

Latitudes of acceptance, non-commitment and rejection term paper examples

[Experience](#), [Belief](#)



Syrian Chemical Attack August

Introduction

Social Judgment Theory (SJT) is a persuasive theory that was proposed by Muzafer sheriff, Carolyn sheriff and Carl Hovland. Epistemologically this theory states that there exists a single universal interpretation (of one truth) on how people judge received messages. Ontologically, the SJT theory is deterministic since individual behavior is predictable (Connolly et al. 2000). Axiologically, SJT is value-neutral since the theoretical propositions remain objective and free from biasness. The theory of SJT explains how individuals judge the messages get. The theory also predicts that people accept or reject particular attitudes and messages (Connolly et al. 2000). Weekley and Ployhart (2006) argue that SJT has relative simplicity because it is a relatively simple study. In reference to Weekley and Ployhart (2006) theoretical propositions within SJT are consistent with each other. Weekley and Ployhart (2006) also illustrates that SJT generates new hypotheses, expands the range of knowledge and has organizing power through organizing people's existing knowledge concerning the attitudes in our mind. This paper compares the differences, similarities, stand points and ideas of China and Saudi Arabia through Social Judgment Theory. It further seeks to analyze how Social Judgment Theory relates to the news coverage through this theory by explaining the press coverage by the international media outlets.

Social Judgment Theory exhibits how people compare their sole positions on matters to other people's positions. Bailey (2004) argues that individuals hold personal positions on latitudes and issues they think is tolerable or

intolerable in general for other people. With the surfacing of lethal chemical weapons attacks on the suburb of Damascus, including disturbing images on both local and international TV brought concern from all over the world. The U. S. President had strong words on the use of chemical weapons. The prime minister of United Kingdom David Cameron and his secretary responded to media footage with a robust conversation on individual responsibility to take action instead of sitting back and watching as tragedy unfolds. At this stage, the inspectors of the UN weapons had not investigated and so there was no proof of chemical weapon attack or responsibility of Assad in such an action. China and Saudi Arabia were puzzled by who Cameron and his secretary were talking about, they even emphasized of what and who had bestowed Britain with the responsibility of policing world affairs. Before these issues had been presented in parliament, the media had fully and indignantly produce coverage of dead and suffering Syrians by the Assad regime. They advocated for action upon the doer of these actions and neglected the fact that the source of the footages and their contexts had not been verified. In the midst of all the information coverage and communication china was accusing United States of lying about Syria. China argued that U. S. had messed up with Afghanistan and Iraq. They had also noted that it was the rebels that had committed the attack and U. S. was ignoring that fact in order to attack Syria for political reasons.

China and Saudi Arabia hold individual position on Syrian civilian chemical weapons attack regarding the issue and latitude of Syria chemical attack that happened in August 2013. The two nations and Russia in inclusion seem

to think that U. S. is driven by political agendas. This is a move they observe to be unacceptable from them as competitors. The international media too seem to be influenced by governmental opinion of their native nations. BBC for example puts the blame of President Assad even without any evidence from United Nations investigations; they perceive latitude of rejection from the acts of terror and are not willing to change their perceived blame of the Assad regime. On the other hand, China media seeks to seek the source of atrocities and puts emphasis on the need to investigation caution on interference of Syrian sovereignty.

Bailey (2004) defines social attitudes as non-cumulative especially on the issues of extreme attitude. In this regard, China and Saudi Arabia seem not to take same route with U. S. which would like to exercise their supremacy and solve the Syrian issues from his perspective. China relates their argument from history i. e. America involvement in destabilized Iraq and Afghanistan. Even with these two nations seeming to embrace identical altitude regarding this issue i. e. use of chemical weapons against nations code of governance they have extreme opposite latitude on Syrian chemical weapon issue. While china is against U. S. and U. K. intervention Saudi Arabia on the contrary are against the leadership of Assad, they use of chemical weapons and mass protest and they would look forward for intensive investigation of the claims, though as China they remain against U. S. interference with sovereignty of Syria as a country.

