
Culture and Status-Related Behavior: Japanese and American Perceptions of Interaction in Asymmetric Dyads

Rotem Kowner
University of Haifa

Richard Wiseman
California State University, Fullerton

In examining the pattern of status-related behavior in the United States and Japan, the authors compared perceptions of verbal and nonverbal behaviors of lower and higher status people in asymmetric dyadic interaction using 105 behavioral scales. A similar gap was found between perceptions of behavior of lower and higher status people in both cultures, suggesting that this status-related behavior follows a fundamental pattern probably common across cultures. Nevertheless, culture appears to affect the magnitude at which status-related behavior is manifested. In Japan, a hierarchical, collectivist, tight, and high-context culture, the authors found perceptions of greater differences in the behavior of lower and higher status people than in the United States, a more egalitarian, individualist, and low-context culture. The sources and implications of this general pattern of status-related behavior and its cross-cultural differences are discussed.

Cross-Cultural Research, Vol. 37 No. X, Month 2003 1-
DOI: 10.1177/1069397103251425
© 2003 Sage Publications

Keywords: *culture; behavior; social status; status violation; Japanese society; American society; asymmetric dyadic interaction; intercultural contact*

Social status is a feature that denotes one's social dominance and reflects one's relative position in a social hierarchy (Patterson, 1983). Status is also a "widely accepted, socially valued characteristic that forms the basis for a broad range of attributions and expectations" (Ellyson & Dovidio, 1985, p. 7). Status is displayed and recognized during human interaction, whether in large groups or in dyads, and the perception of its presence is a cornerstone of the social order in any society (Asch, 1946). People's status leads not only to specific expectations related to their ability to perform tasks but also to general expectations unrelated to tasks. People express their status especially within hierarchies, which are created to formalize the distribution of power and are enforced by social norms.

Human patterns of status-related behavior can be partly traced to the behavior of animals, nonhuman primates in particular. As with humans, dominance rank in primates reflects relationship and not attributes of individuals. The relative rank of an individual in a group of primates is often manifested by its displays of dominance and submission in the presence of others. The display of social rank among nonhuman primates consists of some cues absent in humans (e.g., dominant scent marking, crook tail over back, mounting); it coincides with many others (e.g., dominant direct stare, eyebrow raising) but misses many subtle verbal cues found in humans (for review, see Mitchell & Maple, 1985).

As for humans, numerous studies have indicated the existence of a similar pattern of status-related behavior. It is omnipresent in almost any human interaction and is found across cultures. The

Authors' Note: We thank Ogawa Toshiki, Yoshida Fujio, and Tsukagoshi Masayuki in Japan and Kimberly Hubert and Judith Sanders in the United States for their assistance in conducting the empirical part of this study. We also thank Shalom H. Schwartz and several anonymous reviewers for their comments on earlier drafts. Correspondence concerning this article should be addressed to Rotem Kowner, Department of Multidisciplinary Studies, University of Haifa, Haifa 31905, Israel; e-mail: kowner@research.haifa.ac.il or to Richard Wiseman, Department of Speech Communication, California State University, Fullerton, Fullerton, CA 92834-6868.

perception of a social interaction in terms of status often leads to an appropriate behavior: people who, in the presence of others, perceive themselves as having lower or higher status may behave in a mode that typically matches this perception. People of higher status are more likely to choose their place in social interaction (Lott & Sommer, 1967), control the approach of others (Walker & Borden, 1976), and touch others informally (J. A. Hall, 1996). People of higher status are also more likely than their lower status counterparts to start a conversation (Packwood, 1974) and to interrupt it (Natale, Entin, & Jaffee, 1979), and they tend to speak more loudly (Packwood, 1974) and longer (Sorrentino & Boutillier, 1975).

In this manner, the perception of one's status relative to other people in a given interaction may lead to two distinctive modes of behavior and communication style. On one hand, perception of oneself as having higher status tends to lead to dominant, assertive, overbearing, forceful, inconsiderate, and disrespectful behavior. Such behavior may simply and often unconsciously reflect one's higher status and dominance but may also actively define the status difference and thus force the other party to behave in the expected typical lower status mode. On the other hand, perception of one's status as lower than others' leads to subordinate, timid, considerate, and respectful behavior. This mode of behavior causes contentment in the higher status others and lessens their aggression. The greater the perception of a gap between one's own and others' relative status, the stronger the tendency to act in these modes of behavior.

People may resort to one or more of several options to manifest their sense of relative status. They may do so verbally and/or nonverbally. When verbally expressing their status, they may do so through the form of their discourse (by the volume of the voice, the length of their speech, etc.) and/or its content (amount of criticism, apology, etc.). People who express their status through nonverbal behavior may do so by self-related activities (folding hands, smiling, walking around, etc.) or other-related activities (touching others, staring at others, etc.). Status may also affect the emotional and cognitive state of people as well as their attitude to communication with people of different status. Finally, status may affect the actual appearance (i.e., grooming) or at least perceptions of appearance (i.e., body size) of people.

CULTURAL EFFECT ON STATUS-RELATED BEHAVIOR

Culture, the “social heritage” of a given community, is one of the cardinal determinants of an individual’s behavior during communication, and it interacts with status. Culture has much to do with the value system of people in a social interaction as well as the perceptions they have of their role and relative power either in reality or as an ideal. This culture-bound cognition in turn demarcates the range of behavioral patterns people are likely to display in accordance with their status. Hence, culture may affect people’s status-related behavior but also people’s perceptions of others’ status-related behavior.

Several studies showed that culture affects various aspects of status-related behavior, such as the distance between speakers (Sussman & Rosenfeld, 1982), the use of gestures during speech (Ekman, 1976), or even the extent of touching (Heslin & Alper, 1983). Although it is reasonable to suggest that a similar pattern of status-related behavior takes place in any culture, no study, as far as we know, has ever ventured to examine this premise, either by comparing a single behavioral item across a large number of cultures or by comparing multiple items across at least a few cultures.

A number of cultural variables may affect status-related behavior during communication. In recent decades, researchers have recognized several bipolar constructs as significant variables in differentiating behavior and communication across culture, and some of them seem to be relevant to status-related behavior as well. These constructs include individualism versus collectivism (or independence vs. interdependence), tightness versus looseness, and high-context versus low-context communication.

The continuum of individualism-collectivism has become a central dimension of supposed cultural variability. Whereas individualistic cultures favor individual goals over group goals, collectivistic cultures prefer the latter (Hofstede, 1980, 1983; Triandis, 1995). Using somewhat different terms, Markus and Kitayama (1991) extended the individualism-collectivism (rendered into independence-interdependence) paradigm and examined its effect on the self. These authors suggested that public features, such as status, play an important role in the self of people in collectivistic societies; whereas in individualistic societies, this role is assumed by internal and private features, such as abilities and feelings. Triandis (1995) proposed further elaboration of this distinction, which has great relevance for the issue of status. He

added to the individualist versus collectivist dimension an additional horizontal versus vertical dimension, thus creating combinations of four types (horizontal individualism, horizontal collectivism, vertical individualism, and vertical collectivism). In both individualist and collectivist cultures, Triandis contended, the horizontal dimension emphasizes that people are similar on most attributes, especially status, whereas the vertical dimension emphasizes the acceptance of inequality as part of social order and that rank has its privileges.

The continuum of tightness-looseness is another important dimension that depicts the extent to which a culture allows deviation from behavioral norms. Tight cultures do not permit their members much deviation from what constitutes correct action, whereas loose cultures do not encourage such a consensus (Pelto, 1968). We presume that tightness amplifies the behavioral pattern of people of different status because they are more likely to obey the behavior ascribed by their social position. Finally, the high-low context continuum describes the amount of information available in communication. In high-context communication, most of the information exists in the context, is internalized in the people communicating, or is found in the physical context. In low-context communication, most of the information lies in explicit codes (E. T. Hall, 1976, 1983). Hence, high-context communication implies greater emphasis on status display through nonverbal communication than through the content of the discourse between people of asymmetrical status.

