

Simpatía as a Cultural Script of Hispanics

Harry C. Triandis
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Judith Lisansky
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Gerardo Marín
University of San Francisco

Hector Betancourt
Pontificia Universidad Católica, Santiago, Chile

A *cultural script* is a pattern of social interaction that is characteristic of a particular cultural group. Data from three samples of Hispanic and non-Hispanic recruits as well as samples of Hispanic monolinguals and bilinguals, suggest that the Hispanics have a cultural script, which we called *simpatía*. Hispanics are more likely than the non-Hispanics to expect high frequencies of positive social behaviors and low frequencies of negative social behaviors. This suggests different levels of adaptation for social behavior in the two cultures. The inattention among non-Hispanics to the presence of this script among Hispanics is likely to lead to misunderstandings when Hispanics and non-Hispanics interact. Hispanics are likely to perceive as negative behaviors those behaviors that are considered neutral by non-Hispanics; also, behaviors that are perceived as positive by non-Hispanics are likely to be perceived as neutral by the Hispanics.

A cultural script is a pattern of social interaction that is characteristic of a particular cultural group. For example, Greeks are more likely to get help from an in-group member than from an out-group member (Feldman, 1968; Triandis & Vassiliou, 1972). This behavioral pattern is associated with the concept of *philotimo*, which is one of the strongest norms of traditional Greek society: doing what in-group members expect. Another example comes from Japan, where Doi (1973) identified the cultural script of *amae*, which occurs when a person wants to be dependent on another, to be passively loved. High status persons cultivate such dependence on the part of lower status persons, who feel grateful for the opportunity to be dependent and work hard to satisfy the higher status person.

Among South African blacks the concept of *ubuntu* prescribes giving of sympathy and help to those who need it and showing respect for the dignity of others—people must not be manipulated; old people must be treated with respect; a caring, sharing relationship is emphasized. “You must not live for yourself, but for others” (Godsell, 1982).

Among Hispanics and Latin Americans a cultural script that seems to be equally important to the Greek’s *philotimo*, the African *ubuntu*, and the Japanese’s *amae* is that of *simpatía*. This word has no equivalent in English but refers to a permanent personal quality where an individual is perceived as likeable, attractive, fun to be with, and easy-going. An individual who is *simpático* shows certain levels of conformity and an ability to share in other’s feelings (Real Academia Española, 1980), behaves with dignity and respect toward others, and seems to strive for harmony in interpersonal relations. This latter characteristic implies a general avoidance of interpersonal conflict and a tendency for positive behaviors to be emphasized in positive situations and negative behaviors to be de-emphasized in negative situations.

Although there are few studies that empirically test the role of *simpatía* as a cultural script in social relations among Hispanics and Latin Americans, a number of authors

We are grateful to Hector Betancourt for assistance with data collection, and to C. Harry Hui and Victor Ottati for assistance with data analysis.

This study was supported in part by the Organizational Effectiveness Research Group, Office of Naval Research (Code 452), under Contract No. N00014-80-C-0407, NR 170-906, Harry C. Triandis, principal investigator.

Judith Lisansky is now at the State University of New Jersey, Cook College, New Brunswick, New Jersey 08903.

Requests for reprints should be sent to Harry C. Triandis, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign, Department of Psychology, 603 E. Daniel Street, Champaign, Illinois 61820.

have written about it from a sociological and anthropological perspective. Burma (1970) for example, observes that Mexican Americans stress politeness, pleasantness, agreeableness, keeping one's temper, and passively enduring stress. Madsen (1972) proposes that Mexican Americans value the person's guarding against offending others, that is, directly questioning another's beliefs or actions or attempting direct criticisms that may be offensive. Murillo (1976), again, writing about Mexican Americans, notes that there is great value placed on manners and courtesy in interpersonal relations. The manner of expression is likely to be elaborate and indirect, and there is much concern to make social relations appear at least harmonious. Murillo notes that because direct argument or contradiction is considered rude, a person will tend not to disagree unless this can be done tactfully.

Wagenheim (1972), writing about Puerto Rican culture, states that disrespectful behavior, such as arguments, fights and direct confrontation, tends to be interpreted as assaults on the essential dignity of others. He notes that a common method of resistance to someone else's views is by means of a *pelea monga* or the relaxed fight. Rather than disagree or confront, the preferred reaction is a form of passive noncooperation. Wagenheim also observes that Puerto Ricans rarely give a directly negative answer if they can avoid it.

Landy (1959), writing earlier about a sugar cane community in Puerto Rico, notes that the cultural traits considered desirable for individuals and interpersonal relations are respectfulness, obedience, liking people, pleasantness, being nice to people, all important aspects of being simpático.

The importance of being simpático is further exemplified by Alum and Manteiga's (1977) assertion that the awkwardness in interpersonal relations that results from not being simpático (i.e., being unlikeable, unwitty, disagreeable, etc.) is one of the worst "cultural sins" among Cubans.

The value Hispanics and Latin Americans place on the avoidance of negative behaviors (e.g., criticizing, insulting, fighting, etc.) has also been widely documented (e.g., Diaz-Royo, 1974; Fitzpatrick, 1971; Heller, 1966; Madsen, 1972; Rubel, 1970). This concern

for the avoidance of negative behaviors in interpersonal relations has been explained as being based on Hispanics' cultural values of *respecto* (respect) and *dignidad* (worthiness). Behaviors that are interpreted culturally as criticisms or insults, for example, are perceived by Hispanics as assaults on the other person's dignity and self-respect (Diaz-Royo, 1974; Tumin & Feldman, 1971). A direct derivation of this cultural value is the preference for avoiding conflict, a fact that has been documented in the past for Hispanics and Latin Americans (e.g., Kagan, Knight & Martinez-Romero, 1982; Kagan & Madsen, 1971, 1972). As a matter of fact, in a recent study (Kagan et al., 1982) with Anglo-American, Mexican-American, and Mexican children, the authors found that when questioned about how they would react to situations that often result in aggression, Anglo-American and Mexican-American children indicated that they would confront the aggressor, whereas Mexican children indicated that they would avoid the confrontation.