In reference to Connolly et al. (2000), an attitude is a blend of three latitudes or zones. To begin with, is the leeway of acceptance that there is a range are seen as worth consideration or reasonable. The second latitude is that of

rejection; the latitude supports ideas that seem objectionable and unreasonable. In regard to the Syrian Chemical weapon attacks, the thought of use of chemical weapons on citizens is perverse. The last latitude is that of non-commitment; and it represents those ideas that are neither questionable nor acceptable. The media i. e. BBC and Aljazeera have come out to condemn the issues and campaigned to help destroy the weapons used against citizen. The issue of use of chemical weapons against children among other civilian in the country has been demonstrated are objectionable and unreasonable by the media. Notably, the organization for prohibition of chemical weapons has noted that the Obama administration has offered to help technologically, financially and materially to support termination of Assad regime because e of the deadly chemicals before the end of the year. According to Weekley and Ployhart (2006) acceptable, objectionable and non-committal latitudes comprise of a full scale of a persons altitude. Weekley and Ployhart (2006) define acceptance latitude as a range of viewpoints on an issuethat an individual deems acceptable. In the Syrian case, involvement of United Nations investigation is universally accepted by all parties. Regarding the latitude of rejection, this is evident when some nations are against interference of Assad regime to try and calm mthe country's violence and the use of international organs to assist in peace keeping. In reference to Weekley and Ployhart (2006) the latitude of objection has been deemed indispensable in Social Justice Theory in determining a person's degree of involvement and so the propensity to attitude changes.

In reference to Connolly et al. (2000) the higher the rejection latitude, the

harder it is to persuade such a person. The August 21 tragedy in Syria has since changed the U. S. and Middle East policy in a manner that reverberates for many years. Through BBC and CNN media messages U. S. government has been provoked to pull military action in a claim to save Syrian people and force the government of Syria to destroy the chemical weapons. Such are notions that have been received with a lot of hostility by other nations who are in for political and financial interest. It is a clear indication of an extreme opposite latitude with what U. S. has supported.

In the heart of the extreme opposite is the latitude of non-commitment, it has a wide range of standpoints where a person feels initially indifferent. Bailey (2004) has claimed that the wider the incongruity, the more the addressees will change their attitudes. In this regard, the message persuading most is the one which varies greatly from the listener's view but it falls within her latitude either that of acceptance or the one for non-commitment.

According to Hardman (2009) a message is perceived as to be very dissimilar from an individual's anchor and so becomes under latitude of rejection. In our case scenario it makes persuasion very unlikely because of the contrast effect. Russia and China in this regard have a contrasting effect with U. S. and will seek for a way that will change the will of the Americans in order to neutralize U. S. interest and create a fair issue platform that will not seemingly benefit foreign country policy from Syria's misfortune. The Chinese media in this position is non-committed to Syrian matters. In this regard the contrast effect takes place the moment the information is realized to be contradictory to what the anchor wanted to put forward and it therefore falls

within non-commitment latitude are those that are likely to reach the preferred change of attitude. Persuasion to get support to overthrow Assad regime has gained momentum through the use of media to influence the positions of the undecided nations by the U. S.

The researchers of Social Justice Theory speculate firm stand in direct opposite latitude result from high level of ego involvement. The behavior of U. S., China and Russia on the issue of Syria chemical weapons seem to be driven by the ego of the three great nations. Weekley and Ployhart (2006) argue that involvement of ego is important on the issue of personal life that is often established by being in a group which has familiar stand. In keeping with Weekley and Ployhart (2006) work, the point of ego inclusion depends on whether the message (issue) arouses intense attitude on whether the governments involved with a little detachment as initially a realistic matter. Some of the factors that attribute to high involvement of ego are; politics, religion and family - these contribute to ones' self-identity.

In this regard China which has developed a nuanced relationship with Syria is seen to guide its financial ties with the country. China has great socio-economic interest in Syria and will favor any decision in favor of the current Syrian regime. This renewed interest between Beijing and Damascus has made China to have premeditated acceptance latitude towards the welfare of Syria. In this regard Beijing is against any decision that will support meddling with Syrian internal affairs.

