University of Wisconsin Milwaukee
UWM Digital Commons

Theses and Dissertations

May 2014

Vicarious and Source Credibility: A Cross Cultural Explanation

Keith Edward Dilbeck
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Follow this and additional works at: https://dc.uwm.edu/etd

Part of the Communication Commons

Recommended Citation

VICARIOUS AND SOURCE CREDIBILITY: A CROSS CULTURAL
EXPLANATION

by

Keith E. Dilbeck

A Dissertation Submitted in

Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

in Communication

at

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

May 2014

ABSTRACT
VICARIOUS AND SOURCE CREDIBILITY: A CROSS CULTURAL
EXPLANATION

by

Keith E. Dilbeck

The University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee, 2014
Under the Supervision of Professor Mike Allen

Two factors represent orientations of credibility elements, vicarious and source

credibility. Both orientations include credibility elements: competence, trustworthiness,

and goodwill/care. The two factor solution (vicarious = x axis; source = y axis) develops

a credibility grid based on five classifications of credibility evaluations. The five

credibility grid evaluations are defined by cross-cultural communication theory.

Quantitative evidence is derived from three tests (a) the model, (b) the function, and (c)

classification. Data from questionnaries involving 1,149 participants are analyzed both

within and across US, Spanish, and Japanese cultures. Reliabitliy estimates for US (.75)

and Spanish (.63) are stable, but deficient for Japanese (.50) data. A paired-sample t-test

both within and across cutlures identify vicarious and source credibility as significantly

different, and factor analysis indicates the model is stable. Means and correlation analysis

indicate that each of the cultures vary in function related to theory. Classification results

from discriminant analysis, where vicarious and source become a single function, identify

new grounds for cross-cutlural communication research. Overall results provide new

grounds for credibility research by including vicarious credibility as an advancement to

source credibility.

This work is dedicated
to
my wife, Ayako...
どうも有難うございます

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF FIGURES

LIST OF TABLES

ACKNOWLEDMENTS

The primary acknowledgement recognizes the competence of all the previous work of those mentors that made the dissertation possible. Without such foundational scholarship and guidance the dissertation would likely remain unwritten. For your insight, I am eternally grateful - thank you: Dr. Mike Allen (and committee members), Dr. Rosechongporn, Dr. Knutson, and my dear friend I still believe you can hear me, Dr. James C. McCroskey (Jim).

In addition, the work recognizes the inexhaustible efforts of the translators and scholars that made possible the data collection across cultures. Without your trustworthiness, the generalizability of the dissertation would remain little more than guesswork – thank you: Ayako Dilbeck, Andrés Domínguez, Dr. Dornaletetxe, Dr. Omari, Phan Knutson, and faculty in the participating Japanese, Spanish, and US universities.

For the support of my colleagues, family in nature, the gestures of kindness and genuine care for my wellbeing deserve acknowledgement of unspeakable gratitude. In all the haste and overwhelming focus the dissertation demands, you sustained my humanity in reminding me that life must be lived at the same time. Here's to you, my lifetime friends: Arrington Stoll, Dr. Kulovitz, Dr. Abu Bakar, and Jules Maloney.

Finally, acknowledgement identifies the very long line of supporters that made me a priority in order to complete the dissertation. Though it is my name on the title page, the dissertation is the product of a very large and valuable network – thank you all...

Introduction

Elements of Source Credibility

Since early in the twentieth century, communication scholars have examined the construct of credibility across a wide variety of social contexts to understand the impact on audiences. Decades of research generated in US culture supports Aristotle's original three elements of credibility: competence, trust, and goodwill/caring (Dilbeck, Dominguez, Dornaletetxe, McMurrich, & Allen, 2013; Finn, et. al, 2009; McCroskey & Teven, 1999). The competence element reflects an evaluation of performance ability for the communicator. For example, deciding on the correct behavioral sets that match various relationships within various contexts (Dilbeck, 2008; Duran & Kelly, 1988). The trust and goodwill/caring elements generally associate with more orientation/attitudinal based theory. For example, the trust element relates to the interpersonal attraction and homophily (McCroskey, McCroskey, & Richmond, 2006) that facilitates the reduction of uncertainty through increased predictability of relationship outcomes (Berger, & Clatterbuck, 1976; Brashers, 2001; Dainton, & Aylor, 2001); and the goodwill/care element relates to immediacy behaviors that tend to express interpersonal care or closeness in relationships (McCrosley & Teven, 1999; Mehrabian, 1971, 1981). All three elements tend to generalize across cultures (Dilbeck, et al., 2013).

The early empirical evidence that one message provided by different speakers with variable credibility generates a significant difference in audience opinion (Hovland & Weiss, 1952; Ludlum, 1958) initiated a long tradition of communication research. Three influential studies emerged that further developed the foundation of communication research on Aristotle's credibility elements (Berlo, Lemert, & Mertz,

1970; McCroskey, 1966; Whitehead, 1968). Later, the three measures of source credibility were simultaneously tested, and results again confirmed audiences consistently differentiate Aristotle's dimensions of source credibility (Applbaum & Anatol, 1972). Further experimental work on Aristotle's view of credibility continued to scientifically study various attitudes associated with specific behaviors (Infante, 1980). Over a forty year span to operationalize the credibility elements, three widely accepted factors of credibility represented a massive body of research, specifically competence, trust, and goodwill/caring (McCroskey & Teven, 1999; Thweat & McCroskey, 1998).

The early research set the foundation for a growing body of reported evidence to follow. For example, drawing from meta-analysis of teacher source credibility (Finn, et al, 2009), competence, trust, goodwill/caring tend to have a moderate meaningful relationship between teacher credibility and overall student outcomes. Most recently, a three-factor source credibility measure (McCroskey & Teven, 1999) indicates validity of teacher source credibility across cultures (Dilbeck, et. al, 2013). The next step to advance communication research with credibility theory across cultures, then, follows the advice from both early research (McCroskey, 1969) and recent research (Dilbeck, et. al, 2013) to increase the generalizability of source credibility across cultures beyond the context of instruction.

A number of intercultural communication theories describe differences and similarities of self and other oriented cultural values (Hoffstede, 1983; Lim, 2003; Neuliep, 2009; Nisbet, 2003; Oyserman, et. al, 2003) using a dualistic style of research design to further test the construct of credibility across cultures. The self-oriented cultural values indicate an orientation of credibility referred to as source-credibility. The other-

oriented cultural values indicate an orientation of a credibility referred to as the sponsorship effect (McCroskey, 2006), or vicarious-credibility. The two factor approach suggests a message source personally attributes credibility elements to her/himself (source credibility), or depends upon a network of affiliated others to make the attributions on her/his behalf (vicarious-credibility). In other words, the speaker that dedicates content of a speech to express personal acts of expertise, ethical standards, and personal generosity, employs source credibility. On the other hand, the speaker introduced by a third party or referring to a third party indirectly to attribute the same elemental attributions depends on vicarious credibility. For example, the individual that talks about personal experience as a published scholar relies on source credibility; however, the individual introduced to an audience by a favorable third party as appearing on the cover of an international NEWS report relies on vicarious credibility.

Perhaps due to the overwhelming duration of time spent focused of Aristotle's perspective of credibility or social influence, and the massive body of research conducted in the US which dedicates ostensible attention to Aristotle's credibility, overlooks the sponsorship effect the accounts for the social influence of a message source's network. Very little scientific communication research focuses on the operations of sponsoring the credibility elements of a source. However, work including audience adaptation, such as audience predisposition with testimonials does indicate an other-oriented currency of credibility referred to the "sponsorship effect" (McCroskey, 2006, p. 88). The work describes the sponsorship effect as an undeveloped value in current credibility research. Together the traditional patterns of self and other oriented cultural values tend to

compliment the traditional variations of source and vicarious credibility elements across cultures.

Influence of Culture

Effective management of the credibility orientations (vicarious/source) in social influence situations remains the key to effective intercultural communication, as culture represents the norms and values that influence the conduct of cultural members. As such, the inclusion and operation of cultural values provides the general framework to experience social influence. Within cultures, individuals must think about how to communicate to produce social identities. To solicit credible identity attributions, people communicate in ways that grant cultural membership to experience a sense of belonging. Cultural norms and values, then, provide guidelines from which to regulate the behavior of members of various cultures and therefore the use of credibility to stimulate the intended meaning in an audience.

In all cultures various systems of social organization exist. The separated social hierarchical boundaries between various individuals' social responsibilities fit within some cultural description. Several cultures are generally described by communication research as valuing independence. Over decades, intercultural and cross-cultural communication research efforts result in describing source-oriented cultures as independent (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua, 1988; Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984; Oyserman, 2002), idiocentric (Triandis, Leung, Villareal, & Clack, 1985), analytic (Lim, Kim, & Kim, 2011, Nisbett, 2001) with individualistic self construals (Markus, & Kitayama, 1991, Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003), emphasis on personal objectives (Hui, & Villareal, 1989) competitive conflict styles (Leung, 1988; Trubisky,

Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991), and with self oriented facework (Ting-Toomey, 2005). The literature defines cultural values based on social recognition (Ahuvia, 2002) and earned social placement (Neuliep, 2009).

On the other hand, collectivistic cultures value loyalty and generosity to others (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984), communalism (Moemeka, 1998), holism (Lim, et al., 2011; Nisbett, 2003) interdependence (Gudykunst, Ting-Toomey, & Chua,1988), allocentricism (Triandis, et. al, 1985), collectivistic self construals (Markus & Kitayama, 1991) emphasis on group affiliation (Hui, & Villareal, 1989) common conflict avoidance (Leung, 1988; Trubisky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991), and other facework (Ting-Toomey, 2005), representing the theoretical polar opposites to individualism. Cumulatively, the collectivistic values represent maintaining social harmony and identifying with group interests over individual interests. Both sides of the theoretical framework differentiate the values for source-credibility and vicarious-credibility.

Observing cultural values permits the evaluation of the social influence of communicative acts that both require and derive the various evaluations of credibility. Cultural values serve purposes consistent with outcomes of social influence, so for the current study, a two dimensional approach (source/vicarious credibility) becomes a powerful tool to understand social influence across cultures. Cultural background provides an opportunity to use intercultural communication theory as an explanation for evaluations of credibility. The purpose is useful for the aim of intercultural communication competence, because an individual can learn the consequences and results from employing credibility in various ways, in various cultural settings, and

decide personally what changes may be necessary in order to strengthen social influence across cultures.

The cultural background necessary for social influence reflected in evaluations of credibility provides a conceptual framework to serve as a proxy for cultural values. The manifestation of culturally defined characteristics of credibility requires more than single individuals. Fundamentally, groups of people must be included to measure certain cultural values. Therefore the social influence that operates using credibility orientations becomes a necessary focus of intercultural communication research. Needing more than one source to achieve a result leads to some set of cultural values that guides standards of social influence, which manifest as drivers of credibility orientations.

The social influence derived from cultural values relates to social placement. Some cultures tend to value *earning* a social place within the hierarchical structure, while other cultures tend to value social network relationships that *position* individuals within the hierarchical structure (see, Neuliep, 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). Typically, the difference mirrors avowed vs. ascribed social placement. Drawing from social interaction theory (Williams, 2003), for example, social group membership standards often require individuals to claim identity attributions that fit group cohesion (avowed), while managing membership status according to group standards (ascribed). The process defines how people behave to earn social placement and determine a social position in reference to a network of social relationships. In both cases, individuals derive social influence by means of the orientation of credibility associated with earned and positioned social hierarchical organization. For those that earn social placement, source credibility

becomes a valued orientation of credibility. For those positioned along the hierarchy, vicarious, or the sponsorship effect becomes a valued orientation of credibility.

The characteristics of social organization related to cultural values drive social influence. The foundation of intercultural communication competence, then, is in recognizing that social influence depends on the assumptions associated with culturally defined social placement. What varies is the expressions of credibility elements according to source and vicarious orientations – a two dimensional solution. In other words, the hierarchical style valued by a culture provides a means of determining the necessary credibility orientation and to derive social influence.

In sum, no culture exists without orientations of credibility, and the characteristics of credibility emerge from cultural values. Even if a cultural group achieved perfect uniformity across all members, some set of cultural values would still develop as necessary to plan and maintain communicative experiences. Consequently, a constant variable in human life is to "get along" with each other to "get things done," just as is described in organizational culture (see Blake & Mouton, 1985). The purpose of culturally defined social influence then cannot be achieved without some combination of source and vicarious credibility orientations. The process of realizing cultural values that guide the efforts of social influence helps to manage credibility effectively to get things done, and examining credibility orientations based on cultural values helps to ultimately increase intercultural communication competence.

The Credibility Grid

The grid represents the various ways to apply orientations of credibility in exercising social influence across cultures. One axis of credibility orientations values

earning a place along the social hierarchy. Culturally defined, earned hierarchical style relates to the orientation of source-credibility, based on pursuit of social recognition. The experience of social recognition occurs when an individual draws attention to personal identity attributions, such as academic service awards, occupational promotions for reliable work ethics, or even the athletic capability of an Olympic gold medal winner. The personal attributions draw attention to the source, establishing the elements of credibility for the individual, earned as a member of the culture.

The other axis of credibility values positioned social placement, and relates to the orientation of vicarious credibility, based on cultural values of social harmony. The experience of social positioning occurs, for example, when individuals contribute to group cohesion by "knowing their place" as group members. Social places become created in the hierarchy, for example, through obliging elders and guiding youth, rights to decision making in the workplace due to age and family name, and developing life plans according to one's role in the family as first/last born. The loci of social positions draw attention to membership roles and overall cohesion, from which the elements of credibility become evaluated based on how well members solicit supportive reference from affiliated others.

Both orientations of credibility (source/vicarious) maintain the elements of credibility (competence, trust, goodwill/caring). For example, self-oriented cultural values relate to all elements of credibility, but may place higher value on the competence element of source credibility from earned and task oriented social scripts. The other-oriented cultural values may place higher value on the goodwill/care element of vicarious credibility from positioned relationship oriented scripts. The difference in credibility

orientations, however, is found in primarily valuing self or primarily valuing others in the process of managing social influence and the expression of credibility.

Cultural Evaluations of Credibility

Positioned credibility

In the lower right hand corner of the grid, a maximum value for vicarious credibility (5) is combined with a minimum value for source credibility (1). An individual producing behaviors based on the positioned assumptions becomes focused on maximizing social harmony by exercising cultural values associated with collectivism, holism, other-facework, rhetorical reflection, and achieving social influence through valuing social group interests over personal interests.

As Lim, Kim, and Kim (2011) suggest, in cultures with high value for holistic identity, consideration for the independent self identity as separable from social groups, such as families and occupational groups, does not exist. Perhaps due to the wide range of cultural values in common with collectivistic and other-oriented styles of social conduct, striving to establish one's self as uniquely and necessarily independent becomes a fool's errand. Members of such cultures instead develop a sense of belonging from a set of social identity attributions provided by group members in the social hierarchy. A probable reason, as Lim, Kim, and Kim (2011) further describe holism, rests on, for example, the observable behaviors of children that necessarily turn to parents and elders in the decision making processes of future life planning. To choose otherwise renders an attempt at separation from the hierarchical social structure, and deteriorates the effective use of credibility necessary for task oriented, decision making processes.

The concept of Chinese guan-xi stands as an example of the use of positioned

credibility (Dilbeck, 2013; Gao, 1996). The evaluation of positioned credibility through

guan-xi emerges from the assistance that social in-group members share to

support/sponsor one another through a series of good deeds that respect the hierarchical

order and cultural values of social harmony. The evaluation of vicarious credibility

operates similarly to guan-xi. Both vicarious credibility and guan-xi value group

relationships whereby members make matters easier for one another to associate, like,

affiliate, or support each other. For example, a person applying for a faculty position in a

university with reference to a shared social network of affiliates becomes more credible

by stepping away from a high dependence on providing self-oriented evidence, and

toward an increased dependence on more other-oriented evidence through third party

references. Given a faculty position becomes available in a university, the applicant that

shares a family relationship, a unique national or cultural background, or even a history

of friendship with the hiring search committee members, experiences higher levels of

credibility, beyond just the competence element, due to affiliated relationship status.

Evidence suggests cultural values associated with social harmony theoretically

explain the use of vicarious credibility as a dependent factor. Research founded on the

traditional theory of collectivism (Hofstede, 1980; Hofstede & Bond, 1984) describes

behaviors attributable to the forfeiture of one's own desires replaced by the overall

desires of a group. Social scientific conclusions indicate behaviors in contention with

collectivistic group identity attributions deviate from virtues of group membership,

developing a social identity as inappropriate and counterintuitive to group expectations.

Social relationships then experience increased difficulty with managing uncertainty about

the individual performing behaviors against group desires (Stephan, Stephan, &

Gudykunst, 1999). In turn, perceptions from the group about the individual increase with anxiety, and finally social difficulties arise due to the individual's absence of consideration about group concerns. Incidentally, the presence of individualistic social identity attributions corresponds with a decrease in credibility based on the cultural explanation associated with the vicarious credibility orientation. Participating in task oriented, decision-making processes without expressed concern for the group over self-concerns cultivates a powerful way to lose credibility in collectivistic cultures.

Additional theoretical framework further supports the process of positioned hierarchical culture as an explanation of positioned credibility. The other-facework orientation (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003) and the rhetorical reflector (Knutson, & Posirisuk, 2006) help to clarify variability in vicarious credibility. In conflict situations, for example, the individual that threatens the face of another not only endangers the loss of face for the group of the other, but also risks her/his own face as a representative of his/her own group. In other words, when person A embarrasses person B, person A not only embarrasses person B, but also the group of person B, and person A's own group all at the same time. The decision to help to maintain everyone's face, then, renders the best outcome potential – social harmony. In interpersonal relationship building, the rhetorical reflector gathers interpersonal information from others to better understand her/his place within the social group, as a means to competently address fellow members according to social strata. In other words, the situation dictates that the individual must be sure to address fellow group members according to correct cultural expectations (e.g. respectful pronouns for the status of elders and for the youth).

Both other-facework and rhetorical reflection describe factors dedicated to valuing other-oriented concerns for group decision making processes. The other-facework factor describes valuing the social image of others engaged in the communication process. For instance, data analyses of samples drawn from the US, Germany, Japan, and China, indicate that cultural values which associate with collectivistic descriptions influence the concern for other-facework. Generally, "face represents an individual's claimed sense of positive image in the context of social interaction" (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003, p. 600); and, specifically, the other-facework orientation represents claims of a positive image of others in communication contexts. Thus, other-facework varies as a matter of cultural values associated with "saving" the face of other/group members, particularly during conflict situations. Should a conflict emerge during a decision making process, the face of others becomes more important than task completion. In other words, displaying the goodwill to care for the public image of others supersedes the display of personal competence and expertise.

Work with the theory of rhetorical sensitivity explains positioned credibility as associated with collectivistic cultural values. Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketu, and Smith (2003) explain that rhetorical sensitivity describes communication that balances concerns for self and other(s). The rhetorical reflection factor, in particular, describes an individual oriented to collect information from others in the absence of intervening self-oriented expressions – a very good listener. The rhetorical reflector bases decisions on accommodating the decisions of group members, behaves like an interpersonal chameleon, and adapts to social identity ascriptions that fit with cultural values of a position hierarchy. Incidentally, data analysis results from the US and Thailand indicate

that Thai people, as a collectivistic culture, average higher on rhetorical reflection than those from the US; where as US population tends to average higher on the opposing self-oriented factor, noble self (Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketu, & Smith, 2003; Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006). The results provide reason to believe that cultural values tend to explain the use of credibility, as position credibility also depends on social harmony and collectivistic cultural values.

The description of social harmony (Dilbeck, 2013) associates with values that fit holism, collectivism, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection. The theoretical framework corresponds with the description of a position social hierarchical culture (Neuliep, 2003), where members of the culture ascribe social identity to individuals. The use of credibility in a position hierarchy, then, greatly depends on the vicarious support of a network of affiliated group members, and therefore is defined by the cultural values that associate with the social influence derived from vicarious credibility. Faced with task oriented, decision making situations, the person deriving positioned credibility theoretically scores high on all "P" statements of the Grid Measure:

Competence

- I notice it disturbs people around me when I talk about my own personal competence
- I talk about how my competence depends on what people say about me

Trust

- I believe it is rude to explain my own ethical standards
- I depend on people that know me well to say that I have good ethical standards

Care

- - I predict people will lose interest in me if I talk about my own acts of compassion

  - I depend on people that know me well to say that I am a compassionate person

Earned credibility

The top left corner represents a minimum value for vicarious credibility (1), and a maximum value for source credibility (5). An individual producing behaviors based on the earned credibility assumptions becomes focused on maximizing social recognition. The individual exercises cultural values associated with individualism, analytic values, self-facework, noble-self, and achieving social influence by using personal reference without social group approval.

A long line of theoretical tradition spurred from Hofstede and Bond (1984) describes self-oriented cultures with individualism. Among the wide variety of international data over the years, the US repeatedly ranks among the cultures scoring highest for individualistic orientation. Members of individualistic cultures similar to the US tend to participate in the decision making process from independent self-oriented concerns. As such, the concern with individualism is the concern with social recognition, and social recognition establishes the cultural measure of source credibility. For example, through events similar to personal awards, the uniqueness of social contributions, "being the best," etc… individuals earn social recognition. Founded on an earned social hierarchy, earned credibility, then, depends on an audience that values personal responsibility of individuals to achieve her/his independent social influence. Consequently, gaining social influence from earned credibility in task oriented, decision making situations means soliciting credibility evaluations from an audience that values the source as individualistically virtuous.

The assumption of earned credibility hinges on persuading an audience to depend on the individual under evaluation to make decisions without the need for second opinions, or to refer to the predisposition of testimonials. For example, when Lance Armstrong initially denied claims of having used self enhancing drugs to win the Tour de France, fans continued to evaluate him as credible, accepting his argument against the claims of unethical behavior. Perhaps through attributions of overcoming cancer, breaking athletic world records, and becoming a father of seven, a wide range of audience members evaluated Lance Armstrong as a sort of symbolical superman. If fact, some may claim that the testimonials related others eventually lead to exposing his use of drugs. Lance Armstrong provided a large audience with a structure of argumentation that maintained his earned credibility in the absence of testimonials that give way to vicarious credibility evaluations.

Earned credibility ranks highly among audience members with cultural values associated with analytical argumentation over the more intuitive holistic perspective of vicarious credibility. The analytical construct (Nisbett, Peng, Choi, & Norenzayan, 2001), an antithetical concept to holism, describes a pattern of thinking that values objectification and argumentation over relational affability. "Analytic thought recruits symbolic representational systems, and its computations reflect rule structure" (Nisbett, et al., 2001, p. 293), a difference between a dialectically collaborative processes vs. the foundational principles and the logic of argumentation (Lim, Kim, & Kim, 2011). Basically, members of earned hierarchical cultures value expressions associated with analytical thought and tend to value being right and just vs. being gregarious and affable. Essentially, the difference rests in valuing objective procedure over the affability of

relationships – being right vs. being friendly, or in Lance's case, winning over sportsman like conduct.

As Nisbett, et al. (2001) define, analytic thought involves "detachment of the object from its context, a tendency to focus on attributes of the object to assign it to categories, and a preference for using rules about the categories to explain and predict the object's behavior" (p. 294). Basically, the definition of analytical thought rests on "the practice of decontextualizing structure from content" (p. 294). The definition coincides with the conceptual framework of Hall's (1976) descriptions of contextual sensitivity as determined by culture. Some cultures use language to imply contextual meaning. Others use language to assist a source in clarifying the explanation of a direct line of thought. The former depends on positioned hierarchy for communicators to accurately assume meaning from a universally shared understanding of implications (high context), while the latter places responsibility on the speaker to effectively explain her/his independent and potentially unique meaning (low context). The description of analytical thought associated with culture renders earned credibility as closely related to the source credibility orientation. The source becomes independently responsible to derive explicit social influence from an individually earned social placement vs. dependent upon the ascripted identity attributions from the universally implied meaning shared by an affiliated network.