From the above considerations we expected our Hispanic respondents to be more likely than our non-Hispanic subjects to stress harmony and behaviors implying good relations (important components of *simpatía*) in social situations where Hispanics or non-Hispanics are the actors or the targets of various actions. As a matter of fact, in a previous study (Triandis, Hui, Albert, Leung, Lisansky, Diaz-Loving, Plascencia, Marín, Betancourt, & Loyola-Cintrón, 1984) we found that a factor encompassing the above behaviors and labeled "Friendliness" emerged as an important central characteristic in the models of social behavior held by a group of Latin American social scientists.

Method

Data Set 1

Subjects

Ninety male Navy recruits (41 Hispanics and 49 non-Hispanics) responded to a questionnaire as part of a larger study of their perceptions of the social environment. In each of three Navy recruit stations (Florida, California, and Illinois), when a Spanish-surnamed recruit was to be classified, the classification officer checked the recruit's self-identification on an application form on which Hispanic was one of the ways in which the applicant could describe himself. If the Spanish-surnamed recruit had selected the Hispanic label, he was asked to complete the

questionnaire. At the same time, another recruit (with a non-Spanish surname) was randomly selected and given the same questionnaire. These other recruits are here referred to as non-Hispanics and will include both whites and the few blacks as well as Hispanics who did not identify themselves as "Hispanics."

The logic of this procedure takes into account the extensive literature on U.S. minorities, which indicates that minorities differ in acculturation (e.g., Padilla, 1980). Many who might be considered minority members, by some criterion, are indistinguishable from the non-Hispanics. Also, any one criterion for deciding that a person belongs to a minority group may be defective (Marín & Marín, 1982). Thus, two criteria are needed. Self-identification is an important criterion, because it is a central element of the way an individual constructs social reality. The designation of the other sample as non-Hispanic assumes that in the U.S. there are some similarities in point of view across social class, race, age, sex, and other variables. To the extent that one can empirically demonstrate a contrast between Hispanics and non-Hispanics, as we have defined it, in spite of the large variance in the non-Hispanic sample that is inevitable with this procedure, one has identified some rather reliable and important attribute of Hispanics.

In addition, a subset of the questions was administered to two other samples: A group of 60 bilingual (English-Spanish) college students from a large state university in the Los Angeles area answered part of the questionnaire, for a different study, in English or Spanish (in counter-balanced order), and 50 monolingual juniors and seniors at a high school in San Juan, Puerto Rico, answered the questions only in Spanish.

Instrument

The questionnaire consisted of various intergroup situations described by identifying the actor (Hispanic or non-Hispanic), the target of the action (Hispanic or non-Hispanic), and the setting (tries to show dignity toward, tries to show loyalty toward, criticizes, admires, shows respect, tries to show affection, obeys, gives orders to). The eight settings were selected after consultations with anthropologists who had studied Hispanics in California, Texas, Cuba, and Puerto Rico. The combination of these characteristics provided 2 (Attributes of Actor) \times 2 (Attributes of Target) \times $8 = 32$ different intergroup situations. After each situation the subjects found a set of emically derived behaviors (ranging from 5 to 11; see Triandis, 1972, for discussion of procedures) where the respondent had to estimate the likelihood of each behavior occurring in the situation. The estimates were made on a 10-point scale (1 = *never*, 2 = *seldom*, . . . 9 = *almost always*, 10 = *always*). For example, one item described the actor as a Hispanic, the target as a non-Hispanic, the setting as "tries to show dignity toward," and the behavior whose probability was estimated by the various samples as "does difficult task for." The Navy recruits made a total of 260 judgments and the bilinguals and Puerto Rican subjects made a sample of these judgments.

Data Set 2

Subjects

One hundred twenty-two male Navy recruits (62 non-Hispanics and 60 Hispanics) responded to this study's

questionnaire. Subjects were chosen in the same fashion as those of Data Set 1.

Instrument

In this study the instrument was pseudo-etic¹ (the scales were simply taken from previous studies of the Greek and American cultures; see Triandis, Vassiliou & Nassiakou, 1968); it required 600 judgments of the extent to which 1 of 20 behaviors is likely to occur in 1 of 30 roles. For example, how likely is it that a mother will admire a son? The subjects were asked to indicate on a 10-point scale, whether the first member of the role is likely to engage in the behavior. The roles and behaviors were selected from previous studies (Triandis et al., 1968) to represent the most heterogeneous roles and behaviors found in those studies. These studies had identified, through factor analyses, patterns of roles (e.g., family roles, public roles, conflict roles) and patterns of behaviors (e.g., associative vs. dissociative; superordinate vs. subordinate; intimate vs. formal; overt vs. covert). Roles and behaviors were selected to represent the extreme poles of these factors. Also, the roles Navy Officer-Seaman, Seaman-Navy Officer, Navy Officer-Navy Officer, Seaman-Seaman, were added to the sample of roles because they were particularly relevant to the sample of subjects of this study.

Data Set 3

Subjects

One hundred five male Navy recruits (54 non-Hispanic and 51 Hispanic) were sampled by procedures already described in Data Set 1.

Instrument

In this study, the instrument was mixed emic and etic (see footnote 1) requiring 600 judgments of the extent to which 1 of 20 behaviors is likely to occur in 1 of 30 roles. The roles were the same as those mentioned in Data Set 2. The behaviors were obtained through interviews with samples of Hispanic and non-Hispanic students. These students were asked to mention behaviors that might occur in such roles. For example, what behaviors are typical of mothers interacting with sons? The most frequently mentioned behaviors were included in the questionnaire. Some behaviors were frequently mentioned by the Hispanics but not the non-Hispanic subjects. These were included as emic Hispanic behaviors. Other behaviors were frequently mentioned by the non-Hispanics but not the Hispanics. These were included in the questionnaire as emic non-Hispanic behaviors. However, the majority of the behaviors were suggested by both cultural groups in this pretest and thus are considered

¹ Emic constructs are those that are unique to one culture; etic constructs are those found in more than one culture; pseudo-etic constructs are emic of the culture of the researcher that are simply assumed to be etic. In general, emic constructs are those freely provided by the subjects; etic are usually constructs of the researcher.

etic. The final questionnaire included 15 etic, 3 Hispanic emic and 2 non-Hispanic emic behaviors for each role, for a total of 20 judgments per role.

