2004

Cultural Long-Term Orientation and Facework Strategies

Rebecca S. Merkin
CUNY Bernard M Baruch College

Cultural Long-Term Orientation and Facework Strategies

Rebecca S. Merkin

Department of Communication and Culture

New York University

This study added to extant research by investigating the relation between cultural long-term orientation (LTO) or Confucian Dynamism and harmony and cooperation facework strategies. Studying intercultural communication is particularly vital at this time given the increasing global nature of today's communication interactions.

Respondents from two cultures—Hong Kong and the United States—completed questionnaires. Multivariate analysis of variance results showed that LTO culture members were more likely to use harmonious and cooperative facework strategies than their short-term orientated counterparts. An inadvertent finding from this study was that Hong Kong, originally thought to be high on the LTO dimension, actually scored moderate. This finding brings into question the assumption that "culture" can be classified by country and advocates use of Hofstede's Value Survey Measure for determining culture change.

When we face the world we present a civilized front to other individuals managing different relationships in particular contexts. This front or "line" (Goffman, 1955) is a pattern of verbal and nonverbal acts carried out to express our point of view of a situation. According to Goffman (1967), face is "the positive social value a person effectively claims for himself [or herself] by the line others assume he [or she] has taken during a particular contact" (Goffman, 1967, p. 5). Face is one's negotiated identity. It can be viewed as one's public self-image. Feelings are attached to one's self, and one's self is expressed through face (Goffman, 1955). Thus, our face is connected to our innermost identity and its maintenance in interpersonal relationships is of utmost importance.

Facework consists of actions taken to support desires to maintain or gain face. Goffman (1967) defines facework as "actions taken by a person to make whatever he

---

Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rebecca S. Merkin, Department of Communication and Culture, New York University, 239 Greene Street, New York, NY 10003. E-mail: rmerkin@aol.com

[or she] is doing consistent with face" (p. 12). When a person's face is threatened —for example, when a person makes a request or is enmeshed in conflict—facework is the necessary action taken to restore one's desired identity.

Cross-cultural communication, by definition, is potentially threatening to face because cultures encode and decode messages differently (Hulbert, 1994). Culture is significant because it is mostly through culture that human groups organize, direct, and pattern their behavior (Kim, 1993). This process occurs in part because of varying cultural dimensions that influence human behavior (Hofstede, 1980; Marsella, 1985; Rosaldo, 1984; Triandis & Albert, 1987). Because the nature of intercultural communication is complex, it is imperative that differences relating to culture be considered lest, for example, inadvertent "insults" should cause others to lose face, which, in turn, might cause all communication to break down. It is, therefore, important to investigate cultural differences to prevent individuals from losing face during cross-cultural interactions.

One major researcher who increased cultural understanding is Hofstede (1980), who, in his study, broke cultural differences up into four dimensions (e.g., uncertainty avoidance) that classify the different ways culture members respond to varying situations. After Hofstede concluded his study, however, it appears that his results did not completely represent the range of cultural characteristics Asian culture members possess.

According to a group of Chinese researchers (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987), Hofstede's (1980) notion of uncertainty avoidance was considered to have a predominantly Western European bias in that it left out various Confucian-based notions widely held by Eastern cultural members. These researchers, together with Hofstede and Bond (1984,1988), studied Asian participants previously not tested with regard to their cultural characteristics. Their results substantiated that a fifth dimension of cultural variation exists. This dimension, Confucian dynamism, refers to characteristics reflecting a long-term orientation (LTO).

LTO refers to a society fostering virtues oriented toward future rewards, such as the promotion of cooperation and harmony for the good of all men. The Asian cultures studied by Hofstede and Bond (1984) had a greater LTO than the more Western cultures tested by Hofstede (1980). Although Hofstede's original cultural dimensions and influence on facework have been studied (Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Merkin, 2000; Oetzel et al., 2001), the effect on facework of this later dimension of LTO (Hofstede & Band, 1984, 1988) has not been investigated. Therefore, this study went further than previous facework studies and investigated whether the LTO cultural dimension influences the use of facework strategies in response to a face-threatening situation.

RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

In an interpersonal context, long-term oriented cultural members value thrift, perseverance, and willingness to subordinate one's self for the purposes of harmony

and cooperation. Therefore, it is likely that members of a LTO culture are more inclined to use harmonious and cooperative facework than members of short-term oriented cultures who subscribe to the ideas of one truth, quick results, and social pressure. Thus, the following hypotheses result:

H1. Members of long-term oriented cultures carry out more Confucian-oriented cooperative facework strategies than members of short-term oriented cultures.

H2. Members of long-term oriented cultures carry out more Confucian-oriented harmonious facework strategies than members of short-term oriented cultures.

METHOD

The purpose of this study is to analyze facework using Hofstede and Bond's (1984) Confucian dynamism dimension. More specifically, this study tests long- and short-term orientation (Hofstede & Bond, 1984, 1988) as a possible predictor of facework strategy choices. The specific facework strategy choices tested were harmony and cooperation. These facework strategy choices were tested as suggested by Cocroft and Ting–Toomey (1994). Cross-cultural communication studies must include strategies applicable to the cultures of the study. Both cooperation and harmony are elements inherent in long-term oriented cultures, as elucidated by Hofstede and Bond (1984), therefore, they are tested in this study. Both the cooperation and harmony strategy measures used for this study were previously used successfully by intercultural researchers. The one-factor structure of scale items can be found in Tables 1 and 2.

Participants

This study was part of an overall study in which several cultures were included. The United States and Hong Kong, the specific countries sampled here, represent the highest and lowest extremes of the continuum from a short-term orientation

TABLE 1
Harmony Scale Items

Scale Items	Unrotated Single Factor Loadings
1. I would avoid outright disagreement with him or her.	.70
2. I would try to avoid conflict with the other person.	.68
3. I would try to smooth over topics that might lead to disagreement.	.66
4. I would maintain harmony between me and my acquaintance.	.65
5. I would express sympathy for the other person's predicament.	.65
6. I would try to smile and express positive emotions only.	.52
7. I would suggest that we cooperate to come to a mutual resolution.	.46

TABLE 2
Cooperative Scale Items

Scale Items	Unrotated Single Factor Loadings
1. Joint effort is the best way to achieve success.	.78
2. Individual success can be achieved while working with others.	.71
3. To succeed, one must cooperate with others.	.70
4. Success is best achieved through cooperation rather than through competition.	.55
5. I enjoy working with others to achieve joint success.	.53

(STO) to a LTO as determined by Hofstede and Bond (1984, 1988). Hofstede (1980, 1991) specified that the best way to operationalize culture would be to use matching samples. When matching participants on as many characteristics as possible, these factors would remain constant and, therefore, would not act as competing effects when trying to isolate cultural effects. In this study, participants were matched on age, education, and sex. Therefore, for the most part, the participants in this study were matched. They were all college students studying in their own home countries within the same age range. Specifically, the mean age of the Hong Kong sample was 18 and the mean age for the U.S. sample was 20. In addition, the mean education level of both the Hong Kong and U.S. samples was exactly matched at 14 years of education. Finally, students broke up into similar ratios between men and women with women, for the most part, dominating the samples. This investigation also followed Hofstede's (1994) criteria that the minimum number of respondents per country used in comparisons should be 20 and the ideal number should be 50. The total Hong Kong sample included 92 participants who came primarily from Hong Kong Baptist University ($n = 60$) and secondarily from the Chinese University of Hong Kong ($n = 32$). The Hong Kong sample consisted of 59 women and 22 men. (Only 71 Hong Kong responses were available for this study because of missing data.) The U.S. sample ($n = 241$) came from a large Midwestern university. In the U.S. sample, 150 were women and 91 were men.

Design and Statistical Procedures

This study employed a multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) designed to test the main effect of Hofstede and Bond's (1984) LTO on facework strategies. The sample size necessary for adequate power in the hypotheses using MANOVA designs is 58 participants per group (Lauter, 1978), and according to Cohen (1988), 70 participants per group. Both samples had adequate sample sizes with more than 70 participants per group.