In brief, Sherif and Hovland (1980) speculated that people that are highly concerned in some issues are more prone to evaluating all probable outcomes, this results to exceptionally limited or non-existent latitude of non-

commitment. So the latitude in this case depended on a previous scenario and it automatically leads to latitude of rejection. In keeping with Connolly et al. (2000) individuals with deep concerns of overboard opinions on their part of argument are ever careful and reject the issue due to their strong stand point and are extremely unwilling to change their mind. A lot of participation also indicates that individuals possess fairly inadequate latitude of acceptance. In reference to SJT, information falling within rejection latitude is hard to persuade. On the other hand, highly participatory individuals are difficult to persuade. In the case scenario, it is had to change the stand point of Russia, U. S and China due to their close involvement with Syria affairs. In resistance, people with less concern on issues, or with limited ego connection, are probable to possess great latitude of acceptance. Saudi Arabia falls in this category, the country has less involvement in Syrian matters and its fundamental goal is to support whichever channel that will help solve the present predict situation in Syria. In accordance to the SJT theory such parties are less informed and careless about the subject matter and are open to many opinions and ideas regarding and issue. SJT indicates that social judgment regards on how we perceive other people, form impressions and how we analyze social phenomenon. On some occasion we make wrong judgment on people on the basis of bias and discrimination and prejudice. This is the same notion to the country that looks down upon other country and want to interfere with their domestic differences without following the laid procedure by the group of countries and international bodies like the United Nations.

In reference to Balas (2007) attitude change begins with the change on the

distance of involvement. In regard to chemical weapons in Syria, the media has been used to influence nations on the risk behind chemical weapons. This fact has prompted change of attitude by the nations that were at first against interference with Syria affairs and so sovereignty. The position of other nations and their vote on the decision to be taken by the U. N body depends on the closeness of their ties with the Syrian Assad government, influence by the United States and their relationship with the other extreme government. Media also plays a great role in influencing many people on what decision to take. The media in this case will use visual images of slain children to seek sympathy and appeal for fast intervention to the Syrian crisis.

On occasions, the attitude change can be accidental (Sherif & Hovland, 1980). It brings a boomerang effect and change of an attitude to the contrary course from the one is advocated by the message rather than being driven to an idea. Kott and Citrenbaum (2010) further acknowledge that a chief proposition of SJT is that persuasion is hard to accomplish. Connolly et al. (2000) also indicates that successful persuasive message is the messages that target the latitude of the receiver i. e. the latitude of approval and incongruity from an anchor position such that the received message can hardly be contrasted or assimilated.

References

Bailey, G. (2004). NPR activists and classical monks: Differentiating public radio formats. *Journal of Radio Studies*, 11(2), 184-193. Retrieved from <http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=ufh&AN=>

<https://assignbuster.com/latitudes-of-acceptance-non-commitment-and-rejection-term-paper-examples/>

15950011&site= ehost-live

Balas, G. (2007). From underserved to broadly served: The class interests of public broadcasting. *Critical Studies in Media Communication*, 24(4), 365-369.

Connolly, T., Arkes, H. & Hammond, K. (2000). *Judgment and decision making: an interdisciplinary reader*. Cambridge, U. K. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Griffin, E. (2006). *A primary look at communiqué theory (6th Ed.)*. New York: McGraw Hill

Hardman, D. (2009). *Judgment and decision making*. Malden, MA: Wiley-Blackwell.

Kott, A. & Citrenbaum, G. (2010). *Estimating impact a handbook of computational methods and models for anticipating economic, social, political and security effects in international interventions*. New York London: Springer.

Sherif, M. & Hovland, C. (1980). *Social judgment: assimilation and contrast effects in communication and attitude change*. Westport, Conn: Greenwood Press.

Weekley, J. & Ployhart, R. (2006). *Situational judgment tests theory, measurement, and application*. Mahwah, N. J: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Publishers.