. One day, Mrs. Kida visited Mrs. Hori (who acted as a go-between with Mr. Hori to arrange the Kida's wedding) and asked for her advice to solve her problem. Now Mrs. Hori is going to try to persuade Mrs. Kida not to divorce her husband. How should she go about doing this?

Situation 4: Miss Ueda, a college student, has been commuting to her school for more than two years. It usually takes three hours for her to go to and from school. She now wants to rent a room near her college with a friend of hers, Miss Yoshida. Although the rent is much cheaper than the cost of commuting, her mother objects to her moving out. The main reason for her mother's reluctance is that away from her parents, Miss Ueda may fall into temptations of many kinds. How should Miss Ueda persuade her mother to let her rent a room near campus?

Situation 5: Mr. Hara, a high school student, has been working at a small restaurant for two years as a part-time employee. An older waitress knows that he has made a lot of mistakes in his job since he began. Now Mr. Hara lords over his junior part-time employees, and he scolds them in an authoritarian tone when he finds out even the smallest mistake they make. Sensing that Mr. Hara often disturbs the harmonious atmosphere among other workers at the

restaurant, the older waitress asks Mr. Okazaki (a retired senior partner who knows Mr. Hara well) to persuade Mr. Hara to alter the way he behaves toward the junior part-time employees. How should she go about doing this?

Situation 6: Mr. Doi, who has graduated from the university last spring, has been working at a part-time job, making as much money as he would from a full-time job. His father does not like this arrangement and wants his son to get a steady job in order to become a full-fledged member of society. How should his father go about persuading his son?

From these six situations, two were selected by a panel of two Japanese and two North Americans because they were fairly typical of both Japanese and North American culture (i.e., Situation 4 and Situation 6) . Situation 4 involves a young college girl who is trying to persuade her mother to allow her to get an apartment close to campus (hereafter called the Apartment situation). Situation 6 (hereafter called the Job situation) involves a father who is trying to persuade his son to settle down and get a full-time job.

In the second stage of materials development, the two compliance-gaining situations were used to inductively generate examples of specific statements (or messages) that might be made by the persuaders to their targets. Ten Japanese students (five males and five females), who had recently arrived in the United States, were used to generate the messages. The students were visiting a large university in Michigan for a short summer program in English and were asked (via a questionnaire in Japanese) to provide examples of compliance-gaining messages that might be used in each situation.

The questionnaire asked the respondents to imagine themselves as the persuader in the compliance-gaining situation that they were given. On the first page of the questionnaire, subjects were asked to write down (in Japanese) three statements that they might make in the particular situation to try to gain compliance. After the subject responded to the first page, he or she was asked on the second page to report three things that might be said as a "last resort," i.e., possibly the harshest things that might be said to gain compliance. This procedure was followed to elicit anti-social messages as well as pro-social messages. Earlier research has found that in initial interactions, subjects generally report using only pro-social messages to gain compliance. Only after the pro-social strategies have failed do persuaders try to use anti-social messages.

It must be noted that the questionnaire containing the compliance-gaining stimulus situations (The Apartment and Job situations) were presented to the respondents in Japanese. Moreover, the respondents were asked to write down in Japanese the specific compliance-gaining messages that they would use in the particular situations. This procedure was followed so that the Japanese respondents would read the research materials and respond to them in their native language, thus producing messages typically found in contemporary Japanese society. Japanese compliance-gaining messages produced in this way should not

be influenced by any systematic effect due to the research materials being presented in English. This rationale was based on research by Ervin-Tripp (1967).

Approximately 120 messages were generated from the two situations (i.e., 6 messages per respondent x 10 respondents x 2 persuasive situations). The messages were translated into English and examined by two North American judges to see if any examples were presented that might possibly typify a strategy found among the Japanese, but not reported among Westerners. None was found. In fact, the Japanese reported using threats (strategies not commonly associated with the Japanese stereotype) quite frequently when asked to provide "last resort" or "harsh" strategies. However, even though these strategies exist in the Japanese compliance-gaining repertoire, the question still remained whether these anti-social strategies would be used as frequently among the Japanese as among North Americans.

In the third stage, compliance-gaining messages were selected or created by two North American experts to be used in the major portion of the data collection. At least three messages were compiled for each of the 24 compliance-gaining strategies from the combined typologies of Marwell and Schmitt (1967), and Schenck-Hamlin et al. (1982). Multiple messages were used so that there would be no systematic effect due to one particular message. Actual messages generated by the Japanese respondents in stage two

were used as often as possible to provide representative examples of the strategies for the Japanese. When there were not enough Japanese messages to provide three examples for each strategy, additional messages were created in English. Messages were selected which were isomorphic with the conceptual definition of each strategy.

The final stage in the preparation of materials involved constructing the questionnaire. Each questionnaire was to include one of the compliance-gaining situations and a number of messages that might be uttered in that situation. Two equivalent forms of the questionnaire were constructed in both Japanese and English. This was done so true cultural differences could be assessed when examining preferential differences for particular compliance-gaining messages. In other words, rather than the effects being confounded due to differences in translation, true effects should be due only to cultural differences (because the materials are equivalent). The strength of cultural effects should not be attenuated, or confounded, by effects specific to the translation of the research materials.

Both the persuasive situations and the individual messages were translated from either English or Japanese, into the second language, and back again. This process of back-translation has been suggested by Sechrest, Fay and Zaidi (1976) to gain equivalence in cross-cultural research materials. Stress was placed upon reaching equivalence in

meaning rather than arriving at an exact literal translation. In all, 161 compliance-gaining messages were either created or selected from those generated by Japanese respondents in earlier stages.

Of this number, 77 compliance-gaining messages (representing the 24 strategies) were developed for the Apartment situation and 84 messages were developed for the Job situation. Initially it was planned to select 72 messages for each situation, i.e., 3 messages for each of the 24 strategies. However, when data was to be collected from most of the Japanese subjects, problems occurred that created a situation in which 76 messages were presented to respondents for each situation.

The problems arose because initially more than three messages for each strategy were generated. When these messages and translations were photocopied to be used in the research, the additional four messages were not eliminated. Therefore, in the first wave of the data collection 76 messages were given to the subjects (instead of 72). As a result, some strategies had more than three examples while others had less. Only two examples of the Positive Expertise and Negative Self-feeling strategies were presented to the respondents for the Job situation. For the Apartment situation, Positive Expertise had only one example; while Altruism, Positive Altercasting, Negative Altercasting, and Hinting had only two messages per strategy. All the remaining strategies had at least

three representative messages, with some having four messages.

Data Collection Procedures

Q Technique

Once the materials had been back-translated, the data were collected using Q technique (for discussions of Q methodology see Cattell, 1952; Guilford, 1954; Kerlinger, 1973; Mowrer, 1953; Nunnally, 1978; and Stephenson, 1952, 1953, 1967). Q technique is a method of data collection in which respondents are asked to sort items (individually printed on cards commonly called a Q deck) into separate categories (based upon a ranking criterion). In general, the categories into which the items are sorted are arrayed along a continuum anchored at both ends by antithetical statements.

One unique characteristic of this method, as Stephenson (1952, 1967) has outlined, is that the rating data for the individual messages are normalized procedurally rather than statistically. That is, respondents generally are asked to place a specific number of items in each of the categories. The exact number of items in each category is calculated so that when the items are sorted in front of the respondent, the array approximates the normal curve.

Q technique was used in order to gain the greatest utility in understanding the data. Q methodology can be used in an inductive mode to generate theory. Moreover, the data from the Q sort can be used to test hypotheses

(see, for example, Kerlinger, 1967; Nunnally, 1978; and Stephenson, 1953, 1967). In this study, Q methodology was used to: (a) test hypotheses of group differences in terms of the compliance-gaining strategies, and (b) to inductively discover preference of use rating patterns for the compliance-gaining messages among the various groups.

Q Sort Procedure

The actual Q sort was conducted in the following way. Each respondent was given a description of one of the two persuasive situations. Two groups of Japanese respondents received descriptions of the situations in Japanese. One group received the Apartment situation (n = 14); the other received the Job situation (n = 10). Two additional groups of Japanese respondents received the two persuasive situations in English. The n for the Apartment situation group was 9; the n for the Job situation group was 8. In addition, the two North American groups received the situations in English (one situation per group). The n for each of these was 20. The total N for the entire sample was 81. This arrangement created a 3 x 2 (Groups x Situations) factorial design.

For the present study, the individual items that were sorted were the 76 compliance-gaining messages created for each persuasive situation (representing the 24 compliance-gaining strategies). Respondents were asked to sort the individual messages into 11 categories ranging from those that they definitely would use to those that they

definitely would not use. They were instructed to place three cards in the first category (rank 1), four cards in the next (rank 2), and so on. The middle category (rank 6) contained twelve cards. After rank 6, the number of cards in each category was reversed in descending order so that the final category (i.e., rank 11) contained three cards (the same number as in rank 1).

After sorting, each individual message was given (for coding purposes) a score from 1 (definitely would use) to 11 (definitely would not use) depending upon placement in the Q sort. Later the values were reversed for data analysis.

Because the 24 compliance-gaining strategies are correlated, MANOVA was used to test strategy use differences among the groups. In addition to testing for treatment group and situation main effects, contrasts assessed differences between: (a) the average of the combined Japanese groups and the North Americans, and (b) the Japanese who responded in Japanese and the Japanese who responded in English. Contrast interactions were examined as well.

As a supplement, the data were analyzed using traditional Q methodology that correlates subjects rather than variables. These analyses resulted in the identification of particular types (or clusters) of subjects that demonstrated a preference (or disdain) for the compliance-gaining messages in each persuasive

situation. The results of the primary and supplementary analyses will now be reported in Chapter Five.

Chapter Five

Results

This chapter is divided into two major sections. Section one reports the results of the overall MANOVA analyses and a priori comparisons that tested the hypotheses and research questions. Section two contains the results of the supplementary analyses from the Q technique. This latter approach is more inductive and presents generalizations concerning "types" or clusters of individuals in terms of how they have responded to the entire set of the compliance-gaining messages.

Measurement Considerations

The dependent measure indices were created for each of the 24 compliance-gaining strategies by summing the message items that represented the specific strategy. Separate indices were created for each of the two compliance-gaining situations used in the study. Initial coefficient alpha reliabilities were low in most cases. Because of the way in which the representative messages were created (i.e., in two different languages by members of two diverse cultures) low reliabilities are not to be unexpected. However, an attempt was made to increase reliability of the measures. Items that lowered the reliability of each subscale were dropped. Whenever possible, a minimum of at least two items were retained for each index. Appendix A contains

the final items that made up each of the indices created for the 24 compliance-gaining strategies in the Apartment situation. Appendix B lists the final items making up the indices for the 24 strategies for the Job situation. Reliabilities are reported as Cronbach's coefficient alpha.

Test of Hypotheses and Research Questions

The three treatment groups in this study were composed of: (a) Japanese subjects who read and responded to the research materials in the Japanese language, (b) Japanese subjects who read and responded to the research materials in English, and (c) North American subjects who read and responded to the materials (that had been back-translated from Japanese) in English. Multivariate analyses of variance were performed initially to determine if there were significant differences among the three treatment groups, significant differences between the two persuasive situations, and any significant groups by situation interactions (in terms of use ratings for all of the 24 compliance-gaining strategies). This arrangement produced a 3 x 2 (Groups by Situations) factoral design that was analyzed using the MANOVA subprogram in SPSS-X (SPSS-X Inc., 1983). Interactions were tested first, and then main effects for Groups and Situations.

The hypotheses and research questions were tested by two planned comparisons. The first contrast compared the

average of the mean use rating for the two Japanese groups with the mean for the North Americans. Possible Groups by Situations contrast interactions were also tested. This contrast looked for effects due to culture. The second contrast compared the Japanese group who participated in the study in Japanese with the Japanese group who participated in English. Again, possible contrast interactions with the persuasive situations were tested. This contrast looked for effects due to language of administration. The treatment group factor was partitioned into two components (with one degree of freedom) for each of the orthogonal contrasts. The regression model sums of squares (weighted squares of means) was used because of the unbalanced design (Nie & Hull, 1981).