Oetzel and Ting-Toomey's (2003) face negotiation theory coincides with earned credibility by means of self-facework, or high value for one's own social image. Evidence suggests members of individualistic cultures tend to report more concern for self-face than concern for other-face (Ting-Toomey & Kurogi, 1998). For example, the

Japanese culture values higher other-face and lower self-face concerns than the

individualistic US (Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994; Gudykunst, & Nishida, 1994). The

conceptual framework defines self-facework as the polar opposite of other-facework, and

provides grounds to accept the theoretical relationship with earned credibility.

The conceptual framework of rhetorical sensitivity, as described by Knutson,

Komolsevin, Chatiketu, and Smith (2003), identifies the noble-self factor as conceptually

convergent with earned credibility. The noble self communicates from a individualistic

orientation to express the perceivable virtues of self. The operation is conceptually

similar to, though not correlated with, socio-communicative styles assertiveness and

responsiveness (Dilbeck & McCroskey, 2009). Just as the noble self expresses virtues of

self, the assertive individual stakes claims for expressing one's own opinion. The self

oriented assertiveness tends to explain the strive for social recognition associated with the

earned social hierarchical structure in an individualistic culture. To derive credibility

from the noble self-orientation, then, members of the culture tend to depend on personal

responsibility to earn social influence.

Individualism, analytic orientation, self-facework, and noble self all associate

with values of social recognition. The theoretical framework corresponds with the

description of an earned social hierarchical culture, where members of the culture express

avowed social identity attributions of self. The use of credibility in an earned social

hierarchy, then, greatly depends on the individual responsibility to directly express

personalized elements of credibility. Earned credibility therefore is defined by the

cultural values associated with the social influence derived from the source credibility

orientation. Faced with task oriented, decision making situations that require credibility,

the person deriving earned credibility theoretically scores high on all "E" statements of the Grid Measure:

Competence

- I proudly accept opportunities to be recognized for my own personal skill

- I say that my personal skill does not depend on what anybody says about me

Trust

- I explain to people that I am a well-known trustworthy person

- I show no concerned with what other people say about my trustworthiness

Care

- I take personal responsibility to reassure people that I am a generous person

- I ignore what other people say about my personal generosity

Recessive credibility

The bottom left hand value of the grid represents a minimum value for both social harmony (1) and social recognition (1). The individual that solicits low value in both orientation of credibility withdraws from deriving social influence. The condition represents the complacency of conformity to status quo assumptions, and becomes disinclined to discuss attributions of self or rely on the evaluations presented by affiliated others. The individual exhibits nonassertive behaviors with low need to assume any power to influence an audience either from source credibility or vicarious credibility orientations. There exists a noticeable absence in any attempt to derive credibility, and the individual recedes, or backs away from efforts to influence the outcomes of task oriented, decision making processes; hence, recessive credibility.

In task oriented, decision making situations, the recessive individual avoids initiating or evaluating innovative ideas. Similar to the relationship communication apprehension shares with fear, shyness, and reticence to communicate (Brogan, Jowi, McCroskey, & Wrench, 2008; Daly & McCroskey, 1984; Kang, & Pearce, 1984; Richmond & McCroskey, 1995), the recessive use of credibility associates with withdrawal from developing social influence. Recessive credibility becomes a matter of an audience evaluation of the individual that nonassertive, dodging discussion of credibility elements attributed to one's self, either directly from the source or vicariously from a social network. Just as the original work with communication apprehension research describes "communication-bound anxiety" (McCroskey, 1970), the recessive use of credibility indicates possible anxiety towards social influence to move an audience to action. Basically, recessive credibility underlines a lack of desire to commit to social influence. Individualistic cultures interpret the behaviors as low willingness to communicate through behaviors associated with indifference and reluctance to participate in decision making situations. Collectivistic cultures perceive the behaviors as humble and respectful but also not participative. Either way, however, the recessive credibility evaluation means the individual recedes from discussing topics of character evaluations presented either by the source or vicariously through others.

Past research with willingness to communicate across cultures (Knutson, Komolsevin, Chatiketu, & Smith, 2003) identifies a potential serious ethnocentric error worthy of note. That is, while the behaviors associated with such lack of assertiveness in the US remain well documented, the same behaviors across alternative cultures tend to stimulate attributions of respect and humbleness. What is a lack of assertiveness in the

US does not necessarily stimulate the same audience evaluation in different cultures. For example, Thai culture initially manages introductions to strangers with rhetorical reflection (Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006), similar to the responsiveness socio-communicative style (Dilbeck & McCroskey, 2009), and over time shifts to display behaviors associated with rhetorical sensitivity. Essentially, due to a high value of social harmony in Thai culture (Dilbeck, McCroskey, Richmond, & McCroskey, 2009), members of the culture produce behaviors interpretable as humble and respectful as a matter of facework, until at such time the interpersonal relationship allows for a finer balance between self and others.

However, though recessive credibility mimics the resulting effects of the reticence of communication apprehension, the interpretation of recessive credibility to prevaricate social influence in decision making processes remains unchanged across cultures. Several individuals actively engage in discussing self credibility elements (earned); others engage the ascribed elements from others (positioned), but neither behave with indifference towards innovating the status quo. The recessive individual does not commit to acts of social influence, and rather withdraws from deriving credibility from either type of cultural hierarchies. Thai culture as valuing social harmony and as a positioned social hierarchy suggests a high value for vicarious credibility as an act of social influence. The derivation of credibility, then, depends on ascripted identity attributions that require acts of respect and humble modesty, similar to positioned credibility. Otherwise interpreted as apprehensive in US culture, the Thai behaviors of respect do not depict reluctance to engage in social influence, and therefore do not exemplify recessive credibility.

The audience evaluation of recessive credibility depends on minimum value for both cultural descriptions. Hence the conceptualization of recessive of credibility does not commit to the same ethnocentric error, and behavioral attributes maintain across cultures. Withdrawing from attempts to gain social influence remains a universal characteristic of recessive credibility as apprehension toward the utility of social influence. The difference focuses not merely on variations of general willingness to communicate, but rather the specific willingness to actively use the elements of credibility to move an audience to action in the context of task oriented, decision making situations.

A valuable result from identifying that behaviors theoretically described in one culture do not stimulate the same meaning across cultures becomes useful for differentiating culturally explained credibility. Instead of the traditional individualistic or collectivistic cultural description, research from Oyserman, et al. (2002), for example, identifies that the Japanese culture counter-stereotypically tends to score higher on individualism and not lower on collectivism, relative to the US from meta-analysis on Hofstede and Bond's (1984) individualism/collectivism. The results bring about the realization to generate cultural descriptions that reach beyond the traditional bi-polar continuum style of thought.

Recessive credibility begins to describe a conceptual framework to consider low on both source and vicarious credibility orientations, an altogether alternative cultural explanation for the use of credibility. For instance, recessive credibility operates similarly to original research with socio-communicative styles (Bacon & Severson, 1986; Snavely & Walters, 1983) where low in both assertiveness and responsiveness renders a

description of "non-competence," instead of incompetence. What happens is that the individual's behaviors do not provide observable interactions from which to gauge competence, and instead manifest as acts of social withdrawal from leadership and administrative influence. The recessive use of credibility similarly displays behaviors both low in source credibility and low in vicarious credibility, absent of observable interactions to gauge decision making processes that derive social influence.

Due to the relationship facework and credibility share with the interaction scripts of culture (see Cocroft & Ting-Toomey, 1994), recessive credibility operates similarly to facework avoidance. The individual that holds no desire to harness social influence from source or vicarious credibility orientations to innovate the status quo also bears no burden to manage saving the face of self and other(s). Recessive credibility constantly helps to sustain an opportunity to avoid the cognitive labors of facework. In turn, the individual becomes socially indifferent, and derives minimal credibility from attributions associated with self and the affiliated network relationships.

Avoiding communication situations means emotionally charged, and possibly poorly thought out messages remain silent, providing communicators opportunity to save face (Oetzel, 1998; Oetzel, & Ting-Toomey, 2003). Communicators become relieved of the accountability to "mind their manners." On one hand, as a matter of anxiety towards mismanaging social harmony in a positioned hierarchy, the utility of recessive credibility becomes the opportune choice. Withdrawing from attempts at social influence becomes a more desirable option than communicating incorrect, disagreeable, and potentially embarrassing information. On the other hand, as a matter of anxiety towards mismanaging social recognition in an earned hierarchy, the utility of recessive credibility

also becomes the opportune choice. Withdrawing from attempts at social influence also becomes a more desirable option than communicating incorrect, disagreeable, and potentially embarrassing information. Fundamentally, recessive credibility finds utility in remaining uncommunicative more valuable than the risk of miscommunicating. While avoiding does not always help to resolve or prevent miscommunication, avoiding does allow communicators the chance to avoid face threats and the loss of face; hence, avoid the loss of credibility. The audience evaluation simply does not perceive an attempt from a source or an affiliated social group to gain the credibility necessary for social influence. Instead, recessive credibility emerges as a result of an audience evaluation that perceives communication acts as withdrawing from decision making activities.

In sum, recessive credibility depends on the low desire to apply the elements of credibility to neither source credibility nor vicarious credibility, and therefore is defined by the absence of concern for social influence. The individual does not grant the audience opportunity to evaluate any attempt at social influence. Perhaps because of a lack of concern for specific situational issues faced with task oriented, decision making situations, recessive credibility passes off decisions for others to manage. The person displaying minimum value for social recognition and social harmony theoretically scores high on all "R" statements of the Grid Measure:

Competence

- I try to prevent conversations about my personal professionalism
- I stay away from discussing what my group says about my professionalism

Trust

- I retreat from conversations that focus on my personal honor

- I refuse to discuss how my honor depends on what people say about me

Care

- I avoid talking about the ways that I show kindness to others

- I stay out of conversations that focus on how people talk about my kindness

Monitored credibility

Monitored credibility marks caution in the face of task oriented, decision making processes. The center of the grid depicts the credibility derived from carefully monitoring the main effects of too much or too little source (3) and vicarious credibility orientations (3). The individual that shows an audience moderate value for both orientations of credibility exhibits enough effort to assert one's own opinions without undermining the opportunity to participate in group decision making processes. Monitored credibility generates the perception of diplomacy to do what needs to be done without forfeiting self concerns or disturbing others. Consequently, the individual carefully monitors the use of credibility as more important than the actual decision-making process or outcome-results, as a means to sustain social group membership and public presentation.

The self-monitoring person looks to group members for direction in a way that masks uncertainty. The operation is similar to acts of passing, though less extreme. Procedurally, due to utilizing a repertoire of identity attributions to produce the perception of an acceptable authentic identity (Garnett, & Buchner, 2000; Goffman, 1963; Griffin, 1992; Renfrow, 2001; Williams, 2000), passing theory is likely a unique function of the attribution theoretical process. The audience is presented with enough internal and external contextual information to produce the influence associated with a desirable identity, suitable for meeting the standards of social group membership

entitlement. Passing theory, as a function of attribution theory, provides a description useful for social influence in regards to monitoring the use of source and vicarious credibility orientations.

Behaving with a high level of psychological agreeableness (Jensen-Campbell, Adams, Perry, Workman, Furdella, & Egan, 2002), the self-monitoring (Harnish & Bridges, 2006; Snyder, 1974, 1987) individual values more concern for facework (Ting-Toomey, 2005) than for deriving social influence to determine correct individual and group decisions. The credibility assessment relates to Oetzel and Ting-toomey's (2003) integrating face that describes how individuals produce "give and take" so that a compromise can be made. Of course, without collaboration, compromise often results in neither party truly achieving desired outcomes; hence, a sign that saving self and other face presents greater importance than actual decision making outcomes.

The individual focused on deriving monitored credibility seeks to determine social influence based on two general types of social comparison, normative group standards and accuracy of individualized information (Suls, & Fletcher, 1983). The question becomes what is everyone else doing when confronted with ambiguous group membership standards, or, given group banality, what is the way to increase social recognition? The differentiation process parallels the descriptions of holism and analytical cultural values (Lim, et al., 2011; Nisbett, 2003), where the individual evaluates balancing the approbation found in balancing appreciation for relationships and argumentation, a balance between being friends and being right. The differentiation, then, also parallels source and vicarious credibility orientations, as the monitoring individual attentively balances acts of social harmony with earning social recognition. Monitored

credibility remains in a constant state of careful application of credibility orientations, cautiously limiting too much of either.

Research on European cultures provides practical understanding. For example, research on Spanish culture (Corral & Calvete, 2000) provides valuable results on self-monitoring (n = 346, X^2 = 310, df = 133, $p < .01$, RMSEA = .060, GFI = .91, AGFI = .88, CFI = .78). Findings indicate Spanish culture interprets the self monitoring individual as acutely perceptive about assertive expression and self-presentation of other people in social situations, as a means to monitor her/his own self presentation. To participate in Spanish culture means high willingness to engage in controversial assertions in passionately debated topics, while at the same time maximizing conversational group inclusion with disregard for ad-homonym fallacies. The operation allows for individual assertive deliberation to conclude with social group relationship maintenance. The implication is that task oriented, decision making processes call for a moderated mix of asserting one's own ideas with inclusive value for group membership preservation – an operation that constantly monitors the stability of source and vicarious credibility orientations as main effects.

Generally, the conceptualization of monitored credibility means people present an audience with control over values for social influence in a way that sustains the ability to modify self presentation and sensitivity to the expressive behaviors of others (Calvete & Corral, 2000; Lonnox & Wolfe, 1984). The theoretical framework corresponds with the limiting the use of self avowed earned social recognition, and the social positioning of ascripted group membership standards. The use of credibility, then, greatly depends on the audience's evaluation of the individual's responsibility to cautiously monitor

individualistic with collectivistic (Oyserman, et al., 2002), and independent with interdependent (Kim & Sharkey, 1995) cultural values. Monitored credibility becomes defined by the cultural value sets associated with limiting the social influence derived by balancing both the dependence upon source and the dependence upon vicarious credibility. Faced with task oriented, decision making situations that require credibility, the person deriving monitored credibility theoretically scores high on all "M" statements of the Grid Measure:

Competence

- I carefully talk about my own knowledge without attracting too much attention
- I sometimes express disagreement with what people say about my knowledge

Trust

- I am cautious about saying too much about my own morality
- I express uncertainty about the accuracy of what my group says about my morality

Care

- I moderate how much I tell others that I am a helpful person
- I sometimes correct what my group says about the helpful things I do

Dynamic credibility

Represented in the upper right corner of the grid is the culturally synchronized assessment of credibility that includes maximized value for both source (5) and vicarious credibility (5). An individual deriving dynamic credibility focuses on maximizing both social recognition and social harmony by exercising an integration of audience evaluations from both earned and positioned hierarchical cultural values. Deriving

dynamic credibility hinges on the interaction effect produced from high value for both vicarious and source credibility orientations. When high value for vicarious credibility couples with high value for source credibility, deriving social influence necessarily means focused attention on the product from which source and vicarious credibility orientations center. The result of valuing both orientations becomes the primary concern for the use of dynamic credibility as an interaction effect.

Utilizing dynamic credibility means valuing group concerns while at the same time collaborating on how personal achievements match the specific group concerns. In other words, audience evaluation standards of dynamic credibility value earning social recognition for being the best at what everyone else is doing. As such, dynamic credibility is neither primarily dependent on personal responsibility to apply credibility elements independently of others, nor primarily dependent upon forfeiting self concerns in place of group concerns. Rather the dynamic individual rhetorically presents an audience with a systemic perspective that accounts for interdependence without having to accept social group positioning. The dynamic individual, therefore, discusses the elements of credibility as complex manifestations resulting from dialectically providing an audience with a match between what the individual has earned and where that same individual fits in (or does not fit in) with group efforts in task oriented, decision making situations.

Quite literally dynamic credibility remains open to audience assessment of potentially disagreeable self and group concerns, as to assimilate all available means of social influence without having to submit completely to either perspective. The reasoning echoes Aristotle's description of the cultivated mind, where one may entertain the

disagreeable perspectives of others without having to accept the alternative perspectives. The individual that employs dynamic credibility perceives potential insecurity from dependence on individual source credibility and the vulnerable banality from dependence on holistic vicarious credibility. Dynamic credibility undergoes audience evaluation of social influence as a result of the interaction effect from both orientations. Maximizing the second order result of the two-factor solution becomes the primary objective. That is, the fundamental conceptual framework operationally considers the function of a micro perspective of earned source credibility relative to the macro perspective of vicarious credibility positioned within a network of affiliated relationships.

To date, no scientific communication research discusses the interaction effect of the source and vicarious credibility dynamic. For nearly seventy years social scientific communication research has hunted for an operational definition of dynamic credibility with efforts resulting in tenable inconsistencies. Over the decades, the number of operational definitions has varied widely and the various dimensional descriptions have varied even more widely (Anderson, 1961; Beebe, 1974; Berlo & Lemert, 1961; Burgoon, Birk, & Pfau, 1990; Metzger, Flanagin, Eyal, Lemus, & McCann, 2003; McCroskey & Young, 1981). Dynamism, while statistically independent remains psychologically unclear and relatively unstable. In all of the research, attention to the role of vicarious credibility in conjunction with source credibility remains absent.

To be fair, the concept of credibility dynamism has reached across cultures. For example, Confucian dynamism (Hofstede & Bond, 1988; Ting-Toomey, 2012; Yeh, & Lawrence, 1995; Yum, 1988) accounts for Asian philosophy and religious orientations. However, the research continues to measure the dynamism dimension on the basis of the

type of source that was involved, instead of more true to the holistic perspective that considers isolated individualistic credibility as an alien concept. Vicarious credibility operationally means identifying the credibility of a network of affiliations that stands in place of the individual. A source remaining silent and absent can still continue to gain (or lose) credibility. None of the current research considers the interaction effect resulting from the multidimensional credibility view. The absence of vicarious credibility in conjunction with source credibility has been perpetuated to the present. Without consideration for vicarious credibility in conjunction with source credibility, the magnitude of explainable variance remains unmeasured. Unfortunately, in searching for an instrument for vicarious credibility, such a measure does not yet exist.

Recent research, applied to international peacebuilding defines a useful model to begin testing dynamic credibility evaluations from a systems approach (see Ricigliano, 2012). The system emerges as a product of a variety of micro level perspectives that tend to influence one another in relation to a macro level perspective. The combination of the two perspectives gives way to understanding the dynamics of task oriented, decision making social conduct that brings about social influence. From micro level variation to macro level change, and vice versa, social influence derives as a result of systemic interactions. For dynamic credibility, the systems approach means audience evaluations made about the independent uniqueness of what a source(s) has earned (micro level) relative to a systematic network of affiliated others (macro level). Members with high source credibility tend to gain access to influence a systemic change relative to the position upon which the source credibility interacts with vicarious credibility – an understudied operation in current communication research.

Dynamic feedback, or feedback loops (Ricigliano, 2012) present a unique aspect related to dynamic credibility. As Ricigliano describes, dynamic feedback analogously resembles that of a spider web, where activity at one point triggers a resonant reaction along all other points. The operation means source and vicarious evaluations take place simultaneously. As an example of dynamic credibility, during the 2008 i-Com convention in Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, the keynote speaker responded to questions from the audience about the research under discussion. As a response to the audience, the speaker claimed that the value of research findings were not only a result of his own intellect (decrease dependence on source), but rather a result of his participation with the high caliber of work from the variety of scholars that helped to develop such findings (increase in vicarious). The response meant that the keynote balanced credibility orientations. The speaker went on to claim that the information being shared is far more valuable than the person sharing the information – a reference to the product of the system. The speaker initially balanced deriving credibility from a source orientation with the vicarious orientation, only to derive, in the end, a substantial increase in overall credibility by recognizing the systemic interaction of research efforts. The example illustrates that dynamic credibility may increase and decrease source and vicarious evaluations simultaneously, and that the parts interact to synchronize with the whole in manifesting social influence.

The more modern perspective of dynamic credibility tends to dispel the traditional Cartesian continuum style of social science (see Mase, 1970) that creates a conceptual framework reflecting an either-or approach. For instance, when intercultural communication theory describes behavioral expressions according to collectivistic, high-

context, holistic, other face, and rhetorical reflection, the vicarious credibility orientation

becomes primary. When intercultural communication theory describes behavioral

expressions according to the opposite, the source credibility orientation becomes primary.

However, when intercultural communication theory describes behavioral expressions

according to interdependent, mutual face, and rhetorical sensitivity, then the vicarious

and source credibility orientations converge as a dynamic manifestation of social

influence similar to systems theory. In addition, where recessive credibility withdraws

from social influence, and monitored credibility remains in a constant regulation of the

main effects, dynamic credibility depends on the audience to evaluate social influence

derived from the magnitude of systemic interaction effects between vicarious and source

credibility orientations. Simply put, dynamic credibility is an audience evaluation of the

systemic interaction among and between the parts, related to the whole.

　　　To evaluate dynamic credibility, instead of providing an audience evidence of

valuing self or other facework, interdependent and mutual facework emerge (Oetzel &

Ting-toomey, 2003; Ting-toomey, 2005). Instead of individualistic or collectivistic

(Oyserman, et. al, 2002), interdependent construals emerge (Gudykunst, Matsumoto,

Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim, & Heyman, 1996; Ting-Toomey, 2005). Instead of noble

self or rhetorical reflection, rhetorical sensitivity emerges (Knutson, & Posirisuk, 2006).

And where holism meets the analytical (Lim, et al. 2011; Nisbett, 2001), an audience

evaluates the collaborative effort of a variety of individual experts. Dynamic credibility

develops as a result of an audience evaluation, then, defined by maximizing values for the

converging interaction of credibility orientations within the cultural system – the

intersection between the micro (source) and macro (vicarious) levels of a system of

cultural values. Faced with task oriented, decision making situations that require credibility, the person deriving dynamic credibility theoretically scores high on all "D" statements of the Grid Measure:

Competence

- I discuss how my group contributes to my own unique individual expertise
- I describe the mutual professionalism I personally share with experts that know me

Trust

- I describe how my personal trustworthiness relates to people that know me
- I discuss how the honor of my group is a reflection of my honorable reputation

Care

- I discuss the kindness I have in common with the group I belong to
- I explain that the kindness of my group corresponds with my individual kindness

Summary

In sum, evaluations of credibility emerge from cultural values. The process of realizing cultural values that guide the efforts of social influence helps to manage credibility effectively for people to get things done. The purpose of culturally defined social influence means the manifestation of some combination of source and vicarious credibility orientations. Examining credibility orientations based on cultural values, then, helps to ultimately increase intercultural communication competence.

Effective management of the credibility orientations (vicarious/source) in social influence situations remains the key, as culture represents the norms and values that influence the conduct of cultural members. The cultural background provides an

opportunity to use cross-cultural communication theory as an explanation for the various

evaluations of credibility. Cultural norms and values, then, provide guidelines from

which to regulate the behavior of members of various cultures and therefore the use of

credibility to stimulate the intended meaning in an audience. As such, the inclusion and

operation of cultural values provides the general framework to experience social

influence.

The social influence derived from cultural values relates to social placement.

Some cultures tend to value *earning* a social place within the hierarchical structure, while

other cultures tend to value social network relationships that *position* individuals within

the hierarchical structure (see, Neuliep, 2000; Sidanius & Pratto, 1999). For those that

earn social placement, source credibility becomes a valued orientation of credibility. For

those positioned along the hierarchy, vicarious, or the sponsorship effect becomes a

valued orientation of credibility. The foundation of intercultural communication

competence, then, is in recognizing that social influence depends on the assumptions

associated with culturally defined social placement. What varies is the evaluations of

credibility elements according to source and vicarious orientations – a two dimensional

solution.