Results

Data Set 1

The data are in the form of means obtained from the non-Hispanic ($n = 49$) and Hispanic ($n = 41$) recruits answering in English, the bilinguals answering in Spanish ($n = 60$), the bilinguals answering in English ($n = 60$), and the monolinguals answering in Spanish ($n = 53$). For any given item we had an array of means. For example, when the actor was a Hispanic, the target a Hispanic, the setting "tries to show dignity toward," and the behavior, whose probability had to be estimated on a scale from 1 = *never* to 10 = *always*, "feels proud of own heritage," the obtained means were: non-Hispanics 7.3; Hispanics 8.7 (note the larger mean is consistent with the *simpatía* script); the bilinguals 8.2 and 8.6, and the monolinguals 7.6. Thus in this example, all the Hispanic samples show the script. As another example, when the actor was non-Hispanic, the target Hispanic, the setting "to criticize," and the behavior "calls him names," the means were: non-Hispanics 5.4, Hispanics 4.6 (shows the script), bilinguals 6.5 and 6.8 (do not show the script), and monolinguals 5.7 (do not show the script).

Chi-Square Analyses

A quick overview of the data can be obtained by examining whether there are differences between the non-Hispanic and Hispanic samples in the frequencies of behaviors considered likely to occur. To do this we summed the frequencies in the 6 to 10 behavior categories (from "may occur" to "will always occur") and computed chi-squares with only one degree of freedom.

In looking at the data, we have classified the situations into those where the actor is intending to do something associative (e.g., admire) or dissociative (e.g., criticize) by doing something positive (e.g., is polite) or negative (e.g., argues with). We will only report the frequencies of the chi-squares that reached significance ($p < .05$). Although out of the 260 chi-squares computed 13 can be expected

to reach significance by chance, our results showed 43 significant chi-squares.

For associative situations and positive behaviors there were 35 significant chi-squares, indicating that the Hispanic frequencies were higher than the non-Hispanic frequencies. For associative situations and negative behaviors there were five significant chi-squares, indicating the same pattern.

For dissociative situations and positive behaviors there were no significant chi-squares. For dissociative situations and negative behaviors the pattern was strikingly different from that found for associative situations: The Hispanic frequencies were lower than the non-Hispanic frequencies, and there were three significant chi-squares.

There were no important patterns associated with the actor or target being Hispanic or non-Hispanic, except that the Hispanics perceived more positive acts than the non-Hispanic subjects in situations containing Hispanic target persons (12 significant chi-squares) and the non-Hispanic subjects saw more superordinate behaviors than the Hispanics when responding to situations containing Hispanic target persons (8 significant chi-squares).

Multivariate Analyses of Variance (MANOVAS)

For each situation we examined the effect of the subjects (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) in a between-subjects design and the effect of the actors (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) and targets (Hispanic vs. non-Hispanic) and their interactions, in a within-subjects design.

Setting 1: Trying to show loyalty toward target person. The Hispanics were higher than the non-Hispanic respondents in reporting that it is likely that a person would be honest ($p < .03$), friendly ($p < .05$), and would do what the target person wants done ($p < .01$) while trying to show loyalty toward the target person. Furthermore, the actor would defend ($p < .01$), respect the person ($p < .01$), respect the culture of ($p < .01$), and value the language of ($p < .01$) the target person in attempting to show loyalty. The mean Hispanic responses to these items were around 7 (i.e. corresponded to "more often than not"), while the mean non-Hispanic

responses were around 5.5 ("may occur"). The fact that the non-Hispanic respondents use the middle of the 10-point scale so much suggests that this situation (showing loyalty) does not have definite meaning for this sample.

There were no significant differences associated with the actor, but there were two significant ($p < .01$) differences associated with the target person: Non-Hispanic targets were seen as more likely to elicit a selfish behavior when an actor is trying to show loyalty than was the case for Hispanic targets and more likely to elicit respect of the target's culture than was the case for Hispanic targets.

There were no significant Subject \times Actor or Subject \times Target interactions, but there were significant ($p < .01$) Actor \times Target interactions. The general pattern was that the non-Hispanic Actor \times Hispanic Target interactions were seen as characterized by less positive behaviors than the other combinations.

Setting 2: Trying to show dignity toward target person. Hispanic subjects were significantly ($p < .001$) different from non-Hispanic subjects in viewing "treats others as equal" as a more likely behavior ($M = 7.5$ vs. 6.3) when the actor is trying to show dignity. A similar pattern ($p < .02$) occurred for "respects the other."

In this situation the actors were seen as more likely ($p < .005$) to "believe in self (in who he is)" if they were Hispanic (7.8) than non-Hispanic (7.3). Again, several significant interactions of Actor \times Target were observed. The culturally heterogeneous pairs (non-Hispanic-Hispanic or Hispanic-non-Hispanic) were seen as less likely to "treat others as equal" ($p < .02$), "respect the other" ($p < .01$), "do a difficult task for the other" ($p < .02$) and were more likely to "act selfishly" ($p < .002$) than the ethnically homogeneous pairs.

Setting 3: Criticizes. The Hispanics ($M = 4.3$) were significantly less likely ($p < .01$) to see "rejects opinions of" associated with this situation than were the non-Hispanics ($M = 5.4$). There was also less likelihood ($p < .05$) of the behavior "argues with" in the case of the Hispanics when compared with the non-Hispanic respondents.

Hispanic actors were perceived as less likely

to "put down the culture of" ($p < .01$), "tell him what he did wrong" ($p < .01$), "raise their voice" ($p < .05$), and "point out bad qualities" ($p < .05$) than non-Hispanic actors. There were no significant effects for target person.

