

## **CASE STUDY ANALYSIS OF THE CROSS CULTURE RESEARCH**

**I Gede Nika Wirawan**

ITB Stikom Bali  
email: [nikawirawan@gmail.com](mailto:nikawirawan@gmail.com)

### **Abstract**

The analysis is based on three hypotheses which is not correlated one other. There are three hypothesis used in this research. The first one is the economic explanation, the second one is cultural values, and the last one is cognitive explanation. The first hypothesis (economic explanation) is not reliable if we combine to the third hypothesis (cognitive explanation) because those theories overlap each other. Theory of economic explanation mentions that there is a positive relationship between the economic health of cities and helping people. It means that the healthier of the economic condition in one city would affect the positively in the behavior of the people in helping the other people. So, we would expect that the rich city which has an excellent economic condition would have a tendency in helping the others. Meanwhile the theory of cognitive explanation mentions that the people in the country which have a high walking speed would tend not to help the others since everybody is busy with their own business and have a lack of time to help the people in the street.

**Keywords:** *cross culture, economic condition, cognitive explanation*

## 1. INTRODUCTION

According to Steblay (1987) strangers are more likely to receive help in some cities than they are in others. However, population sized is only one of many qualities that define the character of a city and that differentiate cities from each other (Mikaye: 1989). In this research, the researcher examines the helping behavior in a cross-national with the sample of 23 large cities all around the world. The study in this research has three problems, i.e.:

1. Is helping of strangers a cross-culturally meaningful characteristic of a place?
2. Does helping of strangers vary cross-culturally?
3. What are some community characteristics that are related to helping of strangers across cultures?

Based on the problems above, the research has three main goals, they are:

1. The first objective of this study was to determine if a city's tendency to offer nonemergency help to strangers is stable across situations over a wide range of cultures.
2. A second objective of this study was to obtain a descriptive body of data on helping behavior across cultures using identical procedures.
3. The last objective is to identify country-level variables that might relate to differences in helping.

### • Theoretical Framework

This research uses three theories as explain below:

1. *Economic explanations.* Stressful conditions are associated with maladaptive individual behaviors that are detrimental to the social functioning of the community.
2. *Cultural values.* *simpatia* (in Spanish) or *simpatico* (in Portuguese), characterizes Spanish and Latin American in helping people.
3. *Cognitive explanations: pace of life.* Cognitive processing theories predict that a rapid pace of life decreases the likelihood of finding time for social responsibilities, particularly when those responsibilities involve strangers.

## 2. Methods

The subjects in this study were large cities in each of 23 countries, in America, Asia, Africa and Europe. The experiments included *Dropped pen*, *Hurt leg*, *Helping a blind person across the street*. The data was collected through experiment. First, all experimenters received both a detailed instruction sheet and on-site field training for acting their roles, learning the procedures for subject selection and scoring of subjects. Second, the experimenters practiced together. Third, no verbal communication was required of experimenters. The research is analyzed quantitatively to analyze the number of people in one country who help the experimenter and rank the country based on the number of people who help the experimenter. Meanwhile, qualitative method is used to analyze the reason why some countries tend to be more helpful than the other country.

## 3. Discussion

The most helpful group is Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Lilongwe, Malawi; Calcutta, India; and Vienna, Austria. Similarly, meanwhile the least helpful group is Sofia, Bulgaria; Amsterdam, Netherlands; New York; and Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. This has been explained by the fact that stressful economic conditions caused high unemployment rates and high frequency of business failures. Another strong finding in this study is that cities from Latin America and Spain have a

high number in helping people. This is because of the cultural of *simpatia* or *simpatico*. In addition, there was some tendency for participants in cities in which the people have a high walking speed to be less helpful since the people in that country are very busy and have no time to help the other people.

### **WEAKNESSES**

- **Data Source**

The pedestrian's occupations and other important information such as age, marital status and nationality is not mention in the research. Specific information about the data of the pedestrians is very necessary since their information would give us about their detail personal information, such as age, occupation and nationality. The age is very important information since it would be one of the indicator that could give us information whether the pedestrian helpful or not. For the example, the people who are in their 60s or 70s are old people who are very weak and have no power to help the people who just dropping his pen. So, it is not realistic if we expect the elderly to help us in the street to take our pen which is falling down. Besides, we cannot suppose the elderly to help the blind person to cross the street. The elderly needs help. So, we cannot presume them to give help to the other people in the street. We cannot also expect the children as well, since the children in their early age tend to ignore the older people than them, so that they are not supposed to help the blind person crossing the street. It is also very dangerous to ask children to cross the blind person in the street. This is the reason why the researcher should give the detail information of the pedestrian.