The next step to advance communication research with credibility theory across

cultures follows the advice from both early research (McCroskey, 1969) and recent

research (Dilbeck, et. al, 2013) to increase the generalizability of source credibility across

cultures beyond the context of instruction. A number of cross cultural communication

theories describe differences and similarities of self and other oriented cultural values

(Hoffstede, 1983; Lim, 2003; Neuliep, 2009; Nisbet, 2003; Oyserman, et. al, 2003,

Oetzle, & Ting-Toomey, 2005; Knutson, & Posirisuk, 2006). The self-oriented cultural values indicate an orientation of credibility referred to as source-credibility. The other-oriented cultural values indicate an orientation of a credibility referred to as the sponsorship effect, or vicarious-credibility. The two factor approach suggests a message source personally attributes credibility elements to her/himself (source credibility), or depends upon a network of affiliated others to make the attributions on her/his behalf (vicarious-credibility). The social influence reflected in evaluations of credibility provides a conceptual framework to serve as a proxy for cultural values.

Five classifications develop as a grid, which represent the various ways to apply orientations of credibility in exercising social influence across cultures. One credibility orientation values earning a place along the social hierarchy. Culturally defined, earned hierarchical style relates to the orientation of source-credibility, based on pursuit of social recognition. The other orientation of credibility values positioned social placement, and relates to the orientation of vicarious credibility, based on cultural values of social harmony. Both orientations of credibility (source/vicarious) maintain the elements of credibility (competence, trust, goodwill/caring). The difference in credibility orientations, however, is found in primarily valuing self or primarily valuing others in the process of managing social influence and the expression of credibility. The overall purpose is useful for the aim of intercultural communication competence, because an individual learns the consequences and results from employing credibility in various ways, in various cultural settings, and decide personally what changes may be necessary in order to strengthen social influence across cultures.

Chapter Two

Method

Participants

University students from a variety of nations participated (United States, Spain,

Japan). Subjects were at least eighteen years old completing questionnaires online.

Collaborating scholars in other countries provided the students the link. The total number

of participants were 1,149 (Japan = 233, Spain = 300, US = 616). The US sample was

recruited from undergraduate students in communication courses at a large urban public

Midwestern Research I institution receiving extra credit for completion of the survey.

Data collection began in October, and ran until mid November of the fall semester (male

= 37%, female = 63%). All participants were native to the US with an age range from 18-

25 years. The Spanish sample was recruited from two universities where students did not

receive extra credit in communication studies courses, heavily focused on media studies.

One Spanish university is located in Madrid, and the other is located more toward the

northern region of Spain in Segovia. The Spanish data collection began in October, and

ran until mid November of the fall semester (male = 39%, female = 61%). All

participants were native to Spain, and the average age range was from 21-25 years. The

Japanese sample was recruited from three universities two are located in the Tokyo

region and one is located in the Osaka region of Japan, where only a portion of the

students received extra credit in in a variety of humanities courses. The Japanese data

collection began in October and ran until the beginning of November (male = 7%, female

= 93%) of the fall semester. All participants were native to Japan, and the average age range was from 18-20 years.

Instruments: The Credibility Grid

The current study adapted credibility measures from previous work (Dilbeck, et. al, 2013; McCroskey, 1966; McCroskey & Teven, 1999). The instruments were modified in four ways: (a) items no longer target an instructor, (b) items are transformed from sematic-differential to Likert type scales (Likert, 1931), (c) the measure uses self-report (see Appendix i), and (d) items included credibility grid semantic references (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic). 30 Likert type items were generated. The elemental dimension is divided into three components: 10 items evaluate competence, 10 items consider trust, and 10 items target goodwill/caring. The grid dimension is divided into 5 components: 6 items target each of the 5 credibility grid evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, and dynamic). Finally, the credibility orientation dimension is divided into components: 15 for source and 15 for vicarious credibility.

The two orientation (vicarious and source) scales are employed. One scale inquires about source credibility, where items targeting credibility elements associate directly with the message source. The other scale inquires about vicarious credibility, where items targeting credibility elements associate directly with a network of affiliated others, related to the message source. Source credibility items use the key words to target the participant's dependence upon talking about her/himself, while vicarious items use the same key words to target the participant's dependence upon affiliated others to speak on behalf of her/himself. Since no pre-existing measure of vicarious credibility were

found, the measure was developed to include the same semantic key words as source credibility items (e.g. expertise, morality, generosity, etc…).

The grid model operates through classification of credibility evaluations, elements, and orientations (see Figure 1). All "E" items represent the earned credibility evaluation. All "D" items represent the dynamic credibility evaluation. All "M" items represent the monitored credibility evaluation. All "P" items represent the positioned credibility style. All "R" items represent the recessive credibility evaluation. All items from each evaluation are summed for a total score of the specific credibility classification (e.g. add all "E" items for the earned credibility evaluation score). Furthermore, each evaluation contains a measure of the three credibility elements (competence, trust, goodwill/caring). All items targeting credibility elements across all credibility evaluations are summed for a total value of the specific credibility element (e.g. add all competence items across evaluation scores for the overall competence score; repeat the process for each element). Finally, each element is applied to both source and vicarious credibility orientations. All items targeting source or vicarious credibility orientations are summed separately for each credibility orientation (e.g. add all source credibility items across elements for the overall source credibility orientation score; repeat the process for vicarious credibility). During data collection, items are randomly ordered to decrease probability of participant detection of research hypotheses and research questions.

Instruments: Construct Validity

For construct validity, additional cross-cultural measures include: (a) individualism/collectivism (Oyserman, Coon, & Kemmelmeier, 2002), (b) Holism (Lim, Kim, & Kim, 2011), (c) Interdependence and Independence (Kim & Sharkey, 1995), (d)

Facework Negotiation (Oetzel & Ting-Toomey, 2003), and (e) Rhetorical Sensitivity

(Knutson & Posirisuk, 2006). The instruments possess a history of cross-cultrual

application to observe the dualistic (self/other) bi-polarity of cultural values. The

instruments also work to provide evidence of the additional both/neither orientations of

the dualistic measures – high/low in both self and others. Reliability estimates on all

measures usually range from .75 to .88.

Individualism/collectivism: Oyserman, et al. (2002)

The Oyserman, et al. (2002) instrument includes 15 Likert type items to measure

the dualistic construct of individualism and collectivism. 7 items measure the cultural

values for individualism, and 8 items measure the cultural values for collectivism. The

Oyserman et al. (2002) measure is derived from meta-analysis that includes

approximately 50 studies incorporating data from multiple cultures. Data from the meta-

analysis also indicate the presence of cultures valuing a both/neither perspective of more

and less of both factors, relevant to the US.

Independent/Interdependent Construals

The Kim and Sharkey (1995) instrument for interdependence and independence

includes a total of 18 items. 10 items measure interdependence, and 8 items measure

independence. The Kim and Sharkey (1995) measure derives from cross-cultural research

focused on the development of self-construals from independent and interdependent

orientations.

Holism/Analytical

The Lim, Kim, and Kim (2011) instrument for Holistic and Analytical cultural

values originally includes 28 items. However, to avoid double counting, the items found

in Oyserman et al. (2002), Kim and Sharkey (1995), Oetzel and Ting-Toomey (2003) that are also used in the Lim, Kim, and Kim (2011) measure are omitted. The remaining items, unique to Lim, et al. (2011), total to 16 items. 9 items target holism, and 7 items target the individualism that theoretically explains analytical cultural values. The 12 omitted items are already measured by the other instruments used in the current study for construct validity, and used to account for the analytical cultural values.

Facework negotiation

The Oetzel and Ting-Toomey (2003) instrument for Facework Negotiation includes 28 items. 10 items target self-oriented facework strategies from subcategories labeled Independent (3 items), Self-face (4 items), and Dominant (3 items). 11 items target other oriented facework strategies from subcategories labeled Interdependent (5 items), and Other-face (6 items). In addition, the Oetzel and Ting-Toomey (2003) instrument includes items associated with a balance of both and neither perspectives of self and other facework orientations. The both subcategory is labeled Integrated (4 items), and the neither subcategory is labeled Avoidant (3 items).

Rhetorical Sensitivity

The Rhetorical Sensitivity instrument originally from Knutsen, Komolsevin, Datthugawat, Smith, and Kaweewong, (2003), and advanced by Knutson and Posirisuk (2006) includes 30 items, 10 for each factor – Noble self, Rhetorical sensitivity, and Rhetorical reflection. The Noble self items measure the self oriented cultural values. The Rhetorical Reflector items measure the other oriented cultural values. The Rhetorical Sensitivity items measure the presence of balancing both self and other orientations. The instrument is originally used as a scale to measure Thai rhetorical sensitivity; however,

the instrument is also the only measure of Rhetorical Sensitivity to establish strong reliability. The coefficient alphas are .88 for Noble self, .81 for rhetorical sensitivity, and .82 for Rhetorical reflector.

Instruments: Translation

Except for the English versions used in the US, all questionnaires undergo appropriate translation and back translation procedures to ensure validity of items across cultures. The entire questionnaire for every sample first undergoes translation from the English language to the native language of each culture (Spanish and Japanese) by a qualified communication scholar. Subsequently, the entire questionnaire undergoes back translation from the native language of each culture back to the English language. Each item is then evaluated for conceptual validity. Following confirmation of validity of all translations, items are loaded to Qualtrics, and links are distributed accordingly to participating cultures. A variety of significant linguistic modifications take place across translated instruments.

Spanish Translation

Given the shared Latin roots between Spanish and English, the Spanish version modified only few terms among the items. Significant modification includes the word "care" for the credibility element in Spanish. The "care" term becomes the Spanish "preocupación," a term that sounds similar to English preoccupation, but is used in Spanish to express personal concern for others. Also, the Spanish scale terms that use "strongly" agree/disagree are modified to "totalmente," and becomes "totally" agree/disagree due to potential confusion with "strongly" in the Spanish language.

Japanese Translation

The Japanese version undergoes more extensive modifications. Due to the use of honorifics in Japanese language, items that address self or others are modified to include culturally appropriate address according to social position. Also, various items apply Japanese rules of omission in grammar to omit terms used to identify self and others when the contextual information already clarifies the direction of sentence structure. In other words, when necessary, words like "I" and "other people/my group" are dropped to avoid linguistic redundancies. Furthermore, the terms used for "honor" as a measure of the trust element of credibility originally translates to "meiyo," a term synonymous and too easily confused with "glory." Therefore, the Japanese term "shinrai" is used to represent "honor," a synonym for trustworthy, reliability, and character combined. In addition, the dynamic credibility evaluation items change from the use of terms such as "reflect" and "in common" to "the differences and similarities" I share with my group. The modification helps to clarify the intent of items by avoiding shared identity confusion between self and others. For example, "I explain that the kindness of my group is a reflection of my own individual kindness" becomes "I explain that the kindness of my group shares similarities and differences with my individual kindness." Finally, the Japanese scale item "strongly disagree" becomes "if you do not agree at all," and "strongly agree" becomes "I agree very much."

Statistical Analysis

The analysis proceeds in three tests. The first tests the measurement model. The second tests the function of credibility orientations, and the third tests the classifications of credibility evaluations. The test of the model includes reliability estimates, a paired t-test between vicarious and source credibility averages, and an analysis of the factor

structure. To test the function of credibility components, a correlation analysis and a step-wise multiple regression analysis are performed. The test of the classification of credibility evaluations performs a discriminant analysis. All of the tests are administered within and across cultures.

Test One

Reliability

Data are coded for each culture, coded for theoretical factors, tested for normality, and reliability estimates are performed for each measure. The descriptive statistics determine whether or not data analyses operate according to statistical assumptions that data are distributed normally. Furthermore, overall reliability estimates for each instrument within each sample are standardized according to Cronbach's alpa reliability (Cronbach, 1951) (see Table 1). Subsequently, subcomponents of each measure also undergo the same reliability estimates independently. For example, each of the credibility elements, credibility orientations, and grid evaluations are analyzed for standardized reliability estimates for US, Spain, and Japan.

Paired t-test

Data are analyzed to determine whether or not a significant difference exists between the two major credibility orientation factors of the credibility grid (vicarious and source credibility). The purpose of the paired t-test is to determine whether or not each participant perceived a statistically significant difference between the average scores of the same measurement made under two difference conditions – vicarious and source credibility. Both measurements were taken from each participant in all of the samples, and the paired t-test is based on the paired differences between the two average scores

that exist both within and across cutlures. The significance levels are based on a 99%
confidence interval.

Factor Analysis

Data are factor analyzed for factor measurement stability by identifying patterns
of regularity among variables. A principle components analysis (Pearson, 1901) and
varimax rotation (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999) determines
eigenvectors derived from data within and across each sample. The general purpose of
the factor analysis is to determine whether or not participants perceive the semantic
differentiation among theoretical dimensions of the two-factor solution (vicarious and
source) credibility orientations as expected. Minimum extraction is set at .10, and the
minimum cut-off for factor loading is set at .50.

The factor analysis also determines variance accounted for, regarding each
dimension within and across each sample. For example, within cultures, data from one
sample regarding the vicarious credibility orientation account for a high percentage of the
variance, where as data from another sample account for a high percentage of variance
regarding the source credibility orientation; and across cultures, the entire data set
regarding the two credibility orientations accounts for a high percentage of variance for
either credibility orientation. The purpose of analyzing the variance accounted for is to
provide an indication of the potential for cultural explanations about how each sample
values each of the credibility grid orientations.

Data then undergo a Chi Squared analysis to determine the goodness of fit
between what was actually observed and what was expected to occur. The analysis
provides insight to whether or not the deviations (between observed and expected) are a

result of random chance, or the result of other unidentified factors. A statistically significant deviation between what was expected and observed in regards to the vicarious credibility orientation, for example, indicates the presence of a cultural explanation about the way a sample values the source and vicarious credibility orientations. The confidence interval is set at 95%, or $p < .05$, and $F > 2.00$.

Test Two

A simple correlation matrix (Pedhazur, 1997) is generated to observe construct validity from the relationship between cross-cultural communication data and credibility data. The purpose is to further gauge the degree to which self and other intercultural communication theory orientations significantly correlate with credibility orientations as expected. Theoretically, as an example, self-orientated cross-cultural communication variables associated with individualism, analytical, independence, self-facework, and noble self should share a positive, significant correlation with the source credibility orientation. On the other hand, for example, other-orientated cross-cultural communication variables associated with collectivism, holism, interdependence, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection should all share a positive, significant correlation with the vicarious credibility orientation.

In addition, a step-wise regression analysis is performed. The general purpose of the step-wise regression analysis is to determine the function in which the credibility orientations (vicarious, source) predict the use of credibility within and across cultures. Each of the orientations undergoes separate step-wise regression analyses. The order in which the credibility orientations predict the use of credibility helps to clarify the relationship cross-cultural communication theory shares with the use of credibility.

Futthermore, given the credibility orientations share a low degree of collinearity from the regression analysis, results indicate that the orientations operate as the theory suggests. A high degree of collinearity indicates the opposite. The maximum collinearity among credibility orientations is set at $\leq$ .40.

Test Three

A discriminant analysis is performed. The general purpose of the discriminant analysis is to determine the degree to which the function of the credibility orientations (source and vicarious) vary within cultures, according to the credibility evaluation classifications. The order in which the credibility orientations determine the classification of credibility evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) helps to clarify the relationship cross-cultural communication theory shares with the use of credibility. Given a sample, for example, fails to significantly differentiate between source and vicarious credibility orientations, the expected classification should range between recessive and dynamic credibility evaluations, where results indicate a both/neither function of cross-cultural communication values. Given a sample does indicate a significant degree of differentiation between credibility orientations, the expected classifications should range between earned and positioned credibility evaluations, where results indicate an either/or function of cross-cultural values. A t-test is used to determine the differentiation among credibility orientations.

In addition, a simple correlation matrix (Pedhazur, 1997) is generated to observe the relationship between cross-cultural communication data and credibility data. The purpose is to gauge the degree to which intercultural communication theory orientations (re: self, other, both, and neither) significantly correlate with the credibility grid

evaluations as expected. Theoretically, as an example, self-orientated cross-cultural communication variables associated with individualism, analytical, independence, self-facework, and noble self should share a positive, significant correlation with the earned credibility grid evaluation. On the other hand, the other-orientated cross-cultural communication variables associated with collectivism, holism, interdependence, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection should all share a positive, significant correlation with the positioned credibility grid evaluation. However, the cross-cultural communication variables associated with the both/neither factors such as integrated face, mutual face, interdependent self-construals, and rhetorical sensitivity should result in a positive, significant correlation with recessive, monitored, and dynamic credibility evaluations. The confidence interval is set at 95%, or $p < .05$.

Chapter Three

Results

The research proposed to test the model, function, and classification of the two-factor solution credibility grid. Prior to analysis data were examined for coding/data entry errors, and tests for normality were conducted for each of the constructs derived from individual items. Tests for normality included kurtosis, skewness, and visual inspection of histograms. Constructs appear to be within normality. Means, standard deviations, and reliability estimates for all variables appear in Table 1.

Further analysis provides explanations of data collection and statistical treatment beginning within cultures, followed by analysis across cultures. First demographic findings provide information concerning age and gender. Following the demographic information, the three tests are discussed. The first tests the model, a paired t-test, and a principal components factor analysis with varimax rotation to reveal that variables represent separate constructs. The second set of tests examines the function of credibility orientations through correlation and regression analysis. The third tests the discriminant classifications of credibility evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic). Finally, a conclusion is provided, briefly summarizing all research results.

United States

Demographics

616 participants from the US are included in the sample. Only participants reporting U.S. nationality were included in the analysis. Participants include 227 male (37%) and 389 female (63%). Average age range is from 18-25, representing 85.6% of the entire US sample. The overall reliability estimate of the credibility grid instrument is

approximately .75. All subcomponent reliability estimates are listed in Table 1 along with means and standard deviations.

Test 1: Model

Initially, a factor analysis was performed on the overall credibility measure to analyze the factor structure of all credibility variables (orientations, elements, and evaluations) combined. Results from a correlation determinant ($p > .000001$) and a Chi-squared analysis ($X^2 = 4017.439$, df = 435, $p < .01$) indicate participants perceive significant differences among credibility variables. An examination of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample is factorable (KMO = .796). Subsequently, a paired sample t-test was performed to determine that a significant difference does exist between source and vicarious credibility orientations (M= 1.43, SD = .199, $t = 7.182$, *df* = 615, $p < .001$). Therefore, a principle components analysis (Pearson, 1901) employing a Varimax rotation (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999) of each credibility orientation (vicarious/source) was performed separately for both orientations. After loadings less than .50 were excluded, the analysis yielded three components from the source credibility orientation that accesses recessive, dynamic, and monitored credibility evaluations. A factor analysis of vicarious credibility orientation, however, expands to include five theoretical components that accesses all of the credibility grid evaluations as theoretically expected (factor loadings =>.50). The results of an orthogonal rotation of the solution are shown in Tables 2 and 3.

Test 2: Function

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the US credibility variables and US cross-cultural variables (see Tables 4 & 5). Vicarious and source credibility orientation scores are positively and significantly correlated with one another ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), indicating that US participants moderately differentiate between the two credibility orientations. Each of the credibility orientation scores also correlate positively and significantly with credibility elements (see Table 3). The relationship that the trust element shares with source credibility ($r = .77$, $p < .01$), and vicarious credibility ($r = .78$, $p < .01$) represents the strongest elemental correlation, indicating that US participants depend most on the trustworthiness attributions in task oriented decision making processes. Furthermore, the credibility evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) share a positive and significant correlation with both source and vicarious credibility orientations, where source credibility correlates most with the monitored evaluation ($r = .66$, $p < .01$), and vicarious correlates most with the positioned evaluation ($r = .64$, $p < .01$). The results of the credibility evaluations indicate that the more US participants use credibility, the more the participants become cautious when providing an audience with self references, and depend on affiliated others to provide an audience with information concerning the fulfillment of ascripted social attributions.

Cross-cultural communication variables were summed and grouped according to self, other, and both orientations. Vicarious and source credibility orientations are positively and significantly correlated with all cross-cultural communication variables, though correlations remain low to moderate levels throughout the data set (see Table 5). Both vicarious and source credibility are positively and significantly correlated with

overall cross-cultural communication ($r = .35$, $p < .01$, $r = .30$, $p < .01$). Vicarious credibility positively and significantly correlates highest with the both-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .34$, $p < .01$). However, source credibility positively and significantly correlates highest with the other-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .37$, p $< .01$). Results indicate that US participants rely on vicarious credibility by making references to rhetorical sensitivity, integrated and interdependent facework, and rely on source credibility by making references to other-construals, other-facework, collectivism, and rhetorical reflection. Overall cross-cultural communication variables correlate highest with the dynamic credibility evaluation (r $= .31$, p $< .01$), and the dynamic evaluation correlates highest with the both-oriented credibility evaluation (r $= .39$, p $< .01$). The results indicate US audience evaluations of credibility vary mostly as a result of the interactive involvement the source shares as a member of the cultural system.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Step-wise multiple regression analyses examined the grid evaluations as predictors of how US participants would most likely solicit credibility evaluations from an audience. The multiple regression model with all five predictors (grid evaluations) produced a low level of multi-collinearity (See Table 6). According to US participants, the strongest predictor of overall credibility is the positioned evaluation ($R^2 = .50$, $F(1, 614) = 616.879$, $p < .01$). As for the source credibility orientation, US participants indicate the monitored evaluation as the strongest predictor ($R^2 = .44$, $F(1, 614) = 482.034$, $p < .01$). For the vicarious credibility orientation participants indicate the positioned evaluation as the strongest predictor ($R^2 = .41$, $F(1, 614) = 429.920$, $p < .01$).

The credibility evaluation scales had significant positive regression weights, indicating information directed toward source credibility is expected to solicit the monitored grid evaluation, and information directed toward vicarious credibility is expected to solicit the positioned grid evaluation.

Test Three: Classification

Data were grouped based on the two-factor solution (vicarious and source) to create a new variable labeled the credibility discriminant function. The credibility discrimination function score was used to predict which credibility evaluation participants would most likely choose to solicit from an audience. The group co-ordinance for each credibility evaluation (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) was determined by using the discriminant function score to define the boundary between groups. The results from US data indicate participants significantly differentiate among predictor variables, based on the discriminant function ($\Lambda = .16$, χ^2 (8, $N = 616$) = 1103.861, $p < .01$). According to the structure matrix, the predictor variables strongly associated with the discriminant function ($r = .83$, $p < .01$), accounting for 69% of the variance. The cross validation accuracy rate (87.5%) indicates the criteria for correctly classified grouped cases are satisfied.

According the credibility discriminant function, based on both vicarious and source credibility orientations simultaneously, participants in the US sample tended to have higher classification scores on the dynamic evaluation with 83% classification accuracy. The dynamic classification is a product of maximizing both vicarious and source credibility, demonstrating the credibility drawn from a systemic micro-macro relationship that the target individual shares with a network of affiliated others. The

second highest score belongs to the positioned evaluation with 93% classification

accuracy. The positioned evaluation is a product of high vicarious and low source

credibility, indicating US participants tend to solicit credibility on the basis of social

placement determined by social group membership, and values for social harmony.

Spain

Demographics

Participants included in the Spanish sample number 300. Only participants

reporting Spanish nationality are included. Participants include 116 male (39%) and 184

female (61%). Average age range is from 18-25, representing 88% of the entire Spanish

sample. The overall reliability estimate of the Spanish credibility grid instrument is

approximately .67. All subcomponent reliability estimates are listed in Table 1 along with

means and standard deviations.