In this case there were two Subject \times Actor significant ($p < .01$) interactions: For "puts down culture of" this was seen by Hispanic subjects as extremely unlikely (3.3) in the case of Hispanic actors and as possible (5.1) in the case of non-Hispanic actors, as perceived by non-Hispanic subjects. Also, Hispanic actors were seen by Hispanic subjects as unlikely to "point out bad qualities," but non-Hispanic actors were seen as more likely to do this by both non-Hispanic and Hispanic subjects ($p < .05$).

There was one Subject \times Target significant ($p < .05$) interaction, in which Hispanic subjects saw that when the target was Hispanic the actor would "start by complimenting" the target (5.6), whereas non-Hispanic subjects did not see this as likely (4.9).

There were some Actor \times Target interactions. Specifically, in culturally homogeneous pairs, actors were seen as unlikely to "put down the culture of" and "reject the opinions of" the target to a greater extent than was the case for the culturally heterogeneous pairs ($p < .01$). Conversely, the heterogeneous pairs were less likely to "start by complimenting" than the homogeneous ($p < .05$).

Setting 4: Admires. Subject effects indicated that the Hispanics were more likely than the non-Hispanics ($p < .01$) to "say, I recognize your abilities," "say, I recognize your success," "imitate," and "show respect for." Hispanic actors were seen as more likely to "show respect" ($p < .05$) and non-Hispanic targets were seen as more likely to elicit "I recognize your abilities" statements ($p < .05$).

Subject \times Target interactions were generally nonsignificant, but one did reach significance at $p < .05$: Hispanics saw that it was more likely for the actor to say "I recognize your abilities" to a non-Hispanic target, and non-Hispanic subjects saw this as unlikely in the case of Hispanic targets.

All Actor \times Target interactions were significant. Again, the culturally heterogeneous pairs differed from the homogeneous. In the heterogeneous the actors were less likely to

say "I recognize your abilities" ($p < .01$) and "I recognize your success" ($p < .01$) and to "show respect" ($p < .01$); they were more likely to "criticize" ($p < .05$) and less likely to "imitate" ($p < .05$) the target.

Setting 5: Show respect. All scales showed significant ($p < .01$) differences between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic subjects. In all cases the Hispanics were more likely (7.5) than the non-Hispanics (6.2) to see "is polite," "treats as equal," "helps," "is understanding," "listens to what he has to say," "treats him well," and "values his culture" as likely to occur.

There was one actor effect. The Hispanic actors were seen as more likely than the non-Hispanic actors to "treat as equal" ($p < .05$). There were no significant target effects, and no Subject \times Actor effects. But there were three Subject \times Target effects: The highest likelihood that the behaviors "treats as equal" ($p < .05$), "is understanding" ($p < .01$), and "listens to what he has to say" ($p < .01$) are perceived as likely to occur was found in the case of Hispanic subjects with Hispanic targets; the lowest in the case of non-Hispanic subjects with Hispanic targets.

Finally, all Actor \times Target interactions were significant ($p < .01$), with the general trend for Hispanic actors to be more positive toward Hispanic targets and non-Hispanic actors less positive toward Hispanic targets. For example, "listens to what he has to say" was seen as more likely (6.9) for non-Hispanic-non-Hispanic and Hispanic-Hispanic dyads, but less likely for Hispanic-non-Hispanic (6.4) and non-Hispanic-Hispanic (6.2) dyads.

Setting 6: Shows affection. The Hispanics were significantly higher than the non-Hispanics in "hugs" ($p < .05$), "embraces" ($p < .01$), "praises" ($p < .05$), "respects" ($p < .01$), and "cares for" ($p < .05$). There were no other effects and interactions, except for the Actor \times Target interactions. Again, the culturally homogeneous dyads were seen as more likely to experience "does favor for," "shares experiences with," "hugs," (all at $p < .01$), "embraces" ($p < .05$), "respects" and "cares for" (both at $p < .01$), and "does things for" ($p < .05$) than the culturally heterogeneous dyads. For example, the likelihood for "cares for" was judged at 7.0 for the Hispanic-

Hispanic and 6.4 for the Hispanic-non-Hispanic dyads.

Setting 7: Obeys. Hispanics were again more positive (does what is reasonable, is submissive, trusts judgment of, does exactly what he is asked to do, and is respectful). All but the last effect were significant at $p < .01$; the last one was significant at $p < .05$. The mean Hispanic response was close to 7 and the non-Hispanic mean was about 6.

There was a difference for actor. Hispanic actors were seen as more likely to do "what is reasonable," and less likely "to trust judgment of." There was one significant Subject \times target interaction: Hispanic subjects saw "is submissive" as more likely (6.2) when the target was a non-Hispanic, whereas non-Hispanic subjects saw this response as much less likely (5.2) when the target was a non-Hispanic. But the difference was significant at only $p < .05$.

There were two Actor \times Target interactions that reached significance. "Does what is reasonable" was more likely ($p < .01$) in the case of Hispanic-Hispanic dyads (7.2) and least likely in the case of non-Hispanic-Hispanic dyads (6.5). "Does exactly what he is asked to do" reached a maximum (6.7) for non-Hispanic-non-Hispanic and a minimum (6.2) for Hispanic-non-Hispanic dyads ($p < .05$).

Setting 8: Gives orders to. The Hispanics were higher (7.0) than the non-Hispanic respondents (6.1) in seeing "asks him to do something in a nice way" as likely to occur in that situation ($p < .01$). Actors were seen as more likely to "tell what needs to be done," "be bossy," "speak in a demanding way," "be authoritarian" and "domineering" if they were non-Hispanic than if they were Hispanic, but there were no significant effects associated with the ethnicity of the target. There were no significant Subject \times Actor or Subject \times Target effects, and only one weak ($p < .05$) Actor \times Target effect. The latter was that non-Hispanic actors were more likely to threaten a Hispanic target than were Hispanic actors likely to threaten a Hispanic target.