OVERVIEW

Our primary goal in this study was to analyze the effect of culture on the general pattern of status-related behavior in asymmetric dyadic interaction. For this purpose, we examined the way members of two different cultures perceived the effect of divergent status of two communicating people on their verbal and nonverbal behavior. In this study, we focused on perceptions of dyadic interaction in two major societies. The first, the United States, has often been depicted as the quintessential individualist (independent), low-context, and rather loose culture. American individualism tends to be vertical, especially in business and political settings but moving in social settings to the horizontal direction (Triandis, 1995). The other society, Japan, has been often depicted as the

quintessential vertical collectivist (interdependent), high-context, and tight culture (e.g., Gudykunst & Nishida, 1993).

Within this framework, we examined the following hypotheses:

Hypothesis 1: Status-related behavior in asymmetric dyadic interaction follows a fundamental pattern that varies minimally across cultures.

Therefore, when interacting with a person of a different status, lower and higher status people in both Japan and the United States will behave in a similar fashion.

Hypothesis 2: In hierarchical, tight, and high-context societies, there are greater differences between status-related behavior of lower and higher status people than in more egalitarian, loose, and low-context societies.

Although the general pattern of status-related behavior seems to follow certain universal guidelines, culture affects the magnitude of this pattern for both lower and higher status people and especially the differences in their behavior. More specifically, we expected to find in Japan, a typical hierarchical and high-context society, greater differences between the behavior of lower and higher status people than in the United States, a nation that cherishes, at least in theory, egalitarian relations.

The above hypotheses led to several predictions. First, there would be high correlation between perceptions of status-related behavior of people of similar status in both cultures. Japanese lower status people in interaction were expected to manifest less dominance and more humility than their counterparts in the United States, whereas higher status people in Japan were expected to behave more aggressively and with more discourtesy than their American counterparts. Consequently, we predicted that the gap between the perceptions of behavior of lower and higher status people in Japan would be greater than the gap in the United States.

METHOD

Participants and design. The participants were 109 Japanese undergraduates (64 females and 45 males; mean age \pm *SD* = 21.4 \pm

2.5 years) enrolled in the University of Tsukuba and 168 American undergraduates (96 females and 72 males; mean age \pm *SD* = 23.6 \pm 6.6 years) enrolled in the California State University, Fullerton. There were two independent variables. The first was a repeated measure within-subjects variable, status position, that measured participants' evaluation of lower and higher status people on 105 behavioral scales. The second variable was a between-subjects variable, culture type, which in this study could be defined also as nation, and measured differences between American and Japanese perceptions of status.

Testing material. The questionnaire employed in this study was initially developed for use among Japanese participants. In the first phase of its development, a group of 10 Japanese students was asked to suggest infinite behavioral characteristics of a dyad of unequal status in an encounter within the same culture. Their suggestions, as well as items gathered by the first author through a survey of relevant literature, produced a list of about 200 items. In the second phase, another group of 20 Japanese students was asked to rate the behavior of high- and low-status people on each item and to rate their relevance to status. Items that seemed unclear, overlapping, and irrelevant to status or produced large standard deviations were deleted and a new, shorter questionnaire was constructed.

The resulting questionnaire consisted of two parts. The first was designed to examine status-related behavioral patterns of communication. It consisted of 105 items to be rated on a 9-point response format ranging from one behavioral response to its opposite response. The questionnaire was originally written in Japanese and translated into English and back into Japanese by two bilingual people independently. Discrepancies were settled by a third person to ensure cross-cultural equivalence. The items were selected to encompass various aspects of verbal and nonverbal behavior presumed relevant in dyadic interaction. The translation process involved various measures to ensure linguistic and psychological equivalence, such as avoiding obscure, rare, or abstract expressions; adding explanations to clarify meaning; avoiding changing meaning by changing verb tense; and especially avoiding items that could be problematic or totally nonequivalent in another culture (see Butcher, 1996).

Each item was designed to be rated simultaneously for both lower and higher status partners in an interaction. These

interlocutors were carefully defined to avoid diffuse status characteristics, such as sex, race, and physical attractiveness (cf. Berger, Rosenholtz, & Zelditch, 1980). The items were arranged in a random order to avoid inference by one item with another. The second part was designed to examine participants' own attitude to communication with lower and higher status people. It consisted of 3 items rated on a 9-point response format. Two cross-cultural comparisons of the variances of the matched sets of the 105 items (i.e., U.S.–high status vs. Japan–high status and U.S.–low status vs. Japan–low status) revealed a moderate amount of deviations from the assumption of homoscedasticity (i.e., equal variances). More specifically, 21% (44 out of 210) of the paired comparisons had significant differences in the standard deviations for the corresponding items. All of the significant differences were characterized as having lower standard deviations for the Japanese respondents than for the U.S. respondents. In light of these differences, it was decided to convert all of the raw data to z scores. These z scores were computed separately for each culture, using the overall mean of all 210 items and the overall standard deviation of the responses to the 210 items. Subsequent statistical analyses were based on these z scores and not the raw data. The content of the items as well as the z scores are reported in Table 3.

Procedure. The survey was conducted in a classroom and presented as a status communication questionnaire. Participants were told that it aimed to examine the communication style of people of different social status. They were asked to imagine a few situations where a higher status person interacted with a lower status person (a superior and a subordinate in a corporation, a teacher and a student in school, etc.). Then, they were asked to rate simultaneously each of these two interacting parties on 105 behavioral scales and then to rate simultaneously their own attitudes to communication with higher and lower status people.

RESULTS

The following sections describe attempts to analyze factorially and validate the translation of the measure used in Japan for use in the United States as well as to examine the hypotheses postulated in this study.

**FACTOR ANALYSIS OF INTRACULTURAL
AND CROSS-CULTURAL EQUIVALENCE
AND STATUS-RELATED BEHAVIOR**

Intracultural comparisons of perceptual dimensions of high- and low-status others. A confirmatory factor analysis was used to compare the perceptual dimensions (i.e., factor structures) for judgments of high- and low-status others. The first comparison was made for the respondents from the United States. To establish a base of comparison, an exploratory factor analysis of the 105 behavioral items for the assessment of high-status others was computed. Using Cattell's (1966) Scree test, the interpretability of factors, and Thurstone's (1947) recommendations for a simple factor structure as criteria for factor extraction, we decided that a five-factor solution using principal component analysis was best. These five factors accounted for 33.1% of the total variance in the 105 items. To determine a parsimonious and interpretable solution, the five factors were rotated by Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization.

This five-factor structure representing the perceptual dimensions that the American respondents used in judging high-status others served as a baseline for making comparisons with American respondents' perceptual dimensions in judging low-status others. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis by means of structural equations indicated that the American high-status model was not an adequate fit for the American low-status data (χ^2/df ratio = 1.9, goodness-of-fit index [GFI] = .59, root mean square residual [RMSR] = .47, incremental fit index [IFI] = .58). An examination of the modification indices and the residuals indicated that the lack of fit concerned mainly Factors 3, 4, and 5 (with high status as factor referent), whereas Factors 1 and 2 seemed to be fairly consistent over the two data sets. These results suggested that there were both generalizable and status-specific factors.

As for the Japanese respondents' ratings for high- and low-status others, we decided to use the Japanese high-status perceptual dimensions as a comparative baseline for the analysis. An exploratory factor analysis of the 105 behavioral items for the Japanese respondents' assessments of high-status others was computed. Using Cattell's (1966) Scree test, the interpretability of factors, and Thurstone's (1947) recommendations for a simple factor structure as criteria for factor extraction, we decided that a five-factor solution using principal component analysis was best. These five

factors accounted for 35.5% of the total variance in the 105 items. To determine a parsimonious and interpretable solution, the five factors were rotated by Varimax rotation with Kaiser normalization.

