ROLE PERCEPTIONS IN PERU [1]

WALLACE D. LOH   HARRY C. TRIANDIS
University of Michigan, USA   *University of Illinois, USA*

Perception des rôles au Pérou. — Le Différentiateur de Rôle (RD) a été utilisé pour étudier comment les Péruviens (N = 161) perçoivent les rôles. Les analyses factorielles font apparaître cinq facteurs de comportement identiques pour chacune des deux formes de l'instrument qui ont été utilisées. Une analyse factorielle *(two-mode factor analysis)* à 6 types de sujets pour chacune des deux formes, mais il n'y a pas de différences majeures dans les structures de réponses par rapport aux facteurs de comportement. Les échantillons sont supposés provenir de la même population. Les résultats sont cohérents avec l'hypothèse selon laquelle des normes de conduite clairement définies sont liées aux différences dans le statut social des paires de rôles qui reflètent le caractère hiérarchique de la société. L'hypothèse d'une invariance interculturelle de la structure factorielle des normes de conduite est confirmée. Les AA. résument brièvement les différences essentielles qui apparaissent dans la perception des rôles chez les Américains, les Grecs et les Péruviens.

This study examines the structure of role perceptions in Peru with the Role Differential (Triandis, Vassiliou and Nassiakou, 1968). Role perception refers to the subjective definition of what someone in a given social position is supposed to think and do (Mead, 1934), that is, his perception of the modes of behaviors that are considered appropriate by the culture for the actors in certain role positions. The study of role perceptions, then, focuses on the patterned relationship between the cultural and the individual levels (Biddle and Thomas, 1966). A peasant will not learn the behaviors of a landlord since they occupy different positions in the social structure. However, they both share the same culture pattern, and as a consequence, the role perceptions of each include a common set of expectations regarding the appropriate ways of interpersonal conduct. The judicious selection of roles and behaviors in an investigation of role perceptions could lead to the delineation of the main patterns of a social system (Merton, 1957).

Two general hypotheses, one within-culture and one between-cultures, were examined in the present study : — First, it was hypothesized that Peruvian society

is characterized by clearly defined vertical relationships. Anthropological observations have portrayed Peru as having " a natural hierarchical order where few are born to rule and many born to serve " (Whyte and Holmberg, 1956, p. 2). Parsons' (1951) and Lipset's (1967) pattern variable analysis of Latin America in terms of particularistic-ascriptive value orientations dominated by superordinate-subordinate relationships is generally in accord with Peru's historical experience. An analysis of role perceptions should reveal well-defined behavioral norms associated with differential status role-pairs (e.g., peasant-landlord). — Second, it was hypothesized that the factor structure of behavioral norms, as measured by the Role Differential, is invariant across cultures. The Peruvian factor solutions are expected to reveal a high degree of correspondence with the results obtained with the same instrument in the United States and Greece (Triandis *et al.*, 1968)

METHOD

Subjects

The sample consisted of 161 male high school seniors from Lima, Peru. Two forms of the Role Differential (described below) were used for comparison purposes; 77 Ss responded to Form A and 84 Ss to Form B. The schools were selected so as to represent the different socialeconomic sectors of Lima. They ranged from public schools, composed of Indian and *mestizo* (mixed-blood) students of the laboring class, to private Catholic schools catering to white, upper class students. The mean age of the respondents was 17.4 years.

The Role Differential

The Role Differential (RD) is a recently developed instrument (Triandis *et al.*, 1968) adapted from the earlier research on behavioral intentions (Triandis, 1964a, 1964b). The general formats of both the Behavioral Differential (BD), for the measurement of behavioral intentions, and the RD, for the measurement of role perceptions, are similar to that of the Semantic Differential (Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum, 1957).

The concepts judged with the RD are role-pairs (e.g., peasant-landlord). Note that the hyphen between the role-pair members indicates the direction of action. The first member is the actor; the second is the person-object acted upon. A typical RD judgment is exemplified below :

peasant-landlord

would ___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___:___ would not

invite this person to a party

The S indicates by checking one of the spaces whether the behavior of inviting to a party is considered appropriate within his cultural group for a peasant to engage in vis-a-vis a landlord. The instructions stress that what is asked for is not a moral or ideal judgment (what the actor ought to do), but rather, a judgment reflecting what other persons in the respondent's culture actually do.

Form A of the RD employed in this study consisted of 25 different role-pairs, each of which was judged against a common set of 17 social behaviors. Form B consisted of another 25 different role-pairs, each of which was judged against another common set of 18 social behaviors.