In this design, subjects were nested within each of six cells. Subjects in each cell received only one of the persuasive situations in only one language. Barlett's test of sphericity performed on the data supported the assumption that the 24 compliance-gaining strategies were intercorrelated, $\underline{F}(276) = 543.61$, $\underline{p} < .01$. Table 1 lists the cell means, standard deviations, and main effect means for the likelihood of use ratings for each of the 24 compliance-gaining strategies.

Table 1

Means and Standard Deviations

for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
1. Positive Expertise				
Apt.	7.93 (1.38)[a]	7.56 (2.29)[b]	9.20 (1.01)[c]	8.27
Job	7.75 (1.21)[d]	8.75 (1.44)[e]	8.48 (1.12)[f]	8.33
Total	7.78	8.28	8.84	
2. Negative Expertise				
Apt.	7.14 (1.17)	6.00 (1.41)	6.63 (1.22)	6.65
Job	8.35 (1.90)	7.69 (1.39)	7.08 (1.14)	7.70
Total	7.78	8.28	8.84	
3. Positive Self-feeling				
Apt.	5.61 (1.53)	6.22 (1.37)	6.85 (1.01)	6.13
Job	7.15 (1.58)	8.38 (1.30)	9.23 (1.32)	8.25
Total	6.38	7.16	8.04	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
4. Negative Self-feeling				
Apt.	6.21 (1.44)	5.94 (1.45)	5.48 (1.11)	5.96
Job	7.35 (1.11)	6.63 (1.13)	6.68 (1.77)	6.88
Total	6.81	6.38	6.08	
5. Positive Esteem				
Apt.	4.10 (1.42)	5.33 (0.75)	4.45 (0.96)	4.59
Job	5.25 (1.23)	6.38 (1.33)	4.68 (1.39)	5.43
Total	4.76	5.72	4.56	
6. Negative Esteem				
Apt.	3.89 (1.32)	3.83 (1.00)	3.93 (0.89)	3.87
Job	6.05 (1.80)	5.75 (2.42)	4.98 (1.28)	5.59
Total	5.01	4.74	4.45	
7. Altruism				
Apt.	7.71 (1.31)	7.89 (1.29)	6.50 (0.89)	7.24
Job	4.17 (1.01)	3.79 (1.25)	4.48 (1.25)	4.15
Total	5.90	5.69	5.49	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
8. Warning				
Apt.	6.00 (1.92)	5.17 (2.06)	6.35 (1.72)	5.90
Job	6.70 (1.51)	7.00 (1.31)	7.38 (1.58)	7.03
Total	6.38	6.14	6.86	
9. Guilt				
Apt.	4.57 (1.92)	3.56 (1.78)	4.13 (1.20)	4.18
Job	7.50 (0.88)	7.38 (1.27)	4.88 (1.39)	6.58
Total	5.98	5.66	4.50	
10. Allurement				
Apt.	5.71 (2.08)	5.17 (2.00)	6.25 (0.84)	5.61
Job	6.00 (1.76)	7.13 (1.36)	7.15 (1.38)	6.76
Total	5.72	6.13	6.70	
11. Explanation				
Apt.	9.96 (1.31)	8.44 (1.45)	8.93 (1.03)	9.15
Job	7.70 (1.25)	7.31 (1.64)	6.15 (1.17)	7.05
Total	8.83	7.93	7.54	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
12. Threat				
Apt.	3.55 (2.09)	3.07 (1.79)	2.52 (1.72)	3.15
Job	4.60 (1.74)	3.38 (1.33)	3.53 (1.81)	3.83
Total	4.10	3.35	3.02	
13. Aversive Stimulation				
Apt.	4.75 (1.98)	4.00 (1.90)	4.05 (1.71)	4.30
Job	3.95 (1.99)	4.44 (2.04)	4.20 (1.43)	4.20
Total	4.33	4.29	4.13	
14. Positive Altercasting				
Apt.	6.04 (1.73)	7.33 (1.00)	5.30 (0.92)	6.14
Job	6.60 (0.84)	7.63 (1.66)	8.23 (1.54)	7.48
Total	6.37	7.31	6.76	
15. Negative Altercasting				
Apt.	4.32 (1.50)	4.06 (1.13)	2.60 (1.07)	3.63
Job	6.47 (1.33)	5.08 (1.82)	4.30 (1.14)	5.28
Total	5.47	4.45	3.45	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
16. Moral Appeal				
Apt.	6.05 (1.25)	5.48 (1.55)	4.07 (1.13)	5.18
Job	7.95 (2.14)	7.19 (2.19)	4.68 (1.41)	6.60
Total	6.98	6.34	4.37	
17. Ingratiation				
Apt.	5.64 (1.84)	6.15 (1.44)	6.85 (1.59)	6.22
Job	6.85 (1.31)	5.63 (1.38)	6.33 (1.46)	6.27
Total	6.24	5.90	6.59	
18. Promise				
Apt.	7.38 (1.66)	7.92 (1.24)	6.93 (1.10)	7.44
Job	4.50 (0.82)	4.06 (1.50)	6.45 (1.50)	5.00
Total	6.03	5.95	6.69	
19. Liking				
Apt.	6.24 (1.55)	7.07 (1.67)	6.57 (0.92)	6.60
Job	4.50 (1.55)	7.13 (1.77)	5.75 (1.12)	5.79
Total	5.33	7.11	6.16	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Groups

Situations

	Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
20. Pre-giving				
Apt.	5.21 (1.59)	4.56 (1.63)	5.48 (1.25)	5.13
Job	2.80 (0.95)	3.38 (1.13)	4.88 (1.21)	3.68
Total	3.96	4.10	5.18	
21. Debt				
Apt.	3.52 (1.62)	5.59 (1.61)	5.48 (1.36)	4.81
Job	3.40 (2.05)	4.56 (1.43)	2.88 (1.36)	3.61
Total	3.47	4.99	4.18	
22. Bargaining				
Apt.	7.04 (1.67)	5.56 (1.63)	8.00 (1.26)	6.75
Job	4.50 (1.50)	4.83 (1.81)	7.50 (1.64)	5.61
Total	5.60	5.19	7.75	
23. Direct Request				
Apt.	7.64 (1.79)	6.83 (2.28)	8.50 (1.77)	7.63
Job	7.13 (1.77)	5.46 (0.89)	6.92 (1.20)	6.50
Total	7.33	6.16	7.71	

(table continues)

Means and Standard Deviations
for each Compliance-Gaining Strategy

Situations	Groups: Japanese/ Japanese	Japanese/ English	North American	Total
24. Hinting				
Apt.	7.57 (2.17)	5.00 (2.35)	6.35 (1.35)	6.37
Job	4.75 (1.34)	4.56 (1.84)	6.35 (1.48)	4.87
Total	6.21	4.83	5.83	

Note. The higher the mean, the greater the likelihood of use. Standard deviations in parenthesis.
[a]n = 14, [b]n = 9, [c]n = 20, [d]n = 10, [e]n = 8, [f]n = 20.

Main Findings

Overall Comparisions of Treatment Groups

Multivariate Tests

A significant multivariate groups by situations interaction was obtained, Wilk's lambda = .17, approximate $F(48, 104) = 3.08$, $p < .01$. In addition, significant multivariate main effects were found due to the three treatment group conditions, Wilk's lambda = .08, approximate $F(48, 104) = 5.74$, $p < .01$. Significant multivariate main effects were also found for the two persuasive situations, Wilk's lambda = .09, approximate $F(24, 52) = 22.20$, $p < .01$. The significant results of these omnibus tests suggested that the relationships between the independent and dependent variables be examined in detail.

Univariate Tests

Groups by Situations Interactions

Significant groups by situations interactions were found for 7 of the 24 compliance-gaining strategies. These were: Altruism, $F(2, 75) = 6.09$, $p < .01$; Guilt, $F(2, 75) = 8.39$, $p = .001$; Positive Altercasting, $F(2, 75) = 8.66$, $p < .001$; Promise, $F(2, 75) = 11.60$, $p < .001$; Pregiving, $F(2, 75) = 3.54$, $p < .05$; Debt, $F(2, 75) = 5.13$, $p < .01$; and Bargaining, $F(2, 75) = 3.34$, $p < .05$. These interactions overrode main effects for group membership and persuasive situation for these strategies. The contrast interactions, which are of greater interest in this

research design, are discussed below.

Main Effects for the Treatment Groups

Fifteen significant univariate effects were found when assessing main effects due to the three treatment group conditions. These were: Positive Expertise, $F(2, 75) = 4.36$, $p < .05$; Negative Expertise, $F(2, 75) = 3.77$, $p < .05$; Positive Self-feeling, $F(2, 75) = 11.51$, $p < .001$; Positive Esteem, $F(2, 75) = 7.13$, $p = .001$; Guilt, $F(2, 75) = 8.93$, $p < .001$; Explanation, $F(2, 75) = 7.91$, $p = .001$; Positive Altercasting, $F(2, 75) = 3.72$, $p < .05$; Negative Altercasting, $F(2, 75) = 17.32$, $p < .001$; Moral Appeal, $F(2, 75) = 24.51$, $p < .001$; Liking, $F(2, 75) = 8.05$, $p = .001$; Pre-giving, $F(2, 75) = 8.22$, $p = .001$; Debt, $F(2, 75) = 5.44$, $p < .01$; Bargaining, $F(2, 75) = 21.15$, $p < .001$; Direct Request, $F(2, 75) = 5.42$; $< .01$; and Hinting, $F(2, 75) = 3.36$, $p < .05$. The differences among the three groups are examined below and the results of the a priori contrasts are reported.

Main Effects for Persuasive Situation

Significant univariate main effects due to persuasive situation were found for twenty compliance-gaining strategies. These were: Negative Expertise, $F(1, 75) = 12.45$, $p = .001$; Positive Self-feeling, $F(1, 75) = 41.00$, $p < .001$; Negative Self-feeling, $F(1, 75) = 9.19$, $p < .01$; Positive Esteem, $F(1, 75) = 7.80$, $p < .01$; Negative Esteem, $F(1, 75) = 26.45$, $p < .001$; Altruism, $F(1, 75) = 137.32$, $p < .001$; Warning, $F(1, 75) = 8.58$, $p < .01$; Guilt,

$F(1, 75) = 53.63$, $p < .001$; Allurement, $F(1, 75) = 8.18$, $p < .01$; Explanation, $F(1, 75) = 47.61$, $p < .001$; Positive Altercasting, $F(1, 75) = 15.77$, $p < .001$; Negative Altercasting, $F(1, 75) = 28.01$, $p < .001$; Moral Appeal, $F(1, 75) = 14.93$, $p < .001$; Promise, $F(1, 75) = 56.43$, $p < .001$; Liking, $F(1, 75) = 6.75$, $p < .05$; Pre-giving, $F(1, 75) = 20.20$, $p < .001$; Debt, $F(1, 75) = 11.83$; $p < .001$; Bargaining, $F(1, 75) = 11.49$; $p < .001$; Direct Request, $F(1, 75) = 8.73$, $p < .01$; and Hinting, $F(1, 75) = 12.39$, $p < .001$.

Higher use ratings were reported in the Apartment situation than in the Job situation for Altruism, Explanation, Promise, Liking, Pre-giving, Debt, Bargaining, Direct Request and Hinting (regardless of culture or language of administration). Higher use ratings were found in the Job situation than in the Apartment situation for Negative Expertise, Positive Self-feeling, Negative Self-feeling, Positive Esteem, Negative Esteem, Warning, Guilt, Allurement, Positive Altercasting, Negative Altercasting, and Moral Appeal (regardless of culture or language of administration).

Tests of Hypotheses

Culture Effects: Comparing Japanese with North Americans

This contrast compared the mean of the Japanese groups to the mean of the North American group.

Contrast Interactions

A significant multivariate Groups by Situations contrast interaction was found, Wilk's lambda = .31, $F(24, 52) = 4.92$, $p < .01$. Subsequent univariate analyses resulted in seven significant contrast interactions. These were: Positive Expertise, $F(1, 75) = 4.10$, $p < .05$; Altruism, $F(1, 75) = 12.06$, $p = .001$; Guilt, $F(1, 75) = 16.51$, $p < .001$; Positive Altercasting, $F(1,75) = 17.29$, $p < .001$; Promise, $F(1, 75) = 22.82$, $p < .001$, Pre-giving, $F(1, 75) = 4.14$, $p < .05$; and Debt, $F(1, 75) = 8.67$, $p < .01$.