As suggested by Hofstede (1994), the LTO cultural dimension was operationalized by country. The countries corresponding to varying levels of

LTO were applied as indicated by Hofstede and Bond (1988). Although this study originally was carried out in six countries, the countries chosen for this study had the lowest and highest LTO scores of the countries sampled, namely, the United States and Hong Kong, respectively. There were nine facework strategies originally tested, namely, direct, indirect, distancing, leveling, harmony-maintaining, ritualism, hostility (aggression), self-attribution, and consultation expectations for structural change. Each of the nine strategies originally tested corresponded to each of Hofstede's (1980) different cultural dimensions according to Hofstede's (1980) theoretical predictions. This particular study is reporting only on the two strategies specifically related to LTO and STO, that is, cooperation (also called leveling) and harmony as elucidated by Hofstede (1980) as relating to the cultural conception of LTO. The other strategies tested in the overall study related to other dimensions of cultural variability than LTO (e.g., hostility related to uncertainty avoidance, not LTO).

Procedure

A pilot test was made to test six hypothetical situations created to be used to represent a face-threatening situation. The purpose of presenting such a situation is to provide a basis for respondents to express which facework strategies they would be most likely to use. Of the six hypothetical situations tested, two were derived from Cocroft's (1992) examples and one situation was derived from a critical incident in Brislin et al.'s (1986) *Intercultural Interactions*. The remaining three situations were based on Miller's (1992) categories of embarrassing social predicaments. After presenting 50 students with the six situations, these situations were considered in focus group discussions until the most face-threatening situation to U.S. respondents became apparent.

The situation that most respondents regarded as representative of a face-threatening situation was Situation 2 (see Appendix A), which was derived from a critical incident in Brislin et al.'s (1986) *Intercultural Interactions*. This was the basis for the decision to use this scenario. This same situation was modified according to consultations with cultural members, where possible, from Chinese respondents. With respect to external validity, the results of this study can only be generalized to situations similar to the situation described in this study. However, heuristic value can still be obtained by such results. This hypothetical situation was decided on for use in this study so that the researcher could elicit a variety of responses or strategies to a situation of face loss. Thus, as discussed earlier, respondents were asked to respond to the hypothetical situation in Appendix B.

Students were requested by their professors in their classes in their home countries to respond to questionnaires requesting them to read a hypothetical situation representing a face-threatening situation (i.e., spilling a glass of wine on the other in a restaurant—see Appendix B). On the same questionnaire, respondents were then presented with the nine face-saving strategies presented earlier and were

asked to indicate, on a 5-point Likert-type scale, the extent to which they would use each strategy. The selection of 1 indicated that the respondent definitely would use the strategy, whereas the selection of 5 indicated that the respondent definitely would not use the strategy. Students received the questionnaires in their classes. Demographic questionnaires were also included to assess further respondent characteristics and to aid in the replication efforts of others. Participants were told to work through their booklet at their own speed and to feel free to turn back and forth between pages. When students finished their questionnaires they were collected by their professor.

Instrumentation

Besides operationalizing LTO and STO by country, scales to measure the LTO and STO constructs were also included on a larger questionnaire examining many cultural dimensions and facework strategies. Hofstede's Value Survey Measure (VSM) for LTO (Hofstede, 1994) is a four-item questionnaire section used to compare culturally determined values between people from the two countries selected on LTO; the four questions allowed for the calculation of an index score. Index scores were calculated as a confirmation measure. Six additional questions provided demographic data.

Harmony strategies were measured using Cocroft's (1992) construction of response items because Cocroft (1992; Cocroft & Ting–Toomey, 1994) successfully utilized these response items with Japanese and U.S. respondents. The strategy responses corresponding to harmony strategies were factor analyzed and represented by a separate factor (see Table 1). This assures the construct validity of these response items. For reliabilities of both strategies, see Table 3.

Cooperation strategies were operationalized in this study by using the Cooperative/Competitive Strategy Scale (CCSS; Simmons, Tucker, & King, 1988), which measures the motivation to use competitive, cooperative, or avoidance strategies to achieve success. This is a 24-item scale containing three independent subscales. Each item is followed by five response options ranging from *always* (5) to *never* (1). Although the CCSS was scored by adding all responses within the three subscales and computing the aggregate average for each subscale, this study employed the cooperative subscale only (see Table 2). Test–retest reliability for the Cooperative subscale has been reported at .75 (Simmons et al., 1988). Construct validity was also established by Ward (1993), who confirmed the factor structure of the Simmons et al. (1988) scale with an independent sample of employed adults. This

TABLE 3
Reliabilities for Dependent Variables

	United States		Hong Kong	
Dependent Variable	Reliability	N	Reliability	N
Cooperation	.74	240	.70	71
Harmony	.70	240	.68	71

scale was first pilot-tested and yielded the reliability of .82 for the Cooperative subscale eventually used. The factor structure of the cooperative strategies was also confirmed in this study as being one factor. These factor loadings can also be found in Table 2.