Analyses

Two factor analyses were performed with each of the two Forms. The purpose of the first analysis was to determine the factor structure of behavioral norms. The following description refers to the data of Form A, but the procedure for Form B was the same. The responses to the 17 behavior scales for each of the 25 role-pairs were summed for all 77 Ss. The matrix of rolepairs by behaviors was intercorrelated and principal axes analyses with Varimax rotations yielded

five interpretable behavioral norms factors. Next, a two-mode factor analysis (Tucker and Messick, 1963) was done to determine the factor structure of Ss according to their response patterns to the previously obtained behavior factors. The Varimax criterion was employed and six types of Ss based on the similarities of their responses to the behaviors were extracted.

RESULTS

Reliability

The RD instrument has been shown to have high reliability in earlier studies. Correlations of common roles and behaviors independently judged yielded mean coefficients of .92 for American samples and .89 for Greek samples (Triandis *et al.*, 1968). Two role-pairs were repeated with identical behaviors in Forms A and B to check the reliability of the present data. The correlations obtained were .90 and .87, for the two forms respectively.

Factor structure of behavioral norms

Forms A and B of the RD each resulted in five behavior factors; they accounted for 91 % and 96 % of the variance, respectively. The factor solutions are presented in Tables 1 and 2 (p. 178-9). With Form A, the first behavior factor is REJECTION. It is defined by the behaviors of *mock, ignore, avoid,* etc. The second factor is termed RESPECT and is defined by the behaviors of *admire the character* and *obey.* The third is FORMAL FRIENDSHIP and is defined by *treat as an equal.* The fourth factor, SUBORDINATION, is characterized by high loadings on *envy, not treat as a subordinate,* and *accept marriage to own sister.* The fifth factor is MARITAL ACCEPTANCE and is characterized by loadings on *marry, accept as compadre* (godfather) and *accept marriage to own sister.* The factor structures obtained with Form B are remarkably similar. The first factor is RESPECT. It has high loadings on *trust word of, trust morals of, help,* etc. The second factor involves SUPERORDINATION; it is defined by *punish, refute word of,* etc. The third factor is FORMAL FRIENDSHIP; it is defined by the behaviors of *invite to party* and *accept as business partner.* The fourth consists of only one high loading scale : *accept as kin by marriage;* this was termed MARITAL ACCEPTANCE. The fifth factor has loadings on *refute word of* and *not admire character of;* this characterizes REJECTION. The correspondence between the factor solutions of the two Forms is noteworthy considering that the two instruments varied in all three of their domains : role-pairs, behaviors, and respondents. This reflects the high reliability of the procedure.

Factor structure of subject types

The two-mode factor analysis yielded six Subject Types for each of the two Forms of the RD. However, examination of each type in terms of the role-pair loadings for each of the previously obtained behavior factors revealed no major differences in the response patterns. It was therefore concluded that all the Subject Types came from the same population. Chi-square analyses for each Subject Type were calculated as a check on possible differences in role perceptions as a function of respondents' social-economic status (SES). The sample of each Subject Type was categorized by high and low factor loadings on the role-pairs and by five levels of SES. The results showed only four of the twelve chi-squares for both Forms to be significant. Hence the null-hypothesis that Ss of different

SES levels would not differ in the relative frequency with which they were high or low on each of the Subject Types was not rejected. This finding is not surprising because the present sample is in fact a select, homogeneous group, with regard to educational attainment. About 50 % of the national population is illiterate, and of every 1000 children who enter the first year of grammar school, only 51 graduate from high school (Whyte, 1961). Against this background, the high school seniors tested were indeed an educationally elite group.

TABLE 1

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTORS FROM ROLE DIFFERENTIAL
JUDGMENTS (FORM A) OF PERUVIAN SUBJECTS (N = 77)[1]

Behavior factor	Behaviors with highest loadings
Factor I. REJECTION (32 %)[2]	
Insult	.87
Avoid relations with	.89
Mock	.97
Ignore	.92
Deprecate	.96
Factor II. RESPECT (19 %)	
Admire character of	.80
Obey	.93
Trust in word of	.81
Factor III. FORMAL FRIENDSHIP (16 %)	
Invite to movies	.82
Treat as an equal	.88
Accept as intimate friend	.64
Factor IV. SUBORDINATION (12 %)	
Treat as subordinate	-.67
Accept marriage to own sister	.73
Envy	.92
Factor V. MARITAL ACCEPTANCE (11 %)	
Accept marriage to own sister	.61
Marry	.60
Accept as compadre	.87

[1] Based on means of 17 behaviors over 25 role pairs.
[2] Percentage of total variance accounted for.