Test 1: Model

Initially, a factor analysis was performed on the overall credibility measure to

analyze the factor structure of all credibility variables (orientations, elements, and

evaluations) combined. Results from a correlation determinant ($p > .000001$) and a Chi-

squared analysis ($X^2 = 1411.585$, df = 299, $p < .01$) indicate participants perceive a

significant difference among credibility variables. An examination of the Kaiser-Meyer

Olkin measure of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample is factorable (KMO =

.718). Subsequently, a paired sample t-test was performed to determine that a significant

difference does exist between source and vicarious credibility orientations (M= 1.17, SD

= 6.393, $t = 3.179$, $df = 299$, $p < .05$). Therefore, a principle components analysis

(Pearson, 1901) and varimax rotation (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999)

of each credibility orientation (vicarious/source) was performed separately. After loadings less than .50 were excluded, the analysis yielded four components from the source credibility orientation that accesses a monitored/recessive factor, dynamic/earned factor, and positioned credibility evaluations. A factor analysis of vicarious credibility orientation, however, expands to include five theoretical components that accesses all of the credibility grid evaluations as theoretically expected (factor loadings =>.50). The results of an orthogonal rotation of the solution are shown in Table 7 and 8.

Test 2: Function

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the Spanish credibility variables and Spanish cross-cultural variables (see Tables 9 & 10). Vicarious and source credibility orientation scores are positively and significantly correlated with one another ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), indicating that Spanish participants moderately differentiate between credibility orientations. Each of the credibility orientation scores also correlate positively and significantly with credibility elements (see Table 3). The relationship that the competence element shares with source credibility ($r = .71$, $p < .01$), and the relationship that the trust element shares with vicarious credibility ($r = .78$, $p < .01$) represent the strongest elemental correlations. The results indicate that Spanish participants rely primarily on the source-competence and more on vicarious-trustworthiness attributions in task oriented decision making processes. Furthermore, the credibility evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) share a positive and significant correlation with both source and vicarious credibility orientations, where source credibility correlates most with the monitored evaluation ($r =$

.66, $p < .01$) and vicarious credibility correlates most with the dynamic evaluation ($r = .59$, $p < .01$). The results of the credibility evaluations indicate that the more Spanish participants use credibility, the more the participants cautiously monitor providing an audience with self references, and at the same time depend on the systemic relationship shared with a network of affiliated others.

Cross-cultural communication variables were summed and grouped according to self, other, and both orientations. Vicarious and source credibility orientations are positively and significantly correlated with all cross-cultural communication variables, though correlations remain low to moderate levels throughout the data set (see Table 10). Both vicarious and source credibility are positively and significantly correlated with overall cross-cultural communication variables combined ($r = .43$, $p < .01$, $r = .33$, $p < .01$). Vicarious credibility positively and significantly correlates highest with other-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .40$, $p < .01$). However, source credibility also positively and significantly correlates with the other-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .38$, $p < .01$). Results indicate that the more participants solicit audience evaluations to derive credibility, the more participants rely on an other-oriented perspective attributable to other-construals, other-facework, collectivism, and rhetorical reflection. Overall cross-cultural communication variables correlate highest with the dynamic credibility evaluation ($r = .40$, $p < .01$), and the dynamic credibility evaluation correlates highest with the both-orientation and the other-oriented cross-cultural variables ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). The results indicate Spanish audience evaluations of credibility vary mostly as a result of the interactive relationship the source plays as a member of the cultural system.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Step-wise multiple regression analyses examined the grid evaluations as predictors of how Spanish participants would most likely solicit credibility evaluations from an audience. The multiple regression model with all five predictors produced a moderate level of multi-collinearity (See Table 11). According to Spanish participants, the strongest predictor of overall credibility is the monitored evaluation ($R^2 = .45$, F (1, 298) = 248.728, $p < .01$). As for the source credibility orientation, Spanish participants indicate the monitored evaluation as the strongest predictor ($R^2 = .44$, F (1, 298) = 229.969, $p < .01$), and the dynamic evaluation as the strongest predictor of the vicarious credibility orientation ($R^2 = .35$, F (1, 298) = 157.954, $p < .01$). The credibility evaluation scales had significant positive regression weights, indicating information directed toward source credibility is expected to solicit the monitored grid evaluation, and information directed toward vicarious credibility is expected to solicit the dynamic grid evaluation.

Test Three: Classification

Data were grouped based on the two-factor solution (vicarious and source) to create a new variable labeled the credibility discriminant function. The credibility discrimination function score was used to predict which credibility evaluation participants would most likely choose to solicit from an audience. Using the discriminant function score, the group co-ordinance for each credibility evaluation (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) was determined by defining the boundary between groups. The results from Spanish data indicate participants significantly differentiate among predictor variables, based on the discriminant function ($\Lambda = .14$, χ^2 (8, $n = 300$) = 580.572, $p < .01$). According to the structure matrix, the predictor variables strongly

associated with the discriminant function (r = .83, p < .01), accounting for 63% of the variance. The cross validation accuracy rate (90%) indicates the criteria for correctly classified grouped cases are satisfied.

Spanish participants tended to score highest on soliciting the dynamic evaluation than any other credibility evaluation with 91% classification accuracy. The dynamic classification is a product of maximizing both vicarious and source credibility, demonstrating the credibility drawn from a systemic micro-macro relationship that the target individual shares with a network of affiliated others. The second highest classification score is the earned evaluation with 85% classification accuracy. The earned classification is a product of high source credibility and low vicarious credibility, indicating Spanish participants tend to solicit credibility on the basis of social recognition. Regardless of what others may say, expressing the thoughts and opinions of the target individual remains the primary objective.

Japan

Demographics

Participants included in the Japanese sample are 233. All participants report Japanese nationality and those that identified themselves as non-native to Japanese nationality were discarded. Participants include 16 male (7%) and 217 female (93%), an overwheliming bias. Average age range is from 18-25, representing 92% of the entire Japanese sample. The overall reliability estimate of the Japanese credibility grid instrument is approximately .50. All subcomponent reliability estimates for elements, credibility orientations, and credibility evaluations are listed in Table 1 along with means and standard deviations.

Test 1: Model

Initially, a factor analysis was performed on the overall credibility measure to analyze the factor structure of all credibility variables (orientations, elements, and evaluations) combined. Results from a correlation determinant ($p > .000001$) and a Chi-squared analysis ($X^2 = 1133.010$, df = 232, $p < .01$) indicate participants perceive a significant difference among credibility variables. An examination of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample is factorable (KMO = .676). Subsequently, a paired sample t-test was performed to determine that a significant difference does exist between source and vicarious credibility orientations (M= 1.845, SD = 5.09, $t = 5.535$, *df* = 232, $p < .01$). Therefore, a principle components analysis (Pearson, 1901) and varimax rotation (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999) of each credibility orientation (vicarious/source) was performed separately. After loadings less than .50 were excluded, the analysis yielded five components from the source credibility orientation that accesses (a) a positioned/recessive factor (based on competence), (b) a dynamic/earned factor, (c) a recessive/monitored/dynamic factor (based on trust), (d) a single item earned factor (based on goodwill/care), and (e) a single item recessive factor (based on trust). A factor analysis of vicarious credibility orientation, however, expands to include five theoretical components that accesses all of the credibility grid evaluations as theoretically expected (factor loadings =>.50). The results of an orthogonal rotation of the solution are shown in Tables 12 and 13.

Test Two: Correlation Analysis

Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the Japanese credibility variables and Japanese cross-cultural variables (see Tables 14 &15).

Vicarious and source credibility orientation scores are positively and significantly

correlated with one another ($r = .29$, $p < .01$), indicating that Japanese participants show

the strongest differentiation between credibility orientations. Each of the credibility

orientation scores correlates positively and significantly with credibility elements (see

Table 3). Both competence and goodwill/care correlate positively and significantly with

source credibility ($r = .64$, $p < .01$, $r = .63$, $p < .01$), and the strongest correlation exists

between the trust element and vicarious credibility ($r = .70$, $p < .01$). The results indicate

that Japanese participants depend most on source-competence/goodwill-care, and

vicarious-trustworthiness elementts in task oriented decision making processes.

Furthermore, the credibility evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored,

dynamic) share a positive and significant correlation with both source and vicarious

credibility orientations, where source credibility correlates most with the positioned

evaluation ($r = .64$, $p < .01$) and vicarious credibility correlates most with the earned

evaluation ($r = .58$, $p < .01$). The results of the credibility evaluations indicate that the

more Japanese participants use credibility, the more the participants solicit audience

evaluations related to fulfilling ascribed attributions with self references, and depend on

the network of affiliated others to represent group member social recognition. In other

words, Japanese participants report using source credibility to evidence social harmony

and use vicarious credibility to evidence social recognition.

Cross-cultural communication variables were summed and grouped according to self,

other, and both orientations. Vicarious and source credibility orientations are positively

and significantly correlated with all cross-cultural communication variables, though

correlations remain low to moderate levels throughout the data set (see table 15). Both

vicarious and source credibility are positively and significantly correlated with overall cross-cultural communication ($r = .20$, $p < .01$, $r = .33$, $p < .01$). Vicarious credibility positively and significantly correlates highest with self-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). The results indicate that the more Japanese participants rely on a social network of affiliated others to derive credibility, the more references are made to self-construals, self-facework, noble-self, and individualism. Source credibility positively and significantly correlates with the both-oriented cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .28$, $p < .01$), also indicating that the more Japanese participants rely on personal attributions to derive credibility, the more references are made to an interdependent-construal, integrated facework, and rhetorical sensitivity. The group is responsible for the social recognition of the individual, and the individual is responsible to maintain social harmony. Overall cross-cultural communication variables correlate highest with the positioned credibility orientation ($r = .39$, $p < .01$), and the positioned evaluation correlates highest with the other-oriented cultural variables ($r = .36$, $p < .01$). The results indicate Japanese audience evaluations of credibility vary mostly as a result of a positioned cultural worldview. *Multiple Regression Analysis*

Step-wise multiple regression analyses examined the grid evaluations as predictors of how Japanese participants would most likely solicit credibility evaluations from an audience. The multiple regression model with all five predictors produced a low level of multi-collinearity (See Table 16). According to Japanese participants, the strongest predictor of overall credibility is the positioned evaluation ($R^2 = .40$, $F(1, 231) = 155.834$, $p < .01$). The source credibility orientation also produced a low level of

collinearity, and participants indicate the positioned evaluation as the strongest predictor (R^2 = .41, $F(1, 227)$ = 158.496, $p < .01$). The vicarious credibility orientation also produced a low level of collinearity, and participants indicate the earned evaluation as the strongest predictor (R^2 = .34, $F(1, 227)$ = 118.653, $p < .01$). The credibility evaluation scales had significant positive regression weights, indicating information directed toward source credibility is expected to solicit the positioned grid evaluation, and information directed toward vicarious credibility is expected to solicit the earned grid evaluation.

Test Three: Classification

Data were grouped based on the two-factor solution (vicarious and source) to create a new variable labeled the credibility discriminant function. The credibility discrimination function score was used to predict which credibility evaluation participants would most likely choose to solicit from an audience. Using the discriminant function score, the group co-ordinance for each credibility evaluation (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) was determined by defining the boundary between groups. The results from Japanese data indicate participants significantly differentiate among predictor variables, based on the discriminant function (Λ = .09, χ^2 (8, n = 200) = 464.304, $p < .01$). According to the structure matrix, the predictor variables strongly associated with the discriminant function (r = .89, $p < .01$), accounting for 75% of the variance. The cross validation accuracy rate (89.5%) indicates the criteria for correctly classified grouped cases are satisfied.

Japanese participants tended to score highest on soliciting the dynamic evaluation than any other credibility evaluation with 81% classification accuracy. The dynamic classification is a product of maximizing both vicarious and source credibility,

demonstrating the credibility drawn from a systemic micro-macro relationship that the target individual shares with a network of affiliated others. The second highest score classifies as the monitored evaluation with 100% classification accuracy. The monitored classification is a product of a moderately high score on source credibility and a moderately high score on vicarious credibility, indicating Japanese participants tend to solicit credibility on the basis of caution with concern for a social image.

Across Cultures

Demographics

Participants included across cultures are 1149. All participants report U.S., Spanish, or Japanese nationality and those that identified themselves as non-native to any of the three nationalities were discarded. Participants include 359 male (31%) and 790 female (69%). Average age range is from 18-25, representing 89% of the entire sample across cultures. The overall reliability estimate of the credibility grid instrument is approximately .70. All subcomponent reliability estimates are listed in Table 1 along with means and standard deviations.

Test 1: Model

Initially, a factor analysis was performed on the overall credibility measure to analyze the factor structure of all credibility variables (orientations, elements, and evaluations) combined. Results from a correlation determinant ($p > .000001$) and a Chi-squared analysis ($X^2 = 5599.351$, $df = 435$, $p < .01$) indicate participants perceive a significant difference among credibility variables. An examination of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample is factorable (KMO = .808). Subsequently, a paired sample t-test was performed to determine that a significant

difference does exist between source and vicarious credibility orientations (M= 1.45, SD = 5.387, $t = 9.108$, $df = 1148$, $p < .001$). Therefore, a principle components analysis (Pearson, 1901) and varimax rotation (Fabrigar, Wegener, MacCallum, & Strahan, 1999) of each credibility orientation (vicarious/source) was performed separately. After loadings less than .50 were excluded, the analysis yielded three components from the source credibility orientation that accesses (a) positioned/monitored, (b) earned/dynamic, and (c) recessive credibility evaluations. A factor analysis of vicarious credibility orientation, however, expands to include five theoretical components that accesses all of the credibility grid evaluations as theoretically expected (factor loadings =>.50). The results of an orthogonal rotation of the solution are shown in Tables 17 and 18.

Test 2: Function

Correlation Analysis

Correlation analyses were conducted to examine the relationship between the credibility and cross-cultural variables across cultures (see Tables 19 & 20). Vicarious and source credibility orientation scores are positively and significantly correlated with one another ($r = .51$, $p < .01$), indicating that participants moderately differentiate between credibility orientations as related to the overall use of credibility across cultures. Each of the credibility orientation scores also correlate positively and significantly with credibility elements (see Table 3). The relationships that the trust and goodwill/care elements share with source credibility are identical ($r = .72$, $p < .01$), and the relationship that the trust element shares with vicarious credibility ($r = .76$, $p < .01$) represents the strongest elemental correlation. The results indicate that participants across cultures depend most on the source-trust/goodwill-caring and vicarious-trustworthiness

attributions in task oriented decision making processes. Furthermore, the credibility

evaluations (earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, dynamic) share a positive and

significant correlation with both source and vicarious credibility orientations, where

source credibility correlates most with the monitored evaluation ($r = .64$, $p < .01$), and

vicarious credibility correlates most with the positioned evaluation ($r = .57$, $p < .01$). The

results of the credibility evaluations indicate that the more participants across cultures use

credibility, the more the participants cautiously monitor providing an audience with self

references, and depend more on a network of affiliated others to express fulfillment of

ascripted social attributions.

     Cross-cultural communication variables were summed and grouped according to

self, other, and both orientations. Vicarious and source credibility orientations are

positively and significantly correlated with all cross-cultural communication variables,

though correlations remain low to moderate levels throughout the data set (see Table 20).

Both vicarious and source credibility are positively and significantly correlated with

overall cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .35$, $p < .01$, $r = .31$, $p < .01$).

Vicarious credibility positively and significantly correlates highest with the both-oriented

cross-cultural communication variables ($r = .31$, $p < .01$). The results indicate that the

more participants across cultures rely on a social network of affiliated others to derive

credibility, the more references are made to an interdependent-construal, integrated

facework, holism, and rhetorical sensitivity. Source credibility positively and

significantly correlates highest with the other-oriented cross-cultural communication

variables ($r = .35$, $p < .01$). Results indicate that the more participants across cultures rely

on personal attributions to derive credibility, the more references are made to other-

construals, other-facework, collectivism, and rhetorical reflection. Overall cross-cultural communication variables correlate highest with the dynamic credibility evaluation ($r = .33$, $p < .01$), and the dynamic credibility evaluation correlates highest with the both-orientation and the other-oriented cross-cultural variables ($r = .41$, $p < .01$). The results indicate audience evaluations of credibility across cultures vary mostly as a result of the interactive relationship the source plays as a member of the cultural system.

Multiple Regression Analysis

Step-wise multiple regression analyses examined the grid evaluations as predictors of how participants across cultures would most likely solicit credibility evaluations from an audience. The multiple regression model with all five predictors produced a low level of multi-collinearity (See Table 21). According to participants across cultures, the strongest predictor of overall credibility is the positioned evaluation ($R^2 = .47$, $F(1, 1147) = 1031.422$, $p < .01$). As for the source credibility orientation participants indicate the monitored evaluation as the strongest predictor ($R^2 = .41$, $F(1, 1147) = 783.369$, $p < .01$). The vicarious credibility orientation also produced a low level of collinearity, and participants indicate the positioned evaluation as the strongest predictor ($R^2 = .33$, $F(1, 1147) = 552.074$, $p < .01$). The credibility evaluation scales had significant positive regression weights, indicating information directed toward source credibility is expected to solicit the monitored grid evaluation, and information directed toward vicarious credibility is expected to solicit the positioned grid evaluation.

Test Three: Classification

Data were grouped based on the two-factor solution (vicarious and source) to create a new variable labeled the credibility discriminant function. The credibility

discrimination function score was used to predict which credibility evaluation

participants would most likely choose to solicit from an audience. Using the discriminant

function score, the group co-ordinance for each credibility evaluation (earned, positioned,

recessive, monitored, dynamic) was determined by defining the boundary between

groups. The results from data across cultures indicate participants significantly

differentiate among predictor variables, based on the discriminant function ($\Lambda = .16$, χ^2

$(8, n = 1149) = 2128.220, p < .01$). According to the structure matrix, the predictor

variables strongly associated with the discriminant function ($r = .83, p < .01$), accounting

for 63% of the variance. The cross validation accuracy rate (89%) indicates the criteria

for correctly classified grouped cases are satisfied.

Participants across cultures tended to score highest on soliciting the dynamic

evaluation than any other credibility evaluation with 83% classification accuracy. The

dynamic classification is a product of maximizing both vicarious and source credibility,

demonstrating the credibility drawn from a systemic micro-macro relationship that the

target individual shares with a network of affiliated others. The second highest score

belongs to the positioned evaluation with 97% classification accuracy. The positioned

evaluation is a product of high vicarious and low source credibility, indicating

participants across cultures tend to solicit credibility on the basis of social placement

determined by social group membership, and values for social harmony.

Summary

The overall reliability scores are acceptable for the US and Spain, but not for the

Japanese data set. The indication is that US and Spanish participants generally

demonstrated making conceptual semantic differences among factors. Data indicate,

through factor analysis that the model is indeed factorable. Furthermore, both within and across cultures, results suggest that participants significantly differentiated between the two credibility orientations. Within cultures, participants report the source credibility orientation factor structure as most culture specific, demonstrating the most variance from one culture to the next. However, participants in all cultures, both within and across, report the vicarious credibility orientation factor structure as theoretically expected. Overall, though the model demonstrates deficiencies in reliability estimates, the credibility measure is useful.

Participants report that the relationship credibility variables share with cross-cultural communication variables emerges lower than theoretically expected. The indication is that, while credibility and cross-cultural theory share a positive significant correlation, the relationship is not as strong as expected. Furthermore, while the multiple regression analysis tends to support the correlational results, the predictability of credibility evaluations associated with credibility orientations is not as strong as initially expected. The results indicate that cross-cultural communication theory only partially explains the use of source and vicarious credibility orientations when participants solicit audience evaluations in task oriented decision making situations.

The discriminant analysis tends to explain the credibility orientations within and across cultures. Even with partially deficient reliability scores, the model remains accurate in predicting the classifications within and across cultures. In other words, participants differentiate among predictor variables, and the structure matrix, along with the accuracy of classifications, indicate the model predicts credibility grid evaluations. The discriminant function satisfies the accuracy criteria within and across cultures.

Chapter Four

Discussion

Summary: Credibility Grid

The dissertation develops a generalizable model to predict the use of credibility in task oriented, decision making situations within and across cultures. A two-factor solution provided a basis for a credibility grid system, based on vicarious and source credibility orientations that observes participants' variations in soliciting audience evaluations. Both credibility orientations are derived from three credibility elements: (a) competence, (b) trust, and (c) goodwill/caring. The source credibility orientation represents elemental information directed toward the target individual directly to solicit audience evaluations. The vicarious credibility orientation directs elemental information toward the social network affiliated with the target individual to solicit audience evaluations. The use of source credibility is relatively "self oriented" in task oriented decision making situations, while vicarious is relatively "other oriented." Both orientations operate to solicit an overall audience evaluation of credibility. The credibility grid model provides insight on how to more effectively manage social influence with the use of credibility across cultures.

Five credibility evaluations are derived from the two dimensions (source, vicarious orientations) grid system – earned, positioned, recessive, monitored, and dynamic. The earned and positioned evaluations are derived from two opposing social hierarchical worldviews. The earned hierarchy represents a worldview based in large part on values of social recognition, theoretically related to values of high source credibility and low vicarious credibility. The positioned hierarchy represents a worldview based

more on values of social harmony, theoretically related to values of low source credibility and high vicarious credibility. The remaining three evaluations (recessive, monitored, dynamic) advance the duality of hierarchical worldviews to consider more of a unidimensional perspective, where recessive is low on both vicarious and source credibility, monitored limits a moderate use of both, and dynamic maximizes the relationship between both source and vicarious credibility orientations.

Because the dissertation focuses on cultural values as an explanation of credibility variations, the project incorporates five cross-cultural communication theories. The five theories include (a) work from Oyserman, et. al (2002) on Hofstede's (1980) traditional individualism collectivism factors, (b) Kim and Sharkey's (1995) work on self construals, (c) Lim, Kim, and Kim's (2011) work on holism, (d) Oetzle and Ting-Toomey's (2005) theoretical develop of facework negotiation, and (e) Knutson and Posirisuk's (2006) work on rhetorical sensitivity. Individualism and collectivism were employed due to the cultural explanations associated with the processes of social roles relating either to self interests or group interests in decision making processes. Self construals were employed due to cultural variations about how individuals develop social identities independently or interdependently. Holism provides a recent alternative conceptual definition to Hofstede's collectivism, compared with individualism. Facework operates as an interpretive conceptual framework that considers how individuals make claim to social images as a product of self or other, in addition to the both neither perspectives. Finally, rhetorical sensitivity is employed due to the dichotomy of noble-self (self orientation) or rhetorical reflector (other orientation), in addition to the rhetorical sensitivity factor that considers a balanced combination of both self and other(s). The mix of theory allows for

both a dualistic perspective and a unidimensional perspective to derive results relating credibility to cross cultural communication theory. Ultimately, the cross-cultural communication theory and the credibility grid evaluations represent the various ways to exercise orientations of credibility to improve the competence of social influence within and across cultures.

Summary: findings

Results from the factor analysis indicate support for the credibility grid model formulation based on the contrast of vicarious axis and source axis. In addition, the overall Cronbach's alpha reliability estimate for US (alpha = .75), for Spanish (alpha = .67), for Japanese (alpha = .50), and across cultures (alpha = .70) suggests that the model is statistically reliable for US and Spanish cultures, however questionable for Japanese culture. Though the reliability estimates were lower than expected within Japanese culture, the results of the discriminant analysis remained highly accurate, indicating that the model will only increase in accuracy with increased reliability estimates. Furthermore, that the two credibility orientations (source, vicarious) result as significantly different in all cultures indicates vicarious credibility is a valuable addition to credibility theory that provides a means to examin credibility across cutlures.

The cultural background used to define credibility evaluations provides a conceptual framework to serve as a proxy for cultural values. Participants from the US culture report highest average scores for valuing the earned credibility style, followed by Spanish culture, and last Japanese culture. The earned credibility evaluation is defined by values of social recognition associated with individualism, and reflects similar result as past cross-cultural communication research. The positioned credibility orientation

average scores, based on social harmony and collectivism, also reflect similar past research results where the highest scores come from Japanese participants, followed by the US, and finally Spanish culture. Furthermore, as past cross-cultural communication theorists suggest, participants from the Japanese culture score highest for valuing the recessive credibility evaluation, followed by a relatively equal, but lower scores for both Spanish and US participants. The recessive evaluation is generally based on avoidance and apprehension toward decision making situations. The scores for the monitored evaluations tend to be valued relatively equal across cultures. However, the dynamic evaluation, an evaluation that maximizes both vicarious and source credibility evaluations, is valued highest by US participants, followed by Japanese, and finally Spanish cultures.