The Japanese reported using Altruism, Positive Altercasting, and Promise strategies more than North Americans in the Apartment situation, and less than the North Americans in the Job situation. The Japanese and North American ratings for Guilt were about equal in the Apartment situation. However, the Japanese gave much higher ratings for Guilt strategies than the North Americans in the Job situation.

The North Americans used Positive Expertise, Pre-giving, and Debt strategies more than the Japanese in the Apartment situation. For the Job situation, North Americans used Positive Expertise and Pre-giving strategies

more than the Japanese, but had lower ratings than the Japanese for Debt.

Contrast Effects for Culture

A significant contrast effect for culture was obtained using multivariate analysis of variance, Wilk's lambda = .21, $F(24, 52) = 7.99$, $p < .01$. Subsequent univariate analyses resulted in eight significant differences due to culture. These were: Positive Self-feeling, $F(1, 75) = 16.07$, $p < .001$; Positive Esteem, $F(1, 75) = 6.58$, $p < .05$; Allurement, $F(1, 75) = 4.06$, $p < .05$; Explanation, $F(1, 75) = 8.41$, $p < .01$; Negative Altercasting, $F(1, 75) = 27.83$, $p < .001$; Moral Appeal, $F(1, 75) = 44.50$, $p < .001$; Bargaining, $F(1, 75) = 42.12$, $p < .001$; and Direct Request, $F(1, 75) = 6.67$, $p < .05$.

The Japanese reported using Positive Esteem, Allurement, Explanation, Negative Altercasting, and Moral Appeal strategies significantly more than the North Americans regardless of persuasive situation. The North Americans reported using, Positive Self-feeling, Bargaining, and Direct Request strategies significantly more than the Japanese regardless of persuasive situation.

Language Effects: Comparing the Two Japanese Groups

This contrast compared the mean of the Japanese group that participated in Japanese with the mean of the Japanese group that participated in English.

Contrast Interactions

A significant multivariate groups by situation contrast interaction was found, Wilk's lambda = .53, approximate $F(24, 52) = 1.88$, $p < .05$. Subsequent univariate analyses resulted in two contrast interactions: Liking $F(1\ 75) = 4.29$, $p < .05$; and Hinting $F(1, 75) = 4.72$, $p < .05$.

Contrast Effects due to Language

Significant multivariate contrast effects were obtained due to the language used by the Japanese, Wilk's lambda = .37, approximate $F(24, 52) = 3.63$, $p < .01$. Subsequent univariate tests resulted in contrast effects for eight strategies due to language. These were: Negative Expertise, $F(1, 75) = 4.52$, $p < .05$; Positive Self-feeling, $F(1, 75) = 4.69$, $p < .05$; Positive Esteem $F(1, 75) = 9.26$, $p < .01$; Explanation, $F(1, 75) = 5.66$, $p < .05$; Positive Altercasting, $F(1, 75) = 7.41$, $p < .01$; Negative Altercasting, $F(1, 75) = 4.00$, $p < .05$; Debt, $F(1, 75) = 10.87$, $p = .001$; and Direct Request, $F(1\ 75) = 5/58$, $p < .05$.

The Japanese who participated in English used Negative Expertise, Explanation, Negative Altercasting, and Direct Request more than those who participated in English. The Japanese who participated in English used Positive Self-feeling, Positive Esteem, Positive Altercasting, and Debt more than the Japanese participating in Japanese.

Summary

Earlier, it was posited (H_1 through H_6) that the Japanese would use the strategies of Positive Expertise, Liking, Pre-giving, Ingratiation, Explanation, and Hinting significantly more than North Americans. Of these, the Japanese were found to use only Explanation (H_5) more than North Americans. Significant interactions were found for Positive Expertise (H_1) and Pre-giving (H_3). These interactions prevented interpreting main effects for culture.

Moreover, it was proposed that North Americans would use the strategies of Threat, Aversive Stimulation, and Altruism (H_7 through H_9) significantly more than the Japanese. None of these hypotheses were confirmed. However, a significant interaction was found for Altruism (H_9), again preventing an interpretation of main effects. The tenth hypothesis that posited language differences between the two Japanese groups parallel to cultural differences received only partial support.

Research questions (Q_1 through Q_4) were posed concerning the strategies of Debt, Moral Appeal, Positive Esteem, and Negative Esteem. The Japanese were found to use Moral Appeal (Q_2) and Positive Esteem (Q_3) significantly more than North Americans. A significant interaction was found for Debt (Q_1). Table 2 presents the results of the tests of hypotheses and research questions.

Table 3 presents significant relationships that were revealed in this study that were not initially hypothesized. Table 4 contains a ranking of means (in descending order of use) for the 24 compliance-gaining strategies in the Apartment Situation for both the Japanese and North Americans. The mean use rankings in descending order for the Job Situation are found in Table 5. The ramifications of these results for theory and research in the area of cross-cultural persuasion will be discussed in Chapter Six.

Table 2

Summary of Results for Hypotheses and Research Questions

Hypothesized Cultural Relationships

Hypothesis	Compliance-gaining Strategy	Results
	Japanese > North Americans	
H_1:	Positive Expertise	interaction*
H_2:	Liking	nsd
H_3:	Pre-giving	interaction*
H_4:	Ingratiation	nsd
H_5:	Explanation	JAP > NA**
H_6:	Hinting	nsd
	North Americans > Japanese	
H_7:	Threat	nsd
H_8:	Aversive Stimulation	nsd
H_9:	Altruism	interaction**
	Research Questions	
Q_1:	Debt	interaction**
Q_2:	Moral Appeal	JAP > NA***
Q_3:	Positive Esteem	JAP > NA*
Q_4:	Negative Esteem	nsd

Note. Comparisons are based on the mean of the combined Japanese groups versus the mean for North Americans.
JAP = Japanese, NA = North Americans.
*p < .05; **p < .01; ***p < .001

Table 3

Unpostulated Cultural Relationships

Compliance-gaining Strategy	Relationship	Significance
Positive Self-feeling	NA > JAP	$p < .001$
Guilt	interaction	$p < .001$
Positive Altercasting	interaction	$p < .001$
Negative Altercasting	JAP > NA	$p < .001$
Promise	interaction	$p < .001$
Bargaining	NA > JAP	$p < .001$
Direct Request	NA > JAP	$p < .05$
Allurement	NA > JAP	$p < .05$

Note. Comparisons are based on the mean for the combined Japanese groups versus the mean for North Americans. JAP = Japanese, NA = North Americans.

Table 4

Ranking of Mean Use Ratings for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

Apartment Situation

	Japanese		N. American	
1.	Explanation	9.20	Pos. Expertise	9.20
2.	Altruism	7.80	Explanation	8.93
3.	Pos. Expertise	7.75	Direct Request	8.50
4.	Promise	7.65	Bargaining	8.00
5.	Direct Request	7.24	Promise	6.93
6.	Pos. Altercasting	6.69	Pos. Self-feeling	6.85
7.	Liking	6.66	Ingratiation	6.85
8.	Neg. Expertise	6.57	Neg. Expertise	6.63
9.	Bargaining	6.30	Liking	6.57
10.	Hinting	6.29	Altruism	6.50
11.	Neg. Self-feeling	6.08	Warning	6.35
12.	Pos. Self-feeling	5.92	Hinting	6.35
13.	Ingratiation	5.90	Allurement	6.25
14.	Moral Appeal	5.77	Neg. Self-feeling	5.48
15.	Warning	5.59	Pre-giving	5.48
16.	Allurement	5.44	Debt	5.48
17.	Pre-giving	4.89	Pos. Altercasting	5.30
18.	Pos. Esteem	4.72	Pos. Esteem	4.45
19.	Debt	4.56	Guilt	4.13
20.	Avers. Stimulation	4.38	Moral Appeal	4.07
21.	Neg. Altercasting	4.19	Avers. Stimulation	4.05

(table continues)

Apartment Situation

Japanese		N. American	
22. Guilt	4.07	Neg. Esteem	3.93
23. Neg. Esteem	3.86	Neg. Altercasting	2.60
24. Threat	3.31	Threat	2.52

Note. Use ratings ranged from 1 (definitely would not use) to 11 (definitely would use)

Table 5

Ranking of Mean Use Ratings for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

Job Situation

	Japanese		N. American	
1.	Pos. Expertise	8.25	Pos. Self-feeling	9.23
2.	Neg. Expertise	8.02	Pos. Expertise	8.48
3.	Pos. Self-feeling	7.77	Pos. Altercasting	8.23
4.	Moral Appeal	7.57	Bargaining	7.50
5.	Explanation	7.51	Warning	7.38
6.	Guilt	7.44	Allurement	7.15
7.	Pos. Altercasting	7.07	Neg. Expertise	7.08
8.	Neg. Self-feeling	6.99	Direct Request	6.92
9.	Warning	6.85	Neg. Self-feeling	6.68
10.	Allurement	6.57	Promise	6.45
11.	Direct Request	6.30	Ingratiation	6.33
12.	Ingratiation	6.24	Explanation	6.15
13.	Negative Esteem	5.90	Liking	5.75
14.	Pos. Esteem	5.82	Hinting	5.30
15.	Liking	5.82	Neg. Esteem	4.98
16.	Neg. Altercasting	5.78	Guilt	4.88
17.	Bargaining	4.67	Pre-giving	4.88
18.	Hinting	4.66	Pos. Esteem	4.68
19.	Promise	4.28	Moral Appeal	4.68
20.	Avers. Stimulation	4.20	Altruism	4.48
21.	Threat	3.99	Neg. Altercasting	4.30
22.	Altruism	3.98	Avers. Stimulation	4.20

(table continues)

Job Situation

Japanese		N. American	
23. Debt	3.98	Threat	3.53
24. Pre-giving	3.09	Debt	2.88

Note. Use ratings ranged from 1 (definitely would not use) to 11 (definitely would use)

Supplementary Analyses

The Q analysis represents a more inductive approach to understanding how individuals use compliance-gaining messages. More specifically, Q technique is able to identify clusters or groups of individuals (i.e., "types") who report a similar preference (or disdain) for using particular compliance-gaining messages. In this instance, respondents are grouped together (i.e., "factored") based upon their ratings of the specific compliance-gaining messages. The earlier portion of the results reported the findings of differences in terms of use of compliance-gaining strategies. The present section deals with the clusters of respondents that were produced due to similarities or dissimilarities in compliance-gaining message use.

The Q matrix was factor analyzed using the principal factors method with Oblimax rotation. Squared multiple correlations (SMC) were used in the diagonal of the association matrix. Due to the fact that different message items were created for each of the two persuasive situations, items for each situation were analyzed separately. Respondents in the three treatment groups for each persuasive situation were combined and factored. Specific types (or clusters) of respondents were identified in terms of how they rated whether they definitely would, or would not, use the individual message items.

One of the conventions in interpreting Q results is to rely primarily on: a) items with Z-scores greater than +1.0 or less than -1.0, b) differences between Z-scores which exceed an absolute value of 1.0, and c) consensus items (i.e., messages) that the types of individuals use in much the same way (Van Tubergen, 1980). This emphasizes items placed in the two or three ranking categories at either end of the sorting distribution, i.e., those items that typal members definitely would or would not use.

Q Analyses for the Apartment Situation

Type I Individuals

When the respondents for all three groups were combined and factor analyzed, a two factor solution best fit the data. Two types of individuals emerged. Type I was composed of 33 respondents: fifteen were Japanese and 18 were North Americans. Of the Japanese members, eight participated in the research in Japanese and seven participated in English. This typal cluster contained all of the North American subjects for this persuasive situation except two.

The Type I individuals preferred messages that involved some type of analytical reasoning or explanation. They might be termed more "western" in orientation. They definitely would use strategies that explained reasons for getting an apartment, e.g., to learn new responsibilities, it would be a good experience, it would save time and money, it would allow more time for study, it would be more

economical, and that the experience would make the girl more mature and prepared for life as an adult. The messages that Type I individuals definitely would use (i.e., that have Z-scores of 1.0 and above) are found in Appendix C. The messages that have the three highest Z-scores are those that were most preferred.

Type I individuals would not use messages that involved threats or aversive stimulation. For example, the three messages rated as those that they most definitely would not use involved leaving home, refusing to talk to the parents, or refusing to go to school in order to force the parents' permission. Appendix C contains those messages that would definitely not be used by the Type I individuals (i.e., the messages with the Z-scores less than -1.0). Again, the lowest three messages were those least preferred.