To illustrate the two-mode factor analysis, the results of the first and most important Subject Type obtained with Form B are presented in Table 3 (see p. 180). (A similar pattern of responses was obtained with Form A so they are not presented here.) The Subject Type is defined and interpreted on the basis of the factor loadings on the different role-pairs to each of the behavior factors. For

example, the loadings for the landlord-peasant and peasant-landlord role-pairs on the behavior scales that define the RESPECT factor are –.51 and –.57, respectively. The Ss perceive both landlord and peasant as having very little RESPECT for each other. It should be noted that the role-pairs listed in Table 3 vary by status. When this variable is considered, the data reveal a fairly consistent trend for the lower

TABLE 2

VARIMAX ROTATED FACTORS FROM ROLE DIFFERENTIAL JUDGMENTS
(FORM B) OF PERUVIAN SUBJECTS (N = 84)[1]

Behavior factor	Behaviors with highest loadings
Factor I. RESPECT (41 %)[2]	
Admire ideas of	.90
Help	.94
Admire honesty of	.97
Trust morals of	.96
Send gifts to	.92
Admire character of	.84
Trust word of	.84
Factor II. SUPERORDINATION (31 %)	
Be on first name basis	.85
Be commanded by	–.97
Refute word of	.80
Punish	.86
Obey	–.90
Be Boss of	.96
Factor III. FORMAL FRIENDSHIP (12 %)	
Accept as business partner	.63
Invite to party	.83
Accept as game partner	.66
Factor IV. MARITAL ACCEPTANCE (8 %)	
Accept as kin by marriage	.94
Factor V. REJECTION (4 %)	
Refute word of	.53
Admire character of	–.32
Trust word of	–.32

[1] Based on means of 18 behaviors over 25 role-pairs.
[2] Percentage of total variance accounted for.

status member to be perceived as less RESPECTFUL, less SUPERORDINATE, and more REJECTING of the higher status member than vice versa. The generally higher loadings for the lower status member on FORMAL FRIENDSHIP may suggest an ingratiation tactic. The overall response pattern, then, could be summarized as one of REJECTION and DISRESPECT towards SUPERORDINATES with FRIENDSHIP

TABLE 3

SUMMARY OF TWO-MODE FACTOR ANALYSIS OF THE ROLE DIFFERENTIAL (FORM B):
FACTOR STRUCTURES OF SUBJECT TYPES DEFINED BY RESPONSE PATTERNS (ROLE-PAIR LOADINGS) TO THE BEHAVIOR FACTORS[1].

SUBJECT TYPE I : HOSTILITY TOWARDS SUPERORDINATES WITH FRIENDSHIP INGRATIATION

Role-pairs	Behavior factors				
	1. RESPECT	2. SUPERORDINATION	3. FRIENDSHIP	4. MARITAL ACC.	5. REJECTION
landlord-peasant	-.51	.58	.35	-.15	-.04
peasant-landlord	-.57	.40	.25	-.32	.40
executive-employee	-.30	.70	.19	-.22	.18
employee-executive	-.48	.68	.16	-.32	.26
teacher-student	-.28	.54	-.45	-.10	.04
student-teacher	-.49	.18	.10	-.45	.12
White-Asian	-.52	.67	.48	-.46	-.03
Asian-White	-.56	.62	.47	-.40	.47
captain-soldier	-.31	.65	-.03	-.08	.29
soldier-captain	-.38	.49	.21	-.35	.19
private-public student	-.54	.63	.43	-.46	.23
public-private student	-.60	.49	.46	-.41	.35
uncle-nephew	-.49	.66	.39	-.28	-.03
nephew-uncle	-.63	.56	.40	-.54	.33
mother-son	-.42	.68	.46	-.27	.12
son-mother	-.43	.55	.14	-.44	.16
laborer-laborer	-.31	.74	.53	-.35	.19
laborer-architect	-.73	.46	.44	-.53	.33

[1] Based on covariances of 18 behaviors for 84 subjects.

ingratiation overtures. It is characteristic of one type of Subject, and distinguishes this type from the other types.