This five-factor structure representing the perceptual dimensions that the Japanese respondents used in judging high-status others served as a baseline for making comparisons with Japanese respondents' perceptual dimensions in judging low-status others. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis by means of structural equations indicated that the Japanese high-status model was not an adequate fit for the Japanese low-status data (χ^2/df ratio = 1.8, GFI = .50, RMSR = .38, IFI = .38). An examination of the modification indices and the residuals indicated that the lack of fit concerned mainly Factors 3 and 5, whereas Factors 1, 2, and 4 seemed to be fairly consistent over the two data sets. These results suggested that there were both generalizable and status-specific factors.

Cross-cultural comparisons of perceptual dimensions of high- and low-status others. A confirmatory factor analysis was used to compare the perceptual dimensions (i.e., factor structures) for American and Japanese respondents' judgments of high- and low-status others (see Butcher & Han, 1996). The first comparison was made for the judgments of high-status others. To establish a base of comparison, the results of the exploratory factor analysis of the 105 behavioral items for the American respondents' assessments of high-status others were used.

This five-factor structure representing the perceptual dimensions that the American respondents used in judging high-status others served as a baseline for making comparisons with Japanese respondents' perceptual dimensions in judging high-status others. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis by means of structural equations indicated that the American high-status model was not an adequate fit for the Japanese high-status data (χ^2/df ratio = 1.8, GFI = .54, RMSR = .45, IFI = .44). An examination of the modification indices and the residuals indicated that there was a cross-cultural similarity in terms of Factors 1 and 2, moderate similarity for Factor 3, and a lack of similarity for Factors 4 and 5 (the American factors being the referent). These results suggested that there were both cross-cultural and culture-specific factors for the perceptual ratings of high-status others.

The second cross-cultural comparison was made for the judgments of low-status others. To establish a base of comparison, the results of the exploratory factor analysis of the 105 behavioral items for the American respondents' assessments of low-status others were used. This five-factor structure representing the perceptual dimensions that the American respondents used in judging low-status others served as a baseline for making comparisons with Japanese respondents' perceptual dimensions in judging low-status others. The results of the confirmatory factor analysis by means of structural equations indicated that the American low-status model was not an adequate fit for the Japanese low-status data (χ^2/df ratio = 1.8, GFI = .47, RMSR = .41, IFI = .34). An examination of the modification indices and the residuals indicated that there was a cross-cultural similarity in terms of Factors 1 and 2, moderate similarity for Factor 3, and a lack of similarity for Factors 4 and 5 (the American factors being the referent). These results suggested that there were both cross-cultural and culture-specific factors for the perceptual ratings of high-status others.

The nature of perceptual dimensions of status. Because the confirmatory factor analyses found unique patterns in the perceptual dimensions used by American and Japanese respondents in making judgments of high- and low-status others, we decided to compute an exploratory factor analysis for each combination of culture and status. This resulted in four factor analyses (i.e., Japanese-high, Japanese-low, American-high, and American-low).

The first exploratory factor analysis was for the Japanese respondents' judgments of high-status others. As indicated above, it was decided to extract a five-factor solution. A total of 40 items had significant factor loadings (i.e., $>.40$) on the first factor. These items suggested that this factor focused on Sensitivity/Aggressiveness Toward Other. The second factor had 14 items with high factor loadings. These items concerned becoming pale, sweating, blushing, folding hands, shaking one's leg, apologizing, covering one's mouth, stuttering, and showing shaky hands. These items pointed to Anxious Behavior. The third factor had 10 items, including showing positive emotion, laughing, using facial expressions, telling jokes, and smiling. These items pointed to Positive Expressiveness. The fourth factor had 11 items, including speaking a lot, using long sentences, speaking with loud volume, speaking quickly, letting other speak, varying the tone of one's voice, and using silence. These items focused on Voice. Finally, the fifth factor had 7

items, including hand movement, consciousness of own behavior, sensitivity to nonverbal messages, challenging the other, and physical stature. This factor was labeled Nonverbal Communication.

The second factor analysis was computed for the Japanese respondents' assessments of low-status others. A principal component analysis with Varimax rotation revealed an interpretable five-factor solution. The five factors accounted for 34.9% of the variance of the 105 items. The first factor had 27 items with high factor loadings. These items included speaking respectfully, greeting, refusing requests, arguing, providing feedback, getting angry, challenging the other, yawning, insulting, complaining, bowing, embarrassing the other, ignoring the other, and showing negative emotions. This factor seemed to be measuring Sensitivity/Aggressiveness Toward Other. The second factor's 20 high-loading items were concerned with behavior such as smoking, complimenting the other, blushing, physical stature, drinking while interacting, shaking one's legs, crying, bowing, covering one's mouth, shaking one's hands, blinking, and stuttering. These focused on Anxious Behavior. The third factor had 14 items, such as using eye contact, engaging in humor, showing positive emotions, laughing, speaking emotionally, and smiling. It was labeled Positive Social Behavior. The fourth factor had 13 items focused on such behaviors as speaking a lot, using long sentences, speaking in a loud voice, letting the other speak, varying tone of voice, keeping silent, showing facial expression, gesturing, and talking about self. It was labeled Voice. The last factor had only 5 items, namely, expressing one's opinion, being masculine/feminine, crying, determining the topic of talk, and having a large/small body size. These items seemed to focus on Potency/Weakness in Expression.

The third factor analysis was computed for the American respondents' judgments of high-status others. As indicated above, it was decided to extract a five-factor solution. The first factor had a total of 29 significant items, of which the largest loading concerned getting angry at the other, criticizing the other, listening to the other, embarrassing the other, and allowing the other to talk. These items suggested that this factor focused on Sensitivity/Aggressiveness Toward Other. The second factor had 13 items, which were thought to measure Logical/Emotional Communication. The third factor was labeled Nonverbal Communication (10 items), the fourth factor was labeled Physical Appearance (10 items), and the fifth factor was labeled Voice (6 items).

The last factor analysis was for the American respondents' judgments of low-status others. A total of 47 items had significant factor loadings on the first factor. They suggested that this factor focused on Sensitivity/Aggressiveness Toward Other. The second was labeled Nonverbal Communication (12 items). The third factor was labeled Physical Activity (10 items). The fourth factor had only 5 items with high loading factors, mostly focusing on restrained gestures, crossing one's legs, touching one's face, determining the topic, and shouting. This was a difficult factor to label (in part due to the few items loading on it), but it was decided to label it Constrained/Expansive Behavior. Finally, the fifth factor had 4 items with high factor loading: knowing the other's feelings, looking attractive, crying, and bowing. This factor was labeled Deferential Behavior.

Interrelationships between factors. Table 1 presents the correlations between the factors for four pairings, namely, American high status and American low status, American high status and Japanese high status, American low status and Japanese low status, and Japanese high status and Japanese low status. In terms of intracultural comparisons, a number of similarities were found among the perceptual dimensions used in assessing status behavior. For the American sample, substantively (i.e., $r > .70$) significant correlations were found for high-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) and low-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) ($r = .88$) and for high-status Factor 2 (Logical/Emotional Communication) and low-status Factor 3 (Physical Activity) ($r = .84$). The latter correlation could be due to the possibility that high-status others reflect their potency through verbal/logical communication, whereas low-status others reflect their potency through lesser amounts of physical activity (e.g., stuttering, blinking, blushing). For the Japanese sample, substantively significant correlations were found for three pairings: high-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) and low-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) ($r = .91$), high-status Factor 2 (Anxious Behavior) and low-status Factor 2 (Anxious Behavior) ($r = .78$), and high-status Factor 4 (Voice) and low-status Factor 4 (Voice) ($r = .80$). These correlations seem fairly straightforward in their interpretation.