The second weakness from the data source is that all of the experimenters are not actors, they are students who help the researcher in doing the experiments. In this kind of research in which the data is collecting by the experiment in the street need the real actor who can experiments like a real blind people, or like a real people who is hurting his leg, so that the experiments looks real for the pedestrians. If the experiments were done by unreal actor who act like a blind person or someone who is hurting leg, it could look like a fake for the pedestrians. Who will help someone who pretended to be a sick people? Nobody help people who just pretending them self as a sick people in the street. It is just a waste of time for them. So, the involvement of the real actors in this research is very necessary.

- **The result of the study**

The researcher did not mention the exact location of the area, whether the location is close to the supermarket or school. It determines a lot in giving the result of the research. It will determine who the pedestrians are. If the research was conducted in front of the bank for the example it would give the bad result in the research. Since all of the people in the bank might getting in a rush to go get in and out of the bank. The people might not have time to help the people in the street. The same case would happen as well in front of the hospital, all of the people who pass the hospital might have a limited time to get treatment in the hospital and it makes them ignoring the people around them. We could not expect those of people who getting in a rush to help us. That is the reason why we need to know the specific location where the research is being conducted.

Besides, the result does not represent the entire city or nation. In the analysis it seems that the researcher judges the Nation and the city through this experiment, which is not acceptable to determine whether the people of country is helpful or not. Although the research finding shows that Brazil is the most helpful country compare to the other country in the world, it does not mean that all the people in Brazil are helpful. It also the same case like in New York. The people

in New York has a different characteristic with the people in other places in United States since US is a diverse country. So, we cannot label all of the people in US unhelpful just because the research is conducting in New York. The research should be done in some places in one country not only in one place to get more qualification to indicate whether the people in one country are more helpful than the other country.

The analysis is based on three hypotheses which is not correlated one other. There are three hypothesis used in this research. The first one is the economic explanation, the second one is cultural values, and the last one is cognitive explanation. The first hypothesis (economic explanation) is not reliable if we combine to the third hypothesis (cognitive explanation) because those theories overlap each other. Theory of economic explanation mentions that there is a positive relationship between the economic health of cities and helping people. It means that the healthier of the economic condition in one city would affect the positively in the behavior of the people in helping the other people. So, we would expect that the rich city which has an excellent economic condition would have a tendency in helping the others. Meanwhile the theory of cognitive explanation mentions that the people in the country which have a high walking speed would tend not to help the others since everybody is busy with their own business and have a lack of time to help the people in the street.

If we look at those theories, we can see that one theory is overlapping the other. The theory considers that the country with the health economic condition would have the people who tend to be more helpful. All over the word, the city which has a health economic environment also has a high speed of walk. In the city which has an economic environment like New York, the people have a lack of time since they have to work hard. So, in this case the first theory is not correlated to the second theory. The city with a health economic environment is positively correlated to the behavior of the people to help the other people. Meanwhile the city with a high speed of walk negatively correlated with the behavior of helping the other. So, we cannot use this theory as a parameter of the result in the research since the rich city means that the city also has a high walking speed.

The theories used in the research caused the ambiguity of the explanation in the discussion section about the description why some countries are more helpful than the other country. We could see in the result that the New York City is in the bottom two position. New York is a city which has a good economic environment compare to the other city in the world, this city provide its people with a high standard live, especially in Manhattan. According to the statistic data provided by the official website of New York Government [www.nycedc.com](http://www.nycedc.com) shows that since October 2011, private sector employment in this city has risen by 94,400 jobs, or 2.9 percent. The City's unemployment rate fell from 9.5 percent in September 2012 to 9.3 percent in October. Between September and October, the number of employed City residents rose by 16,700, and the number of unemployed City residents fell by 9,600. And According to Forbes Magazine, America has 8% economic growth this year. The data proves that New York City has a very nice economic condition in which the people can rely on to invest their money.

It would be definitely true if the people in New York City have a high life standard. According the theory of economic explanation, the people who live in the city which has a good economic condition tend to be more helpful than the city which does not. We can see from the explanation above that New York is a very healthy economically and according to the theory that this city must have people with a nice life. It also mentions in the hypothesis that the workers

who were satisfied their pay were more likely to engage in prosocial behavior. But we can see in the result that New York in the bottom two position of the list. So, we can infer from the explanation above that the finding is not representing the theory. Although it is mention that the city has a high walking speed, it is still unclear that this city is in the bottom position of the result. So, it is definitely proven that the theory s not representing the result of the study.