<center>DISCUSSION</center>

The between-cultures hypothesis stated that the factor structure of behavioral norms would reveal a high degree of correspondence across different cultures. A comparison of the present results with those previously obtained indicates that factor invariance has been maintained from one study to another. In general, the behaviors of *admire the character of*, *obey*, and *trust the world of*, define the RESPECT factor in Japan (Triandis, Tanaka, and Shanmugam, 1966), the United States (Triandis *et al.*, 1968), and Peru. *Admire the ideas of* also defines RESPECT in the United States and Peru, but it is associated with FRIENDSHIP in Japan. *Be partners in game* is common to FRIENDSHIP across the three countries, but in Japan it also defines MARITAL ACCEPTANCE. *Be commanded by* is associated with SUBORDINATION in the United States, Peru, and Greece (Triandis *et al.*, 1968). The behavior of *avoid* defines REJECTION in both Greece and Peru. The general pattern that emerges from these cross-cultural studies is the similarity of the factor structure of behaviors. A methodological implication can be derived from these findings. A procedure that maximizes the cross-cultural comparability of research on role perceptions would entail two steps : the independent determination for each culture of a sample of relevant behaviors, and the use of those behaviors common to several cultures as a baseline for comparisons.

The empirical trends observed in the two-mode factor analysis are generally consistent with the sociological and anthropological descriptions of the hierarchical nature of Peruvian social structure. The analysis revealed a consistent trend for the lower status person to be seen as more subordinate to the higher status person than vice versa. Furthermore, the former were perceived as more rejecting and less respectful towards the latter than vice versa. Much has been written on the fatalistic Latin American outlook. The present findings appear to include another dimension, *viz.*, that this resigned perspective is accompanied by negative affect and behaviors. It is often easier to focus on the features of a culture by comparing it with others than by presenting it by itself. Comparison of the Peruvian data with that obtained from American and Greek samples (Triandis *et al.*, 1968) show interesting differences. In the United States, in cases where the actor is of low status, behaviors such as *argue with* are often directed towards the high status person. This reflects the equalitarian character of the society. Peruvian employees, in contrast, are unlikely to confront authority directly in face-to-face situations even when they privately resent improper actions taken by a supervisor (Whyte and Williams, 1963). In Greece, the high status person has very little RESPECT and FRIENDSHIP for the low status person, and both reveal a high degree of mutual REJECTION. The directional tendency of disrespect and hostility of the low status to the high status person evident in the Peruvian data is absent in Greece. Triandis *et al.* (1968) interpret their findings as reflecting the extreme anti-authoritarianism and competitiveness that exist between Greeks who are not considered members of the in-group. The Peruvian pattern of subordination

coupled with general hostility towards superordinate roles stems directly from the hierarchical nature of the society.

REFERENCES

BIDDLE, B.J. & THOMAS, E.J. (Eds.). *Role theory : Concepts and research.* New York : Wiley, 1966.

LIPSET, S.M. Values, education, and entrepreneurship. In S.M. Lipset and A. Solari (Eds.), *Elites in Latin America.* New York : Oxford Press, 1967.

MEAD, G.H. *Mind, self and society.* Chicago : University of Chicago Press, 1934.

MERTON, R.K. *Social theory and social structure.* Glencoe, Ill. : The Free Press, 1957 (Rev. Ed.).

PARSONS, T. *The social system.* Glencoe, Ill. : The Free Press, 1951.

TRIANDIS, H.C. Exploratory factor analyses of the behavioral component of social attitudes. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology,* 1964a, 68, 420-430.

TRIANDIS, H.C. Cultural influences upon cognitive processes. In L. Berkowitz (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology.* New York : Academic Press, 1964b. Pp. 1-48.

TRIANDIS, H.C., TANAKA, Y. & SHANMUGAM, A.V. Interpersonal attitudes among American, Indian, and Japanese students. *International Journal of Psychology,* 1966, 1, 177-206.

TRIANDIS, H.C, VASSILIOU, V. & NASSIAKOU, M. Three cross-cultural studies of subjective culture. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, Monograph Supplement,* 1968, 8, 1-42.

TUCKER, L.R. & MESSICK, S. An individual differences model for multidimensional scaling. *Psychometrika,* 1963, 28, 333-367.

WHYTE, W.F. & HOLMBERG, A.R Human problems of US enterprise in Latin America. *Human Organization,* 1956, 15, No. 3.

WHYTE, W.F. Culture, industrial relations, and economic development : The case of Peru. *Industrial and Labor Relations Review,* 1963, 16, 583-593.

WHYTE, W.F. & WILLIAMS, L. Supervisory leadership : An international comparison. *Proceedings of the Thirteenth International Management Congress,* 1963. Pp. 381-488.