RESULTS

Multivariate Analyses

Data analysis was first conducted to test whether the U.S. sample scored low on LTO and the Hong Kong sample scored high on LTO. This was accomplished by comparing Hofstede's original (1980) scores against results using the data collected for this study calculated according to Hofstede's (1994) VSM. The U.S. sample's original country score was 29. Calculated results from this study indicated a similar U.S. LTO score of 35. The LTO country score for the Hong Kong sample originally was 96; however, the VSM LTO score calculated from data collected for this study was 47, a much larger discrepancy than for the U.S. score. Barlett's test of sphericity, 365.87, $F(3,308) = 15.50, p < .0001$, indicated that multivariate analysis was necessary.

The strategies were analyzed using MANOVA treating LTO as the independent variable. Dependent variables were the two facework strategies of cooperation and harmony. The MANOVA results showed a significant multivariate effect for LTO, Wilk's lambda = .02, $F(3, 309) = 4163.67, p < .0001$. Follow up of an analysis of variance was, therefore, conducted to further analyze the data. Main effects for LTO on harmony and cooperation were both significant (see Table 3). A separate test showed that there were no significant sex differences in this study's results. For Dependent variable descriptive statistics see Table 4. The ANOVA summary can be found in Table 5.

DISCUSSION

This study tested how the cultural dimension LTO and STO (Hofstede & Bond, 1984) could influence cultural members' strategy choices in response to a face-threatening situation. MANOVA results and follow-up univariate tests supported both hypotheses. Therefore, interpretation of these hypotheses follow. Confucian dynamism, the concept behind the LTO dimension, refers to the value

TABLE 4
Descriptive Statistics for Dependent Variables

Dependent Variable	United States		Hong Kong	
	M	SD	M	SD
Harmony	1.92	.53	2.14	.49
Cooperation	1.89	.50	2.21	.49

TABLE 5
Analysis of Variance Summary

Facework Strategies	Hong Kong and United States		
	F	Eta^2	p
Cooperative	20.30	.06	.001
Harmony	11.33	.04	.001

placed on balance and social harmony (Chang & Holt, 1994). Thus, interpersonal relations stressing cooperation and harmony would be a natural consequence of such values. According to Confucian values, both the end goal and communication strategies are similar.

Cooperation and harmony strategies both act to smooth over situations that might cause one to stick out and be noticed in an embarrassing manner. Given the Confucian ethic, even if one would not be in a face-threatening situation, harmony would still be one of the ultimate goals of interaction for LTO culture members. Thus, harmony and cooperation are important strategies to smooth over face-threatening situations. Such strategies act to allow both interacting parties to continue communicating without too much disruption.

LTO cultures such as the culture in Hong Kong mandate communication styles that respect the relationship. Culture members with a LTO believe that the relationship is more important than accurate informational exchanges. If what one says might hurt the group or threaten someone's face, it is not appropriate to say it.

STO cultures such as the United States, on the other hand, have a different view of what is appropriate. Communication competence researchers (for example, see Rubin, 1985; Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984; Weimann, 1977) would agree that for U.S. Americans, communication competence reflects appropriateness and effectiveness. The appropriateness concept refers to communication that does not result in people losing face.