Type II Individuals

The Type II cluster was composed of 13 individuals. Eleven were Japanese and only 2 were North American. Seven of the Japanese participated in Japanese, and six in English. This typal cluster may be termed more "Japanese" in nature. Like the Type I individuals, members of the Type II cluster preferred using explanation messages. They said they definitely would use messages that explained reasons the daughter needed to get the apartment, e.g., to save time, to study more, to get better grades, and because the travel time adversely affects studying. In addition,

Type II individuals selected messages that involve some type of promise, or fulfillment of some type of societal role obligation, e.g., a promise to do well in school, to visit, and to phone frequently. Examples of these messages (Z-scores > 1.0) are found in Appendix D.

Type II individuals reported that they would not use strategies involving any type of ingratiation, e.g., buying a small gift or present, or "buttering-up" the mother by telling her that she is a good homemaker. This type of individual also would not use messages that alluded to the fact that others would think more or less of the mother. Examples of these messages (Z-scores < -1.0) are found in Appendix D.

Both Type I and Type II individuals would use a number of items in the same way (see Appendix E). For example, both groups stated a preference for messages involving some type of explanation or statement of rationale. On the other hand, both typal groups demonstrated that they definitely would not use messages involving what the mother's friends thought of her, or her decision, nor messages involving the mother's indebtedness to her daughter, or some type of negative altercasting.

There were a number of messages that demonstrated differences between the two types. These are found in Appendix F. In contrast to Type II individuals, Type I individuals preferred using a strategy reminding the parents that they have done a good job raising their

daughter and this should be sufficient rationale for allowing her to move out. In contrast to Type I individuals, Type II individuals would definitely not use messages that involved ingratiation, e.g., that her mother is loving and trusting, that her parents have been good parents, or messages involving buying a small present or gift for the mother. In addition, Type I individuals reported that they would definitely not use messages that involved threats, guilt, or aversive stimulation. Type II individuals also would not use threats, but not to the same degree as Type I individuals.

Q Analyses for the Job Situation

When the respondents that sorted message items for the Job situation were factor analyzed, two factors again emerged. These two factors were "purer" in terms of cultural identity than the factors for the Apartment situation. That is, most of the individuals in the Type I cluster were North Americans. Of the 21 individuals in this group, only two were Japanese (both of whom participated in English). Most of the members of the Type II cluster were Japanese. Of the 17 individuals in this group, only one was North American. The Type II cluster contained nine Japanese who participated in the Q sort in Japanese, and eight Japanese who participated in English.

Type I Individuals

Type I (i.e., "western") individuals demonstrated a preference for messages involving security,

self-satisfaction, independence, and feeling good about one's self. They also selected messages that focused on financial considerations, e.g., getting pay increases, a secure future, more money, and having the father defray additional costs. Type I individuals would not use messages that dealt with playing on indebtedness to the father, threats by the father to restrict privileges, and threats of anger by the father. Appendix G contains messages that would (Z-score > 1.0), and would not be (Z-score < -1.0), used by Type I individuals.

Type II Individuals

Type II (i.e., "Japanese") individuals would use messages that involved societal expectations, sitting down and relaxing before talking about getting a full-time job, and self-satisfaction. They also preferred messages that focused on a secure future, thinking of things in the long run, and greater independence. Examples of the messages that Type II individuals prefer are found in Appendix G (Z-scores > 1.0).

Type II people would not use messages that involve giving favors or incentives to the son prior to seeking compliance, e.g., those dealing with allowing the son to get a car, giving the son a camera, or to helping to pay the rent. To a lesser extent they would not use messages that focused on the son sacrificing for the father's sake, taking away privileges, or indebtedness to the father. Type II individuals would not use messages that involved

the threat of anger by the father. Messages that Type II individuals would and would not use are found in Appendix H.

Both Type I and Type II individuals demonstrated a preference for messages involving security, self-satisfaction, and sitting down and relaxing before talking about getting a full-time job. Both clusters also preferred messages that focused on independence, and not thinking of things on a short-term basis. Other favorable consensus messages also focused on self-pride and greater self-discipline. Both clusters would not use messages concerning taking away privileges, indebtedness to the father or family, and threats of anger on the part of the father for non-compliance. Consensus items for Types I and II individuals in the Job situation are found in Appendix I.

Appendix J contains messages that demonstrated the greatest differences between Type I and Type II individuals for the Job Situation. Type I individuals demonstrated a greater preference for items involving expenses and financial support. In contrast to Type I individuals, Type II individuals stated that they would not use messages such as allowing the son to get a car or a camera, or suggestions of financial support and paying expenses. In contrast to Type II individuals, Type I individuals would not use messages such as the family would be disappointed in the son if he did not get a full-time job; or that he

would be an uappreciative son, immature, irresponsible, short-sighted, or in some way morally wrong for not seeking full-time employment. On the other hand, Type II individuals stated a preference for messages involving moral obligations and the fulfillment of role obligations in society. A discussion of the conclusions are found in Chapter Six.

Chapter Six

Conclusions

The main purposes of this research were twofold: (a) to compare the Japanese and North Americans in terms of their use of compliance-gaining strategies, and (b) to assess the effects of language of administration in cross-cultural research materials. In addition, the research design permitted an examination of how the situation in which persuasion occurs influences the use of compliance-gaining strategies. The Q technique provided a more inductive approach into examining the similar subjective evaluations of compliance-gaining message use which operate among clusters or types of individuals.

The main findings are as follows. First, cultural differences (as well as similarities) were found between the Japanese and North Americans in using particular compliance-gaining strategies. Second, the language in which the Japanese subjects participated in the research did affect the use of compliance-gaining strategies, but in a limited, unsystematic way. In addition, situational differences were found to have an important influence upon compliance-gaining strategy use for both the Japanese and North Americans. Particularly important was the power relationship between persuader and target. Finally, specific types of individuals were found to use differing

compliance-gaining messages as the persuasive situation varied. That is, there are clusters of individuals that subjectively perceive using compliance-gaining messages in much the same way, in the same circumstances. These types, however, are not completely isomorphic with cultural groupings or identity.

Results of the Tests of Hypotheses Pertaining to Culture

Japanese Preferences

Hypotheses one through six predicted that the Japanese would use the compliance-gaining strategies of: (a) Positive Expertise, (b) Liking, (c) Pre-giving, (d) Ingratiation, (e) Explanation, and (f) Hinting more than North Americans. Of these, the Japanese were found to use the Explanation strategy significantly more than North Americans.

Significant culture by situation interactions were found for Positive Expertise and Pre-giving. By examining the means in these interactions, it can be seen that the North Americans (not the Japanese) use these strategies more in both situations. However, the interactions rule out any interpretations based solely on culture.

No significant differences were found for Liking, Ingratiation, or Hinting. Even though these strategies fit a common Japanese stereotype, the Japanese did not use them significantly more than the North Americans. When the cell

means were examined, Liking and Ingratiation were used more by the Japanese, and Hinting more by the North Americans.

North American Preferences

Hypotheses seven through nine predicted that the North Americans would use the strategies of: (a) Threat, (b) Aversive Stimulation, and (c) Altruism more than the Japanese. Significant differences were not found for Threat and Aversive Stimulation (even though these strategies conform to the stereotype of the more aggressive, confrontational North American). Empirically, use of these strategies by North Americans was not significantly different than that of the Japanese.

A significant crossover interaction was found for Altruism. The Japanese use Altruism more in the Apartment situation. In contrast, the North Americans use Altruism more in the Job situation. For the Japanese, the appeals to altruism (i.e., "comply for my sake") are more appropriate for a daughter requesting compliance of her mother than for a father requesting compliance from his son. It appears that in the traditional society of Japan a father's request for compliance has its basis in the authority (and power) of the paternal role.

Effects due to Language of Administration

The tenth hypothesis predicted, in general terms, significant differences in the use of compliance-gaining strategies between the two Japanese groups based on language differences (i.e., whether the Japanese

respondents participated in Japanese or English). A total of eight significant differences were found.

The Japanese using Japanese gave higher ratings for Negative Expertise, Explanation, Negative Altercasting, and Direct Request. Only two of these (Explanation and Negative Altercasting) had the same pattern of use as found when comparing the average Japanese response with that of the North Americans (i.e., that the Japanese use them more).

The Japanese using English used Positive Self-feeling, Positive Esteem, Positive Altercasting and Debt more highly than the Japanese in Japanese. Only one of these (Positive Self-feeling) demonstrated the same relationship as that found when comparing strategy use by culture (i.e., that the North Americans use this strategy more). In contrast, the results for Positive Esteem and Direct Request were opposite those found when comparing the two cultures.

Answers to Research Questions

Four research questions were proposed concerning: (a) Debt, (b) Moral Appeal, (c) Positive Esteem, and (d) Negative Esteem. The Japanese were found to use Moral Appeal strategies significantly more than the North Americans. These findings coincide with those of M. Burgoon et al. (1982) who found higher use of Moral Appeal by Asian Hawaiians than Caucasians. Furthermore, the Japanese use the Positive Esteem strategy more than North Americans. A significant culture by situation interaction

was found for Debt. No significant difference was found for Negative Esteem.

Unhypothesized Relationships

Main Effects for Culture.

Significant differences were also found between the Japanese and North Americans for a number of strategies not initially hypothesized. The Japanese use Negative Altercasting significantly more than North Americans. North Americans use Positive Self-feeling, Bargaining, Direct Request, and Allurement more than the Japanese.

Culture by Situation Interactions

Seven contrast interactions were obtained for: (a) Altruism, (b) Guilt, (c) Positive Altercasting, (d) Promise, (e) Pre-giving, (f) Debt, and (g) Bargaining when the two cultural groups were compared. Altruism, Guilt, Positive Altercasting, Promise, and Debt produced crossover interactions.

The Japanese use Altruism much more than the North Americans in the Apartment situation (with a very high rating). However, they use Altruism comparatively less in the Job Situation.

For Guilt, the rating for the two cultural groups is about equal in the Apartment situation (a low rating), but the Japanese use Guilt much more (moderately high rating) in the Job situation (where the persuader has more power than the target).

The North Americans use Positive Altercasting less

than the Japanese in the Apartment situation (a moderately low rating), but use it more than the Japanese in the Job situation (a fairly high rating). The Japanese use Positive Altercasting about equally in both situations (with a moderately high rating).

The Japanese use Promise slightly more than the North Americans in the Apartment situation (fairly high rating), but a great deal less than the North Americans in the Job situation (low rating). The North Americans use Promise about equally in both situations (with a moderately high rating).

North Americans use Debt strategies more than the Japanese in the Apartment situation (moderately low rating), but less than the Japanese in the Job situation (lowest rating). Use for the Japanese in both situations is about equal (moderately low to very low).

For Pre-giving, the North Americans use this strategy slightly more than the Japanese in the Apartment Situation (moderately low ratings), but a great deal more in the Job situation. (North American ratings were moderately low, but the Japanese rating of this strategy was the lowest.)

The North American use of Bargaining was greater than the Japanese in both situations (moderately high). However, the Japanese use of this strategy was much lower in the Job situation (moderately low) than in the Apartment situation (intermediate rating).

These relationships demonstrate the important impact

that the context of the persuasive situation has upon strategy use. More specifically, these interactions point out the importance of the power relationship between the persuader and target. In the Apartment situation, the daughter has less power than her mother. In the Job situation, the father has a great deal more power than the son. This relational dynamic is even more enhanced in Japanese society where the power relationships of familial roles are adhered to more strictly.

Thus, it appears more appropriate for the Japanese to use Guilt strategies when a father is trying to persuade a son, and to use Promise strategies when a daughter is trying to persuade her mother. For the North Americans, Guilt strategies are not used as effectively for a father with his son as they are for the Japanese. Moreover, Promise strategies would be used more by the father to gain compliance from the son among North Americans than it would be among the Japanese.

These findings reflect the Japanese norm of a high degree of respect and honor for parents. To make a parent feel guilty would be disrespectful. However, it is the father who is able in his position of authority to provoke his son to action through guilt due to the power relationship.

It is in this area where cultural differences have a great impact. The power differential between persuader and target will vary to a large degree across cultures. The

amount of power a target yields to a persuader will be heavily influenced by the norms and values of a particular society.