The more analytic MANOVA results corresponded well with the chi-square analyses. Of course, they were based on the same data,

but used all 10 categories of the response scale, rather than just the frequencies in the categories 6 to 10. The positive situations (show dignity, loyalty, admires, respect, affection, obeys) contrasted sharply with the negative (criticizes, gives orders). In the positive interpersonal situations the Hispanics were significantly more likely to see high probabilities of a positive behavior in 34 cases, and of negative behavior in only one case. In the negative situations the Hispanics were less likely to see high probabilities of negative behaviors in four cases and more likely to see high probabilities of positive behaviors in two cases. Thus, there is an unmistakable pattern: Hispanics see less negative and more positive behaviors as likely to occur in situations that have a potential for conflict. The emphasis on interpersonal harmony is then clearly present in the Hispanic data, as expected from the literature review.

In addition, the MANOVAs showed a number of expectations of "subtle prejudice," for example, the Hispanic subjects seeing more harmony in Hispanic-Hispanic dyads, more bossiness among non-Hispanics, and suggestions of non-Hispanics as having more status than Hispanics.

Reactions of the Hispanic Bilinguals and the Monolinguals

To what extent are the data obtained with Hispanic recruits representative of data obtained with the other samples of Hispanics? To answer this question we examined the Navy Hispanic recruit means in relation to the means we obtained from the Hispanic bilinguals and the monolingual Puerto Ricans.

These data were collected for another study (Marín, Triandis, Betancourt & Kashima, 1983). Because they were available, it seemed useful to check if the *simpatía* script was present in that set of responses also. The bilinguals answered the questions in English or in Spanish (in counterbalanced order). The purpose of that study was to study the discrepancies obtained when bilinguals answer in their two languages. Since we needed a wide sample of types of questions, we selected questions from several different studies, including 78 of the most interesting questions

from the present study, for inclusion in the study with the bilinguals.

Because the bilinguals and monolinguals responded to only a subset of the questions, we did not have all the information in this case that we had in the case of the Navy recruits. Nevertheless, there was enough information to make comparisons.² Again one can examine positive-intentions situations and see whether positive or negative behaviors show any pattern. We note only those cases where all the Hispanic means are higher (or lower) than the non-Hispanic means. For positive behaviors we find 40 instances when all the Hispanic means are higher than the non-Hispanic means. Furthermore, we find two instances where the Hispanic means are lower than the non-Hispanic means when a negative behavior is being judged. Thus, 42 instances support the idea of Hispanics emphasizing harmony more than the non-Hispanic respondents.

In the case of negative-intentions situations (e.g., to criticize) the pattern is somewhat complex. If we compare only the recruits, we find that for 16 out of 16 instances the Hispanic means are consistent with a harmony explanation, relative to the non-Hispanic means. But, if we look at the monolinguals only 5 of the 16 are consistent with the notion of harmony, and in the case of the bilinguals only 1 of the 16 shows the harmonious pattern that is part of the *simpatía* social script.

Corroboration With Additional Items

On another part of the questionnaire answered by the same subjects, 18 situations were presented where an employee or a supervisor makes a mistake and various reactions to the mistake are described. Subjects were asked to rate on two 7-point scales whether the reaction was acceptable and expected.

Factor analyses of the non-Hispanic and Hispanic data were done to determine whether the two groups structure the answers

² Detailed tables with all means used in these analyses are available from the first author.

Table 1
Number of Obtained Versus Expected by Chance Significant t Tests

Level of significance	Number expected by chance	Number obtained in Data Set 2	Number obtained in Data Set 3
.05	30	47	117
.04	24	39	111
.03	18	24	100
.02	12	23	76
.01	6	14	50

to the questions similarly. If the same factors emerge in the two samples this is one clue that the meaning of the items is similar for the two kinds of subjects. In addition, both chi-squares and *t* tests were performed to check on the differences in the frequencies and means of the responses of the two samples.

Looking only at those items that probably had the same meaning (based on the results of the factor analysis) and were significantly different, we found 2 of the 18 items where the response frequencies and means were significantly different. The *t* tests were computed after the data of each sample were converted to standard form (mean of the responses to the 18 items was zero, and standard deviation was 1.00) in order to control for differences in the checking style between the two samples.

One of the two items asked the respondents to rate how acceptable was it for a supervisor to call attention to a mistake made by an employee by directly pointing it out. The standardized mean for the non-Hispanic respondents was .667 whereas the mean for the Hispanic respondents was .311, $t(111) = 2.1$, $p < .038$, on the acceptable dimension. This type of supervisory behavior was then seen as more appropriate by the non-Hispanic than by the Hispanic sample.

The second item asked respondents to rate the acceptability of a supervisor calling attention to a mistake made by an employee by shouting at him. This item was overall perceived as unacceptable by both samples of respondents where the non-Hispanic perceived the behavior as less acceptable (standardized $M = -.528$) than the Hispanic ($M = -.151$) respondents, $t(111) = -.229$, $p < .024$. Although the expression of anger is perceived

as an unacceptable behavior by both samples the relative tolerance of Hispanics for it can be interpreted as allowing the person (the supervisor) to blow off steam and permitting the restoration of harmony that would be so important in maintaining good interpersonal relations. As a matter of fact, in many Mediterranean cultures it is said that Northern Europeans "bottle up" their anger and that by not expressing it undermine the quality of interpersonal relations in the long run.

Data Set 2

Comparisons of the answers of the Hispanic and non-Hispanic samples to each of the 600 role-behavior items were done through *t* tests. One would expect 30 of these *t* tests to be significant, at the $p < .05$ level, by chance. In fact, 47 were significant at that level. Table 1 shows the results for different levels of significance. It indicates that the differences between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic samples are not due to random errors.