Defining vicarious and source credibility as relatively opposite dimensions on a continuum, as more dualistic research methods would prescribe, tends to corroborate past cross-cultural communication research. The process of deriving source credibility in the US and Spanish cultures varies more as result of seeking a monitored credibility evaluation defined as caution to remain in a constant state of regulation to manage some social image. In Japanese culture, however, deriving source credibility varies more as a result of seeking a positioned evaluation, based on maintaining social harmony. The results diverge from US and Spanish cultures, where the Japanese individual becomes representative of collectivistic set of social ascriptions applied to source crediblity.

Vicarious credibility advances theory by involving examination of credibility derived from a social network. As expected, the US vicarious credibility varies as a result of positioned credibility, where the social network acts to validate the individual's

fulfillment of collectivistic social ascriptions. Spanish vicarious credibility begins to differ from US, varying according to dynamic credibility, valuing individualized social group membership instead of fulfillment of collectivistic social ascriptions – a likely variation in the value of personal autonomy. Japanese vicarious credibility varies according to earned credibility, where opportunities for social recognition become sponsored by in-group membership status with social affiliations. Overall, where source credibility variations support past research, the additional vicarious credibility provides a new area of study for credibility theory.

To a large extent, examining cultural variations about the use of credibility to solicit audience evaluations on the basis of cultural value sets however provides unique results for credibility research. Concerning self-oriented cultural values, US vicarious credibility varies more than source credibility on the basis competence to solicit an earned credibility evaluation, such as that derived from peer review evaluations. The social network provides social recognition for knowledge and professionalism. Concerning other-orietned cultural values, US source credibility varies more than vicarious as a result of trustworthiness that solicits a positioned evaluation, such as fulfilling one's obligations as expected by the social network. The message source provides evidence of ethical standards on the basis of fulfillment of social ascriptions. Concerning both-oriented cultural values, US source credibility also varies more than vicarious credibility as a result of ethical standards and honorability that solicits a dynamic evaluation; such as the evaluation of the interaction a US politician shares among the system of governing branches. Overall US cultural values, however, indicate that an audience is most likely to shape credibility evaluations on the basis of vicarious

trustworthiness that produces a dynamic credibility evaluation. The audience evaluates social influence derived as a product of systemic ethical standards evidenced by the interaction between the source and the social network.

Concerning self-oriented cultural values, Spanish vicarious credibility varies more than source credibility on the basis of competence that solicits a dynamic credibility evaluation. The interaction between the message source and the social network produces systemic cultural ideology that recognizes skill and knowledge, such as traditional excellence – a matador, a paella chef, a vintner, or a flamenco dancer. Concerning other-oriented cultural values, Spanish vicarious credibility also varies more than source credibility as a result of goodwill/care that solicits a positioned evaluation. The social network sponsors the individual for fulfilling social ascriptions associated with helpfulness and generosity. Concerning both-oriented cultural values, Spanish vicarious credibilty further varies more than source credibility as a result of expressed generosity to solicit a dynamic evaluation. Overall Spanish cultural values indicate that audience evaluations develop as a result of vicarious competence that produces a dynamic credibility evaluation. The audience evaluates social influence as derived from the magnitude of systemic skill and knowledge evidenced by the interaction produced between the source and the social network. On all accounts of cultural value orientations, vicarious correlates higher than source credibility.

Concerning self-oriented cultural values, Japanese vicarious credibility varies more than source credibility on the basis honor and trustworthiness, which solicits an earned credibility evaluation. The social network provides the social recognition for an individual's fulfillment of ethical standards, such as the communalism (see Moemeka,

1998) that may be found in the filial piety of a sensei. The result tends to exemplify meta-

analysis (Oyserman, et. al, 2002) findings that identify Japanese culture as both more

collectivistic, and more individualistic than US culture. However, to add to Oyserman et.

al (2002), the current finding suggests Japanese individualism emerges vicariously as a

result of social group membership, whereby the social group defines the individual, and

in/out-group membership status becomes far more salient. Concerning other-oriented

cultural values, Japanese source credibility varies more than vicarious as a result of any

one of the elements (to a low degree) that solicits a positioned evaluation, such as

fulfilling one's obligations to uphold in-group membership entitlement. However, all of

the elemental correlations resulting from Japanese other-oriented cultural values are so

weak that results suggest elements of credibility exist in Japanese culture other than

competence, trust, and goodwill/caring. Perhaps Japanese source credibility operates on

elements beyond the scope of the dissertation. Nonetheless, Japanese source credibility

further varies more than vicarious credibility as a result of the both-orientation cultural

values to express honor, morals, and ethical standards that solicit a positioned evaluation.

Ultimately, overall Japanese cultural values indicate that an audience is most likely to

develop evaluations on the basis of source credibility that solicits a positioned evaluation

based on honor and trustworthiness.

Though the credibility grid provides a dualistic approach to analysis, the grid also

provides the additional both/neither perspective. Where vicarious and source credibility

combine to produce an overall credibility value, a theoretical shift takes place. As a single

factor, Spanish overall credibility varies as a result of the monitored evaluation as

expected, and Japanese overall credibility varies as a result of the positioned evaluation

as expected. However, US overall credibility varies to an even higher degree than Japanese culture as a result of seeking the positioned evaluation. The results, however, emerge with caution, as the cre dibility grid instrument was not designed specifically to account for correlational relationships by combining credibility orientations.

The results from the discriminant analysis, however, do account for the two orientations as a single function. The discriminant analysis examines vicarious and source credibility as a single function to provide valuable differences and similarities across cultures. Both within and across, cultures similarly seek an audience evaluation based on the dynamic classification. An individual deriving dynamic credibility focuses on maximizing both credibility orientations by exercising an integration of earned and positioned evaluations based on cultural values of social recognition and social harmony – both self and others, systemically. The result of valuing both orientations becomes the primary concern for deriving credibility as an interaction effect, instead of managing isolated factors on a continuum.

Differences across cultures are identified which suggest social influence varies as a result of the culture specific manifestation a of the interaction effect. A closer look at the secondary loadings of the discriminant credibility function, however, shows variation across cultures. The Japanese culture classifies more as a result of the monitored evaluation with 100% classification accuracy, indicating Japanese participants tend to seek credibility on the basis of caution with concern for a regulating some social image. Spanish culture classifies more as a result of the earned evaluation with 85% classification accuracy, indicating Spanish participants tend to solicit credibility on the basis of social recognition – a potential explanation of the interpersonal assertiveness

found in Spanish culture. The US, however, classifies more as a result of the positioned credibility evaluation with 93% classification accuracy, further evidencing US participants tend to solicit credibility more on the basis of the interdependence found as a result of social group membership. The results tend to corroborate with cross-cultural results that explain both US source and vicarious credibility as most associated with both-oriented and other-oriented cultural values, and least with self-oriented values. All of the secondary loadings tend to coincide with previous cross-cultural findings with the exception of the US results.

<div align="center">**Implications**</div>

Theoretical Implications

A major theoretical implication of the study is that past scientific communication research with source credibility fails to provide sufficient attention to the concept of vicarious credibility. Participants within and across cultures do differentiate between the two orientations. However, past research on credibility theory fails to provide sufficient consideration for the role of vicarious credibility plays as a necessary addition to the process of deriving audience evaluations of credibility. Vicarious credibility is different from source credibility, cultural values do tend to explain the variation in use of the two orientations, and the additional vicarious credibility orientation provides new grounds for research with credibility theory.

The cultural explanation further supports the argument that past research has given insufficient attention to the role vicarious credibility. The uniqueness of the "both" cultural orientation found in Japanese culture identifies a limitation to traditional perspectives of cross-cultural communication research, and instead suggests the need for

more attention to the salience of group membership entitlement. For example, the

relationship between individualism and collectivism in Japanese culture (r = .87, p < .01)

indicates that the Japanese participants fail to differentiate much between the two factors.

The implication is that Hofstede's (1980) original definition of collectivism may not be

suitable for Japanese culture, as the theoretical framework assumes cultures may not

score high on both factors.

In addition, that US source credibility correlates highest with collectivism ($r =$

.34, $p < .01$) and vicarious correlates highest with individualism ($r = .30$, $p < .01$)

establishes a counterintuitive result with past cross-cultural communication research that

calls for consideration of the interaction effect produced by the discriminant function.

The contrary results are exemplified by Oyserman, et. al (2002) meta-analysis, which

indicates a high probability that Hofestede's original framework does not account for a

unidimensional perspective, and risks generating stereotypical descriptions of culture.

Instead, results from the discriminant function coincides more clearly with the

foundational concepts of US culture, such as, "united we stand, divided we fall." The

source speaks for the social network, while the social network speaks for the individual.

Though the framework does not define US culture is holistic, the role of vicarious

credibility is not only an important addition to credibility theory, but the interaction effect

between the two orientations provides a means to investigate a more cogent cultural

explanation.

A second major theoretical implication targets the utility of the credibility grid

model, which provides two generalizable theoretical perspectives for credibility research.

One perspective provides information from a dualistic framework – the more traditional

approach, one or the other. The other perspective provides information from a unidimensional framework – considering the orientations as a single function, both or neither. The latter approach identifies US culture as more collectivistic than originally thought, and identifies a dynamic interaction from a cultural system as most predictive of credibility evaluations across cultures. The implication is that both perspectives are valuable, and both perspectives tend to support the need to further investigate the role of vicarious credibility.

Practical implications

The general purpose of the project was to provide a means for individuals to apply and adjust use of credibility to improve intercultural communication competence, as an individual learns the consequences and results from employing credibility in various ways, in various cultural settings, and can decide personally what changes may be necessary in order to strengthen social influence across cultures. An individual may apply a specific credibility orientation, or apply credibility orientations as a single function to discover the relationship with specific audience evaluations and cultural values. Separately, both orientations produce valuable information in the use of credibility. As a unidimensional function, across US, Spanish, and Japanese cultures, the dynamic evaluation emerges as the primary classification from discriminant analysis results, indicating both orientations are also valuable as a single function. However, the secondary loadings provide insight to the cultural variations.

In Japanese culture, participants tend to solicit audience evaluations of source credibility on the basis of positioned competence. The implication is that the individual avoids the risk of disturbing the audience by talking about her/his own competence, and

instead talks about the competence of the social network to which he/she belongs. The positioned evaluation involves cultural values associated with collectivism, holism, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection. On the other hand, Japanese participants solicit audience evaluations from vicarious credibility on the basis of earned trustworthiness, where there is little concern or doubt that the social network will provide social recognition on behalf of the individual's ethical standards and honorability. The earned credibility evaluation involves cultural values associated with individualism, analytic orientation, self-facework, and noble-self, sponsored by the network. The implication is that credibility becomes a product of a shared social identity, where the individual may never actually be perceived as separate from the social network of which provides social recognition.

Both orientations function simultaneously in Japanese culture to solicit a secondary audience evaluation on the basis of monitored trustworthiness and competence. The monitored classification indicates carefully talking about personal honor and knowledge to others without attracting too much attention, and at times expressing disagreement with what the social network says about the personal knowledge and honorability of the individual. The monitored credibility evaluation involves a constant state of regulating the balance of individualistic with collectivistic (Oyserman, et al., 2002), and independent with interdependent (Kim & Sharkey, 1995) cultural values. The implication becomes that credibility in Japanese culture means cautiously expressing a moderated balance between goodwill/care and competence, where the individual becomes interdependent upon the social network that provides social recognition for its members.

In Spanish culture, participants solicit audience evaluations of source credibility on the basis of caution to carefully balance talking about personal knowledge without attracting too much attention, and at times expressing disagreement with what people say about one's personal knowledge. The audience evaluation involves individual's responsibility to cautiously monitor individualistic with collectivistic (Oyserman, et al., 2002), and independent with interdependent (Kim & Sharkey, 1995) cultural values that associate with competence. On the other hand, Spanish participants solicit audience evaluations of vicarious credibility on the basis of discussions about how personal trustworthiness relates to the social network, and that the honor of the social network is a reflection of the honorable reputation of the individual. Dynamic credibility develops as a result of an audience evaluation defined by maximizing values for the converging interaction of credibility orientations within the cultural system – the intersection between the micro (source) and macro (vicarious) levels of a system of cultural values. The Spanish dynamic evaluation involves cultural values associated with interdependent and mutual facework emerge (Oetzel & Ting-toomey, 2003; Ting-Toomey, 2005), interdependent construals (Gudykunst, Matsumoto, Ting-Toomey, Nishida, Kim, & Heyman, 1996; Ting-Toomey, 2005), and rhetorical sensitivity's (Knutson, & Posirisuk, 2006) relationship with trustworthiness.

Both orientations function simultaneously to solicit a Spanish audience evaluation on the basis of accepting opportunities to be recognized for personal skill, and that personal skill depends less on what network members say about the message source. The earned credibility evaluation involves cultural values associated with individualism, analytic orientation, self-facework, and noble-self. Deriving credibility in Spanish culture

means expressing a monitored competence, where the individual maintains personal autonomy as a member of a social network that regulates shared attributions of social recognition.

In US culture, participants solicit audience evaluations of source credibility on the basis of caution to say too much about personal moral and ethical standards, and at times express uncertainty about the accuracy of what the social network says about such standards. The audience evaluation involves the individual's responsibility to cautiously monitor individualistic with collectivistic (Oyserman, et al., 2002), and independent with interdependent (Kim & Sharkey, 1995) cultural values that associate with trustworthiness. US participants solicit audience evaluations of vicarious credibility by depending on the social network to testify on behalf of the ethical standards of the individual. The positioned evaluation develops as a result of low value for source credibility and maximized value for vicarious credibility. The evaluation incorporates the high degree of the social influence of testimonials from affiliated group members on behalf of the individual. The positioned evaluation involves cultural values associated with social harmony, holism, collectivism, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection that also relate to trustworthiness.

Both orientations function simultaneously to solicit a single US audience evaluation on the basis of a positioned evaluation, where explaining one's own ethical standards becomes potentially boorish and ill mannered, and instead testimonials of the social network bear more of an impact on audience evaluations of the individual's ethical standards. The positioned credibility evaluation involves cultural values associated with collectivism, holism, other-facework, and rhetorical reflection that relate to

trustworthiness. The indication is that deriving credibility in US culture means expressing

positioned trustworthiness, where the individual partakes in social harmony by fulfilling

ascribed social attributions provided by the social network.

Across cultures, participants solicit audience evaluations of source credibility on

the basis of monitoring affective elements, trustworthiness and goodwill/caring.

Messages are produced with caution to say too much about personal generosity, ethical

standards, and at times to express uncertainty about the accuracy of what the social

network says about such standards. The audience evaluation involves the individual's

careful attention to balancing individualistic with collectivistic (Oyserman, et al., 2002),

and independent with interdependent (Kim & Sharkey, 1995) cultural values. US

participants solicit audience evaluations of vicarious credibility by depending on the

social network to testify on behalf of the ethical standards of the individual. The

positioned evaluation develops as a result of low value for source credibility and

maximized value for vicarious credibility. The evaluation is defined by the high degree of

the social influence of testimonials from affiliated group members on behalf of the

individual. The positioned evaluation involves a set of cultural values associated with

values associated with social harmony, holism, collectivism, other-facework, and

rhetorical reflection that relate to trustworthiness. Both orientations function

simultaneously to solicit an audience evaluation in exactly the same way as vicarious

credibility. The implication from credibility elements across cultures is that what is most

important to an audience is whether or not the source is likable, more than whether or not

the source can get the job done. In other words, the affability of a message source

becomes more socially influential than the expert performance provided to the audience.

Limitations

Data collection processes experienced sample bias, observer effects, and repeated responses. Across cultures, the vast majority of participants were female (69%). The issue becomes of particular concern with data collected from the Japanese culture, where participants include 16 male (7%) and 217 female (93%). A more balanced ratio between male and female data would allow for a less biased response to questionnaire items, and thus a more even perspective among gender roles associated with the use of credibility in task oriented, decision making situations. Spanish data collection experienced difficulty with paper and online data collection process. Approximately half of all participants completed online surveys, while the remaining half were filled out on paper in classrooms. The limitation is that the two different processes experienced variation in observer effects, whereby participants tend to modify behavior according to environmental constraints that arguably tend to decrease the accuracy of reporting.

A second limitation relates to the clarity and complexity of questionnaire items, and length of the overall questionnaire. Many questionnaire items too easily allow for confusion to differentiate between what is meant by "others." Questionnaire items tend to refer to "others" in association with the vicarious credibility drawn from affiliated "others," potentially causing semantic ambiguity for participants to determine whether or not "others" meant audience members or members of one's own social network. Furthermore, the complexity of questionnaire items risks participants potentially over scrutinizibg items. The limitation is that the instrument too easily allows for participants to second guess responses and to question the accuracy of interpretation. Last, an instrumental issue exists with the length of the questionnaire. Many participants did not

complete the entire questionnaire beyond the credibility measure. The results indicate potential exhaustion and lack of desire to provide true scores to all questionnaire items.

A third limitation concerns semantic interpretation from translations across cultures. Specifically, a limitation of self-references creates limitations in semantic clarity. Both Japanese and Spanish cultures use of language allows for omission of words that give reference to self. The Japanese culture typically uses the term "watashi-wa" (私は) for self-reference, and is often omitted when self-references are assumable. However, the term translates to and from English most directly with "as for me," indicating the definition of "self" requires implicit group membership – an indication that the Japanese-self is not actually considered separate from some social group. The Spanish culture also tends to omit terms directly associated with "self." The verbs in Spanish language vary according to pronoun references, where, for example, the infinitive verb "want/desire," is querer, which modifies to reference self-want/desire with quiero, thereby omitting terms such as "I, me, my." The limitation is that the more translations occur, the more cultural variations in the concept of "self" and "others" increase in ambiguity across cultures.

Future Research

The most prominent initial recommendation for future research concerns modification of the instrument. First, questionnaires that include additional/comparative theory beyond the construct of credibility should be cautious to include too many items. Questionnaires that include fewer theoretical measures likely experience a higher frequency of completed measures. Aside from questionnaire length, the Credibility Grid items need to use fewer items permitting a more simple and effective interpretation of factors. Results should experience increased reliability estimates among credibility

variables, due to increased clarity of target concepts; especially, concerning translations across cultures.

Future research needs to consider adding more varied cross-cultural data. Increasing the comparative results across cultures should provide increased understanding of how members of various cultures tend to use credibility, both similarly and differently, in task orientated, decision making situations. In addition, future research needs to consider the value of credibility evaluations in testing for factor reduction. Research that tests, in particular, the recessive credibility evaluation may find the evaluation as a separate construct more associated with communication apprehension. The recessive evaluation is the only credibility grid factor that tends to focus on withdrawing from task orientated decision-making situations. The remaining four credibility grid factors represent variation with active participation in task oriented decision-making situations.

Finally, future credibility research that focuses on dynamism as an element of credibility needs to consider testing the element as a product of both vicarious and source credibility, not as an either/or, dichotomous, continuum construct. Past research, though statistically stable, represents conceptual confusion as reports all use different definitions. According to the results of the current research, both within and across cultures, participants report valuing the dynamic credibility evaluation (a product of maximizing both vicarious and source) over all other evaluations. The results call for future research on credibility to include the vicarious credibility orientation as a necessary advancement to source credibility research. Research efforts should include testing the validity of dynamism with the new definition, based on maximizing the persuasive communication

attributions of self in combination with a system of various social networks. The overall results indicate credibility is not an isolated event, dependent only on the target individual. Rather, credibility, as an audience evaluation, becomes a product of both orientations as a dynamic cultural system, representative of the complex attributions shared among individuals and affiliated social networks.

REFERENCES

Andersen , K. (1961). *An experimental study of the interaction of artistic and non-artistic ethos in persuasion*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Wisconsin.

Ahuvia, A. C. (2002). Individualism/collectivism and cultures of happiness: A theoretical conjecture on the relationship between consumption, culture and subjective well-being at the national level. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, *3*, 23-36.

Bacon, C.C., & Severson, M.L. (1986). Assertiveness, responsiveness, and versatility as predictors of leadership emergence. *Communication Research Reports, 3*, 53-59.

Blake, R.R., & Mouton, J.S. (1985). *The managerial grid III: a new look at the classic that has booster productivity and profits for thousands of corporations worldwide*. Gulf Publishing Co., Book Division. Chicago.

Beebe, S. A. (1974). Eye contact: A nonverbal determinant of speaker credibility. *Communication Education*, *23*, 21-25.

Berger, C.R., & Clatterbuck, G. W. (1976). *Attitude similarity and attributional information as determinants of uncertainty reduction and interpersonal attraction.* Paper presented at the International Communication Association, Portland, OR.

Berlo, D. K., & Lemert, J. B. (1961). "*A factor analytic study of the dimension of source credibility*." Paper presented at the Speech Association of America National Convention, New York.

Brashers, D. E. (2001). Communication and uncertainty management. *Journal of Communication*, *51*, 477-497.

Brogan, S. M., Jowi, D., McCroskey, J. C., & Wrench, J. S. (2008). Social communication apprehension: The intersection of communication apprehension and social phobia. *Human Communication*, *11*, 409-430.

Burgoon, J. K., Birk, T., & Pfau, M. (1990). Nonverbal behaviors, persuasion, and credibility. *Human communication research*, *17*, 140-169.

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

Corral, S., & Calvete, E. (2000). Machiavellianism: Dimensionality of the Mach IV and its relation to self-monitoring in a Spanish sample. *Spanish Journal of Psychology, 3*, 3-13.

Cronbach, L. J. (1951). "Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests." *Psychometrika, 16*, 297–334.

Daly, J. A., & McCroskey, J. C. (1984). *Avoiding communication: Shyness, reticence, and communication apprehension*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Dainton, M., & Aylor, B. (2001). A relational uncertainty analysis of jealousy, trust, and maintenance in long distance versus geographically close relationships. *Communication Quarterly*, *49*, 172-188.

Dilbeck, K. E. (2008). Communication competence and rhetorical sensitivity: A test of conceptual convergence. *Unpublished Master's thesis*, Bangkok University.

Dilbeck, K.E. (2013, November). "*Cross-cultural expectancies for U.S. teachers*

working in Pacific and Southeast Asian cultures: A theoretical analysis of teacher source credibility," Paper presented at the National Communication Association 99th National Convention, Washington DC.

Dilbeck, K. E., Dominguez, A., Dornaletetxe, J., McMurrich, M., & Allen, M. (2013). Instructor Source Credibility: A Cross-cultures Examination. In J. E. Aitken (Ed.), *Cases on communication technology for second language acquisition and cultural learning* (pp. 24-57). Hershey, PA: IGI Global.

Dilbeck, K. E., & McCroskey, J. C. (2009). Socio-communicative orientation, communication competence, and rhetorical sensitivity. *Human Communication*, *12*, 255-266.

Dilbeck, K. E., McCroskey, J. C., Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, L. L. (2009). Self-perceived communication competence in the Thai culture. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *38*, 1-7.

Duran, R. L., & Kelly, L. (1988). The influence of communication competence on perceived task, social, and physical attraction. *Communication Quarterly, 36*, 41-49.

Fabrigar, L.R., Wegener, D.T., MacCallum, R.C., & Strahan, E.J. (1999). Evaluating the use of exploratory factor analysis in psychological research. *Psychological Methods, 4*, 272–299.

Gao, G. (1996) 'Self and Other: A Chinese Perspective on Interpersonal Relationships', In W.B. Gudykunst, S. Ting-Toomey and T. Nishida (eds) *Communication in Personal Relationships across Cultures* (pp. 81–101). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Garnett, R. A., Buchner, B. J. (2000). *"Creation and Maintenance of Identity in Online Chat."* Paper presented to the Southern Sociological Society, New Orleans.