Although members of both STO and LTO cultures may agree on the appropriateness aspect of communication competence, they do not agree on what is effective. Effectiveness refers to achieving communicative goals. According to U.S. Americans, effective communication is usually direct. This assumption reflects the individualism this culture possesses. The U.S. individualism is related to the use of direct (Cocroft & Ting–Toomey, 1994; Lindsley & Braithwaite, 1996) and distancing (i.e., competitiveness, the opposite of cooperation) facework strategies (Hofstede, 1980). U.S. Americans often prefer to achieve effectiveness even to the exclusion of appropriateness, thus causing face loss. To a U.S. American, the loss of face resulting from being on the other end of a direct message is not that great and in some cases, even could be laughed off if someone is extremely direct, depending on the situation. This same kind of experience for members of Confucian-oriented LTO cultures could be more distressing because after losing face, a member of a

LTO culture would not be able to continue on with the relationship, causing the communication to completely break down (Gross & Stone, 1964).Thus, because the goal of LTO culture members is harmony, it should be noted that STO culture members could be causing anguish to LTO culture members by using their strategies of choice (e.g., direct, competitive strategies) with their LTO counterparts and should, perhaps, consider using more strategies that smooth over awkward situations during cross-cultural interactions. Such modifications could conceivably lead to better relations between both LTO and STO culture members.

One last observation regarding the results of this study pertains to Hong Kong's overall status as a LTO culture. Although Hofstede and Bond's (1984) results showed Hong Kong to be a strong long-term oriented culture, this study's results indicated that Hong Kong was only a moderately long-term oriented culture. It is true that this study used college students as a sample, but Hofstede's (1980) businessperson sample would also be worldly and well educated. Thus, it is probably not the sample used that affected these results.

It is well known that Hong Kong is the least traditional of all provinces and territories of China. Given the exposure of Hong Kong's inhabitants' to trade and international businesspeople, perhaps this exposure has caused some more Western values to creep into the previously strong Confucian value system in Hong Kong.

Another possible explanation for the more moderate LTO finding in Hong Kong might be that because the Communist government prohibited traditional Confucian education until recently, the lack of reinforcement of Confucian values could be responsible for a change of attitude among Hong Kong residents. Further study within Mainland China might reveal if LTO has changed all over China. Also, if Mainland China inhabitants score high on LTO, this study could be replicated with a population possessing a more highly infused LTO value system.

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS

The data collection method used for this study, namely, self-report, has both strengths and limitations. Specifically, the self-report method has the advantage of being able to measure information that is carried around in repondents' heads and not readily available using observational techniques. The disadvantage to this method, however, is that respondents are not actually carrying out the behaviors they are reporting they would intend to carry out. The questionnaire was anonymous, and an independent social desirability scale was administered to assure that there were no differences between the samples in this measure, which there were not, so that there was a control for possible respondent social desirability bias in this study. This issue might also be a concern when using self-report measures.This study was originally carried out with the intention of measuring a high LTO culture versus a low LTO culture because Hofstede's original (1980) study found Hong Kong to be a high LTO culture and the United States to be a STO culture. VSM re-

sults, however, showed that Hong Kong, in fact, appears to be a more moderate LTO culture as opposed to a high LTO culture. Subsequent efforts were made to try establishing whether the exact sample used in this study was actually representative of the Hong Kong population in general, without definitive results. Although the representativeness of this college student sample may be in question, the rankings in this study showed that the Hong Kong tested in this study was still higher in LTO than the low LTO culture, the United States. Therefore, despite Hong Kong's moderate LTO finding, there are still significant differences between the groups studied. The two groups, one very low on LTO and one moderately high on LTO, were still significantly separate on the LTO continuum. However, because of the discrepancy between Hofstede's (1980) scores and the results calculated using the VSM (1994), there is a need for replication in future studies with other cultures to see if other cultures have changed from Hofstede's (1980) calculations by using Hofstede's (1994) VSM measure. Such results would reflect the conclusions of this study as well as updating Hofstede and Bond's (1984) results.

Although this study's results lead to more questions about how to measure "culture" (i.e., Hofstede's country calculations vs. VSM scores), there are advantages to such questions. This study was unique in that it tested both Hofstede's (1980) country calculations together with Hofstede's (1994) VSM scores. Despite the fact that further questions arose about measuring culture, strong attempts were made in this study to assure the most representative controlled sample possible. To assure that respondents were truly representative of their culture, culture members filled out questionnaires in their native country. Because the participants were from their native cultures, this study had greater external validity than studies conducted with foreign students studying abroad in the United States, for example. Finally, the participants were also quite similar to each other, which controlled for other possible predictors causing their responses. The samples used in this study were matched by gender, age, and education, thus eliminating competing explanations for the differences this study found in STO and LTO.