Cultural Differences

In general, the strategies preferred by the Japanese are Positive Esteem, Explanation, Negative Altercasting, and Moral Appeal. All of these are isomorphic with the norms of Japanese culture in which "face" is an important concern, and each individual feels a moral obligation to others in society (e.g., the Japanese concepts of amae and on). To be held in positive esteem when complying, or to be thought of as a person with bad qualities--or immoral--if failing to comply, are important face considerations. Explanation strategies are in harmony with the Japanese mindset that depicts the mature person as one who would comply (i.e., take the correct and responsible action) if the circumstances are adequately explained (however circumspectly).

North Americans use Positive Self-feeling, Allurement, Bargaining, and Direct Request strategies more than the Japanese. All of these strategies mirror the North American values of self-aggrandizement, personal rewards involved with compliance, the interpersonal give-and-take of negotiations and bargaining, and direct confrontation or candor.

The results of the Q analyses bear these generalizations out. Q methodology revealed the importance

to both cultural groups of notions such as feeling better about one's self, being more self-satisfied, and more secure. It appears that even in societies such as Japan, where the denial of self is the ideal, some concern is still voiced for one's fulfillment as a person. The degree to which this fulfillment of the self differentiates the individual from others in society seems to be a distinguishing factor between North Americans and the Japanese.

Language Differences

Significant differences in strategy use between the Japanese groups were found for 8 of the 24 strategies when comparing the language of participation. Implicit within this hypothesis was the rationale that the Japanese participating in English would demonstrate use ratings more similar to the North Americans than to the Japanese in Japanese. This hypothesis did not receive total empirical support. Of the eight, only three differences reflected the same relationship found when comparing the two cultural groups.

The Q analysis supported this conclusion. When the Japanese respondents were factored as variables, factors did not emerge primarily along linguistic lines. In fact, cultural factors were much more important than linguistic factors. When clusters of individuals emerged for both persuasive situations, the "Japanese" clusters contained a majority of Japanese respondents who had participated in

both languages.

Therefore, language differences did emerge--but these differences appear limited, and do not demonstrate a pattern consistent with cultural differences. Based on this study, language of administration differences do not appear critical in the research process; however, they cannot be ignored completely. Since the findings of this single study are equivocal, more research is needed in this area.

Limitations of this Study

A number of limitations must be pointed out. First of all, the respondents in this study were all college students from Japan and the United States. This makes generalizability of the findings (especially to the population of all Japanese people) somewhat limited. However, the overall prediction that cultural differences do exist in terms of compliance-gaining strategy use was confirmed. The specific differences will become clearer as more representative samples are used in future research.

A second problem is one that has already been mentioned in earlier cross-cultural research (M. Burgoon et al., 1982). That is, there exists the potential problem that certain strategies may be subsumed by others. The examples have been given of the strategies of Altruism and Moral Appeal. They overlap since by their very nature acts of altruism are considered moral (M. Burgoon et al., 1982). The same problem is also encountered with

Explanation strategies. Strategies such as Moral Appeal might also be thought of as Explanation strategies, as well as strategies such as Postive Altercasting or Negative Altercasting. In addition, Hinting strategies might be considered, in some circumstances, to be Explanation strategies, and so on. In future research, a wise procedure would be to include within each message a linguistic marker that marks a message as an example of a particular strategy. For example, promise messages might vary in content but all could contain the word promise somewhere in the message.

A third limitation has to do with the medium to low reliabilities for some of the compliance-gaining strategy indexes. In future research, messages using linguistic markers could be created in Japanese and then rated in order to select the best representatives of a strategy. If sufficient numbers of Japanese subjects are available, these messages can be pretested on a small sample to select those items that create the most reliable index.

Future Research

Future research should be done in Japan where sample size and representativeness of the sample to the overall Japanese population will not be a problem. In Japan, respondents can be selected from all strata in society (e.g., from all social-economic levels, from rural as well as urban environments, etc.).

Improvements should be made in future Q analyses as

well. Japanese respondents should be asked to do two Q sorts. In the first they should sort messages in terms of whether they would or would not use them. In addition, they should do a second sort in which they determine use or non-use based upon how they believe a typical Japanese person would respond. This approach would be particularly interesting using a persuasive context such as the Apartment situation. It may be that when the Japanese are asked to sort the items based upon how they believe a typical Japanese person would sort the messages that a pure Japanese type would emerge.

In the present research, when the Japanese and North American Q data were combined for the persuasive situations, the Japanese respondents loaded on two factors. That is, some of the Japanese respondents loaded on the same factor as most of the North Americans. This may have been because they perceive themselves more western in thinking, and thus clustered with the North Americans. If they had been asked to sort the items as a typical Japanese, their sort may have been quite different. They may reason that they would sort the items in a particular way, but the typical Japanese person would sort the items differently (i.e., more aligned with traditional Japanese culture).

It would also be of interest, in future research, to factor analyze the compliance-gaining strategies for the Japanese to see if the Guttman simplex pattern emerges as

it has in prior research (Boster & Hunter, 1978; M. Burgoon et al., 1982). If so, this would give further support (in this case from more than one culture) to the argument that the compliance-gaining strategies lie along a unidimensional continuum. From the present research it is apparent that both the Japanese and North Americans prefer using pro-social strategies over the more anti-social ones.

Additional research needs to investigate the effects of language in cross-cultural research. This investigation found limited effects that are somewhat enigmatic. Future research could look at comparisons of the language group and analogous cultural group to see if the differences are significantly different for each compliance-gaining strategy.

A final suggestion concerns an additional way the present data might be analyzed. Subjecting the data to discriminant analysis should result in delimiting those compliance-gaining strategies that discriminate between the Japanese and North American cultural groups. This would add additional support to the present findings of strategy preference for the Japanese and North Americans.

Summary

This study provided a number of improvements over previous research.

1. Greater representational validity was produced for the Japanese in terms of relevance of both the contexts of persuasion and the messages.

2. Japanese respondents participated in Japanese as well as in English.

3. The research design permitted an assessment of the effects of language of administration on strategy use. And,

4. Q analysis was used to enhance and augment the findings of the tests of specific hypotheses.

Overall, no new or undiscovered compliance-gaining strategies emerged from the Japanese respondents. Even though the Japanese are culturally very different from North Americans, they do not appear to use compliance-gaining strategies that are unique to themselves or uncommon to those already reported. Cultural differences not only demonstrate a preference for certain strategies, but seem to dictate the appropriateness of strategies for a particular context.

One key point is that not only are there cultural differences, but there are cultural <u>similarities</u> as well. Even though the Japanese stress the value of society over the individual (much more so than in the United States), the Japanese still use compliance-gaining messages that point out advantages to the individual for compliance.

Moreover, both the Japanese and North Americans use certain pro-social and anti-social strategies in much the same way. Neither culture has a monopoly on pro-social or anti-social strategies. In fact, both cultures demonstrate similarity in rating pro-social strategies more favorably

than anti-social strategies.

The power relationship between the persuader and target of the persuasion is an important determinant of compliance-gaining strategy use. This is especially true for the Japanese, possibly due in most part to the fact the Japanese are extremely status conscious; and this is demonstrated in their communication. Even the difference of one day in age demands changes in how the older person is addressed and in the pattern of conversation. The power relationship is found in both cultures, but the power differential between persuader and target is culturally determined.

In general, the Japanese were found to use strategies that reflect their cultural concerns of the maintenance of face and proper conduct (Positive Esteem and Negative Altercasting). Their strategy use refects the moral obligation each person has to others in society, or demonstrates appeals to higher moral standards (Moral Appeal). In addition, explanation strategies seem to be consonant with their practice of alluding to appropriate action (i.e., compliance) while never requesting this directly.

North Americans use of Positive Self-feeling, Allurement, Bargaining and Direct Request is commensurate with a value system that emphasizes personal gain and satisfaction, face-to-face negotiation, and bargaining. Comparative differences, or similarities, with the Japanese

are not discrete. Strategy use is not found in one culture and absent in the other. Instead, cultural distinctions are found in the degree to which particular strategies are appropriate for specific persons in various situations. These differences appear consistent with the theory that this is a result of the socialization or enculturalization process. As humans become members of their various cultures they learn common perceptions of communicative contexts and the appropriate messages to use in those contexts.

In a more practical vein, the knowledge that the Japanese use strategies such as Positive Esteem, Explanation, Moral Appeal and Negative Altercasting should interest North Americans who want to persuade the Japanese. The Japanese use strategies that appeal to a higher moral code (e.g., duties, obligations, allegiance to the group, etc.), or imply that one might lose face or be shamed if they fail to comply.

North Americans, on the other hand, have a greater preference for strategies that involve Positive Self-feeling, Allurement, Bargaining, and Direct Request. Positive Self-feeling depends upon the target of compliance feeling good about one's self after compliance. Direct Request, Allurement, and Bargaining reflect the interpersonal (and more individualistic) aspects of the western style of negotiation. If the Japanese desire to be more effective persuaders of North Americans, they should

skillfully use these strategies. In the final analysis, persuasive messages will be more effective when presented in a culturally appropriate manner aligned with the relevant cultural norms and values.

Individuals of Japanese and North American culture actively engage in compliance-gaining attempts. This appears pancultural. The actual process and messages used, however, are determined by the cultural norms and values of each society. To be effective cross-cultural communicators, we must be knowledgeable, sensitive, and appreciative of the norms and values of other cultures. We must understand the orientation of the receiver (in terms of rights, power, and obligations) of our cross-cultural communication. If we do this, we can reach better cross-cultural understanding and more harmonious relationships.

REFERENCES

Chapter Seven

References

Andersen, K. E. (1971). Persuasion: Theory and practice. Boston: Allyn & Bacon.

Baxter, L. A. (1984). An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. Human Communication Research, 10, 427-456.

Berlo, D. K. (1960). The process of communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Bettinghaus, E. P. (1980). Persuasive communication. New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Boster, F. J., & Stiff, J. B. (1984). Compliance-gaining message selection behavior. Human Communication Research, 10, 539-556.

Boster, F. J., & Stiff, J. B. (1982, November). A behavioral study of compliance gaining message selection. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Speech Communication Association, Denver, CO.

Boster, F. J., Stiff, J. B., & Reynolds, R. A. (1983, May). Do persons respond differently to inductively-derived and deductively-derived lists of compliance gaining message strategies? A reply to Wiseman and Schenck-Hamlin. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Dallas, TX.

Bostrom, R. N. (1983). Persuasion. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Brown, I. C. (1963). Understanding other cultures. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Burgoon, J. K., Burgoon, M., Miller, G. R., & Sunnafrank, M. (n.d.). Learning theory approaches to persuasion. Unpublished manuscript, Michigan State University, Department of Communication, East Lansing, MI.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J. P., Doran, N. E., & Miller, M. D. (1982). Cultural and situational influences on the process of persuasive strategy selection. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 6, 85-100.

Caudill, W., & Scarr, H. A. (1974). Japanese value orientations and culture change. In T. S. Lebra & W. P. Lebra (Eds.), Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings (pp. 39-89). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.

Cattell, R. B. (1952). The three basic factor-analytic research designs--their interrelations and derivatives. Psychological Bulletin, 49, 499-520.

Cathcart, D., & Cathcart, R. (1976). Japanese social experience and concept of groups. In L. A. Samovar & R. E,. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (2nd ed., pp. 58-66). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Chafe, W. L. (1982). Integration and involvement in speaking, writing, and oral literature. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy (pp. 35-53). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Christopher, R. C. (1983). The Japanese mind: The goliath explained. New York: Linden Press/Simon & Schuster.

Clancy, P. M. (1982). Written and spoken style in Japanese narratives. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Spoken and written language: exploring orality and literacy. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Clark, R. A. (1979). The impact of self interest and desire for liking on the selection of communication strategies. Communication Monographs, 46, 257-273.

Clark, R. A.,& Delia, J. G. (1979). Topoi and rhetorical competence. Quarterly Journal of Speech, 65, 187-206.

Clark, R. A. (1984). Persuasive messages. New York: Harper & Row.

Cody, M. J., & McLaughlin, M. L. (1980). Perceptions of compliance-gaining situations: A dimensional analysis. Communication Monographs, 47, 132-148.

Cody, M. J., McLaughlin, M. L.,& Jordan, W. J. (1980). A multidimensional scaling of three sets of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Quarterly, 28, 34-46.