In terms of the cross-cultural similarities, two substantively significant correlations were found for American and Japanese respondents' perceptual dimensions for judging high-status others: American high-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) and

TABLE 1
Intercorrelations Between Rotated Factor Loadings

	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Factor 3</i>	<i>Factor 4</i>	<i>Factor 5</i>
Factor 1	2.88	.22	.35	.65	2.08
	.84	2.27	2.34	2.40	2.01
	2.80	.26	2.02	.18	.28
Factor 2	.91	2.30	2.21	.09	2.41
	.33	2.22	.56	2.38	.13
	2.39	.69	2.04	.00	2.13
Factor 3	.28	2.27	.62	2.48	2.13
	2.25	.78	2.17	2.07	.01
	2.25	.84	2.25	2.23	2.09
Factor 4	2.06	2.02	.61	2.01	2.01
	2.09	.48	2.16	2.29	2.08
	.11	2.43	.44	.17	2.08
Factor 5	.26	2.53	2.16	.30	2.14
	.26	2.32	.39	2.34	.40
	2.21	.58	2.25	2.28	.04
Factor 5	.00	.05	.45	.80	2.10
	.39	2.29	2.14	2.09	.10
	2.32	2.15	.29	.53	2.12
	.08	2.13	.18	2.01	2.37
	2.32	.15	.07	2.16	2.08

NOTE: The four scores in each cell of the matrix represent the following correlations: The top correlation is for American high status and American low status, the second correlation is for American high status and Japanese high status, the third correlation is for American low status and Japanese low status, and the bottom correlation is for Japanese high status and Japanese low status. The first condition in each pairing is referred to by the column label, and the second condition is referred to by the row label.

Japanese high-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) ($r = .84$) and American high-status Factor 2 (Logical/Emotional Communication) and Japanese high-status Factor 2 (Anxious Behavior) ($r = .69$). The latter correlation was not as high as the other correlations, and there appeared to be a greater verbal facet to American high-status behavior and a greater nonverbal characteristic in Japanese high-status behavior. Only one substantively significant cross-cultural similarity was found for the perceptual dimensions used to judge low-status others: American low-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) and Japanese low-status Factor 1 (Sensitivity/Aggressiveness) ($r = -.80$). Given that the perceptual dimension of Sensitivity/Aggressiveness Toward Other emerged as a similarity in all four combinations of conditions (

Culture \times Status), this may be a culture-general characteristic of status behavior.

Factors seem to emerge as having salience in all four possible permutations of culture and status, namely, an Aggressiveness or Dominance dimension (Factor 1 in all four conditions) and an Anxiety versus Confidence/Logical dimension (Factor 2 in U.S.–high status and Japan–high/low status and Factor 3 in U.S.–low status). The two sets of common items on these dimensions were extracted and examined. For the former dimension, the 14 common high-loading items (e.g., refuses requests, gets angry, criticizes, complains, does not let partner talk, shouts) were extracted, and a mean summed score was computed; this computed score was felt to measure degree of aggressiveness/dominance. For the latter dimension, the 9 common high-loading items (e.g., seldom blushes, seldom apologizes, determines topic of talk, makes decisions, never stutters) were extracted, and a mean summed score was computed; this computed score measured the degree to which the individual was logical, confident, and nonemotional.

Significant differences were found for status, $F(1/537) = 257.1, p < .001, \eta^2 = .324$, and culture, $F(1/537) = 3.9, p < .05, \eta^2 = .007$ on the Aggressiveness dimension. In terms of mean differences, high-status individuals were perceived to exhibit more aggressiveness than lower status individuals (means = .17 and $-.52$, respectively), and greater aggressiveness was perceived overall by U.S. respondents than Japanese respondents (means = 2.13 and 2.23, respectively). Furthermore, there was a highly significant interaction effect between status and culture on the Aggressiveness dimension, $F(1/537) = 118.7, p < .001, \eta^2 = .181$. An examination of the cell means suggests that Japanese low-status individuals were perceived to exhibit significantly less aggressiveness than the other three cohorts (mean = 2.91), whereas Japanese high-status individuals were perceived to exhibit significantly more aggressiveness (mean = .44 vs. U.S. low/high means = 2.26 and .00, respectively). In essence, status in Japanese culture accentuates the differences on this Aggressiveness dimension.

A significant difference was found for status on the Logical/Nonemotional dimension, $F(1/546) = 719.2, p < .001, \eta^2 = .569$; however, no difference was found for culture on this dimension. For the significant status differences, the mean for high-status individuals was significantly higher than for low-status individuals (means = .73 and 2.38, respectively), suggesting that higher status

individuals are perceived as more logical, confident, and nonemotional. Also, a significant interaction effect was found for status and culture on the Logical/Nonemotional dimension, $F(1/546) = 6.4, p < .02, \eta^2 = .012$. An examination of the cell means indicates that the statistical interaction effect is due primarily to the higher than expected mean for the Japan high-status condition (mean = .82 vs. Japan low status = 2.42, U.S. low/high status = 2.35 and .68, respectively), suggesting that higher status Japanese are perceived to be more logical, confident, and nonemotional.

CROSS-CULTURAL SIMILARITY VERSUS DISSIMILARITY

To examine Hypothesis 1, which postulated the existence of a fundamental pattern of interaction between lower and higher status people, we examined the correlation between the mean scores of the 105 behavioral scales as rated for lower and for higher status people in each of the two cultures. We found a highly significant negative correlation between the perceived behavioral patterns of low- and high-status people both in Japan and in the United States. As predicted, we also found a positive correlation between perceptions of the behavioral pattern of same-status people across culture: between low-status people and between high-status people (see Table 2).

Next, we examined separately the perceptions of differences in the behaviors of lower and higher status people within each culture. Whereas the factor analyses provide a more global picture of the perceptual dimensions used to assess status in the two cultures, the examinations of particular items should provide a more detailed perspective on specific behavioral differences as they are influenced by culture and status. As such, there should be some heuristic value for future studies by pointing out domains for specific interest.

As indicated in Table 3, there was a cross-cultural correspondence between the perceived differences of lower and higher status people on 71 of the total 105 items. In both cultures there were differences in the behavior of higher and lower status people in 64 matching items and a lack of differences in an additional 7 matching items. In the remaining 34 items, differences in the behaviors of higher and lower status people were found in only one of the two cultures (see the Low-High Differences columns in each culture in Table 2). Only in 2 of the 64 items in which differences in status-

TABLE 2
Correlation Coefficients Between Patterns
of Status-Related Behavior of Higher and
Lower Status People in Two Cultures (105 Items)

	<i>Japan</i>		<i>United States</i>	
	<i>Lower Status</i>	<i>Higher Status</i>	<i>Lower Status</i>	<i>Higher Status</i>
Japan				
Lower status	—	2.71****	.73****	2.21*
Higher status		—	2.67****	.67****
United States				
Lower status			—	2.54****
Higher status				—

* $p < .05$. **** $p < .0001$.

related behavior were found in both cultures was behavior of higher and lower status people in the two cultures rated in opposite directions (changes of tone of voice, ends conversation abruptly). Out of 105 items examined separately for the Japanese and American samples, we found differences in higher and lower status people in 91 and 72 items, respectively.

To examine Hypothesis 2, which postulated that there are greater differences in the behavior of lower and higher status people in Japan than in the United States, we conducted two-way multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA). To determine if multivariate analysis was warranted in testing the summation scores, we computed Bartlett's test of sphericity. A value of 23,372.8 ($p < .0001$) indicated that the measures were correlated sufficiently to require MANOVA.