The findings of this study are framed by Hofstede and Bond's (1984) conclusions about the cultural dimension of LTO. These findings lend support for Hofstede and Bond's (1984) descriptions of how long-term versus short-term oriented culture members should behave. This study, however, tested just one hypothetical situation, that of a universal face-threatening situation and asked for the likelihood that respondents would behave in a certain manner. In the case of this study, the reported results match the original prediction. Triangulating this study with more realistic observational studies should be carried out in future studies to support these findings to a larger extent. Despite the limitations of this study, the results imply that cultural LTO has an affect on reported facework strategies used by members of such cultures. Specifically, members of long-term oriented cultures reported that they used more cooperative and harmony strategies in response to a hypothetical face-threatening situation than more short-term oriented cultural members.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

REFERENCES

Brislin, R. W., Cushner, K., Cherrie, C., & Yong, M. (1986). *Intercultural interactions*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Chang, H–C, & Holt, G. R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face as interrelational concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework* (pp. 95"132). Albany: State University of New York Press.

Chinese Culture Connection. (1987). Chinese values and the search for culture-free dimensions of cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 18*, 143–164.

Cocroft, B. K.(1992). *Facework in Japan and the United States: A cross-cultural comparison*. Unpublished master's thesis, California State University, Fullerton.

Cocroft, B. K., & Ting"Toomey, S. (1994). Facework in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 18*, 469–506.

Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for behavioral sciences*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work. *Psychiatry, 18*, 213–231.

Goffman, E. (1967). *Interaction ritual*. New York: Doubleday.

Gross, E., & Stone, G. P. (1964). Embarrassment and the analysis of role requirements. *American Journal of Sociology, 70*, 1–15.

Hofstede, G. (1980).*Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and organizations: Software of the mind*. London: McGraw–Hill.

Hofstede, G. (1994). *Value survey module*. Maastricht, The Netherlands: Institute for Research on Intercultural Cooperation.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. (1984). Hofstede's cultural dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*, 417–433.

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M. (1988). The Confucian connection: From cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics, 16*(X), 4–21.

Hulbert, J. E. (1994). Overcoming intercultural communication barriers. *Bulletin of the Association for Business Communication, 57*, 41–44.

Kim, M–S. (1993). Culture-based interactant constraints in explaining intercultural strategic competence. In R. Wiseman & J. Koester (Eds.), *Intercultural communication competence* (pp. 132–152). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lauter, J. (1978). Sample size requirements for the T2 test of MANOVA. *Biometrical Journal, 20*, 389–406.

Lindsley, S. L., & Braithwaite, C. A. (1996). "You should wear a mask": Facework norms in cultural and intercultural conflict in maquiladoras. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 20*, 199–225.

Marsella, A. J. (1985). Culture, self, and mental disorder. In A. J. Marsella, G. DeVos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and Western perspectives* (pp. 279–308). New York: Travistock.

Merkin, R. (2000). *A cross-cultural evaluation of facework communication: An application of Hofstede's cultural dimensions*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Kent State University, Kent, OH.

Miller, R. S. (1992). The nature and severity of self-reported embarrassing circumstances. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 18*; 190–198.

Oetzel, J., Ting-Toomey, S., Matsumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., Takai, J., et al. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: A cross-cultural comparison of China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs, 68*, 235–258.

Rosaldo, M. Z. (1984). Toward an anthropology of self and feeling. In R. A. Shweder & R. A. LeVine (Eds.), *Culture theory* (pp. 137–157). Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Rubin, R. B. (1985). The validity of the communication competence assessment instrument. *Communication Education, 31*, 19–32.

Simmons, C. H., Tucker, S. S., & King, C. S. (1988). The cooperative/competitive strategy scale: A measure of motivation to use cooperative or competitive strategies for success. *Journal of Social Psychology, 128*, 199–205.

Spitzberg, B. H., & Cupach, W. R. (1984). *Interpersonal communication competence.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Triandis, H., & Albert, R. (1987). Cross-cultural perspectives. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 264–295). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ward, E. A. (1993). Factor structure of employed adults' motivation for competitive or cooperative strategy. *Journal of Social Psychology, 133*, 741–743.

Wiemann, J. M. (1977). Explication and test of a model of communication competence. *Human Communications Research, 3*, 195–213.