If the simpático cultural script is operating we would expect the Hispanics to give lower frequencies to negative and higher frequencies to positive behaviors. The 47 significant *t* test results were classified as to whether they fell into that pattern or were inconsistent with it. By chance we would have expected at most half the Hispanic means to exceed the non-Hispanic means and the other half to show the opposite pattern. In fact, 36 of the 47 significant *t* tests were consistent with the simpatía pattern. This is unlikely to have occurred by chance, $\chi^2(1) = 13.04$, $p < .001$. However, the effect is entirely due to the negative behaviors. Of the 47 behaviors that showed significant differences 36 were negative and 11 positive. For the negative behaviors

31 of the 36 showed the simpatía pattern; for the positive only 5 of the 11 did show it.

Of special interest are those cases that do not fall into the simpatía pattern. The 11 cases are listed in Table 2. The five cases involving negative behaviors clearly show that there is more superordination in the Hispanic role perceptions. This is consistent with the high power distance found by Hofstede (1980) in many Hispanic cultures. Thus, among Hispanics in some roles the superordination pattern overcomes the simpatía pattern. Five of the six cases involving positive behavior clearly show that there is less intimacy seen as appropriate in the Hispanic role perceptions. The avoidance of intimacy, however, is also largely linked to high status persons not being intimate with low status persons, so that it may well be part of the same power distance pattern.

Details of this study were presented elsewhere (Triandis, Marín, Hui, Lisansky, &

Ottati, 1984). Suffice it to state here that there were patterns of differences in role perceptions that are consistent with the simpatía script. Specifically, out of 30 roles, each of which provided an opportunity for the two cultural groups to have significantly different means, there were 11 occasions when the Hispanic means were lower than the non-Hispanic means on the behavior "fights with," 7 on the behavior "hits," 6 on "threatens," 3 on the behavior "argues with" and 2 on the behavior "laughs at." On these behaviors there were no cases where the Hispanic means were higher than the non-Hispanic means. In addition, there were two occasions when the Hispanic means statistically significantly exceeded the non-Hispanic means for the behavior "admires," one for "loves," and one for "shows affection toward." On the other hand, on the behaviors "disciplines" and "gives orders to" the Hispanic means exceeded the non-Hispanic means statistically signifi-

Table 2
Cases That Do Not Conform to the Simpatía Pattern (Data Set 3)

Role	Behavior	Non-hispanic <i>M</i>	Hispanic <i>M</i>	Alpha level
Negative behaviors				
Mother-Daughter	Disciplines	5.5	6.7	.03
Mother-Daughter	Gives orders to	5.4	6.9	.01
Father-Daughter	Gives orders to	5.6	6.8	.02
Husband-Wife	Gives orders to	4.2	6.1	.001
Seaman-Seaman	Disciplines	3.3	4.3	.05
Positive behaviors				
Cousin-Cousin	Sends written invitation to	5.2	4.3	.05
Student-Teacher	Treats as brother	3.2	2.1	.01
Seaman-Seaman	Tells personal problems to	4.7	3.9	.05
Grandparent-Grandson	Asks for permission	4.2	3.2	.05
Father-in-law-Son-in-law	Reveals intimate thoughts	4.5	3.3	.01
Mother-in-law-Son-in-law	Tells personal problems to	4.2	2.8	.002
Mother-Daughter	Disciplines	5.4	7.0	.003
Father-Daughter	Disciplines	4.9	6.3	.009
Brother-Brother	Disciplines	3.4	4.9	.002
Sister-Sister	Disciplines	3.7	5.2	.002
Grandparent-Grandson	Disciplines	3.8	5.2	.01
Mother-in-Law-Son-in-Law	Disciplines	2.7	4.2	.009
Cousin-Cousin	Disciplines	2.7	4.3	.001
Naval Officer-Seaman	Disciplines	6.8	8.2	.009
Foreman-Workman	Disciplines	3.8	5.5	.001
Son-Mother	Obeys	7.0	8.1	.01
Nephew-Uncle	Asks for money from	3.1	4.3	.006
Teacher-Student	Gives orders to	7.0	8.2	.01

cantly three times, and the reverse patterns were observed once for each of these two behaviors. In short, there is clear evidence that the significant results fall mostly along predictions from the *simpatía* script and occasionally along predictions from the power distance script.

In summary, whereas most cases do fall into the *simpatía* pattern, there are 11 exceptions, and most of those can be accounted for by an additional pattern linked to power distance.

Data Set 3

Table 1 shows the comparison of the number of *t* tests out of 600 that was expected to be significant by chance with the actual number that was significant. Although 30 were expected to be significant by chance, in fact 117 were significant. Even more impressive is the comparison of the number that was expected to be significant at the .01 level or better (6) with the actual number that was significant at that level (50). Thus, again the differences between the Hispanic and non-Hispanic means are not due to random errors.

Again we asked if the obtained differences fit the *simpatía* script. Again the results were overwhelmingly consistent with this script. For example, 38 of the 50 differences that were significant at the .01 level or better conformed to the script. Because by chance only 25 would have conformed with the script the result is highly significant ($p < .001$). Again the exceptions are presented in Table 2; they occur when the power distance norm overwhelms the *simpatía* script.

Details of this study were presented elsewhere (Triandis, Marín, Hui, Lisansky, & Ottati, 1984). Again the pattern of differences was consistent with the *simpatía* script, with a secondary set of findings consistent with the power distance script. Thus, out of the 30 opportunities to obtain statistically significant results for associative behaviors, the Hispanic means exceeded the non-Hispanic means on several occasions, and there were no reversals. Specifically, on 16 occasions the Hispanics saw more "respects," on 13 occasions more "helps," on 5 more "loves," on 4 more "protects," on 5 more "gives moral and emotional support," and at least once more

"double dates with," "goes places with," "does homework for," "treats as son," "cleans room of," "cooks for," and "gives money to." By contrast the non-Hispanic means exceeded the Hispanic means four times for the behavior "avoids," four times for "hits," four times for "hates," four times for the behavior "fights with" and once for the behavior "fears."

The power distance script emerged for the behavior "obeys" where the Hispanic means exceeded the non-Hispanic means 14 times, and "disciplines" where the Hispanic means exceeded the other sample's means 16 times. There was at least one occasion when the Hispanics were higher than the non-Hispanics on "gives orders to," "teaches," "gives advice," "checks the work of," and "promotes" as well as on "asks for advice," "seeks protection of," "asks him for things," "asks for money," and "tries to impress." In short, the Hispanics are higher than the non-Hispanics in both superordinate and subordinate behaviors, as is implied by the power distance script.