The two independent variables, culture type and status position, were also tested for homogeneity of variances by means of Cochran's *C*. Neither variable yielded significant differences, suggesting that the MANOVA assumption was not violated. Furthermore, the assumption of homogeneity of the dispersion matrices was affirmed by Box's *M* ($M = 7,349.9$, $F[5,050/334,918] = 1.0$, $p = \text{n.s.}$). The MANOVA yielded a significant main effect for Culture Type (Pillai's criterion = .401, $F[105/410] = 2.7$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .401$) and a significant main effect for Status Position (Pillai's criterion = .817, $F[150/410] = 18.3$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .817$).

(Text continued on p. XX)

TABLE 3
A Comparison Between Status-Related Behavior in Japan and the United States (computed in z scores)

Item (1/9 points)	Japan						United States						Japan-United States					
	Lower Status			Higher Status			Lower Status			Higher Status			Low-High Difference			Low-High Difference		
	z	SD	F	z	SD	F	z	SD	F	z	SD	F	z	SD	F	z	SD	F
Verbal activity (form)																		
1. Speaks a lot/a little	0.29	0.8	20.46	0.8	20.34	52.2****	0.28	0.9	20.34	1.0	35.0****	1 >	1.4		1 >			
2. Speaks/does not speak eloquently	0.29	0.7	20.27	0.8	20.60	26.4****	0.35	0.8	20.60	0.9	102.5****	1.1	9.5****		6.4*			
3. Uses long sentences/short sentences	0.29	0.9	20.15	0.9	20.36	8.0**	0.37	0.9	20.36	1.0	49.9****	1.8	4.2		3.7			
4. Speaks in loud voice/soft voice	0.26	0.8	20.47	0.9	20.24	48.1****	0.13	1.0	20.24	1.0	11.6****	1.1	5.2*		3.6			
5. Speaks aggressively/moderately	0.64	0.7	20.28	0.8	20.28	108.3****	0.25	0.9	20.28	1.0	27.1****	19.6****	1 >		6.8**			
6. Speaks politely/impolitely	21.05	0.6	0.28	0.7	20.26	210.5****	20.16	1.1	20.26	1.0	1 >	65.2****	25.3****		69.2****			
7. Speaks casually/respectfully	0.90	0.8	20.09	0.8	0.19	100.0****	0.24	1.0	0.19	1.0	1 >	36.5****	7.2**		28.8****			
8. Speaks fast/slow	20.05	0.7	0.30	0.8	0.11	9.7****	20.08	0.8	0.11	0.8	5.2*	1 >	2.8		1 >			
9. Lets/does not let partner speak	20.17	0.8	0.01	0.9	20.08	2.0	20.19	1.0	20.08	1.0	1 >	1 >	1 >		1 >			
10. Often/seeldom changes tone of voice	0.02	0.9	0.27	0.9	0.11	8.6**	0.11	0.8	0.11	0.9	7.8**	2.5	16.8****		11.1****			

11. Often/seldom keeps silence	20.10	0.9	0.20	1.0	4.9*	20.31	1.0	0.51	1.0	52.3****	4.0	6.5*	6.9**
12. Does not use/uses negative words	20.14	1.0	0.16	1.0	107.1****	0.07	1.0	20.03	1.0	1 >	33.0	24.0****	37.3****
13. Speaks/does not speak while eating	0.79	0.8	20.23	0.9	84.2****	0.11	1.1	0.38	1.1	4.9*	28.2****	30.4****	43.0****
14. Speaks rationally and coldly/emotionally and coldly	0.23	0.6	20.20	0.8	18.7****	0.47	0.8	20.26	1.0	54.3****	6.5*	1 >	3.3
15. Occasionally/never stutters	20.29	0.7	0.74	0.7	112.4****	20.48	0.9	0.72	0.8	166.4****	3.3	1 >	1 >
16. Ends/does not end conversation abruptly	0.77	0.8	20.30	0.9	78.4****	0.38	0.9	20.14	1.0	22.1****	13.6****	1 >	6.6*
Verbal activity (content)													
17. Does not speak/speaks factually	0.50	0.8	0.45	0.8	1.2	20.15	0.9	0.60	0.9	57.2****	48.6****	1.8	31.0****
18. Speaks logically/illogically	20.13	0.8	20.39	0.8	2.8	0.06	0.9	20.66	0.9	51.7****	4.7*	8.7**	11.4***
19. Gives/does not give compliments	21.12	0.5	0.82	0.8	435.8****	0.13	0.9	20.14	0.9	1 >	83.9****	97.5****	130.1****
20. Speaks using/without using humor	0.11	0.9	20.46	0.8	20.7****	20.02	0.9	20.11	0.9	1 >	2.6	5.8*	7.0**
21. Expresses/does not express own opinion	20.04	0.9	20.72	0.8	40.9****	0.17	0.9	20.72	1.0	72.5****	2.8	1 >	1 >
22. Determines/does not determine the topic of the conversation	0.51	0.8	20.81	0.7	165.0****	0.40	0.9	20.77	0.8	156.0****	1 >	1 >	1 >

(continued)

34. Refuses/does not refuse requests	1.05	0.7	20.56	0.8	253.9****	0.53	1.0	20.23	0.9	54.2****	27.0****	6.4*	20.9****
35. Often/seldom makes requests	0.36	1.0	20.90	0.5	29.6****	0.33	0.9	20.46	1.0	57.9****	1 >	5.2*	2.0
36. Often/seldom asks questions	20.58	0.8	0.11	0.9	25.4****	20.28	0.9	0.01	1.0	7.3**	5.6*	1 >	2.3
37. Tries/does not try to persuade partner	20.03	0.9	20.26	1.0	1.8	0.09	0.9	20.24	1.0	9.4****	1.4	1 >	1 >
38. Deletes/adds suffix (J) or prefix (U) from/to partner's name	1.46	0.6	21.07	0.8	645.4****	0.23	1.2	20.07	1.2	5.3*	100.7****	56.7****	101.8****
39. Often/seldom apologizes	20.92	0.6	1.04	0.6	394.3****	20.56	1.0	0.69	0.9	145.2****	10.9****	6.6*	11.0****
40. Often/seldom complains to partner	0.80	0.8	20.63	0.7	178.1****	0.04	1.1	20.00	1.0	1 >	46.2****	12.1****	53.0****
41. Does not give/gives commands to partner	20.98	1.0	0.95	0.9	297.1****	20.34	1.0	0.50	1.1	46.8****	30.5****	25.0****	24.8****
42. Refers to/ignores partner's topics	20.81	0.6	0.14	0.8	86.8****	20.32	0.9	20.14	0.9	2.9	22.8****	6.2*	21.6****
43. Agrees/does not agree with partner	21.00	0.5	0.30	0.7	263.3****	20.33	0.9	0.14	0.7	27.5****	58.9****	2.3	33.5****
44. Invites/does not invite to go to eat	0.66	0.9	20.95	0.6	261.3****	0.18	0.9	20.32	1.0	21.4****	27.3****	29.5****	46.4****
Nonverbal activity (self-related)													
45. Legs shake/do not shake	20.36	0.8	0.91	0.7	127.2****	20.42	1.0	0.64	0.9	104.2****	39.9****	6.7*	1 >
46. Crosses/does not cross legs	0.78	0.8	20.88	0.7	256.4****	0.00	0.9	20.23	1.0	6.3*	49.5****	35.2****	70.5****
47. Walks/does not walk around	0.38	0.9	20.02	1.0	6.0*	0.33	1.0	20.35	1.00	38.2****	1 >	10.2****	3.4
48. Sits/does not sit while partner stands	0.87	0.9	20.87	0.8	231.4****	0.01	1.0	0.16	1.1	1 >	51.6	63.2****	78.7****

(continued)

TABLE 3 (continued)