Cody, M. J., McLaughlin, M. L., & Schneider, M. J. (1981). The impact of relational consequences and intimacy on the selection of interpersonal persuasion tactics: A reanalysis. Communication Quarterly, 29, 91-106.

Cody, M. J., Woelfel, M. L., & Jordan, W. J. (1983). Dimensions of compliance-gaining situations. Human Communication Research, 9, 99-113.

Craig, R. T., Tracy, K., & Spisak, F. (1984, March). A critique of Brown and Levinson's politeness theory. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Eastern Communication Association, Philadelphia, PA.

Cronkite, G. (1969). Persuasion: Speech and behavioral change. Indianapolis, IN: Bobbs-Merril.

DeVos, G. A. (1973). Socialization for achievement: Essays on the cultural psychology of the Japanese. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

DeVos, G. A., & Wagatsuma, H. (1973). Status and role behavior in changing Japan: Psychocultural continuities. In DeVos, G. A. (Ed.), Socialization for achievement: Essays on the cultural psychology of the Japanese (pp. 10-60). Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Dillard, J. P., & Burgoon, M. (1985). Situational influences on the selection of compliance-gaining messages: Two tests of the predictive utililty of the Cody-McLaughlin typology. Communication Monographs, 52, 289-304.

Dillard, J. P., Hunter, J. E., Burgoon, M., Boster, F. J., & Stiff, J. B. (1985, May). An empirical test of the empathy model of compliance gaining message selection. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Honolulu, HI.

Doi, L. T. (1976). The Japanese patterns of communication and the concept of amae. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (2nd ed., pp. 188-193). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Ember, C. R., & Ember, M. (1973). Cultural anthropology. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1964). Language and T.A.T. content in bilinguals. Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 68, 500-507.

Ervin-Tripp, S. M. (1968). An analysis of the interaction of language, topic and listener. In J. A. Fishman (Ed.), Readings in the sociology of language (pp. 192-211). The Hague: Mouton.

Etzioni, A. (1961). A comparative analysis of complex organizations. New York: Free Press.

Falbo, T. (1977). Multidimensional scaling of power strategies. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 35, 537-547.

Falbo, T., & Peplau, L. A. (1980). Power strategies in intimate relationships. Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 38, 618-628.

French, J. R. P., & Raven, B. (1960). The bases of social power. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), Group dynamics (2nd ed., pp. 607-623). New York: Harper and Row.

Glenn, E. S., Witmeyer, D., & Stevenson, K. A. (1973). Cultural styles of persuasion. International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 3, 52-65.

Goodenough, W. H. (1981). Culture, language, and society. Memlo Park, CA: Benjamin/Cummings.

Guilford, J. P. (1954). Psychometric methods (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hage, J. (1972). Techniques and problems of theory contruction in sociology. New York: John Wiley.

Hall, J. W., & Beardsley, R. K. (1965). Twelve doors to Japan. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (n.d.). Message content and situational differences as determinants of compliance gaining message selection. Unpublished manuscript. Department of Psychology, Michigan State University, East Lansing, MI.

Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1978, November). Compliance gaining message selection experiments: Some evidence for an empathy model. Paper presented at the annual conference for the Speech Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Hunter, J. E., & Boster, F. J. (1979). Situational differences in the selection of compliance-gaining messages. Unpublished manuscript. Communication Research and Services, Department of Communication, Arizona State University, Tempe, AZ.

Hull, C. H., & Nie, N. H. (Eds.). (1981). SPSS update 7-9: New procedures and facilities for releases 7-9. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Inoue, K. (1979). Japanese: A story of language and people. In T. Shopen (Ed.). Languages and their speakers. Cambridge, MA: Winthrop.

Kaminski, E. P., McDermott, S. T., & Boster, F. J. (1977, April). The use of compliance-gaining strategies as a function of Machiavellianism and situation. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Central States Speech Association, Southfield, MI.

Kelman, H. C. (1961). The processes of opinion change. Public Opinion Quarterly, 25, 57-78.

Kerlinger, F. N. (1973). Foundations of behavioral research (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.

Kluckhorn, C. (1967). The concept of culture. In Schuler, E. A., Hoult, T. F., Gibson, D. L., & Brookover, W. B. (Eds.). Readings in sociology (3rd ed., pp. 76-88). New York: Thomas Y. Crowell.

Lebra, T. S. (1974). Reciprocity and the asymmetric principle: An analytical reappraisal of the Japanese concept of on. In T. S. Lebra & W. P. Lebra (Eds.), Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings (pp. 192-207). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii Press.

Lustig, M. W., & Myers, S. (1983, February). Compliance-gaining strategy selection: A comparison of six countries. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Western Speech Communication Association, Albuquerque, NM.

Marwell, G., & and Schmitt, D. R. (1967). Dimensions of compliance-gaining behavior: An empirical analysis. Sociometry, 30, 350-364.

McKeon, R. (Ed.). (1941). The basic works of Aristotle. New York: Random House.

McLaughlin, M. L., Cody, M. J., & Robey, C. S. (1980). Situational influences on the selection of strategies to resist compliance-gaining attempts. Human Communication Research, 7, 14-36.

McLuhan, M. (1969). The Gutenberg galaxy: The making of typographic man. New York: New American Library.

Michener, H. A., & Schwertfeger, M. (1975). Liking as a determinant of power tactic preference. Sociometry, 35, 190-202.

Miller, G. R. (1981). "Tis the season to be jolly": A yuletide 1980 assessment of communication research. Human Communication Research, 7, 371-377.

Miller, G. R. (1980). On being persuaded--some basic distinctions. In M. E. Roloff & G. R. Miller (Eds.), Persuasion: New directions in theory and research (pp. 11-28). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Miller, G. R. (1978). The current status of theory and research in interpersonal communication. Human Communication Research, 4, 164-178.

Miller, G. R. (1975). Interpersonal communication: A conceptual perspective. Communication, 2, 93-105.

Miller, G. R. (1966). Speech communication: A behavioral approach. Indianapolis: Bobbs-Merrill.

Miller, G., Boster, F., Roloff, M., and Siebold, D. (1977). Compliance-gaining message strategies: A typology and some findings concerning effects of situational differences. Communication Monographs, 44, 37-50.

Miller, G. R., and Burgoon, M. (1973). New techniques of perusasion. New York: Harper and Row.

Miller, G. R., and Burgoon, M. (1978). Persuasion research: Review and Commentary. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 2 (pp. 29-47). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Miller, G. R., and Steinberg, M. (1975). Between people: A new analysis of interpersonal communication. Chicago: Science Research Associates.

Miller, M. D. (1982). Power and relationship type as predictors of compliance-gaining strategy use. Journal of Language and Social Psychology, 1, 111-121.

Miller, M. D., & Cambra, R. E. (1981, November). Women and men as sources and targets of compliance-gaining message strategies. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Speech Communication Association, Anahiem, CA.

Miller, M. D., Reynolds, R. A., Cambra, R. E. (1982, November). The selection of persuasive strategies in multicultural groups. Paper presented at the meeting of the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Miller, M. D., Reynolds, R. A., Cambra, R. E. (1983, May). Cultural influences on the use of intense language in persuasive messages. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Dallas, TX.

Mowrer O. H. (1953). Q technique--description, history, and critique. In O. H. Mowrer (Ed.), Psychotherapy: Theory and Research (pp. 316-375). New York: Ronald Press.

Nakane, C. (1970). Japanese society. Berkeley, CA: University of California Press.

Nakane, C. (1974). Criteria of group formation. In T. S. Lebra and W. P. Lebra (Eds.), Japanese culture and behavior: Selected readings (pp. 155-173). Honolulu, HI: University of Hawaii.

Naotsuka, R., Sakamoto, N., Hirose, T., Hagihara, H., Ohta, J., Maeda, S., Hara, T., & Iwasaki, K. (1981). Mutual understanding of different cultures. Osaka, Japan: Science Education Institute of Osaka.

Neuliep, J. W., & Hazelton, V., Jr., (1984, November). A cross cultural comparison of Japanese and American persuasive strategy selection. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Speech Communication Association, Chicago, IL.

Nunnally, J. C. (1978). Psychometric theory (2nd ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.

Oliver, R. T. (1962). Culture and communication: The problem of penetrating national and cultural boundaries. Springfield, IL: Charles C. Thomas.

Parsons, T. (1963). On the concept of influence. Public Opinion Quarterly, 27, 37-62.

Petty, R. E., & Cacioppo, J. T. (1981). Attitudes and persuasion: Classic and contemporary approaches. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C. Brown.

Petty, R. E., Ostrom, T. M., & Brock, T. C. (1981). Historical foundations of the cognitive response approach to attitudes and persuasion. In R. E. Petty, T. M. Ostrom, & T. C. Brock, (Eds.), Cognitive responses in persuasion (pp. 5-29). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Pike, K. L., (1967). Language in relation to a unified theory of behavior. The Hague: Mouton.

Poole, M. S.,& Folger, J. P. (1981). A method for establishing the representational validity of interaction coding systems: Do we see what they see? Human Communication Research, 8, 26-42.

Restak, R. M. (1984). The brain. New York: Bantam Books.

Riccollo, S. C., & Trenholm, S. (1983). Predicting manager's choice of influence mode: The effects of interpersonal trust and worker attributions on mangagerial tactics in a simulated organizational setting. Western Journal of Speech Communication, 47, 323-339.

Roloff, M. E., & Barnicott, E. F. (1978). The situational use of pro- and antisocial compliance-gaining strategies by high and low Machiavellians. In B. D. Ruben (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 2 (pp. 193-205). New Brunswick, NJ: Transaction Books.

Roloff, M. E., & Barnicott, E. F. (1979). The influence of dogmatism on the situational use of pro- and anti-social compliance-gaining strategies. The Southern Speech Communication Journal, 45, 37-54.

Sarbaugh, L. E. (1979). Intercultural communication. Rochelle Park, NJ: Hayden Book.

Schenck-Hamlin, W. J., Georgacarakos, G. N, & Wiseman, R. L. (1982). A formal account of interpersonal compliance-gaining. Communication Quarterly, 30, 173-180.

Schenck-Hamlin, W. J., Wiseman, R. L., & Georgacarakos, G. N. (1980, May). A typology of compliance-gaining strategies and the logic of their underlying relationships. A paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Scheidel, T. (1967). Persuasive speaking. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.

Scollon, R., & Scollon, B. K. (in press). Cooking it up and boiling it down: Abstracts in Athabaskan children's story retellings. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Coherence in spoken and written discourse. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Sechrest, L., Fay, T. L., & Zaidi, S. M. (1976). Problems of translation in cross-cultural communication. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), Intercultural communication: A reader (2nd eds., pp. 159-170). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Seibold, D. (1977, November). Critique of top five papers in interpersonal communication and small groups. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Speech Communication Association, Washington, DC.

Shannon, C., & Weaver, W. (1949). Mathematical theory of human communication. Urbana, IL: University of Illinois Press.

Shatzer, M. J., Funkhouser, A., & Hesse, M. (1984, May). Selection of compliance-gaining strategies among four culturally diverse groups. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, San Francisco, CA.

Sillars, A. (1980). The stranger and the spouse as target persons for compliance-gaining strategies: A subjective expected utility model. Human Communication Research, 6, 265-279.

SPSS-X Inc. (1983). SPXX-X User's Guide. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Stephenson W. (1952). Some observations on Q technique. Psychological Bulletin, 49, 483-498.

Stephenson, W. (1953). The study of behavior: Q-technique and its methodology. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Stephenson, W. (1967). The play theory of mass communication. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Thibaut, J. W., & Kelly, H. H. (1950). The social psychology of groups. New York: John Wiley.

Tracy, K., Craig, R. T., & Spisak, F. (1984). The discourse of requests: Assessments of a compliance-gaining approach. Human Communication Research, 10, 513-538.

Tannen, D. (1982). The oral/literate continuum in discourse. In D. Tannen (Ed.), Spoken and written language: Exploring orality and literacy (pp. 1-16). Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Wallace, A.F.C. (1972). Mental illness, biology and culture. In F. L. K. Hsu (Ed.), Psychological anthropology (new edition, pp. 363-402). Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.

Wheeless, L. R., Barraclough, R., & Stewart, R. (1983). Compliance-gaining and power in persuasion. In R. N. Bostrom (Ed.), Communication Yearbook 7 (pp. 105-145). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Williams, D. L., & Boster, F. J. (1981, May). The effects of beneficial situational characteristics, negativism, and dogmatism on compliance-gaining message selection. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Minneapolis, MN.