APPENDIX A

Administered Pilot Test

Please describe a typical situation you have experienced in which you have caused someone to lose face (or threatened a person's dignity or prestige).

_____

_____

_____

_____

Part IV—Please describe a typical situation that you or a friend have experienced in which you or your friend lost face (or your dignity or prestige was threatened).

_____

_____

_____

_____

Part V—In the above situation where you or your friend lost face, what did you or your friend do to regain face?

_____

_____

_____

_____

Situation 1—RESTAURANT CATASTROPHE

Imagine that you are traveling in another country as a tourist and you are the only person from your country in the city you are currently visiting. While visiting a restaurant in this city you knock your full glass of wine onto the floor. It shatters and the wine goes everywhere. Everyone in the restaurant sees this.

Situation 2—MEMORIES OF COLLEGE DAYS

Imagine that you, from Cleveland, ran into your old college buddy, George, whom you haven't seen in years while on a foreign business trip. You were trying to catch up on all that transpired between those years. George invited you home to have dinner with him and his family. The dinner had gone well with you praising the delicious food that was placed before you. As the evening went on, however, you and George began to reminisce a little and talk of your college days and happenings. Your memory stimulated, you brought up several incidents you considered humorous and memorable. In one of them you referred to a time when George made a presentation to one of your "notorious" professors, which did not turn out the way George had expected. You elaborated on George's seemingly ridiculous antics and kept commenting "You should have seen your face!" while making a gruesome face. At this, George paled, and his expression changed. You noticed that others were not laughing and the atmosphere became tense. Although the topic was immediately changed to other things, you left soon afterwards and no mention was made about getting together again.

Situation 3—FIRST JOB

Imagine that after just graduating from college you took your first job in banking. After completing the first month of work, you felt that you were performing up to par. It was just the social adjustment you were finding hard. The core of the department seemed to be made up of a group of tight-knit jocks who worked out together every night after work in the health club. You are short and a bit scrawny. At first the jocks did not pay attention to you. Recently, however, they have been teasing you about your looks and have begun calling you "pee wee."

Situation 4—GARBAGE TREASURES

Imagine that when you were growing up your family did not have a lot of money. You recently started attending an expensive ivy-league college on a full scholarship. Expenses were still tight for you, and you were astounded to find that most of your fellow students were very wealthy. You made friends and got together with a few of them and began sharing an apartment with them in an expensive suburb. You had noticed on the way to school that on garbage day your neighbors had tossed out some great "finds." One day, as you were retrieving a great lamp from your neighbor's garbage, your classmate came out and shouted "ENJOY!"

Situation 5—BULLYING THE BULLY

Imagine that since you started elementary school Bart, the class bully, had chosen you as his prey. There was the time that you were walking home from a recital in your best clothes, and he pushed you down as you were walking, and you fell and

ripped your pants. In high school, when you tried out for the basketball team, he tripped you when no one was looking and you fell flat on your face. When you got to college and saw that he decided to go to the same school, you were horrified and furious. You decided to teach him a lesson so he'd finally get off your back. You knew that every day at exactly five he would take a shower in the same place in your dorm, so you greased the floor in the shower he favored at 4:59. Unfortunately, a group of your friends saw you do this and confronted you.

Situation 6—X-RATED FILM

Imagine that you teach an ethics class at a local university. You are known for your propriety and have a small following of students. Recently, one of your friends confided to you that her son was going to a new x-rated film downtown and asked you to please talk him out of this lifestyle. You go to the x-rated film to find him and bump into one of your favorite students.

APPENDIX B

Scenario Used in Test

HOW WOULD YOU RESPOND?

Please answer all the following questions by marking the response that best describe how you would respond in the situations described. There are no right or wrong answers. (Please respond to all the questions.) After reading the scenario below, please indicate the extent to which you might respond in the way indicated in each statement.

If you strongly agree with the statement, circle 1; if you strongly disagree, circle 5. Circle any number between 1 and 5.

Imagine that you are traveling in another country as a tourist and you are the only person from your country in the city you are currently visiting. While visiting a restaurant in this city you knock your full glass of wine onto the floor. It shatters and the wine goes everywhere. Everyone in the restaurant sees this.