Finally, the Hispanics were higher than the non-Hispanics once on "tells secrets to," "treats as a buddy," and "feels close to," and the non-Hispanics were higher than the Hispanics on "drinks with" and "drinks together with." One should note that drinking is a behavior that can occur in relatively formal (public) settings, whereas the first set of behaviors suggests more intimacy. However, the differences in the intimacy-formality dimension were not very strong, and this may not be a reliable script.

Control Studies

Is the *simpatía* script due to some sort of artifact? For example, are non-Hispanic and Hispanic subjects using the scales differently? To answer this question Triandis, Kashima, Shimada, and Villareal (1984) used standard Thurstone successive intervals scaling (Edwards, 1957). Scale values based on 55 role differential scales, selected according to certain criteria, were computed separately for the Hispanic and non-Hispanic samples. The *simpatía* script was examined with these ratio scale values (because we are dealing with a probability scale there is a zero point). The *simpatía* script emerged just as clearly in spite of this conversion of the data.

Second, Triandis, Kashima, Shimada, and

Villareal (1984) reasoned that if *simpatía* is really a culturally based script it should become less prevalent when the subjects are acculturated. Using the four acculturation indexes developed by Triandis, Kashima, Hui, Lisansky, and Marín (1982), they examined if the *simpatía* script is present among those who are highly acculturated. There was some evidence of a reduction in the intensity of the *simpatía* script, as well as the power distance script, among those who were more acculturated.

Specifically, the four acculturation indexes are orthogonal and measure different aspects of acculturation. Index 1 reflects the Hispanic subject's length of stay in this country and the number of U.S. citizen relatives the subject has. Those low on this index (low-high being determined by a median split on the index) did not show the *simpatía* script for positive behaviors, but they still did show it for negative behaviors ($p < .000$). The more acculturated subjects also showed a significant reduction in the power distance script. For example, the correlation between the acculturation index and the judgment of "son obeys father" was $-.33$ ($p < .05$) and of "worker obeys foreman" it was $-.39$ ($p < .01$), and of "worker fights with-argues with foreman" it was $.34$ ($p < .05$).

The second index reflects the amount of exposure of the Hispanic subjects to English language TV and movies. This index showed a positive correlation with the behaviors "hits" and "ignores." In half of the roles the correlation reached significance, indicating that the more exposure to the English mass media, the more the Hispanics perceived that the behaviors "would hit" and "ignore" are likely to occur in the roles. This is obviously a reduction on the negative side of the *simpatía* script, but it is limited to only these two behaviors.

The third index reflects the attitudes of the subjects toward having English-speaking friends and co-workers. The more they would like to have such social relationships the more egalitarian are their perceptions concerning the way high status persons (e.g., father, foreman, Naval Officer) will act toward lower status persons. Thus, this index, just like the first, also correlated with a reduction of the power distance script.

The fourth index reflects the past history of the subject: how many English-speaking friends and romantic partners he has had. This index shows a strong correlation with the probability that "fights with-and argues with" will occur in the roles. Thus, there is a reduction of the *simpatía* script with this index. For example, fighting in the friend-friend role correlates $.48$ ($p < .001$) with this index.

Discussion

The presence of a strong *simpatía* script in three populations of Navy Hispanic recruits, obtained with rather different instruments, gives us some confidence that this is indeed a Hispanic cultural script.

It is clear from the data that Hispanics expect much more positive behaviors in positive (associative) social situations than non-Hispanic respondents. The emphasis on harmony and on the externalization of positive feelings is quite clear as could be expected from the assumption of a *simpatía* social script among Hispanics and Latin Americans. The expected deemphasis of negative behaviors in negative situations was found for all samples except for our bilingual respondents. This could be due to differences in status (the bilinguals were university college students), acculturation, social class or to other factors that deserve further exploration.

The confirmation of the preference for harmonious social relations among Hispanics and the overall agreements of our data with the implications of *simpatía* as a social script and being *simpático* as a valued personal trait constitute an important step in defining preferred patterns of interpersonal relations for Hispanics. The ignorance of these expectancies by other cultural groups brings about discomfort and stress in intergroup relations, as showed in our data by the differences in results when the interacting dyads (actor and target) were homogeneous or heterogeneous in ethnicity.

In addition to the *simpatía* script the role differential results suggest the presence of a power distance script. That is, Hispanics more than non-Hispanic subjects saw high status actors as more likely to discipline, give orders to, and less likely to treat as a brother, ask

for permission, reveal intimate thoughts, or tell personal problems to a lower status person.

The implications of the existence of such a script for interactions between Hispanic and non-Hispanic persons are that to the extent that non-Hispanics deviate from the *simpatía* script, by criticizing too much, or competing too much, they are likely to be rejected by Hispanics. However, the effect of these difficulties may be moderated in the case of high status persons, who can engage in more superordinate behaviors, without rejection from Hispanics, because of the operation of the power distance script.

The *simpatía* script is one of the components of a more general pattern of cultural differences between Hispanics and non-Hispanic, in which interpersonal behaviors are more important than task achievements in the case of the former than in the case of the latter. This more general pattern can be seen in the case of Hispanics compared to the non-Hispanics, in a number of other findings, such as (a) greater emphasis on talking with friends, even if that makes one late for an appointment, (b) greater importance given to the values of loyal, respected, dutiful, and gracious, (c) more emphasis on cooperation and interpersonal helping, (d) greater willingness to sacrifice oneself for the sake of attending family functions, (e) preference for services (physician, lawyer) received from friends, even if the friends are not too competent. These findings have been reviewed by Triandis (1983), and suggest that Hispanics are allocentric rather than idiocentric. That is, they pay attention to the needs, goals, values, and points of view of others to a greater extent than to their own individual needs, goals, or values.