Wiseman, R. L., & Schenck-Hamlin, W. (1981). A multidimensional scaling validation of an inductively-derived set of compliance-gaining strategies. Communication Monographs, 48, 251-270.

APPENDICES

Appendix A

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

Apartment Situation

1. Positive Expertise:

   a. I would tell my mother that it is more economical living near campus.

2. Negative Expertise: $r = .10$

   a. I will be taking night classes and there is no train that I can take late at night. It will be difficult.

   b. My relationships with my friends will go bad unless I spend some evenings visiting them.

3. Positive Self-feeling: $r = .39$

   a. You would feel better if you allow me to live on my own.

   b. You would be happier if I spent less time traveling and you would worry less.

4. Negative Self-feeling: $r = .21$

   a. You will be upset if I do poorly in school because I have no time for my studies.

   b. You will feel bad if I am always tired because I spend so much time traveling.

5. Positive Esteem: alpha = .72

   a. I would tell my mother that her friends would think well of her if she let me live on my own.

   b. Your friends will think that you are doing the right thing by letting me get my own apartment.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

5. Positive Esteem: alpha = .72

   a. I would tell my mother that her friends would think well of her if she let me live on my own.

   b. Your friends will think that you are doing the right thing by letting me get my own apartment.

   c. Your family will be happy with you if you allow me to get an apartment.

6. Negative Esteem: r = .36

   a. Your friends will think you are making a mistake if you force me to ride the train every night.

   b. Your family will disagree with you if you refuse to let me get an apartment.

7. Altruism: r = .16

   a. You would have less housework to do if I lived away from home.

   b. You would have more time to yourself if I had my own apartment.

8. Warning: r = .59

   a. If you don't allow me to get an apartment, my grades might be worse.

   b. I would tell my parents that my studying will be worse if I don't get an apartment.

9. Guilt: r = .65

   a. I would tell my parents that it would be their fault if I got poor grades and could not study.

   b. I would tell my parents that if I got sick from losing sleep and traveling, it would be their fault.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

10. Allurement: $r = .43$

    a. You would have less housework to do if I lived away from home.

    b. You would have more time to yourself if I had my own apartment.

11. Explanation: $r = .30$

    a. I would explain to my parents the reasons why I needed an apartment near school.

    b. I would tell my parents all of the reasons why riding a train is unpleasant and hurts my school work.

12. Threat: alpha = .84

    a. If you don't allow me to get an apartment, I'll leave home.

    b. I won't talk to you if you don't allow me to get an apartment.

    c. I would tell my parents that I would leave home if they don't allow me to get my own apartment.

13. Aversive Stimulation: $r = .62$

    a. I will continue to complain until you allow me to get an apartment.

    b. I would act moody until I got an apartment.

14. Positive Altercasting: $r = .41$

    a. I would tell my parents that good parents would allow their children to live life on their own.

    b. I would let my parents know that parents who want to do good things for their children allow them to go out on their own and experience life.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

15. Negative Altercasting: $r = .42$

a. I would tell my parents that only bad people would want their child to travel several hours a day to get to school.

b. I would let my parents know that only parents who don't care about their children force them to live at home while going to college.

16. Moral Appeal: alpha = .76

a. It is morally wrong not to encourage your daughter to become more self-sufficient.

b. I would be wrong for you to require me to ride the train to school several hours each day.

c. It would be morally wrong for you to prevent your children from experiencing life on their own.

17. Ingratiation: alpha = .76

a. I would tell my mother what a good homemaker she is and then ask her to let me get an apartment.

b. I would tell my parents that they have been good parents and then ask them to allow me to get an apartment on my own.

c. I would remind my parents that they have done a good job raising me and that now they should allow me to move out on my own.

18. Promise: alpha = .75

a. I would promise to come home every weekend.

b. I would promise to call you often when I get the apartment.

c. I would promise my parents that I would come home to visit frequently if they allow me to get an apartment.

d. I would promise to do well in school if my parents allow me to get an apartment.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

19. Liking: alpha = .59

a. I would be friendly and pleasant to get my mother in a good mood and then ask her permission for the apartment.

b. I would tell mother how much I love her and then ask her to allow me to get an apartment.

c. I would be nice to my mother before I asked her permission to get an apartment.

20. Pre-giving: r = .54

a. I would give mother a gift she wanted and then ask her to allow me to get an apartment.

b. I would help my mother around the house and then ask her to allow me to get an apartment.

21. Debt: alpha = .74

a. I would tell mother that I worked hard to get into college and mother should help any way she can.

b. I would tell my mother that I have been responsible and she owes it to me to allow me to get an apartment.

c. I would let my mother know that I have done many things for her and that she should do this for me.

22. Bargaining: r = .68

a. If you allow me to move I will work to pay the rent.

b. I will pay for more of my expenses if you allow me to get an apartment.

23. Direct Request: r = .75

a. Will you let me get an apartment of my own?

b. May I please get an apartment near school?

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

24. Hinting:

    a. Modern girls should be more independent and do things on their own.

Note. All reliabilities reported as Cronbach's alpha.

Appendix B

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

Job Situation

1. Positive Expertise: $r = .24$

   a. If you get a full-time job it will give you a secure future.

   b. If you get a job your future will be bright.

2. Negative Expertise: $r = .36$

   a. You won't be able to get any bonuses with a part-time job.

   b. You can't get a raise in pay with a part-time job.

3. Positive Self-feeling: $r = .29$

   a. You will feel better about yourself if you get a full-time job.

   b. You will feel more satisfied if you get a full-time job.

4. Negative Self-feeling: $r = .43$

   a. If you don't get a full-time job you won't feel satisfied.

   b. If you don't get a full-time job you won't feel successful.

7. Positive esteem: $r = .29$

   a. I would think a lot more of you if you got a full-time job.

   b. Your family would think a lot better of you if you got a full-time job.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

7. Positive esteem: $r = .29$

   a. I would think a lot more of you if you got a full-time job.

   b. Your family would think a lot better of you if you got a full-time job.

6. Negative Esteem: $r = .20$

   a. Your family will be disappointed with you if you do not get a full-time job.

   b. If you don't get a full-time job you will feel like you have disappointed your family.

7. Altruism: alpha = .50

   a. Please get a full-time job because as your father I am asking you to.

   b. Please sacrifice a little and get a job for my sake.

   c. Sacrifice and get a full-time job for your father's sake.

8. Warning: $r = .25$

   a. If you don't get a full-time job you can't afford to get married.

   b. If you don't get a full-time job you won't have job security.

9. Guilt: $r = .56$

   a. Be an adult, you should feel badly if you don't get a full-time job.

   b. If you don't get a full-time job you will feel you are irresponsible.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

10. Allurement: r = .39

    a. If you get a full-time job you'll probably receive pay increases.

    b. As soon as you get a full-time job you'll be able to get married.

11. Explanation: r = .24

    a. Because hard work is valued in our society, you should get a full-time job.

    b. Getting a full-time job is expected in our society.

12. Threat: r = .71

    a. Get a full-time job or you will make me angry.

    b. If you don't get a full-time job you will make me even more upset than I am now.

13. Aversive Stimulation: r = .26

    a. I will not approve of you getting married until you get a full-time job.

    b. I'll restrict your priviledges until you get a full-time job.

14. Positive Altercasting: r = .37

    a. Since you are good and intelligent you will want to get a full-time job.

    b. Because you are hard working and amibitious, you will want to get a full-time job.

15. Negative Altercasting: alpha = .68

    a. Only an immature person would not want a full-time job.

    b. Only a short-sighted person would not want a full-time job.

    c. Only an unappreciative son would not want a full-time job.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

16. Moral Appeal: $r = .46$

a. It is morally wrong for you not to fulfill your role as a member of society.

b. It is morally wrong for you not to fulfill your obligations as an adult in this society.

17. Ingratiation: $r = .20$

a. You are a very good son, I would appreciate it if you would get a full-time job.

b. The father shows a great deal of affection for his son and then asks him to get a full-time job.

18. Promise: $r = .36$

a. If you get a full-time job, I will allow you to get the car you have been wanting.

b. The father agrees to pay additional costs while the son is looking for employment.

19. Liking: $r = .51$

a. Let's go to a nice restaurant and talk about getting you a full-time job.

b. The father tries to get the son in a good mood before trying to persuade him to get a good job.

20. Pre-giving: $r = .32$

a. I would help pay the rent on this apartment, and then ask him to get a full-time job.

b. The father gives his son a camera and then asks him to get a job.

21. Debt: $r = .54$

a. I am your father. You owe it to met to get a full-time job.

b. After all I have done for you, you owe it to me to get a full-time job.

(appendix continues)

Indexes for Compliance-Gaining Strategies

22. Bargaining: alpha = .89

a. If you get a full-time job, I will help you with the expenses you have.

b. If you get a full-time job I will provide the financial support you need to change jobs.

c. The father tells his son that he will pay additional costs while he looks for a full-time job.

23. Direct Request: alpha = .66

a. Please get a full-time job.

b. I would like you to get a full-time job.

c. Won't you please get a full-time job.

24. Hinting: r = .32

a. Our neighbor's son just got a nice full-time job.

b. So many young people are getting full-time jobs these days.

Note. All reliabilities reported as Cronbach's alpha.

Appendix C

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Apartment Situation

Type I Individuals

Item	Z-score
I would explain to my parents the reasons why I needed and apartment near school.	2.231
I would like to have your permission to get an apartment near campus.	1.845
By getting my own apartment I can learn new responsibilities.	1.771
If you allow me to live on my own it will be a good experience for me.	1.754
If I get an apartment I will save a lot of time and I can study more.	1.455
I would remind my parents that they have done a a good job raising me and that now they should allow me to move out on my own.	1.372
May I please get an apartment near school?	1.330
If I live near campus, I can study more.	1.320
Living alone will make me more mature and and prepared for life as an adult.	1.318
I would tell my mother that it is more economical living near campus.	1.240
I would tell my parents all of the reasons why riding a train is unpleasant and hurts my school work.	1.095
Will you let me get an apartment of my own?	1.080

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
I will get better grades in school if you permit me to live near campus.	1.065
Your friends will think that you are making a mistake if you force me to ride the train every night.	-1.052
I will continue to complain until you allow me to get an apartment.	-1.182
I would tell my parents that it would be their fault if I got poor grades and could not study.	-1.212
I would tell my parents that if I got sick from losing sleep and traveling, it would be their fault.	-1.233
I would act moody until I got an apartment.	-1.239
I would let my parents know that only parents who don't care about their children force them to live at home while going to college.	-1.454
I would tell my parents that only bad people would want their child to travel several hours a day to get to school.	-1.656
I would tell my parents that I would leave home if they don't allow me to get my own apartment.	-1.830
I would refuse to talk with my parents until they allowed me to get an apartment.	-1.935
I would force my parents into granting their permission by saying that I won't go to school without my own apartment.	-1.986
I won't talk to you if you don't allow me to get an apartment.	-1.997
If you don't allow me to get an apartment, I'll leave home.	-2.087

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for those items that the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix D

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Apartment Situation

Type II Individuals

Item	Z-score
If I get an apartment I will save a lot of time and I can study more.	2.049
I would explain to my parents the reasons why I needed an apartment near school.	1.920
I would promise to do well in school if my parents allow me to get an apartment.	1.875
If I live near campus, I can study more.	1.711
I will be taking night classes and there is no train that I can take at night. It will be difficult.	1.675
I would tell my parents all of the reasons why riding a train is unpleasant and hurts my school work.	1.666
I will get better grades in school if you permit me to live near campus.	1.439
I would tell my mother that it is more economical living near campus.	1.405
I would promise my parents that I would come home to visit frequently if they allow me to get an apartment.	1.272
I promise to call you often when I get the apartment.	1.266
By getting my own apartment I can learn new responsibilities.	1.175