Goffman, E. (1963). *Stigma: Notes on the management of spoiled identity*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Griffin, P. (1992). From hiding out to coming out: Empowering lesbian and gay educators. In K. M. Harbeck (Ed.), *Coming out of the classroom closet* (pp. 167–196). Binghamton, NY: Harrington Park Press.

Gudykunst, W. B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism   collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human communication research*, *22*, 510-543.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida, T. (1994). *Bridging Japanese and North American differences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Gudykunst, W. B., Ting-Toomey, S., & Chua, E. (1988). *Culture and interpersonal communication*. Newberry, CA. Sage.

Harnish, R. J., & Bridges, R. K. (2006). Social influence: the role of self-monitoring when making social comparisons. *Psychology & Marketing, 23*, 961-973.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

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

Hofstede, G., & Bond, M.H. (1988). The Confucius connection: from cultural roots to economic growth. *Organizational Dynamics*, *16*, 4-21.

Hui, C. H., & Villareal, M. J. (1989). Individualism-Collectivism and Psychological

   Needs Their Relationships in Two Cultures. *Journal of Cross-Cultural*

   Psychology, *20*, 310-323.

Jensen-Campbell, L. A., Adams, R., Perry, D. G., Workman, K. A., Furdella, J. Q., &

   Egan, S. K. (2002). Agreeableness, extraversion, and peer relations in early

   adolescence: Winning friends and deflecting aggression. *Journal of Research in*

   Personality, *36*, 224-251.

Kang, K. W., & Pearce, W. B. (1984). The place of transcultural concept in

   communication theory and research, with a case study of reticence.

   Communication, 9, 79-96.

Klecka, William R. (1980). *Discriminant analysis*. Quantitative Applications in the

   Social Sciences Series, No. 19. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Kim, M. S., & Sharkey, W. F. (1995). Independent and interdependent construals of

   self: Explaining cultural patterns of interpersonal communication in

   multi   cultural organizational settings. *Communication Quarterly*, *43*, 20-38.

Knutson, T. J., Komolsevin, R., Chatiketu, P., & Smith, V. R. (2003). A cross-cultural

   comparison of Thai and US American rhetorical sensitivity: Implications for

   intercultural communication effectiveness. *International Journal of Intercultural*

   Relations, *27*, 63-78.

Knutson, T. J., & Posirisuk, S. (2006). Thai relational development and rhetorical

   sensitivity as potential contributors to intercultural communication effectiveness:

   JAI YEN YEN. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *35*, 205-217.

Leung, K. (1988). Some determinants of conflict avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural*

Psychology, *19*, 125-136.

Likert, R. (1931). A technique for the measurement of attitudes. *Archives of Psychology.* New York: Columbia University Press.

Lim, T. S., Kim, S. Y., & Kim, J. (2011). Holism: A Missing Link in Individualism-Collectivism Research. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*, *40*, 21-38.

Lonnox, R.D., & Wolfe, R.N. (1984). Revision of the self-monitoring scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 349-364.

Mase, G. (1970). *Schaum's Outline of Continuum Mechanics*. McGraw Hill Professional.

Markus, H. R., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and the self: Implications for cognition, emotion, and motivation. *Psychological Review; Psychological Review*, *98*, 224-253.

McCroskey, J. C. (1966). Scales for the measurement of ethos. *Speech Monographs*, *33*, 65-72.

McCroskey, J. C. (1970). Measures of communication-bound anxiety. *Speech Monographs, 37,* 269-277.

McCroskey, J. C. & Teven, J.J. (1999). Goodwill: a reexamination of the construct and its measurement. *Communication Monographs, 66*, 90-103.

McCroskey, J. C., & Young, T. J. (1981). Ethos and credibility: The construct and its measurement after three decades. *Communication Studies*, *32*, 24-34.

McCroskey, L. L., McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V. P. (2006). Analysis and improvement of the measurement of interpersonal attraction and homophily.

Communication Quarterly, *54*, 1-31.

Mehrabian, A. (1971). *Silent messages.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Mehrabian, A. (1981). *Silent messages: Implicit communication of emotion and attitude.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Metzger, M. J., Flanagin, A. J., Eyal, K., Lemus, D. R. & Mccann, R. M. (2003). Credibility for the 21st Century: Integrating Perspectives on Source, Message, and Media Credibility in the Contemporary Media Environment. *Communication Yearbook, 27*, 293-335.

Moemeka, A. A. (1998). Communalism as a fundamental dimension of culture. *Journal of Communication*, *48*, 118-141.

Neuliep, J. W. (2003). *Intercultural communication: A contextual approach* (2nd ed.). Boston: Houghton-Mifflin.

Neuliep, J. W. (2009). *Intercultural Communication: A Contextual Approach*. Los Angeles: Sage Publication.

Oetzel, J. G. (1998). The effects of ethnicity and self-construals on self- reported conflict styles. *Communication Reports, 11,* 133-144.

Oyserman, D., Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological bulletin*, *128*, 3-72.

Pearson, K. (1901). On Lines and Planes of Closest Fit to Systems of Points in Space *Philosophical Magazine, 2*, 559–572.

Pedhazur, E. J. (1997). Multiple regression in behavioral research: Explanation and prediction (3rd ed). Belmont, CA. Wadsworth.

Renfrow, D. G., (2001). A Cartography of Passing in Everyday Life. *Symbolic Interaction*, *27,* 485-506.

Ricigliano, R. (2012). *Making Peace Last: A Toolbox for Sustainable Peacebuilding*. Boulder, London: Paradigm.

Richmond, V. P., & McCroskey, J. C. (1995). *Communication: Apprehension, avoidance, and effectiveness*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Stephan, W. G., Stephan, C. W., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1999). Anxiety in intergroup relations: A comparison of anxiety/uncertainty management theory and integrated threat theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *23*, 613-628.

Snavely, W. B., & Walters, E. V. (1983). Differences in communication competence among administrator social styles. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *11*, 120-135.

Snyder, M. (1974). Self-monitoring of expressive behavior. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, *30*, 526-537.

Snyder, M. (1987). *Public appearances, private realities: The psychology of self-monitoring*. WH Freeman/Times Books/Henry Holt & Co.

Suls, J. M., & Fletcher, B. (1983). Social comparison in the social and physical sciences: An archival study. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, *44,* 575–580.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2012). *Communicating across cultures*. Guilford Press.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). The matrix of face: An updated face-negotiation theory. *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 71-92). London: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Kurogi, A. (1998). Facework competence in intercultural conflict:

An updated face-negotiation theory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 22,* 187-225.

Triandis, H.C. (1995). *Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H. C., Leung, K., Villareal, M. J., & Clack, F. I. (1985). Allocentric versus idiocentric tendencies: Convergent and discriminant validation. *Journal of Research in personality*, *19*, 395-415.

Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S. L. (1991). The influence of individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, *15*, 65-84.

Williams, C. (2000). Doing Health, Doing Gender. *Social Science & Medicine, 50*, 387-96.

Yeh, R. S., & Lawrence, J. J. (1995). Individualism and Confucian dynamism: a note on Hofstede's cultural root to economic growth. *Journal of international business studies*, *26*, 655-669.

Yum, J. O. (1988). The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communications Monographs*, *55*, 374-388.

TABLES

Table 1: Reliabilities, Means, and Standard Deviations

	US (n = 616)			Spain (n = 300)			Japan (n = 233)			Across (n = 1149)		
	alpha	M	SD	alpha	M	SD	alpha	M	SD	alpha	M	SD
Cred	.75	92.87	9.75	.67	87.47	9.72	.50	92.94	6.84	.70	90.94	9.45
Src	.61	46.65	5.50	.60	44.32	6.23	.37	47.39	4.28	.58	46.19	5.59
Vic	.60	45.22	5.45	.48	43.15	5.37	.34	45.55	4.25	.51	44.74	5.28
Comp	.48	31.54	3.74	.26	31.03	3.77	.15	31.28	3.01	.32	31.36	3.62
Trust	.54	29.99	4.13	.39	28.66	4.24	.25	29.78	3.03	.44	29.6	4.00
Care	.45	30.33	3.86	.42	27.78	4.17	.21	31.87	2.94	.42	29.98	4.04
Earn	.40	19.14	2.90	.26	18.66	3.14	.47	16.76	3.06	.39	18.53	3.13
Post	.55	16.7	3.32	.51	14.44	3.23	.42	18.6	2.85	.56	16.5	3.48
Recv	.76	17.1	3.73	.63	17.29	3.74	.57	19.49	2.86	.71	17.63	3.69
Mont	.49	19.41	2.87	.47	19.15	3.25	.12	19.97	2.24	.42	19.46	2.87
Dync	.68	19.51	3.31	.52	17.94	3.35	.44	18.12	2.59	.60	18.82	3.27
IND	.61	26.24	3.29	.53	26.26	3.52	.47	24.45	2.96	.58	25.85	3.36
COL	.56	27.54	4.01	.56	27.75	4.21	.51	28.02	3.47	.58	27.69	3.96
Intr	.72	34.74	4.65	.65	33.88	4.62	.71	34.79	4.40	.53	34.38	4.60
Indp	.61	27.93	3.80	.53	25.26	3.73	.31	25.72	2.98	.63	26.78	3.84
HOL	.83	22.68	6.00	.71	21.08	4.94	.75	26.11	5.10	.67	22.97	5.82
Indp	.73	12.04	1.95	.73	12.34	1.94	.58	9.78	2.02	.54	11.66	2.19
Self	.66	11.38	1.96	.57	13.76	2.79	.50	14.59	2.18	.80	12.67	2.65
Intr	.60	34.47	4.65	.46	33.88	4.62	.57	16.67	2.57	.78	26.4	9.45
Otr	.70	21.55	2.96	.56	20.8	2.95	.68	14.48	2.11	.75	19.9	3.95
Intg	.78	15.07	2.27	.50	13.98	2.18	.64	13.95	2.05	.60	14.55	2.27
Avd	.85	7.63	2.65	.82	6.91	2.53	.81	10.17	2.32	.55	7.96	2.80
Dom	.71	8.49	2.24	.52	9.32	2.09	.50	8.01	1.90	.59	8.61	2.18
RR	.68	27.78	4.59	.57	24.52	4.17	.70	28.98	4.52	.68	27.78	4.59
RS	.72	36.04	4.44	.60	35.4	4.21	.58	32.41	3.81	.72	36.04	4.44
NS	.72	27.7	5.07	.56	26.15	4.38	.74	24.28	4.84	.72	27.7	5.07

Table 2: Factor Loadings for US Source Credibility

Rotated Component Matrix	Components		
	1	2	3
usRCs9: I try to prevent conversations about my personal professionalism	0.738		
usRTs19: I retreat from conversations that focus on my personal honor	0.627		
usPCs7: I notice it disturbs people around me when I talk about my own personal competence	0.593		
usPTs17: I believe it is rude to explain my own ethical standards	0.586		
usECs1: I proudly accept opportunities to be recognized for my own personal skill			
usPGs27: I predict people will lose interest in me if I talk about my own acts of compassion			
usETs11: I explain to people that I am a well-known trustworthy person		0.766	
usDTs13: I describe how my personal trustworthiness relates to people that know me		0.749	
usEGs21: I take personal responsibility to reassure people that I am a generous person		0.571	
usDGs23: I discuss the kindness I have in common with the group I belong to		0.536	
usDCs3: I discuss how my group contributes to my own unique individual expertise		0.504	
usMGs25: I moderate how much I tell others that I am a helpful person			0.648
usMCs5: I carefully talk about my own knowledge without attracting too much attention			0.581
usRGs29: I avoid talking about the ways that I show kindness to others			0.565
usMTs15: I am cautious about saying too much about my own morality			0.558

Table 3: Factor Loadings for US Vicarious Credibility

Rotated Component Matrix	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
usDTv14 I discuss how the honor of my group is a reflection of my honorable reputation	0.724				
usDCv4 I describe the mutual professionalism I personally share with experts that know me	0.628				
usPCv8 I talk about how my competence depends on what people say about me	0.621				
usDGv24 I explain that the kindness of my group corresponds with my individual kindness	0.581				
usPGv28 I depend on people that know me well to say that I am a compassionate person		0.92			
usPTv18 I depend on people that know me well to say that I have good ethical standards		0.909			
usRCv10 I stay away from discussing what my group says about my professionalism			0.77		
usRGv30 I stay out of conversations that focus on how people talk about my kindness			0.71		
usRTv20 I refuse to discuss how my honor depends on what people say about me			0.531		
usETv12 I show no concerned with what other people say about my trustworthiness				0.783	
usEGv22 I ignore what other people say about my personal generosity				0.733	
usECv2 I say that my personal skill does not depend on what anybody says about me				0.585	
usMCv6 I sometimes express disagreement with what people say about my knowledge					0.814
usMGv26 I sometimes correct what my group says about the helpful things I do					0.693
usMTv16 I express uncertainty about the accuracy of what my group says about my morality					

Table 4: US Correlations among Credibility Variables

	Cred	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rece	Mont
Src	.89**									
Vic	.89**	.59**								
Comp	.80**	.71**	.72**							
Trust	.87**	.77**	.78**	.55**						
Care	.82**	.75**	.72**	.47**	.58**					
Earn	.53**	.39**	.56**	.46**	.48**	.38**				
Post	.71**	.62**	.64**	.53**	.63**	.60**	.15**			
Rece	.50**	.62**	.44**	.43**	.52**	.54**	-.01	.41**		
Mont	.67**	.66**	.53**	.54**	.52**	.60**	.16**	.35**	.41**	
Dync	.54**	.41**	.55**	.49**	.47**	.37**	.42**	.22**	-.12**	.16**

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

Table 5: US Correlations between Credibility and Cross-cultural Variables
** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

	Cred	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Recv	Mont	Dync
IND	.31**	.26**	.30**	.36**	.22**	.21**	.36**	.07*	.03	.24**	.30**
COL	.35**	.34**	.29**	.21**	.39**	.27**	.22**	.32**	.08*	.13**	.33**
Intr	.36**	.38**	.26**	.26**	.37**	.29**	.21**	.26**	.14**	.18**	.31**
Indp	.15**	.05	.22**	.19**	12**	.08*	.37**	-.07	.14**	.08*	.28**
HOL	.25**	.18**	.27**	.18**	.27**	.17**	.22**	.22**	.03	.04	.27**
Ind Face	19**	18**	16**	.22**	.11**	.17**	.24**	.00	.09*	.16**	.11**
Intr Face	.36**	.38**	.26**	.26**	.36**	.29**	.21**	.26**	.14**	.18**	.31**
Self Face	.22**	.24**	.15**	.22**	.19**	.14**	.18**	.09**	.06	.19**	.16**
Inrg Face	.23**	.25**	.16**	.20**	.15**	.23**	.09*	.13**	.09*	.22**	.20**
Avd Face	.30**	.28**	.26**	.17**	.33**	.24**	.10**	.29**	.31**	.11**	.07*
Dom Face	.27**	.14**	.34**	.22**	.24**	.20**	.24**	.18**	.07*	.14**	.21**
RS	.28**	.27**	.23**	.26**	.24**	.19**	.26**	.11**	-.03**	.16**	.37**
RR	.39**	.37**	.33**	.25**	.42**	.30**	.17**	.40**	.22**	.14**	.24**
NS	.22**	.10**	.30**	.17**	.20**	.19**	.21**	.15**	.06	.13**	.15**
Cult All	.36**	.30**	.35**	.28**	.35**	.27**	.26**	.26**	.10**	.20**	.31**
Self	.27**	.16**	.31**	.26**	.22**	.19**	.31**	.10**	.02	.19**	.23**
Otr	.38**	.37**	.31**	.25**	.41**	.29**	.20**	.34**	.15**	.18**	.30**
Both	.39**	.36**	.34**	.28**	.38**	.32**	.29**	.26**	.09*	.19**	.39**

Table 6: US Stepwise Multiple Regression among Credibility Evaluations

	R^2 Adjusted	S.E.	df1	df2	F	Sig.
1	.50	6.888	1	614	616.879	.000
2	.71	5.299	1	613	424.693	.000
3	.85	3.768	1	612	599.834	.000
4	.91	2.864	1	611	448.883	.000
5	1.00	.000	1	610	--	--
1	Position					
2	Position, Monitored					
3	Position, Monitored, Earned					
4	Position, Monitored, Earned, Recessive					
5	Position, Monitored, Earned, Recessive, Dynamic					

<u>Colliniarity Diagnostics</u> <u>Variance Proportions</u>

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Post	Mont	Earn	Rec	Dync
1	1	1.982	1	0.01	0.01				
	2	0.018	10.441	0.99	0.99				
2	1	2.968	1	0	0	0			
	2	0.021	11.802	0.12	0.99	0.17			
	3	0.011	16.65	0.88	0.01	0.82			
3	1	3.949	1	0	0	0	0		
	2	0.026	12.3	0.02	0.74	0	0.28		
	3	0.017	15.315	0.01	0.25	0.65	0.34		
	4	0.008	21.639	0.97	0.01	0.35	0.38		
4	1	4.918	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	2	0.037	11.577	0.02	0.02	0	0.22	0.47	
	3	0.022	14.869	0.01	0.97	0.03	0.02	0.22	
	4	0.014	18.481	0.01	0	0.72	0.35	0.3	
	5	0.008	24.221	0.96	0	0.25	0.41	0.01	
5	1	5.893	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0.048	11.076	0	0.02	0	0.06	0.33	0.12
	3	0.022	16.186	0.02	0.88	0.04	0.05	0.12	0.01
	4	0.014	20.183	0	0.01	0.59	0.45	0.15	0.04
	5	0.013	21.009	0.01	0.08	0.17	0.22	0.36	0.77
	6	0.008	26.835	0.97	0	0.2	0.22	0.04	0.06

Table 7: Factor Loadings for Spanish Source Credibility

Rotated Component Matrix	Component			
	1	2	3	4
spMTs: Tengo cuidado de decir demasiado sobre mis valores éticos	0.71			
spRCs: Intento evitar conversaciones sobre mi profesionalidad	0.67			
spMCs: Hablo con cuidado de mis conocimientos sin atraer demasiada atención	0.606			
spRTs: Me retiro de conversaciones que se centren en mi honor	0.562			
spPTs: Creo que es de mala educación explicar mis valores morales	0.519			
spRGs: Evito hablar sobre las maneras en las que muestro amabilidad a otros				
spDTs: Describo cómo el hecho de que se pueda confiar en mí se ve reflejado en la gente que me conoce		0.711		
spETs: Explico a la gente que soy una persona conocida y de confianza		0.664		
spEGs: Asumo como una responsabilidad personal el asegurar a la gente que soy una persona generosa		0.628		
spDGs: Discuto sobre la amabilidad que comparto con el grupo al que pertenezco		0.518		
spPCs: Noto que molesta a la gente cuando hablo de mi propia: competencia			0.71	
spPGs: Predigo que la gente va a perder interés en mí si hablo de mis actos de compasión			0.54	
spMGs: Modero cuánto les digo a los otros que soy una persona amable			0.525	
spDCs: Discuto cómo mi grupo contribuye a mi propia competencia				
spECs: Acepto con orgullo las oportunidades de ser reconocido por mi propia habilidad personal				0.83

Table 8: Factor Loadings for Spanish Vicarious Credibility

Rotated Component Matrix	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
spPGv Dependo de que la gente que me conoce bien diga que soy una persona compasiva	0.766				
spPTv Dependo de que la gente que me conoce bien diga que tengo buenos valores morales	0.68				
spECv Digo que mis habilidades personales no dependen de lo que alguien diga de mí	-0.649				
spPCv Hablo de cómo mi competencia depende de lo que la gente diga sobre mí	0.535				
spDCv Describo el profesionalismo que comparto con los expertos que me conocen		0.747			
spDTv Describo cómo el honor de mi grupo es un reflejo de me honorable reputación		0.597			
spDGv Explico que la amabilidad de mi grupo se corresponde con mi amabilidad individual		0.537			
spRGv No entro en conversaciones en las que la gente habla de mi amabilidad			0.715		
spRCv Evito discutir lo que mi grupo dice sobre mi profesionalidad			0.665		
spRTv Me niego a discutir cómo mi honor depende de lo que la gente diga sobre mí			0.621		
spEGv No presto la mínima atención a lo que la gente dice de mi generosidad				0.743	
spETv No muestro preocupación por lo que otra gente dice sobre si soy digno de confianza o no			0.669		
spMCv A veces expreso desacuerdo con lo que la gente dice de mis conocimientos					0.792
spMGv A veces corrijo lo que mi grupo dice sobre mis actos de amabilidad					0.605
spMTv Expreso incertidumbre sobre la exactitud de lo que mi grupo dice sobre mis valore morales					0.522

Table 9: Spanish Correlations among Credibility Variables

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont
Src	.86**									
Vic	.81**	.40**								
Comp	.73**	.71**	.51**							
Trust	.84**	.68**	.73**	.42**						
Care	.82**	.68**	.69**	.38**	.55**					
Earn	.46**	.34**	.44**	.37**	.37**	.36**				
Post	.64**	.58**	.49**	.45**	.53**	.55**	-.01			
Rec	.57**	.55**	.38**	.41**	.50**	.44**	.11*	.25**		
Mont	.67**	.66**	.46**	.57**	.51**	.54**	.06	.38**	.28**	
Dync	.55**	.35**	.59**	.32**	.50**	.48**	.24**	.23**	-.09	.25**

Table 10: Spanish Correlations between Credibility and Cross-cultural Variables

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont	Dync
IND	.23**	.12*	.28**	.18**	.19**	.18**	.15**	.08	-.01	.17**	.29**
COL	.33**	.27**	.29**	.22**	.27**	.31**	.04	.29**	.19**	.19**	.25**
Indp	.16**	.07	.21**	.12*	.13*	.13*	.24**	.02	-.05	.09	.19**
Intr	.34**	.26**	.32**	.24**	.28**	.30**	.08	.17**	.20**	.22**	.32**
HOL	.23**	.14**	.26**	.12*	.18**	.25**	.15**	.18**	-.01	.16**	.23**
Indp Face	.13*	.08	.13*	.15**	.10*	.05	.10*	-.05	.09	.13*	.10*
Intr Face	.24**	.15**	.25**	.22**	.21**	.14**	.16**	.10*	.08	.19**	.17**
Intg Face	.19**	.11*	.22**	.13*	.12*	.20**	.08	.14**	.00	.13*	.23**
Self Face	.30**	.26**	.25**	.28**	.25**	.20**	-.03	.29**	.05	.35**	.24**
Otr Face	.32**	.22**	.32**	.23**	.28**	.24**	.02	.24**	.06	.33**	.28**
Avd Face	.12*	.12*	.08	.08	.12*	.08	-.03	.16**	.11*	.12*	-.02
Dom Face	.12*	.02	.19**	.10*	.11*	.07	.01	.18**	-.13*	.03	.28**
RS	.20**	.12*	.22**	.14**	.15**	.19**	.06	.11*	-.01	.16**	.25**
RR	.32**	.29**	.24**	.24**	.24**	.29**	.09	.36**	.08	.19**	.19**
NS	.14**	.08	.17**	.10*	.12*	.12*	.13*	.16**	-.13*	.02	.25**
Cult All	.45**	.33**	.43**	.36**	.35**	.35**	.22*	.30**	.08	.32**	.40**
Self	.30**	.19**	.32**	.27**	.24**	.21**	.21**	.18**	-.05	.21**	.34**
Otr	.46**	.38**	.40**	.35**	.37**	.39**	.12*	.35**	.20**	.32**	.33**
Both	.36**	.23**	.39**	.28**	.28**	.32**	.21**	.22**	.03	.26**	.35*

Table 11: Spanish Stepwise Multiple Regression among Credibility Evaluations

	R^2 Adjusted	S.E.	df1	df2	F	Sig.
1	0.453	7.18479	1	298	248.728	.000
2	0.633	5.88585	1	297	147.045	.000
3	0.818	4.14237	1	296	303.62	.000
4	0.902	3.04241	1	295	253.724	.000
5	1	0	1	294	.	--