This general pattern is of itself a component of an even more general pattern of collectivism, found in most traditional societies. Triandis (1983) reviewed studies suggesting that collectivism versus individualism is a major dimension of cultural difference in social behavior. Individualism has been found to be empirically linked to high Gross National Product (GNP) per capita but also to high divorce, delinquency, crime, and suicide rates and to poor mental health. Triandis's review suggested that individualism is linked to migration, occupational mobility, a large

number of Nobel prizes, interpersonal relations as a means rather than as an end, emphasis on equity rather than equality or need in distributing resources, internal locus of control, less acquiescent response set in answering attitude items, experimentation with new life-styles but also more insecurity, loneliness, and alienation.

One possible limitation of the present findings is that they are based on responses to paper-and-pencil instruments. However, observations of behavior appear consistent with the *simpatía* script. For example, a striking difference in behavior patterns is observed when comparing the meetings of the American Psychological Association with those of the Interamerican Society of Psychology. In the latter there are much higher frequencies of hugging, kissing, holding hands, touching, and being late for sessions (often due to finding a friend on the way to the session) than in the former. Thus, the *simpatía* script is reflected in actual behavior and is a central component of more general, culturally based patterns of social behavior.

References

- Alum, R. A., & Manteiga, F. P. (1977). Cuban and American values: A synoptic comparison. In *Hispanic sub-cultural values: Similarities and differences* (pp. 184-202). Mosaic (ERIC ED 144466).
- Burma, J. H. (1970). *Mexican-Americans in the United States: A reader*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Diaz-Royo, A. T. (1974). *The enculturation process of Puerto Rican highland children*. (Doctoral dissertation, University of Michigan). (University Microfilms No. 75-12506, 324)
- Doi, T. L. (1973). *The anatomy of dependence*. Tokyo: Kodansha International.
- Edwards, A. L. (1957). *Techniques of attitude scale construction*. New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts.
- Feldman, R. E. (1968). Response to compatriot and foreigner who seek assistance. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 10, 202-214.
- Fitzpatrick, J. P. (1971). Puerto Rican Americans (the meaning of migration to the mainland). In M. M. Gordon (Ed.), *Ethnic groups in American life series* (pp. 251-257). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Godsell, G. (1982, July). *Work values and work value conflict in South African organizations*. Paper read at the meetings of the International Association of Cross-Cultural Psychology, Aberdeen, Scotland.
- Heller, C. S. (1966). *Mexican American youth: Forgotten youth at the crossroad*. New York: Random House.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Kagan, S., & Madsen, M. (1971). Cooperation and competition of Mexican, Mexican American, and An-

- glo-American children of two ages under four instructional sets. *Developmental Psychology*, 5, 32-39.
- Kagan, S., & Madsen, M. (1972). Rivalry in Anglo American and Mexican children of two ages. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 24, 214-220.
- Kagan, S., Knight, G. P., & Martinez-Romero, S. (1982). Culture and the development of conflict resolution style. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13, 43-59.
- Landy, D. (1959). *Tropical childhood: Cultural transmission and learning in a rural Puerto Rican village*. Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press.
- Madsen, W. (1972). *Mexican Americans of South Texas* (2nd ed.). New York: Holt, Rinehart & Winston.
- Marín, G., & Marín, B. V. (1982). Methodological fallacies when studying Hispanics. In L. Bickman (Ed.), *Applied social psychology annual* (Vol. 3, pp. 99-117). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Marín, G., Triandis, H. C., Betancourt, H., & Kashima, Y. (1983). Ethnic affirmation versus social desirability as a determinant of discrepancies in the responses of bilinguals to a questionnaire. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 14, 173-186.
- Murillo, N. (1976). The Mexican-American family. In C. A. Hernandez, M. J. Haug, & N. N. Wagner (Eds.), *Chicanos: Social and psychological perspectives* (pp. 15-25). St. Louis: Mosby.
- Padilla, A. M. (1980). *Acculturation: Theory, models and some new findings*. Boulder, Colorado: Westview Press.
- Real Academia Española. (1980). *Manual dictionary and illustration of the Spanish language (Diccionario manual e ilustrado de la lengua española)*. Madrid: Espasa-Calpe.
- Rubel, A. J. (1970). Perceptions of social relations: A comparative analysis. In J. H. Burma (Ed.), *Mexican Americans in the United States: A reader*. Cambridge, MA: Schenkman.
- Triandis, H. C. (1972). *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C. (1983). *Allocentric vs. idiocentric social behavior: A major cultural difference between Hispanics and mainstream*. (Technical Report No. 16). Department of Psychology, University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign.
- Triandis, H. C., Hui, C. H., Albert, R. D., Leung, S., Lisansky, J., Diaz-Loving, R., Plascencia, L., Marín, G., Betancourt, H., & Loyola-Cintrón, L. (1984). Individual models of social behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 46, 1389-1404.
- Triandis, H. C., Kashima, Y., Hui, H. C., Lisansky, J., & Marín, G. (1982). Acculturation and biculturalization indices among relatively acculturated Hispanic young adults. *Interamerican Journal of Psychology*, 16, 140-149.
- Triandis, H. C., Kashima, Y., Shimada E., Villareal, M. (1984). *Acculturation indices as a means of confirming cultural differences*. Manuscript submitted for publication.
- Triandis, H. C., Marín, G., Hui, C. H., Lisansky, J., & Ottati, V. (1984). Role perceptions of Hispanic young adults. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 15, 297-320.
- Triandis, H. C., & Vassiliou, V. (1972). A comparative analysis of subjective culture. In H. C. Triandis (Ed.), *The analysis of subjective culture*. New York: Wiley.
- Triandis, H. C., Vassiliou, V., & Nassiakou, M. (1968). Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. [Monograph]. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 8(4), 1-42.
- Tumin, M., & Feldman, A. (1971). *Social class and social change in Puerto Rico*. New York: Bobbs-Merrill.
- Wagenheim, K. (1972). *Puerto Rico: A profile*. New York: Praeger.

Received April 11, 1983

Revision received August 8, 1983 ■