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
If you don't allow me to get my apartment, it will cost you more money when I commute.	1.144
Living alone will make me more mature and prepared for life as an adult.	1.075
If you allow me to live on my own it will be a good experience for me.	1.047
* * *	
I would let my parents know that only parents who don't care about their children force them to live at home while going to college.	-1.089
I would tell my parents that they have been good parents and then ask them to allow me to get an apartment on my own.	-1.111
Your family will be happy with you if you allow me to get an apartment.	-1.113
I would point out that my mother is loving and trusting and that she should allow me to get my own apartment.	-1.164
I would tell my mother that others would think of as old fashioned if she did not allow met to get an apartment.	-1.281
I would tell my mother that I have been responsible and she owes it to me to allow me to get an apartment.	-1.414
Your family will disagree with you if you refuse to let me get an apartment.	-1.441
I would tell my mother what a good homemaker she is and then ask her to let me get an apartment.	-1.494
I would tell my mother that her friends would think well of her if she let me live on my own.	-1.545
Your friends will think that you are doing the right thing by letting me get my own apartment.	-1.570

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
Your friends will think that you are making a mistake if you force me to ride the train every night.	-1.611
I would by my mother a small present and then ask her to let me get an apartment.	-1.685
I would let my mother know that I have done many things for her and that she should do this for me.	-1.742
I would give mother a gift she wanted and then ask her to allow me to get an apartment.	-1.832

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for messages the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix E

Consensus Items and Average Z-scores

Apartment Situation

Type I and II Individuals

Item	Average Z-score
I would explain to my parents the reasons why I needed an apartment near school.	2.075
If I get an apartment I will save a lot of time and I can study more.	1.752
If I live near campus, I can study more.	1.515
By getting my own apartment I can learn new responibilities.	1.473
If you allow me to live on my own it will be a good experience for me.	1.401
I would tell my parents all of the reasons why ruding a train is unpleasant and hurts my school work.	1.381
I would tell my mother that it is more economical living near campus.	1.322
I will be taking night classes and there is no train that I can take late at night. It will be difficult.	1.315
I will get better grades in school if you permit me to live near campus.	1.252
Living alone will make me more mature and prepared for life as an adult.	1.196
May I please get an apartment near school?	1.051
I promise to call you often when I get the apartment	1.015

* * *

(appendix continues)

Item	Average Z-score
I would tell my mother that her friends would think well of her if she let me live on my own.	-1.073
Your family will disagree with you if you refuse to let me get an apartment.	-1.144
I would let my mother know that I have done many things for her and that she should do this for me.	-1.250
I would let my parents know that only parents who don't care about their children force them to live at home while going to college.	-1.271
Your friends will think that you are making a mistake if you force me to ride the train every night.	-1.332

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for those messages the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix F

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Apartment Situation

Differences between Types I and II

Item	Z-scores		
	Type I	Type II	Diff.
I would remind my parents that they have done a good job raising me and that now they should allow me to move out on my own.	1.372	-0.699	2.070
I would tell my parents that they have been good parents and then ask then to allow me to get an apartment on my own.	0.781	-1.111	1.893
I would point out that my mother is loving and trusting and that she should allow met to get my own apartment.	0.462	-1.164	1.626
I would tell my mother what a good homemaker she is and then ask her to let me get an apartment.	-0.015	-1.494	1.479
I would give mother a gift she wanted and then ask her to allow me to get an apartment.	-0.422	-1.832	1.409
I would buy my mother a small present and then ask her to let me get an apartment.	-0.287	-1.685	1.398
I would like to have your permission to get an apartment near campus.	1.845	0.475	1.370

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-scores		
	Type I	Type II	Diff.
I would tell mother how much I love her and then ask he to allow me to get an apartment.	0.384	-0.894	1.278
I would tell my mother that I have been responsible and she owes it to me to allow me to get an apartment.	-0.149	-1.414	1.265
Your friends will think that you are doing the right thing by letting me get my own apartment.	-0.475	-1.570	1.094
* * *			
I would tell my parents that only bad people would want their child to travel several hours a day to get to school.	-1.656	-0.656	-1.000
If you don't allow me to get an apartment, my grades might be worse.	-0.406	0.651	-1.058
It is morally wrong not to encourage you daughter to become self-sufficient.	-0.974	0.109	-1.083
I would promise to do well in school if my parents allow me to get an apartment.	0.742	1.875	-1.134
I would force my parents into granting their permission by saying that I won't go to school without my own apartment.	-1.986	-0.815	-1.171
If you don't allow met to get an apartment, I'll leave home.	-2.087	-0.892	-1.196
I won't talk to you if you don't allow me to get an apartment.	-1.997	-0.790	-1.207
I would act moody until I got an apartment.	-1.239	-0.027	-1.212

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-scores		
	Type I	Type II	Diff.
I would refust to talk to my parents until they allowed me to get an apartment.	-1.935	-0.710	-1.225
I would tell my parents that it would be their fault if I got poor grades and could not study.	-1.212	0.070	-1.291
I would tell my parents that I would leave home if they don't allow me to get my own apartment.	-1.830	-0.488	-1.342
I would tell my parents that if I got sick from losing sleep and traveling, it would be their fault.	-1.233	0.113	-1.347

Appendix G

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Job Situation

Type I Individuals

Item	Z-score
If you get a full-time job you will have more security.	1.875
You will feel better about yourself if you get a full-time job.	1.821
Working a full-time job makes a person more independent.	1.708
You will feel more satisfied if you get a full-time job.	1.667
Because you are hard working and ambitious, you will want a full-time job.	1.648
Sit down and relax. I'd like to talk to you about getting a full-time job.	1.549
If you get a full-time job you'll probably receive pay increases.	1.365
If you get a full-time job you will be proud of yourself. If you get a full-time job it will make you financially better off.	1.354
If you get a full-time job it will give you a secure future.	1.288
If you get a full-time job you'll feel that you're demonstrating more self-discipline.	1.272
The father agrees to pay additional costs while the son is looking for employment.	1.266
If you get a full-time job you'll have more money.	1.260

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
The father tells his son that he will pay additional costs while he looks for a full-time job.	1.258
If you get a job your future will be bright.	1.222
If you get a full-time job I will provide the financial support you need to change jobs.	1.145
Since you are good and intelligent you will want to get a full-time job.	1.130
* * *	
Only an immature person would not want a full-time job.	-1.163
Sacrifice and get a full-time job for your father's sake.	-1.170
If you don't get a full-time job you'll make me even more upset than I am now.	-1.202
I'll restrict your privileges until you get a full-time job.	-1.280
After all I have done for you, you owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.414
Get a full-time job or you will make me angry.	-1.432
I will not allow you to get married if you do not get a full-time job.	-1.538
Only an unappreciative son would not want a full-time job.	-1.611
If you don't get a full-time job I'll take away your privileges.	-1.838
I will be angry with you until you get a full-time job.	-1.915

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
I am your father. You owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.968

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for those messages that the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix H

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Job Situation

Type II Individuals

Item	Z-score
Getting a full-time job is expected in our society	1.669
Sit down and relax. I'd like to talk to you about getting a full-time job.	1.553
You will feel more satisfied if you get a full-time job.	1.480
If you get a full-time job it will give you a secure future.	1.468
If you get a full-time job you'll have more security.	1.404
Don't think of things in the short run, you'll need a full-time job.	1.338
Working a full-time job makes a person more independent.	1.290
If you don't get a full-time job you won't have job security.	1.266
You can't get a raise in pay with a part time job.	1.239
If you get a full-time job you'll probably receive pay increases.	1.204
You won't be able to get any bonuses with a part-time job.	1.200
It is morally wrong not to work up to one's potential.	1.189
If you don't get a full-time job you won't have benefits.	1.186

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
It is morally wrong for you not to fullfill your role as a member of society.	1.171
It is morally wrong for you not to fullfill your obligation as an adult in this society.	1.094
Sacrifice and get a full-time job for your father's sake.	-1.001
The father does his son a favor and then asks his son to get a full-time job.	-1.044
The father reminds his son of his obligations to his family, then suggests that the son should get a full-time job.	-1.048
Get a full-time job or you will make me angry.	-1.067
I will be angry with you until you get a full-time job.	-1.108
I'll restrict your privileges until you get a full-time job.	-1.116
I will not approve of you getting married until you get a full-time job.	-1.162
I will not allow you to get married if you do not get a full-time job.	-1.164
I am your father. You owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.259
If you get a full-time job, I will help you with the expenses you have.	-1.367
Our neighbor's son just got a nice full-time job.	-1.374
After all I have done for you, you owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.429
If you don't get a full-time job I'll take away your priveleges.	-1.437
I would help my son with his homework and then ask him to get a full-time job.	-1.449

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-score
Please sacrifice a little and get a job for my sake.	-1.483
I would help pay the rent on his apartment, and then ask him to get a full-time job.	-1.590
The father gives his son a camera and then asks him to get a job.	-2.015
If you get a full-time job, I will allow you to get the car that you have been wanting.	-2.020

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for those messages that the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix I

Consensus Items and Average Z-scores

Job Situation

Type I and II Individuals

Item	Average Z-score
If you get a full-time job you'll have more security.	1.640
You'll feel more satisfied if you get a full-time job.	1.574
Sit down and relax. I'd like to talk to you about getting a full-time job.	1.551
Working a full-time job makes a person more independent.	1.499
If you get a full time job it will give you a secure future.	1.378
If you get a full-time job you'll probably receive pay increases.	1.284
Don't think of things in the short run, you need a full-time job.	1.160
If you don't get a full-time job you won't have job security.	1.112
If you get a full-time job it will make you financially better off. If you get a full-time job you will be proud of yourself.	1.104
If you get a job your future will be bright. If you get a full-time job you'll feel that you're demonstrating more self-discipling.	1.104

* * *

(appendix continues)

Item	Average Z-score
I would help my son with his homework and then ask him to get a full-time job.	-1.044
Our neighbor's son just got a nice full-time job.	-1.070
If you don't get a full-time job you'll make me even more upset than I am now.	-1.084
Sacrifice and get a full-time job for your father's sake.	-1.086
Please sacrifice a little and get a job for my sake.	-1.172
I'll restrict your privileges until you get a full-time job.	-1.198
Get a full-time job or you will make me angry.	-1.250
I will not allow you to get married if you do not get a full-time job.	-1.351
After all I have done for you, you owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.421
I will be angry with you until you get a full-time job.	-1.511
I am your father. You owe it to me to get a full-time job.	-1.614
If you don't get a full-time job I'll take away your privileges.	-1.638

Note. Z-scores greater than +1.0 are for those messages that the respondent definitely would use. Z-scores less than -1.0 are those the respondent definitely would not use.

Appendix J

Item Descriptions and Descending Z-scores

Job Situation

Differences between Types I and II

Item	Z-scores		
	Type I	Type II	Diff.
If you get a full-time job, I will help with the expenses you have.	0.749	-1.367	2.116
If you get a full-time job I will provide the financial support you need to change jobs.	1.145	-0.935	2.080
The father tells his son that he will pay additional costs while he looks for a full-time job.	1.258	-0.585	1.842
If you get a full-time job, I will allow you to get the car that you have been wanting.	-0.273	-2.020	1.747
I would help pay the rent on his apartment, and then ask him to get a full-time job.	0.020	-1.590	1.610
You will feel better about yourself if you get a full-time job.	1.821	0.260	1.561
The father agrees to pay additional costs while the son is looking for employment.	1.266	-0.216	1.482
The father gives his son a camera and then asks him to get a job.	-0.810	-2.015	1.205

(appendix continues)

Item	Z-scores		
	Type I	Type II	Diff.
Because you are hard working and ambitious, you will want a full-time job.	1.648	0.582	1.067
* * *			
Your future marriage partner will think worse of you if you only have a part-time job.	-0.558	0.497	-1.055
Your family will be disappointed with you if you do not get a full-time job.	-0.883	0.289	-1.172
Only an immature person would not want a full-time job.	-1.163	0.038	-1.201
It is morally wrong not to work up to one's potential.	-0.058	1.189	-1.247
If you don't get a full-time job you will feel you are irresponsible.	-0.438	0.837	-1.275
Only an unappreciative son would not want a full-time job.	-1.611	-0.225	-1.386
Only a short-sighted person would not want a full-time job.	-0.636	0.815	-1.451
Be an adult, you should feel badly if you don't get a full-time job.	-0.674	0.930	-1.604
Getting a full-time job is expected in our society.	-0.083	1.669	-1.752
It is morally wrong for you not to fulfill your role as a member of society.	-0.708	1.171	-1.879
It is morally wrong for you not to fulfill your obligation as an adult in this society.	-0.792	1.094	-1.886