Item (1/9 points)	Japan						United States						Japan-United States					
	Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Low-Low		High-High		Low-High	
	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
49. Seldom/often moves hands	0.27	0.9	0.04	0.9	2.7	0.04	0.9	0.08	0.9	1 >	3.8	1 >	3.8	1 >	3.8	1 >	1.6	
50. Uses/does not use hands to explain	20.22	0.7	20.15	0.8	1.1	20.05	0.8	20.18	0.9	1.5	3.1	1 >	3.1	1 >	3.1	1 >	1.9	
51. Does not fold/often folds own hands	20.67	0.8	0.81	0.8	207.3****	0.12	0.9	0.14	0.9	1 >	72.8****	40.0****	72.8****	40.0****	72.8****	40.0****	6.4*	
52. Hands do not shake/hands shake	0.42	0.8	20.78	0.7	125.1****	0.35	0.9	20.25	1.1	30.5****	1 >	20.8****	1 >	20.8****	1 >	20.8****	10.3****	
53. Keeps/does not keep hands in pockets	0.90	0.9	20.41	0.9	113.7****	2.06	1.0	2.41	1.0	18.3****	73.0****	42.4****	73.0****	42.4****	73.0****	42.4****	82.4****	
54. Seldom/often touches own face or head	20.03	0.9	20.11	0.9	1 >	0.24	0.9	20.15	0.9	14.4****	6.6*	1.0	6.6*	1.0	6.6*	1.0	4.5*	
55. Makes/never makes gestures to explain oneself	20.40	0.8	0.07	0.9	18.6****	20.28	0.9	20.16	0.9	1.4	1.1	4.8*	1.1	4.8*	1.1	4.8*	4.1	
56. Moves/does not move one's face	20.07	0.8	0.18	0.8	9.1****	0.03	0.7	0.08	0.8	1 >	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.2	1.8	2.2	2.7	
57. Opens/closes one's eyes when listening	20.49	0.9	0.41	0.8	51.5****	20.41	1.0	20.24	1.0	2.4	1 >	23.1****	1 >	23.1****	1 >	23.1****	14.8****	
58. Often/seldom blinks	20.36	0.7	0.50	0.6	84.8****	20.21	0.8	0.31	0.8	36.8****	1.4	5.5*	1.4	5.5*	1.4	5.5*	4.5*	
59. Covers/does not cover one's mouth while speaking	20.24	0.8	0.62	0.7	64.6****	0.02	1.1	0.62	1.0	27.6****	3.4	1 >	3.4	1 >	3.4	1 >	2.1	

60. Yawns/never yawns	0.95	0.8	20.06	1.0	79.0***	0.08	1.0	0.08	1.0	1 >	59.6***	2.2	32.8***
61. Often/seldom blushes	20.55	0.7	0.82	0.8	127.8***	20.42	0.8	0.65	0.8	138.7***	1 >	1.9	1 >
62. Seldom/often becomes pale	0.41	0.7	20.71	0.7	111.4***	0.40	0.8	20.55	0.9	108.4***	1 >	2.0	1 >
63. Often/seldom smiles	20.36	0.8	20.01	0.8	7.5**	20.22	0.9	20.01	1.0	1.4	2.2	1 >	1.0
64. Often/seldom laughs	20.19	0.9	20.32	0.8	2.4	20.17	0.9	0.00	0.9	3.2	1 >	12.0**	4.5*
65. Shows/does not show negative emotions	0.12	0.8	0.24	0.8	1.8	0.02	1.0	20.00	1.0	1 >	1.3	7.3**	1 >
66. Often/seldom shows positive emotions	20.28	0.8	0.06	0.9	7.4**	20.20	0.9	20.16	0.91	1 >	1 >	2.6	2.8
67. Shows wide/limited variety of facial expressions	20.18	0.8	20.16	0.9	1 >	20.17	0.9	20.02	0.9	2.6	1 >	1.2	1 >
68. Seldom/often sweats	0.71	0.8	20.52	0.8	130.3***	0.53	0.8	20.44	0.9	105.0***	1.9	1.9	2.8
69. Becomes/does not become dizzy	0.34	0.8	0.24	0.9	1 >	20.04	0.9	0.53	0.8	40.8***	4.5*	3.2	8.2**
70. Heart beats slow/fast	0.51	0.9	20.60	0.7	26.8***	0.53	0.9	20.27	0.9	66.4***	1 >	3.1	1 >
Nonverbal activity (other-related)													
71. Smokes/does not smoke without asking for permission	1.06	0.9	20.66	1.0	180.4***	0.28	1.2	20.04	1.2	5.9*	35.6***	19.9***	41.1***
72. Eats/does not eat while partner is talking	0.70	0.9	20.50	0.9	111.9***	0.14	1.0	0.03	1.0	1 >	23.9***	22.2***	38.6***
73. Does not drink/drinks while listening	20.72	0.9	0.78	0.7	190.5***	20.11	1.0	0.25	0.9	12.0***	32.3***	21.3***	37.6***
74. Often/seldom greets partner	21.10	0.6	0.06	0.82	139.9***	20.29	0.90	20.34	1.0	1 >	62.2***	13.2***	59.7***
75. Answers/does not answer partners' greetings	20.96	0.8	20.19	0.9	56.1***	20.39	1.0	20.38	0.9	1 >	34.0***	2.6	26.2***

(continued)

TABLE 3 (continued)

Item (1/9 points)	Japan						United States						Japan-United States						
	Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Low-High		Low-High		Low-High		
	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	Low	High	Low	High	F	F	
76. Does not look/looks down at partner	20.84	0.7	0.63	0.9	197.6***	20.40	1.0	0.39	1.0	50.2***	22.1***	3.2	14.6***						
77. Often/seldom looks down while speaking	20.32	0.9	0.71	0.8	19.7***	20.45	0.9	0.64	1.0	113.3***	1 >	1 >	1 >						
78. Looks/does not look at partner's eyes	20.25	0.9	0.37	0.9	2.2	20.11	1.0	20.49	1.0	12.9***	1 >	1 >	1.5						
79. Looks/does not look at partner with coercive face	0.89	0.7	20.64	0.7	237.3***	0.29	0.8	20.29	0.8	44.3***	39.9***	10.6***	32.7***						
80. Shows/does not show respect	21.10	0.6	0.52	0.8	294.7***	20.29	1.1	20.16	1.0	1.3	61.3***	34.8***	82.2***						
81. Restraints/does not restrain oneself ("enryo")	21.04	0.7	0.71	0.8	292.8***	20.14	1.05	0.10	1.07	4.1	63.9***	25.5***	56.0***						
82. Knows/hardly knows partner's feelings	20.01	0.7	0.12	0.8	1 >	20.03	0.9	0.11	0.9	2.0	1 >	1 >	1 >						
83. Sensitive/insensitive to partner's nonverbal signs	20.81	0.7	0.20	0.92	72.8***	20.21	1.0	0.07	0.9	7.6**	28.3***	1 >	15.4***						
84. Often/seldom bows	21.23	0.5	0.77	0.7	494.5***	0.10	1.1	0.44	1.0	9.3***	140.1***	9.5***	108.7***						