1	Monitored
2	Monitored, Earned
3	Monitored, Earned, Positioned
4	Monitored, Earned, Positioned, Recessive
5	Monitored, Earned, Positioned, Recessive, Dynamic

<u>Collinearity Diagnostics</u>   <u>Variance Proportions</u>

Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Mont	Earn	Post	Rec	Dync
1	1	1.986	1	0.01	0.01				
	2	0.014	11.902	0.99	0.99				
2	1	2.964	1	0	0	0			
	2	0.026	10.646	0	0.53	0.52			
	3	0.01	17.346	1	0.46	0.48			
3	1	3.929	1	0	0	0	0		
	2	0.041	9.829	0.01	0.01	0.27	0.57		
	3	0.021	13.74	0	0.71	0.23	0.4		
	4	0.01	20.158	0.98	0.28	0.5	0.03		
4	1	4.896	1	0	0	0	0	0	
	2	0.041	10.965	0.01	0.01	0.25	0.58	0.01	
	3	0.033	12.202	0.01	0.01	0.11	0.07	0.93	
	4	0.02	15.465	0	0.75	0.17	0.33	0.04	
	5	0.01	22.688	0.97	0.23	0.47	0.02	0.02	
5	1	5.868	1	0	0	0	0	0	0
	2	0.045	11.421	0	0	0.08	0.1	0.35	0.18
	3	0.04	12.138	0	0.01	0.12	0.5	0.22	0.03
	4	0.021	16.713	0	0.46	0.34	0.39	0.01	0.08
	5	0.017	18.442	0.01	0.39	0.16	0	0.36	0.63
	6	0.009	25.314	0.98	0.14	0.3	0.01	0.06	0.07

Table 12: Factor Loadings for Japanese Source Credibility

Rotated Component Matrix	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
jpPGs27	0.696				
jpMCs5	0.638				
jpPTs17	0.608				
jpPCs7	0.52				
jpRCs9	0.506				
jpDGs23		0.715			
jpDCs3		0.6			
jpETs11		0.576			
jpMGs25		-0.564			
jpRGs29			0.65		
jpMTs15			0.628		
jpDTs13			0.541		
jpEGs21				0.834	
jpRTs19					0.78
jpECs1					

Table 13: Factor Loadings for Japanese Vicarious Credibility

Rotated Component Matrixa	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
jpETv12	0.769				
jpEGv22	0.712				
jpECv2	0.707				
jpPTv18		0.688			
jpPCv8		0.608			
jpRTv20		0.558			
jpPGv28					
jpDCv4					
jpRGv30			0.695		
jpRCv10			0.67		
jpDTv14				0.729	
jpDGv24				0.618	
jpMGv26				-0.565	
jpMTv16					0.697
jpMCv6					0.57

Table 14: Japanese Correlations among Credibility Variables

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont
Src	.80**									
Vic	.80**	.29**								
Comp	.78**	.64**	.61**							
Trust	.78**	.56**	.70**	.45**						
Care	.72**	.63**	.53**	.33**	.34**					
Earn	.50**	.21**	.58**	.37**	.47**	.30**				
Post	.64**	.64**	.38**	.50**	.47**	.49**	-.03			
Rec	.53**	.53**	.31**	.45**	.34**	.41**	-.08	.35**		
Mont	.49**	.46**	.32**	.37**	.37**	.37**	-.03	.22**	.32**	
Dync	.35**	.18**	.39**	.26**	.31**	.24**	.27**	.03	-.27**	-.14*

Table 15: Japanese Correlations between Credibility and Cross-cultural Variables

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont	Dync
IND	.24**	.14*	.24**	.27**	.21**	.06	.17**	.12*	.04	.06	.20**
COL	-.07	.03	-.14*	-.09	-.07	.00	-.29**	.15*	-.05	.00	.04
Indp	.23**	.09	.28**	.10	.29**	.14*	.36**	-.01	-.06	-.02	.27**
Intr	.13*	.16**	.05	.09	.10	.11*	-.16**	.31**	.09	.07	.04
HOL	.23**	.20**	.17**	.07	.32**	.14*	.19**	.24**	.03	-.05	.136*
Indp Face	.28**	.31**	.14*	.27**	.24**	.13*	.24**	.12*	.16**	.11*	.05
Intr Face	.07	.15*	-.04	.02	.03	.10	-.19**	.23**	.09	.06	.01
Intg Face	.14*	.19**	.03	.11	.12*	.09	-.15*	.22**	.18**	.09	.03
Self Face	.17**	.15*	.13*	.21**	.16**	.03	.02	.14*	.10	.15*	.04
Otr Face	.14*	.26**	-.03	.13*	.11*	.08	-.23**	.33**	.18**	.11*	-.03
Avd Face	.17**	.22**	.05	.19**	.12*	.08	-.01	.21**	.24**	.06	-.08
Dom Face	.14*	-.01	.23**	.13*	.26**	-.08	.28**	.11*	-.17**	-.14*	.21**
RS	.14*	.18**	.05	.14*	.17**	.02	.06	.19**	-.06	-.02	.18**
RR	.18**	.24**	.05	.17**	.13*	.11*	-.04	.28**	.16**	.13*	-.08
NS	.15*	-.01	.24**	.11*	.18**	.04	.41**	-.03	-.272**	-.08	.31**
Cult All	.33**	.33**	.20**	.25**	.36**	.15**	.11*	.39**	.07	.07	.18**
Self	.32**	.16**	.35**	.27**	.36**	.09	.44**	.10	-.10	.01	.32**
Otr	.13*	.23**	-.02	.10	.10	.10	-.22**	.36**	.13*	.11*	-.03
Both	.24**	.28**	.10	.12*	.30**	.13*	.04	.34**	.07	.01	.13*

Table 16: Japanese Stepwise Multiple Regression among Credibility Evaluations

	R² Adjusted	S.E.	df1	df2	F	Sig.
1	0.4	5.297	1	231	155.834	.000
2	0.664	3.962	1	230	182.83	.000
3	0.799	3.068	1	229	154.611	.000
4	0.904	2.121	1	228	251.057	.000
5	1	0	1	227	--	--

1	Positioned
2	Positioned, Earned
3	Positioned, Earned, Recessive
4	Positioned, Earned, Recessive, Dynamic
5	Positioned, Earned, Recessive, Dynamic, Monitored

| Model | Dimension | Collinearity Diagnostics | | Variance Proportions | | | | | |
		Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Post	Earn	Rec	Dync	Mont
1	1	1.989	1	.01	.01				
	2	0.011	13.156	.99	.99				
2	1	2.963	1	.00	.00	.00			
	2	0.029	10.168	.01	.33	.64			
	3	0.009	18.492	.99	.67	.35			
3	1	3.945	1	.00	.00	.00	.00		
	2	0.033	10.883	.00	.09	.65	.09		
	3	0.014	16.628	.00	.77	.00	.57		
	4	0.007	23.459	.99	.14	.35	.33		
4	1	4.926	1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
	2	0.036	11.662	.00	.10	.34	.13	.06	
	3	0.02	15.761	.00	.04	.49	.13	.40	
	4	0.013	19.209	.03	.85	.12	.30	.09	
	5	0.005	32.099	.97	.02	.05	.44	.45	
5	1	5.914	1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	0.038	12.522	.00	.06	.35	.10	.07	.01
	3	0.02	17.237	.00	.06	.48	.11	.40	.00
	4	0.015	20.162	.02	.82	.13	.04	.04	.14
	5	0.01	24.064	.00	.05	.00	.63	.14	.51
	6	0.004	39.816	.98	.00	.03	.13	.35	.33

Table 17: Factor Loadings for Source Credibility Across Cultures

Rotated Component Matrix	Component		
	1	2	3
usPTs17 I believe it is rude to explain my own ethical standards	0.612		
usRTs19 I retreat from conversations that focus on my personal honor	0.589		
usMCs5 I carefully talk about my own knowledge without attracting too much attention	0.577		
usPGs27 I predict people will lose interest in me if I talk about my own acts of compassion	0.555		
usMTs15 I am cautious about saying too much about my own morality	0.529		
usRCs9 I try to prevent conversations about my personal professionalism			
usETs11 I explain to people that I am a well-known trustworthy person		0.74	
usDTs13 I describe how my personal trustworthiness relates to people that know me		0.636	
usDGs23 I discuss the kindness I have in common with the group I belong to		0.585	
usEGs21 I take personal responsibility to reassure people that I am a generous person		0.562	
usDCs3 I discuss how my group contributes to my own unique individual expertise			
usRGs29 I avoid talking about the ways that I show kindness to others			0.572
usPCs7 I notice it disturbs people around me when I talk about my own personal competence			0.523
usMGs25 I moderate how much I tell others that I am a helpful person			0.507
usECs1 I proudly accept opportunities to be recognized for my own personal skill			

Table 18: Factor Loadings for Vicarious Credibility Across Cultures

Rotated Component Matrix	Component				
	1	2	3	4	5
usPGv28 I depend on people that know me well to say that I am a compassionate person	0.846				
usPTv18 I depend on people that know me well to say that I have good ethical standards	0.803				
usPCv8 I talk about how my competence depends on what people say about me					
usECv2 I say that my personal skill does not depend on what anybody says about me					
usDTv14 I discuss how the honor of my group is a reflection of my honorable reputation		0.773			
usDCv4 I describe the mutual professionalism I personally share with experts that know me		0.671			
usDGv24 I explain that the kindness of my group corresponds with my individual kindness		0.513			
usRGv30 I stay out of conversations that focus on how people talk about my kindness			0.731		
usRCv10 I stay away from discussing what my group says about my professionalism			0.73		
usRTv20 I refuse to discuss how my honor depends on what people say about me			0.58		
usETv12 I show no concerned with what other people say about my trustworthiness				0.781	
usEGv22 I ignore what other people say about my personal generosity				0.768	
usMCv6 I sometimes express disagreement with what people say about my knowledge					0.769
usMGv26 I sometimes correct what my group says about the helpful things I do					0.715
usMTv16 I express uncertainty about the accuracy of what my group says about my morality					

Table 19: Correlations among Credibility Variables Across Cultures

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont
Src	.88**									
Vic	.86**	.51**								
Comp	.77**	.69**	.64**							
Trust	.85**	.72**	.76**	.50**						
Care	.81**	.72**	.69**	.41**	.54**					
Earn	.45**	.30**	.48**	.40**	.42**	.27**				
Post	.69**	.63**	.57**	.47**	.57**	.63**	-.01			
Rec	.57**	.58**	.40**	.41**	.47**	.50**	-.07*	.39**		
Mont	.65**	.64**	.48**	.53**	.50**	.55**	.07*	.35**	.37**	
Dync	.52**	.37**	.54**	.41**	.47**	.38**	.36**	.19**	-.16**	.14**

Table 20: Correlations between Credibility and Cross-cultural Variables Across Cultures

	CredAll	Src	Vic	Comp	Trust	Care	Earn	Post	Rec	Mont	Dync
IND	.24**	.17**	.26**	.29**	.20**	.12**	.31**	.01	-.04	.17**	.29**
COL	.28**	.27**	.22**	.17**	.28**	.23**	.06*	.26**	.10**	.13**	.25**
Indp	.19**	.09**	.25**	.17**	.17**	.13**	.36**	.01	-.138**	.06*	.31**
Intr	.33**	.32**	.25**	.23**	.30**	.27**	.09**	.25**	.15**	.18**	.27**
HOL	.28**	.21**	.28**	.14**	.26**	.26**	.11**	.30**	.08**	.08**	.21**
Indp Face	.11**	.09**	.09**	.19**	.09**	-.01	.30**	-.140**	-.02	.09**	.12**
Intr Face	.21**	.19**	.17**	.14**	.21**	.16**	.25**	.13**	-.104**	.05	.31**
Intg Face	.22**	.21**	.17**	.17**	.16**	.20**	.09**	.14**	.03	.16**	.23**
Self Face	.16**	.17**	.11**	.17**	.12**	.10**	-.070**	.140**	.15**	.22**	.02
Otr Face	.16**	.15**	.13**	.19**	.20**	.02	.26**	-.02	-.113**	.11**	.27**
Avd Face	.27**	.26**	.21**	.13**	.24**	.27**	-.070**	.35**	.31**	.13**	.00
Dom Face	.15**	.04	.23**	.17**	.18**	.04	.21**	.06*	-.05	.05	.20**
RS	.20**	.17**	.17**	.21**	.190**	.09**	.25**	.03	-.105**	.10**	.33**
RR	.38**	.37**	.30**	.23**	.35**	.35**	.06*	.45**	.20**	.17**	.19**
NS	.17**	.06*	.24**	.14**	.17**	.10**	.27**	.06*	-.089**	.05*	.22**
Cult All	.38**	.31**	.35**	.30**	.36**	.27**	.24**	.26**	.07**	.21**	.33**
Self	.25**	.14**	.29**	.26**	.23**	.12**	.32**	.05*	-.05	.15**	.27**
Otr	.37**	.35**	.29**	.26**	.36**	.28**	.13**	.32**	.13**	.20**	.29**
Both	.34**	.29**	.31**	.23**	.33**	.27**	.29**	.23**	-.05	.13**	.41**

Table 21: Stepwise Multiple Regression among Credibility Evaluations Across Cultures

	R^2 Adjusted	S.E.	df1	df2	F	Sig.
1	0.473	6.861	1	1147	1031.422	.000
2	0.679	5.356	1	1146	735.938	.000
3	0.841	3.766	1	1145	1173.595	.000
4	0.908	2.864	1	1144	835.93	.000
5	1	0	1	1143	--	--

1	Positioned
2	Positioned, Earned
3	Positioned, Earned, Monitored
4	Positioned, Earned, Monitored, Recessive
5	Positioned, Earned, Monitored, Recessive, Dynamic

	Collinearity Diagnostics			Variance Proportions					
Model	Dimension	Eigenvalue	Condition Index	(Constant)	Post	Earn	Mont	Rec	Dync
1	1	1.979	1	.01	.01				
	2	0.021	9.596	.99	.99				
2	1	2.953	1	.00	.00	.00			
	2	0.036	9.031	.01	.69	.30			
	3	0.011	16.358	.99	.30	.70			
3	1	3.937	1	.00	.00	.00	.00		
	2	0.036	10.408	.01	.56	.32	.00		
	3	0.018	14.696	.02	.42	.33	.56		
	4	0.008	21.597	.97	.02	.34	.44		
4	1	4.908	1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	
	2	0.042	10.841	.01	.15	.34	.00	.20	
	3	0.026	13.743	.00	.75	.00	.00	.53	
	4	0.016	17.366	.02	.08	.29	.67	.25	
	5	0.008	24.284	.97	.01	.37	.32	.02	
5	1	5.881	1	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00	.00
	2	0.051	10.726	.00	.08	.11	.00	.23	.10
	3	0.029	14.362	.01	.62	.09	.01	.22	.07
	4	0.017	18.653	.01	.23	.52	.39	.02	.14
	5	0.014	20.411	.00	.07	.11	.39	.45	.59
	6	0.008	27.305	.98	.00	.17	.22	.08	.11

Table 22: Discriminant Analysis Within and Across Cultures

	Recessive	Earned	Monitored	Positioned	Dynamic	n
US	4, 57%	82, 98%	93, 87%	134, 93%	226, 83%	616
Spain	9, 82%	71, 84%	49 96%	41, 100%	102, 91%	300
Japan	35, 90%	14, 93%	47, 100%	27, 100%	58, 81%	233
Across	20, 69%	151, 100%	199, 90%	274, 97%	387, 83%	1149

Figure 1: Credibility Grid Results Within and Across Cultures

	Cultural Value Orientations			
	Self	Other	Both	Overall
US	Vicarious Earned Comp	Source Position Trust	Source Dynamic Trust	Vicarious Dynamic, Trust
Spain	Vicarious Dynamic Comp	Vicarious Positioned Care	Vicarious Dynamic Care	Vicarious Dynamic, Comp
Japan	Vicarious Earned, Trust	Source Positioned, all	Source Positioned, Trust	Source Position, Trust
Across	Vicarious Dynamic, Trust	Source Position, Trust	Vicarious Dynamic, Trust	Vicarious Dynamic, Trust

APPENDICES

Appendix A: US Questionnaire

Please mark the choice that best describes you

Nationality: USA   Spanish   Japanese
Sex: Male   Female
Age: 18-20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40

INSTRUCTIONS: On the scales below, please indicate the degree to which you believe each behavior applies to you while interacting with others in task oriented, decision making situations. Pease indicate how much you agree or disagree with each question (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree). There are no right or wrong answers. Work quickly; record your first impression.

I proudly accept opportunities to be recognized for my own personal skill
I say that my personal skill does not depend on what anybody says about me
I discuss how my group contributes to my own unique individual expertise
I describe the mutual professionalism I personally share with experts that know me
I carefully talk about my own knowledge without attracting too much attention
I sometimes express disagreement with what people say about my knowledge
I notice it disturbs people around me when I talk about my own personal competence
I talk about how my competence depends on what people say about me
I try to prevent conversations about my personal professionalism
I stay away from discussing what my group says about my professionalism
I explain to people that I am a well-known trustworthy person
I show no concerned with what other people say about my trustworthiness
I describe how my personal trustworthiness relates to people that know me
I discuss how the honor of my group is a reflection of my honorable reputation
I am cautious about saying too much about my own morality
I express uncertainty about the accuracy of what my group says about my morality
I believe it is rude to explain my own ethical standards
I depend on people that know me well to say that I have good ethical standards
I retreat from conversations that focus on my personal honor
I refuse to discuss how my honor depends on what people say about me
I take personal responsibility to reassure people that I am a generous person
I ignore what other people say about my personal generosity
I discuss the kindness I have in common with the group I belong to
I explain that the kindness of my group corresponds with my individual kindness
I moderate how much I tell others that I am a helpful person
I sometimes correct what my group says about the helpful things I do
I predict people will lose interest in me if I talk about my own acts of compassion
I depend on people that know me well to say that I am a compassionate person
I avoid talking about the ways that I show kindness to others
I stay out of conversations that focus on how people talk about my kindness

INSTRUCTIONS: On the scales below, please indicate how accurately each question describes you when communicating with other people on a daily basis. Pease indicate how much you agree or disagree with each question (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

I tend to do my own thing, and others in my family do the same
I take great pride in accomplishing what no one else can accomplish
It is important to me that I perform better than others on a task
I am uniquely different from others in many respects
I like my privacy
I know my weaknesses and strengths
I always state my opinions very clearly
To understand who I am, you must see me with members of my group
To me, pleasure is spending time with others
I would help, within my means, if a relative were in financial difficulty
I make an effort to avoid disagreements with my group members
Before making a decision, I always consult with others
How I behave depends on who I am with, where I am, or both
I have respect for the authority figures with whom I interact
I would rather do a group paper or lab than do one alone

I don't change my opinions in conformity with those of the majority
I don't support my group when they are wrong
I assert my opposition when I disagree strongly with the members of my group
I act the same way no matter who I am with
I enjoy being unique and different from others
I am comfortable with being singled out for praise or rewards
Speaking up in a work/task group is not a problem for me
I value being in a good health above everything else
I will sacrifice my self interests for the benefit of the group I am in
 I act as fellow group members would prefer
I stick with my group even through difficulties
It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group
It is important to me to respect decisions made by the group
I will stay in a group if they need me, even when I am not happy with the group
Even when I strongly disagree with group members, I avoid an argument
I respect who are modest about themselves
I often have the feeling that my relationship with others is more important than my own accomplishments
My happiness depends on the happiness of those around me

INSTRUCTIONS: In this survey, we want to know how you generally think about yourself and your relationship with members of groups to which you belong. Please answer each question by indicating the degree to which you agree or disagree with

the item. Use the following scale to respond to each item: (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree)

If one member of the family fails, the whole family fails
We can guess how good a daughter would be once we know how good her mother is
Children are mirror images of their parents
A child's success is a direct reflection of their parents
There always are excellent parents behind successful children
Knowing the background of a person is a very important factor to deciding how likeable the person is
Abnormal adolescents are products of abnormal families
You can assess a person by looking to the people he or she is associated with
Children have to listen to their parent when they plan their future
It is important for me to act as an independent person
I maintain harmony in the groups of which I am a member
I respect decisions made by my peer group
It is important to consult close friends and get their ideas before making a decision
I respect the majority's wishes in groups of which I am a member
I feel happy when I realize that I am better off than people around me
It is important for me to achieve a high social position

It is important for me to be able to act as a free and independent person
I preferred to be self-reliant rather than depend on others
I try not to depend on others
I respect the decisions made by the other person
I am sensitive to the wishes of other people
My relationship with the other person is more important than winning the conflict
My satisfaction depends on the satisfaction of other people
I sacrifice my self-interest for the benefits of my relationship with others
I am concerned with maintaining the pose of other people
Maintaining humbleness to preserve the relationship is important to me
Helping to maintain other people's pride is important to me
Maintaining peace in interactions with other people is important to me
I try to be sensitive to other people's self-worth
I am concerned with helping other people to maintain his/her credibility
I am concerned with not bringing shame to myself
I am concerned with protecting my self-image
I am concerned with not appearing weak in front of other people
I am concerned with protecting my personal pride
I try to ignore conflicts and behave as if nothing has happened
I try to pretend that conflicts do not happen
I pretend as if conflicts do not exist
I try to persuade other people that my way is the best way
I dominate arguments until the other person understands my position
I insist that my position be accepted during conflicts
I try to meet other people half way

I try to use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made
I propose a middle ground for breaking deadlock
I try to find a middle course to resolve situations

INSTRUCTIONS: For each of the following statements, please indicate the degree to which the statement represents your typical attitudes, beliefs, and behaviors that occur during conversation between yourself and people you have known for a short time. Make your indications by selecting one of the five points on the following scale (1 = strongly disagree, 5 = strongly agree).