The other problem of the discussion section is that some findings in this research remain unquestionable. For the example, why is Malawi which is notably the poor country in Africa, could be in the top three position. According to the theory proposed in the research, it said that the communities in the poor city are high in the number of unemployment rates and frequency of business failure. This city also had higher rates of crime and other social pathologies. A kind of this city belongs to the city which is unhelpful since their psychological circumstances which is not satisfied with their life standard. We could not expect the poor people who have a big problem to help the people in the street who just drop his pen.

According to the data from the Word Bank, which is cited from the official World Bank website, [www.web.worldbank.org](http://www.web.worldbank.org) it mention that in the last two years, Malawi's economic growth has been slowing down from a peak of 9.7% in 2008 to a projection of less than three percent in 2012, way below Africa's average projected growth of 4.8%. In addition the poverty in Malawi continues to be above 50%, with a quarter of the population still ultra-poor. **So**, based on that information we could infer that it is impossible for Malawi in the top three position in the research since the poorer the country the least helpful the people in that place. That theory could not explain why the people in Malawi are helpful. Besides, the paper does not provide any information why this country belongs to the most helpful group.

In the research paper the most helpful group included places as divers as Rio de Janeiro, Brazil; Lilongwe, Malawi; Calcutta, India; and Vienna, Austria. Similarly, the least helpful group attracted bedfellows as dissimilar as Sofia, Bulgaria; Amsterdam, Netherlands; New York; and Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia. From the data above, the researchers make a generalization that the rich cities such as Sofia, Bulgaria; Amsterdam, Netherlands; New York were high on helpfulness whereas some cities in poorer countries (Kuala Lumpur) were the least helpful. This generalization is not an absolute generalization since the research remain unable to explain why the Vienna is in the most helpful group and why Kuala Lumpur is in the least helpful group.

Another strong finding in this study is that cities from Latin America (Brazil, Costa Rica, Mexico, El Salvador) and Spain were all above the mean in overall helping, and on average were more helpful than the other international cities. This difference can be attributed to the importance of the cultural script of *simpatia* (in Spanish) or *simpatico* (in Portuguese) in Latin American and Hispanic cultures (Rodrigues & Assmar, 1988; Triandis et al., 1984). Although the research has actually mentioned that some cities in Latin America were high in helpfulness but the research does not give clear explanation about that culture.

The culture of *simpatico* and *simpatico* belongs to the Hispanic culture. Hispanic culture is very much people-oriented; Hispanics value relationships and often demonstrate behaviors that promote strong and agreeable interactions. Hispanics value a person's ability to maintain positive relationships even in the stressful condition. This cultural concept is known as *simpatia* or *simpatico*.

*Simpatia* is an intrinsic quality in Hispanics; it does not have a clear translation in English. The concept produces a strong sense of connection. Similar to empathy, *simpatia* highlights a person's ability to identify with others' feelings, and therefore, considers others with

formality and respect. Minimizing confrontational situations and maintaining agreement is an important element of *simpatia*. This might translate into an individual encouraging harmonious social relationships and preferring cooperation over competition.

The culture of *Simpatia* or *Simpatico* needs a clear explanation in the theoretical framework. In the other hand, there is no specific information about this culture in the research. It could make misleading information for the reader since the readers do not understand this culture. Clear information was very necessary to support the information of the theory used in this research. Besides, the finding of this research was strongly influenced by this culture. The reason why Latin American Countries have a high number in helpfulness was caused by this culture.

#### **4. SUGGESTION**

1. Further study is needed to clarify this study. Since the data and the analysis of the study are not reliable, some researches are needed to clarify the data and the findings of the research. The specific data like mention previously is needed in this study. The data of the pedestrian in the street is extremely necessary to know who are the people passing the street or who are the people who help the experimenter. Although the focus of the study is not the people but the specific information of the pedestrians would probably influenced the analysis in the discussion.
2. This research is not qualified enough to judge a country whether the people in that country helpful or not. We cannot judge one country just based on this experiment. We need some experiments to judge a country whether that country is helpful or not. Since the characteristic in different city in one country might different to the other city in that country, we could not give a generalization whether this country is helpful or not. We could not judge all of the people in Brazil are helpful through this experiment. Every person has different characteristics.

#### **REFERENCE**

Levine, R.V. (2001). Cross-Cultural Differences in Helping Strangers. *Journal of Cross Cultural Psychology*, 35 (5), 543-560.

“Malawi Economic Growth” [www.web.worldbank.org](http://www.web.worldbank.org) (collected 10/12/12)

“New York Statistic” [www.nycedc.com](http://www.nycedc.com) (collected 10/12/12)