85. Stands close to/far from partner	0.40	0.9	20.24	0.8	27.2****	0.12	0.9	20.19	0.9	10.5***	5.5*	1 >	3.0
86. Often/seldom touches partner	1.04	0.8	0.12	1.0	57.0****	0.22	0.9	20.08	0.9	8.5**	52.6****	2.8	12.3***
87. Does not pat/pats partner's back	21.10	0.7	0.96	0.8	366.9****	20.36	0.9	0.40	0.9	55.9****	55.5****	19.6****	45.5****
88. Waits/does not wait for partner to talk	20.60	0.8	0.47	0.9	80.8****	20.291	1.0	0.18	1.0	18.7****	8.6**	5.1*	8.7**
89. Does not let/lets partner to talk	1.02	0.6	20.61	0.8	258.8****	0.44	0.9	0.03	1.0	14.6****	35.5****	26.9****	44.8****
90. Does not listen/listens to partner's words	0.73	0.8	20.18	0.9	56.1****	0.47	1.0	0.08	1.0	12.3****	6.7*	2.4	6.4*
91. Embarrasses/does not embarrass partner	0.73	0.91	20.15	0.9	63.7****	0.44	1.0	0.07	1.0	11.3****	9.8****	3.0	9.9****
92. Seldom/often challenges partner	20.67	0.8	0.25	0.9	58.1****	20.34	0.9	0.40	1.0	49.5****	9.1****	2.4	1.0
Emotional and cognitive state													
93. Easily/hardly gets angry	0.67	0.7	20.33	0.9	84.0****	0.09	0.9	0.04	0.9	1 >	32.6****	8.6**	27.9****
94. Cries/never cries	0.06	0.9	0.85	0.8	41.9****	20.21	1.0	0.66	1.0	66.4****	5.2*	2.1	1 >
95. Gets/does not get irritated	0.03	0.8	20.46	0.8	19.2****	20.08	0.9	20.23	1.0	2.1	2.0	2.6	4.2
96. Gets/does not get angry if criticized	0.64	0.9	20.82	0.9	150.3****	0.04	1.0	20.28	1.1	8.2**	28.7****	16.6****	33.0****
97. Afraid/unafraid to make requests	20.44	1.0	0.43	1.0	10.8****	20.64	0.9	1.00	0.9	274.8****	1.1	9.2***	5.5*
98. Conscious/unconscious of own appearance	20.40	0.8	20.11	0.9	8.6**	20.15	1.0	20.52	1.0	14.9****	5.1*	17.6****	18.5****
99. Unconscious/conscious of own behavior/words	0.65	0.8	0.02	1.0	31.5****	0.25	1.1	0.32	1.1	1 >	14.2****	5.7*	12.5***

(continued)

TABLE 3 (continued)

Item (1/9 points)	Japan						United States						Japan-United States					
	Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Lower Status		Higher Status		Low-High Difference		Low-High		High-High		Low-High	
	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	z	SD	z	SD	F	F	F	F	F	F	F	
Appearance																		
100. Has a short/tall stature	20.06	0.7	0.14	0.6	6.3*	20.27	0.8	0.55	0.9	81.4***	5.3*	16.9***	13.5***					
101. Looks attractive/ unattractive	0.04	0.4	20.02	0.5	1 >	0.19	0.8	20.33	1.0	28.2***	4.1	11.7***	13.5***					
102. Feminine/masculine	20.14	0.7	0.53	0.7	56.3***	20.13	0.8	0.29	1.0	17.9***	1 >	5.1	3.0					
103. Well/badly groomed	20.06	0.7	20.69	0.7	49.6***	0.08	0.9	20.82	0.9	75.1***	1.6	1.5	2.8					
104. Looks young/old	20.80	0.7	20.74	0.7	360.4***	20.23	0.9	0.28	1.0	25.9***	30.3***	17.8***	30.5***					
105. Has a small/big body	20.19	0.6	0.31	0.7	40.6***	20.20	0.8	0.26	0.8	29.4***	1 >	1 >	1 >					
Own attitudes toward commun- ication with people of lower or higher status																		
1. Very/not at all nervous	0.50	0.9	20.52	0.8	75.7***	0.51	0.8	20.50	0.9	109.6***	1 >	1 >	1 >					
2. Likes/hates to speak	0.15	0.9	20.18	1.1	9.5***	20.08	1.0	0.10	1.0	3.7	3.6	24.7***	12.5***					
3. Feels considerable aversion/no aversion to communicate	0.29	1.0	2.030	0.9	30.3***	0.31	1.0	20.30	0.9	36.5***	1 >	1 >	1 >					

NOTE: Cultural differences in bold indicate greater Japanese high-low differences, whereas cultural differences in italic indicate greater American high-low differences.
* $p < .05$. ** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$. *

Moving to univariate ANOVAs, we first compared the differences of the ratings for each item in either the lower or the higher status people across culture (see the Low-Low and High-High columns in Table 3). Out of 105 items, we found differences in the ratings of higher status people in Japan and the United States in 62 items and in the ratings of lower status people in 52 items. We further analyzed the cultural differences in the within-culture differences in ratings of lower and higher status people (see the Low-High—Low-High column in Table 3). Out of 105 items, cultural differences appeared in 66 items. In 55 of these, the difference in ratings of lower and higher status people in the Japanese sample was greater than in the American sample, whereas in 9 items the difference was greater in the American sample. In the 2 remaining items, the difference was not absolute but in the opposite direction.

Cultural similarities and dissimilarities were especially apparent when we looked at each conceptual cluster separately (see Table 3):

1. *Verbal activity (form)*. Both cultures followed the principle that higher status people speak longer, louder, and more aggressively than lower status people and also feel freer to decide when to speak. Status in Japan, however, determined much more than in the United States the level of polite and respectful manner of speech used by people of different status in an interaction.
2. *Verbal activity (content)*. Both cultures met the expectation that higher status people were more likely to determine the topic of the conversation, make decisions, and act more aggressively toward the partner through criticism, shouting, or insults. Status in Japan, however, determined more than in the United States the likelihood of usage of compliments, humor, and talking about the partner.
3. *Nonverbal activity (self-related)*. In both cultures, status determined behavior that indicated deference and fear. Lower status people in both cultures exhibited more prominently than higher status people signs of tension and deference. Status in Japan, however, determined more than in the United States the display of deference signs.
4. *Nonverbal activity (other-related)*. In both cultures, lower status people displayed much more deference toward their higher status partner than the opposite. Lower status people in Japan, however, displayed almost all deference signs more frequently and strongly than did their American counterparts.
5. *Emotional and cognitive state*. In both cultures, lower status people displayed a less stable emotional state, whereas higher status people could afford to display more anger. Differences in negative

feelings were more prominent in Japan. Lower status people in Japan were more conscious of their appearance but less conscious of their behavior than their higher status compatriots.

6. *Appearance.* In both cultures, higher status people were perceived as bigger, taller, better groomed, older, and more masculine. Nonetheless, higher status people were perceived in the United States as more attractive than lower status people, whereas there was no such difference in Japan.
7. *Own attitudes toward communication with higher and lower status people.* Respondents from both cultures felt similarly more nervous about and more aversion to communication with higher status people. Japanese respondents, however, felt more averse to speaking with higher status people, whereas American respondents tended to feel more averse to speaking with lower status people.

DISCUSSION

The findings confirmed the hypotheses of the study. The high correlation found between the ratings of the behavior of lower and higher status people in culturally dissimilar societies such as Japan and the United States suggests that status-related behavior in asymmetric dyadic interaction follows a similar and probably fundamental pattern. Nonetheless, the differences in the magnitude of status-related behavior perceived in these two nations also suggest that culture, among other factors, affects the way status-related behavior is manifested. In Japan, a hierarchical, collectivist, tight, and high-context culture, we found greater differences in status-related behavior of lower and higher status people than in the United States, a more egalitarian, individualist, and low-context culture.

GENERAL AND CULTURAL ASPECTS OF STATUS-RELATED BEHAVIOR

The existence of a remarkable similarity in the general patterns of behavior of higher or lower status people in Japan and the United States should not be a surprise, because wherever there is a social hierarchy we also find similar social mechanisms that shape similar patterns of behavior. Because social status denotes social dominance, societies of various cultural backgrounds have constructed a set of rewards and punishments that aim to stimulate or curtail the behavior of their members along hierarchical lines.

Status-related behavior is also shaped by a self-fulfilling prophecy. People of higher status are expected, for example, to be more articulate, and this is fulfilled by their greater command of a social interaction (Krauss, Chen, & Chawla, 1996).