Most of the conflicts I have with others are resolved to everyone's satisfaction
More than a few times I've been told that I communicate well in difficult situations
I hold on to the principle "Do unto others as you would have others do unto you"
When conversing, I try to please the other person while being myself
I am a compromising person
I can find a way to make others accept my opinion without making them lose face
I am always the first to say "hello" when greeting an older person
I usually say "excuse me" when I have to bother others
I often give advice to friends who are not as good as I am in class
Others say that I am overconfident
When conversing, I select a topic of discussion that suites the other person's interests
I show admiration to others to make myself accepted
I do not speak against the group's decision
I usually comply with other's opinions even though I disagree with them
I am willing to adjust my talking style to please the other person
I usually speak out in support of my boss
I would be considered a traitor if I expressed an opinion in conflict with the group's opinion
I tease my friend about his/her weakness
I refrain from answering a professor's question when a smarter friend answers it wrong in the first place
The older person's teaching is unconditionally trusted
I express my feelings openly when I am displeased with another person
I speak overtly without caring for other people's feelings
I hold on to my opinion, even though others are opposed to it
I am willing to change my opinion to be compatible with older people
I will retort immediately in conversations when I disagree with the opinion proposed by that person
Children should not propose ideas in opposition to older people
In a discussion, I aggressively express my opinions that are in conflict with others
I usually attack those who have different opinions from mine
Others say that I am aggressive
I like to be the center of attention in a conversation

Appendix B: Spanish Questionnaire

Por favor marque la opción que mejor te describe
Nacionalidad Español   Americano   Japonés
GéneroMasculino   Femenino
Edad   18-20 21-25 26-30 31-35 36-40

INSTRUCCIONES: En las escalas de abajo, por favor indica el grado en el que cada comportamiento se refiere a ti cuando interaccionas con otras personas en situaciones en las que se toma una decisión o se realiza una tarea. Por favor, indica cuánto estás de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada frase. (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo. No hay respuestas correctas o incorrectas. Hazlo rápido, marca tu primera impresión.

spEGv No presto la mínima atención a lo que la gente dice de mi generosidad
spDCs Discuto cómo mi grupo contribuye a mi propia competencia
spDTv Describo cómo el honor de mi grupo es un reflejo de me honorable reputación
spRGv No entro en conversaciones en las que la gente habla de mi amabilidad
spPTv Dependo de que la gente que me conoce bien diga que tengo buenos valores morales
spMCs Hablo con cuidado de mis conocimientos sin atraer demasiada atención
spPCv Hablo de cómo mi competencia depende de lo que la gente diga sobre mí
spRTv Me niego a discutir cómo mi honor depende de lo que la gente diga sobre mí
spDGv Explico que la amabilidad de mi grupo se corresponde con mi amabilidad individual
spETs Explico a la gente que soy una persona conocida y de confianza
spDCv Describo el profesionalismo que comparto con los expertos que me conocen
spETv No muestro preocupación por lo que otra gente dice sobre si soy digno de confianza o no
spRCs Intento evitar conversaciones sobre mi profesionalidad
spDTs Describo cómo el hecho de que se pueda confiar en mí se ve reflejado en la gente que me conoce
spMTs Tengo cuidado de decir demasiado sobre mis valores éticos
spECs Acepto con orgullo las oportunidades de ser reconocido por mi propia habilidad personal
spMGv A veces corrijo lo que mi grupo dice sobre mis actos de amabilidad
spMTv Expreso incertidumbre sobre la exactitud de lo que mi grupo dice sobre mis valore morales
spECv Digo que mis habilidades personales no dependen de lo que alguien diga de mí
spEGs Asumo como una responsabilidad personal el asegurar a la gente que soy una persona generosa
spPTs Creo que es de mala educación explicar mis valores morales
spRCv Evito discutir lo que mi grupo dice sobre mi profesionalidad
spDGs Discuto sobre la amabilidad que comparto con el grupo al que pertenezco
spMGs Modero cuánto les digo a los otros que soy una persona amable
spMCv A veces expreso desacuerdo con lo que la gente dice de mis conocimientos

spPGs Predigo que la gente va a perder interés en mí si hablo de mis actos de compasión
spPGv Dependo de que la gente que me conoce bien diga que soy una persona compasiva
spPCs Noto que molesta a la gente cuando hablo de mi propia competencia
spRTs Me retiro de conversaciones que se centren en mi honor
spRGs Evito hablar sobre las maneras en las que muestro amabilidad a otros

INSTRUCCIONES: En las escalas de abajo, por favor indica la exactitud con la que cada frase te describe cuando comunicas con otras personas a diario. Por favor, indica cuánto estás de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada frase. (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo).

COL13 Mi manera de comportarme depende de con quién estoy, donde estoy, o ambos
IND2 Me llena de orgullo conseguir lo que nadie más puede lograr
IND3 Es importante para mí rendir más que otros al hacer una tarea
COL12 Antes de tomar una decisión, siempre consulto con otros
IND5 Me gusta mi privacidad
COL8 Para entender quien soy, debes verme con miembros de mi grupo
COL9 Para mí, el placer significa pasar tiempo con los demás
IND6 Conozco mis debilidades y mis fortalezas
COL10 Ayudaría, dentro de mis posibilidades, a un familiar en dificultades financieras
IND4 Soy completamente diferente de los demás en muchos aspectos
COL11 Hago esfuerzos para evitar desacuerdos con los miembros de mi grupo
COL14 Tengo respeto por las figuras de autoridad con las que interactúo
IND7 Siempre expreso mis opiniones muy claramente
IND1 Tiendo a hacer lo que quiero, y otros en mi familia tambien lo hacen
COL15 Prefiero escribir un trabajo o un análisis en grupo que hacerlo solo

INSTRUCCIONES: En las escalas de abajo, por favor indica la exactitud con la que cada frase te describe cuando comunicas con otras personas a diario. Por favor, indica cuánto estás de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada frase. (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo).

Indp3 Reafirmo mi oposición cuando estoy fuertemente en desacuerdo con los miembros de mi grupo
Intr16 Respeto a los que son modestos sobre sí mismos
Indp4 Actúo de la misma forma sin importar con quién estoy
Intr12 Es importante para mí mantener la armonía dentro de mi grupo
Indp5 Disfruto siendo único y diferente de los demás
Intr14 Permaneceré en un grupo si me necesitan, incluso cuando no estoy feliz dentro del grupo
Indp6 Me siento cómodo cuando me eligen para darme felicitaciones o premios
intr15   Incluso cuando estoy muy en desacuerdo con miembros del grupo, evito la discusión
Intr11 Permanezco leal a mi grupo incluso en las dificultades
Indp7 Hablar en un trabajo de grupo no es un problema para mí
Indp8 Valoro estar sano por encima de todo lo demás

Intr9 Sacrificaré mis propios intereses por el beneficio del grupo en el que estoy

Intr10 Actúo como mis compañeros de grupo prefieren

Intr13 Es importante para mí respetar las decisiones tomadas por el grupo

Indp2 No apoyo a mi grupo cuando está equivocado

Intr17 Suelo tener la sensación de que mis relaciones con los demás son más importantes que mis logros

Indp1 No cambio de opinión para seguir las opiniones de la mayoría

Intr18 Mi felicidad depende de la felicidad de los que me rodean

INSTRUCCIONES: En esta encuesta, queremos saber qué piensas en general sobre ti mismo/a y tu relación con los miembros de grupos a los que perteneces. Por favor, responde a cada pregunta indicando el grado en que estás de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada frase. Usa la siguiente escala para responder a cada pregunta: (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo)

Hp16 Es importante para mí lograr una alta posición social

H2 Podemos suponer lo bien que se comporta una hija una vez sepamos cómo se comporta su madre

H5 Siempre hay padres excelentes detrás de niños con éxito

Hrc13 Es importante consultar a amigos cercanos y escuchar sus ideas antes de tomar una decisión

H6 Saber los antecedentes de una persona es un factor muy importante para decidir lo agradable que es

H7 Los adolescentes disfuncionales son un producto de familias disfuncionales

H8 Puedes juzgar a una persona fijándote en las personas que la rodean

Hrc14 Respeto los deseos de la mayoría en los grupos a los que pertenezco

H9 Los niños tienen que escuchar a sus padres cuando planean su futuro

Hi10 Es importante para mi actuar como una persona independiente

Hrc11 Mantengo la armonía en los grupos a los que pertenezco

H3 Los niños son espejos de sus padres

Hrc12 Respeto las decisiones tomadas por mi grupo

H1 Si un miembro de la familia fracasa, toda la familia fracasa

Hp15 Me siento feliz cuando me doy cuenta de que estoy en mejores circunstancias que la gente a mi alrededor

H4   El éxito de un niño es un reflejo directo de sus padres

INSTRUCCIONES: En las escalas de abajo, por favor indica la exactitud con la que cada frase te describe cuando comunicas con otras personas a diario. Por favor, indica cuánto estás de acuerdo o en desacuerdo con cada frase. (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo)

otrF11 Ayudar a mantener el orgullo de otras personas es importante para mí

avdF21 Hago como que los conflictos no existiesen

IndF2 Prefiero ser autosuficiente a depender de otros

IndF3 Intento no depender de otros

interF4 Respeto las decisiones tomadas por otras personas

integF28 Intento encontrar el camino del medio para resolver problemas

domF24 Insisto en que mis opiniones sean aceptadas durante los conflictos

InterF6 Mi relación con otras personas es más importante que ganar el conflicto

selfF17 Me preocupa no parecer débil en frente de otras personas

otrF9 Me preocupo de mantener las apariencias de otra gente

otrF10 Mantener la humildad para preservar una relación es importante para mí

InterF8 Sacrifico mis intereses propios por los beneficios de mi relación con los demás

selfF15 Me preocupa no avergonzarme de mí mismo

selfF16 Me preocupa proteger la imagen que tengo de mí mismo

IndF1 Es importante para mí ser capaz de actuar como una persona libre e independiente

selfF18 Me preocupa proteger mi orgullo personal

InterF5 Soy sensible a los deseos de otra gente

avdF19 Intento ignorar los conflictos y comportarme como si nada hubiera pasado

avdF20 Intento hacer como que los conflictos no ocurriesen

domF22 Intento persuadir a otras personas de que mi forma de hacer las cosas es la mejor

otr14 Me preocupa ayudar a otras personas a mantener su credibilidad

otrF12 Mantener la paz en interacciones con otras personas es importante para mí

integF25 Intento conocer a otra gente a medias

integF26 Intento utilizar el "dar y tomar" para alcanzar un acuerdo

integF27 Propongo un término medio para salir de un punto muerto

InterF7 Mi satisfacción depende de la satisfacción de otras personas

otrF13 Intento ser respetuoso/a con la autoestima de otras personas

domF23 Domino las discusiones hasta que otra gente entiende mi posición

INSTRUCCIONES: Para cada una de las siguientes afirmaciones, por favor indica el grado en que representan tus actitudes, creencias y comportamientos más usuales mostrados en conversaciones entre tú y gente que has conocido poco tiempo. Para ello, selecciona uno de los cinco puntos de la siguiente escala (1=totalmente en desacuerdo, 5=totalmente de acuerdo).

RR13 No hablo en contra de la decisión del grupo

RS3 Sigo el principio "haz a otros lo que te gustaría que otros te hicieran a ti"

RS4 Al conversar, intento agradar a la otra persona mientras sigo siendo yo mismo/a

NS28 Suelo atacar a aquellos que tienen opiniones diferentes a las mías

RR16 Suelo hablar públicamente para apoyar a mi jefe/a

RS5 Soy una persona que cede

NS30 Me gusta ser el centro de atención en una conversación

RR12 Muestro admiración a otros para ser aceptado/a

RR17 Sería considerado un traidor si expresara una opinión en conflicto con la opinión del grupo

NS23 Sigo manteniendo mi opinión, incluso cuando otros son contrarios a ella

RS8 Suelo decir "perdone" cuando tengo que molestar a otros/as

RS9 Suelo aconsejar a amigos/as que no son tan buenos como yo en clase

NS10 Otros dicen que estoy demasiado seguro/a de mí mismo/a

RS11 Al conversar, elijo un tema de discusión que se adapte a los intereses de la otra persona

RR14 Suelo acatar las opiniones de otros incluso cuando no estoy de acuerdo con ellas

RS7 Siempre soy el primero en decir "hola" al saludar a una persona de más edad

NS18 Me burlo de las debilidades de mi amigo/a

RR19 Me abstengo de contestar a una pregunta de un profesor cuando un amigo más listo la contesta mal antes

NS21 Expreso mis sentimientos abiertamente cuando otra persona me desagrada

NS22 Hablo abiertamente sin preocuparme por los sentimientos de otras personas

RS1 La mayoría de los conflictos que tengo con otros se resuelven con todas las personas satisfechas

RR24 Estoy dispuesto a cambiar de opinión para llevarme bien con gente mayor

RR20 Las enseñanzas de una persona mayor merecen ser confiadas incondicionalmente

NS25 Replicaré inmediatamente en conversaciones en las que no estoy de acuerdo con la opinión expresada por esa persona

RS6 Puedo encontrar una forma de hacer que otros acepten mi opinión sin hacerles quedar mal

RR26 Los niños no deberían proponer ideas que contradigan las de la gente mayor

NS27 En una discusión, expreso agresivamente las opiniones que están en conflicto con las de otros/as

RS2 Me han dicho que comunico bien en situaciones difíciles

NS29 Otros dicen que soy agresivo

RR15 Estoy dispuesto/a a ajustar mi estilo de conversación para agradar a otra persona

Appendix C: Japanese Questionnaire

あなたに 該当するものにマークをしてください

国籍	日本人	スペイン人	アメリカ人	その他
性別	男性　女性			
年齢	18-20	21-24	25-29	30-34	35-40

下記の指標に従って、他の人と作業をこなすために意思決定をする場面においてどの程度個々の行動があなたにあてはまるか示してください。個々の質問にどの程度同意するか同意しないかを示してください（1＝全く同意しない、5＝大いに同意する。）答えに良い悪いはありません。あまり時間をかけずに、最初に感じたままを書いてください。

jpRTs19 私の信頼性に関する会話には参加しないようにしている

jpECv2 私個人のスキル（技術）は他人がどう言うかには関係ないと言える

jpMGs25 私がどれほど役に立つ人間であるかを他人にいうのは控える

jpDCv4 私は知り合いの専門家が私と個人的なプロ意識を相互に共有していると説明する

jpPGs27 もし私が私自身を優しい人だと言えば、人々は私に対する興味を失うと思う

jpMTv16 私のモラルに（道徳に）関してわたしの仲間がいうことの正当性には疑問を感じる

jpMCs5 私の知識について話すときはあまり注目を浴びないように気を付ける

jpPTs17 私は自身の倫理基準を説明するのは失礼だと思っている

jpRGv30 他の人が私の親切さについて話しているとき、その会話に入ることを避ける

jpRCs9 私の個人的プロ意識についての会話をなるべく避けるようにしている

jpDGv24 私は私のグループの仲間が持ち合わせる思いやりの心と私自身が持つ思いやりの心に相違点と類似点があると説明する

jpRCv10 私のプロ意識についてわたしのグループがいうことを討論するのはさける

jpECs1 私の個人的なスキル（技術）が認められると思われる機会があれば、自慢げに引き受ける

jpPGv28 私が優しい人だと言う評判は、私を良く知っている人に左右される

jpETv12 私はほかの人々が私の信頼性についてなんというかについて、全く気にしない

jpDTs13 私の個人的な信頼性は私を知っている人々と関係があると表現する

jpDCs3 私の特別な専門的知識に私のグループがどう貢献するか議論する

jpMTs15 私は自身のモラル（道徳）に関して発言することには慎重である

jpEGs21 私は私が寛大な人間であると他人に伝える個人的な責任を負う

jpPCv8 私は私の能力は周りの人からの評価に基づく話す

jpPTv18 私は私を良く知る人々が私は良い倫理基準を持っていると言ってくれることに期待する

jpRTv20 私は私の信頼性が他の人の私に対する意見に左右されるという議論を避ける

jpEGv22 私個人の寛大さについて他人がなんというかは知ったことではない

jpPCs7　　　　私が私の個人的能力に関して話すと、周りの人々の迷惑になるということに気付いている

jpDGs23 私の所属するグループの仲間と私が共通して持ち合わせる思いやりの心について論ずる

jpETs11 私は自分が信頼できる人物として知られていると説明する

jpMCv6 私の知識に関してほかの人がいうことに関しての反対意見を時々いう

jpMGv26 私は私のグループの仲間が、私が役立つ人間だと言うことを時々訂正する

jpRGs29 私は私自身の親切さに関して話すのを避ける

jpDTv14 私は私の仲間の信頼性と私自身の個人的な信頼性の相違点と類似点を話す

下記の指標に従って、個々の質問がどの程度正確に日常生活において他の人とコミュニケーションをとるときのあなたの態度にあてはまるかを示してください。個々の質問に、あなたがどの程度同意するか、または同意しないかを示してください。（1＝全く同意しない、5＝大いに同意する。）

IND2 私はほかの誰もやり遂げれなかったことをやり遂げたことに非常に誇りを持つ

COL11 私はなるべく自分の仲間との意見の相違をさける努力をする

IND3 私が他の人よりうまく仕事を行うことは私にとってとても重要である

COL13　私がどのように行動するかは、私がだれといるか、またはどこにいるか、もしくはその両方による

IND4 私はいろいろな点でほかの人々と個性的に違う

IND6 私は自分の強みと弱点を知っている

COL9 わたしにとっての喜びとはほかの人と時間を過ごすことだ

IND7 私は自分の意見をはっきりと述べる

COL8 私が何者なのかを理解するためには私の仲間をみるべきだ

COL10 もし私の親戚が経済的困難にあえばなんとかしてそれを援助する

IND5 私はプライバシーを好む

COL12　　　　何かを決めるとき、私はいつも他人の意見をきく

COL14 私は関係のある有力者を尊敬する

IND1 私は自分に関することをしがちで、私の家族も同様だ

COL15 私は一人ではなく、グループで論文をかくか実験をする方がいい

下記の指標に従って、個々の質問がどの程度正確に日常生活において他の人とコ
ミュニケーションをとるときのあなたの態度にあてはまるかを示してください。
個々の質問に、あなたがどの程度同意するか、または同意しないかを示してくだ
さい。（1＝全く同意しない、5＝大いに同意する。）
inter10 私は自分の仲間たちが好むようにふるまう
indp2 私は自分の仲間が間違っているときは自分の仲間を支援しない
inter18 私の幸せは私の周りの人たちの幸せに依存する
indp5 私はほかの人たちと違っていることや個性的であることを楽しむ
inter17 私は自分自身の成果よりも他者との関係の方が重要であるとよく感じる
inter9 私は自分の仲間の利益のために自分の利害を犠牲にするだろう
inter11 私はどのような困難があろうと自分の仲間と一緒にいる
indp8 私は健康であることをほかの何よりも重視する
indp4 私は誰といようと同じようにふるまう
inter12 私にとって私の仲間の和を守ることは私にとって大切である
inter13 私の仲間によって決められた決断を尊重することは私にとって重要であ
る
indp3 私のグループの仲間達に自分が強く反対するときには、私は自分の反対を
強く主張する
inter14 私は自分のグループに不満があったとしても、そのグループが自分を必
要であればそのグループにとどまるであろう
indp6 ある人物の背景を知ることは、その人が好ましい人かどうかをみきわめる
重要な要因である
inter15 私が所属するグループの大多数が要望することを私は尊重する
indp1 私は大勢の人に合わせるために自分の意見を変えない
indp7 仕事仲間の中で自分の意見をいうことは私にとって問題ではない
inter16 私は謙虚な人を尊敬する
この調査では、あなたが、あなたとあなたが所属するグループの仲間との関係に
ついてどう思っているかを理解したいと思います。個々の質問にあなたがどの程
度同意するか、もしくは同意しないかを答えてください。以下の指標を使って
個々の質問に答えてください。（１＝全く同意しない、５＝大いに同意する）。
Hrc12 私の仲間が決めた決断を尊重する
H2 娘の母親をみれば、その娘がどれほどよい子か推測できる
H3 子供はその親の写し鏡である
Hrc11 私は仲間内の和を保つ
H7 異常な若者は異常な家族の産物である
H8 その人が誰とつきあってるかをみれば、どんな人か見極めることができる
H9 子供は自分の将来について、親の言うことを聞くべきだ
Hi10 自立した人間としてふるまうことは、私にとって重要である
Hrc13 何かを決めるときに、中のいい友達に相談し、彼ら(彼女ら)の意見を得る
ことは重要である
H5 子供の成功の陰にはいつも素晴らしい親の存在がある

Hrc14 私が所属するグループの大半の要望を私は尊重する
H1 もし私の家族のうちの一人が失敗すれば、家族全員が失敗する
H6 ある人物の背景を知ることは、その人が良い人かどうかをみきわめる重要な要因である
Hgc15 私が周りの人たちより成功しているとわかると幸せに感じる
Hgc16 高い社会的地位を獲得することは私にとって、大切である
H4 子供の成功はその子の親の直接の反映である

下記の指標に従って、個々の質問がどの程度正確に日常生活において他の人とコミュニケーションをとるときのあなたの態度にあてはまるかを示してください。個々の質問に、あなたがどの程度同意するか、または同意しないかを示してください。（1＝全く同意しない、5＝大いに同意する。）

intgF25 私は中庸をとるようにしている
indpF2 私は他人に頼らないで、自立することを好む
intrF4 他の人が決めた決断を尊重する
intrF5 私は他人の願望に敏感である
selfF18 わたし個人のプライドを守ることに関心がある
intgF28 私は状況を解決するために、中庸を見つけようとする
otrF12 和を保つようにほかの人と接することは、私にとって大切である
avdF20 私は争い事が起こらなかったかのように振る舞おうとする
domF23 私の立場を他人が理解するまで、私は議論を独占する
intrF8 私は他人との関係のために、自分の利害を犠牲にする
otrF9 私にとって他の人の立場を守ることは重要なことだ
otrF10 関係を保つために謙虚でいることは私にとって重要である
domF22 私のやり方が一番だとほかの人たちを説得しようとする
intrF7 私の満足は他人の満足に依存する
otrF13 他人の自尊心に敏感であろうとする
avdF19 私はできるだけ争いごとをさけ、何もなかったかのように振る舞う
otrF14 他人の信頼性を保つ手助けをすることに関心がある
selfF15 自分自身が恥をかかないように気を付ける
selfF16 私は自己イメージを守ることに関心がある
intrF6 争いごとに勝つことよりも他人との関係を保つことの方が重要である
indpF1 自由で独立した人間として振る舞えることは私にとって重要である
otrF11 他人のプライドを保てるよう手伝うことは、私にとって重要である
avdF21 私は争い事がまったく存在しないかのようによそおう
domF24 争いでは私の立場がわかってもらえるよう主張する
intgF26 私は「ギブアンドテイク」で公平に譲り合い妥協できるように努める
selfF17 私は他人の前で弱くみえないよう気を付ける
intgF27 行き詰まりを打開するために、中庸をとることを提案する
indpF3 できるだけ他人に頼らないようにする

INSTRUCTIO 以下のそれぞれの文章について、その文章がどの程度あなたが知り合って間もない人達と会話をする時のあなたのいつもの態度、考え、行動を表しているか示してください。以下の指標の 5 つのうちの一つを選んで示してください。（1＝全く同意しない、5＝大いに同意する。）

RS2 私は何回も難しい状況でコミュニケーションをうまくとるといわれたことがある

NS23 たとえ他の人達が反対しようと、私は自分の意見に固執する

RS4 説得するとき私は自分を失わないで他人を喜ばせようとする

RR13 私は自分の仲間の決断にさからうようなことは言わない

NS28 私はいつも私とは異なる意見をもつ人たちを攻撃する

RS6 私は他人の名誉を傷つけることなくその人が私の意見を受け入れる方法を見るけることができる

NS30 私は会話の中で注目の的になるのを好む

RR14 普段、私はもし他人の意見に反対でもその意見に従う

RS7 目上の人に会う時はいつも、私から先にその人にあいさつする

RS8 他人に迷惑をかけるときはつねに、「すいません」という

NS10 私は他人から自信過剰だといわれる

RS11 私は他人と会話するとき、その人の利益に見合ったトピックを選ぶ

RR12 私は自分を受け入れてもらうために他人を賞賛する

RS5 私は妥協的な人間である

RR15 他人を喜ばせるために、自分の話し方を合わせようとする

RR17 もし私が仲間の意見と矛盾する意見を述べたら、裏切り者とみなされるだろう

NS18 私は友達の弱点をからかう

RR19 私は、私より頭のよい友達が教授からの問題に最初に答えて間違えた場合は、その問題に答えるのをためらう

NS29 他人は私が攻撃的だという

RR20 年配の人の教えは、無条件で信用する

RS9 私はクラスで私よりできが悪い友達によく助言する

RR16 私はいつも自分の上司の肩をもった発言をする

NS21 私は他人が気に食わない時は、おおっぴらに自分の気持ちを表す

NS22 私は他の人たちの気持ちを考慮することなく公然と話す

RS1 私が経験した、だいたいの争い事はみんなの満足のうちに解決している

RR24 年配の人達にあうように、私は自分の意見をかえるだろう

NS25 私は他人が提案した意見に反対の時は、会話中にすぐに反対意見をのべるだろう

RR26 子供たちは、年配の人たちに反対する考えを述べるべきではない

RS3 「己の欲するところを人に施せ」という教訓を私は守っている

NS27 討論の中で、私は他の人達と相反する私の意見を積極的に述べる

CUMMULATIVE VITEA

Keith E. Dilbeck

Education
B.A. California State University, Sacramento, May 2006
Major: Communication Studies

M.A. Bangkok University – International Program, December 2008
Major: Communication Arts

Dissertation Title: Vicarious and Source Credibility: A Cross-cultural Explanation