Although the human need for hierarchy and craving for social dominance are ubiquitous, they do not preclude culture from affecting social interactions. Culture, we argue, determines the values attached to status, but it also affects the magnitude at which a person's status is manifested through behavior in a given society. Our findings point to the existence of various differences in the perceptions of behavior of lower and higher status people in Japan and the United States in almost any domain of communication. These two cultures differ in the factorial structure of status-related behavior as well as in the magnitude of the differences attributed to the behavior of people of high and low status. As expected, these differences are more apparent in Japan, a culture that combines relatively high levels of vertical collectivism, high context, and tightness. Because we dealt with perceptions rather than actual behavior, it could be argued that culture does not necessarily affect behavior but rather the perceptions of it. Further research, even on a single item, may be needed to establish whether there is any cultural effect on the congruence between status-related behavior and its perception.

Cultural differences were especially prominent in the domain of nonverbal activity related to interaction with the partner. These differences, we suggest, are mainly the result of the divergent role others play in shaping the construal of self in individualistic and collectivistic societies. Whereas in the former societies, others serve as a source for self-evaluation, in the latter societies, relationships with others in a specific context define the self and its position in society (Markus & Kitayama, 1991). The prominence of nonverbal activity in Japan stems, perhaps, from additional cultural sources. Japan, more than any other Asian society, has been influenced by the teaching of Zen Buddhism, which places great value on silence and on the communication of ideas and feeling by nonverbal means (Morsbach, 1973). Similarly, Japanese social relations were regulated in premodern times by strict and often ruthless control that stressed conformity to nonverbal codes of behavior rather than verbal dialogue (Reischauer, 1988).

IMPLICATIONS FOR INTERCULTURAL CONTACT

The significance of this study for intercultural contact, and specifically for Japanese-American communication, lies in the indication of the existence of incongruent behavioral domains in different cultures. Although we demonstrated that people of similar status do generally perceive their own behavior similarly across cultures, status-related behavior across cultures is far from identical.

Status-related behavior may differ across cultures on several levels. The most common differences are those in magnitude. This means that in both cultures, there is a gap between the behavior of people of higher and lower status, but the size of the gap is not necessarily the same. Although American employers, for example, do shout occasionally at their subordinates, they may be surprised at the license Japanese employers take in this aspect. They may also be surprised by the slight response such shouting evokes in the Japanese employees. Japanese employees, by contrast, may be surprised by the loose and seemingly disrespectful attitude and behavior American employees have toward their superiors in certain contexts. In this study we also identified a wider gap between higher and lower status people in Japan than in the United States in criticizing partners, giving them commands, or inviting them to eat. In the United States, however, there was a greater gap in the employment of silence during interaction, eloquence, and the fear to make requests.

More acute differences between cultures may occur when there are status-related differences in behavior in one culture but not in another. Japanese businessmen, for example, may be startled at the fact that American employees may ask for permission to sit when speaking with their seated superiors, because employees in Japan are usually supposed to remain standing. We also found that the frequency of polite versus casual speech, compliments, use of humor, complaints to partners, and greeting partners characterized the differences between lower and higher status Japanese but not Americans. By contrast, there was a gap between level of logic and facts used by lower and higher status Americans but not Japanese. Being aware of such differences and attempting to reduce the salience of one's behaviors when they differ from the expectations of one's interlocutor may reduce violation of behavioral expectations and thus facilitate more effective communication.

All in all, this research may provide a useful basis for future studies examining status interactions more closely in real-world and/or laboratory settings. Although our respondents' perceptions may reflect as well as affect status-related behavior, it is possible that cultural ethos and values enhance perceptions regarding "proper" behavior beyond reality. Finally, this research may also stimulate a fruitful program of cross-cultural research that will isolate cultural factors affecting status-related behavior and assess their impact on intercultural contact.

REFERENCES

- Asch, S. E. (1946). Forming impressions of personality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 41*, 303-314.
- Berger, J., Rosenholtz, S. J., & Zelditch, M. (1980). Status organizing processes. *Annual Review of Sociology, 6*, 479-508.
- Butcher, J. N. (1996). Translation and adaptation of the MMPI-2 for international use. In J. N. Butcher (Ed.), *International adaptations of the MMPI-2: Research and clinical applications* (pp. 26-43). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Butcher, J. N., & Han, K. (1996). Methods of establishing cross-cultural equivalence. In J. N. Butcher (Ed.), *International adaptations of the MMPI-2: Research and clinical applications* (pp. 44-63). Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.
- Cattell, R. B. (1966). The Scree test for the number of factors. *Multivariate Behavioral Research, 23*, 245-251.
- Ekman, P. (1976). Movements with precise meanings. *Journal of Communication, 26*, 14-26.
- Ellyson, S. L., & Dovidio, J. F. (1985). Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior: Basic concepts and issues. In S. L. Ellyson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 1-27). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1993). Interpersonal and intergroup communication in Japan and the United States. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Communication in Japan and the United States* (pp. 149-214). Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, E. T. (1983). *The dance of life*. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.
- Hall, J. A. (1996). Touch, status, and gender at professional meetings. *Journal of Nonverbal Behavior, 20*, 23-44.
- Heslin, R., & Alper, T. (1983). Touch: A bonding gesture. In J. M. Wiemann & R. P. Harrison (Eds.), *Nonverbal interaction* (pp. 47-75). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

- Hofstede, G. (1983). Japanese work-related values in a global perspective. In H. Mannari & H. Befu (Eds.), *The challenge of Japan's internationalization: Organization and culture* (pp. 148-169). Nishinomiya, Japan: Kwansai Gakuin University.
- Krauss, R. M., Chen, Y., & Chawla, P. (1996). Nonverbal behavior and nonverbal communication: What do conversational hand gestures tell us? In M. P. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 28, pp. 389-450). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.
- Lott, D. F., & Sommer, R. (1967). Sitting arrangements and status. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 7*, 90-95.
- Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implication for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review, 98*, 224-253.
- Mitchell, G., & Maple, T. L. (1985). Dominance in nonhuman primates. In S. L. Ellyson & J. F. Dovidio (Eds.), *Power, dominance, and nonverbal behavior* (pp. 49-66). New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Morsbach, H. (1973). Aspects of nonverbal communication in Japan. *Journal of Nervous and Mental Disease, 157*, 262-277.
- Natale, M., Entin, E., & Jaffee, J. (1979). Vocal interruptions in dyadic communication as a function of speech and social anxiety. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 37*, 865-878.
- Packwood, W. T. (1974). Loudness as a variable in persuasion. *Journal of Counseling Psychology, 21*, 1-2.
- Patterson, M. L. (1983). *Nonverbal behavior: A functional perspective*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Pelto, P. J. (1968, April). The difference between "tight" and "loose" societies. *Transaction, 5*, 37-40.
- Reischauer, E. O. (1988). *The Japanese today: Change and continuity*. Cambridge, MA: Belknap.
- Sorrentino, R. M., & Boutillier, R. G. (1975). The effect of quantity and quality of verbal interaction on ratings of leadership ability. *Journal of Experimental Research in Personality, 11*, 403-411.
- Sussman, N. M., & Rosenfeld, H. M. (1982). Influence of culture, language, and sex on conversational distance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 42*, 66-74.
- Thurstone, L. L. (1947). *Multiple factor analysis*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Walker, J. W., & Borden, R. J. (1976). Sex, status, and the invasion of shared space. *Representative Research in Social Psychology, 7*, 28-34.

Rotem Kowner is a senior lecturer of Japanese studies and the director of the Program of Japanese and Asian Studies at the University of Haifa, Israel. He has authored numerous articles in the areas of Japanese personality and communication and Japanese national behavior and identity.

Richard Wiseman is a professor of speech communication at California State University, Fullerton, in the United States. He has authored a num-

ber of books and articles in the areas of intercultural and interpersonal communication. His research focus has been primarily on intercultural communication competence. He is currently the chair of the Intercultural and Development Communication Division of the International Communication Association.