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ABSTRACT

US-China business relationships are on the rise, and organizations can benefit from a better understanding of cross-cultural conflict resolution. The objective of this research was to investigate how culture of the other person and type of conflict affect conflict resolution behaviors chosen while accounting for how much of the home country's cultural values an individual conserves. Chinese participants rated themselves on Chinese values and then responded to a scenario involving either a Chinese or US company and either a person or task-based conflict by using a behavior based conflict resolution measure. While manipulations of culture and conflict failed, relationships between Chinese value conservation and conflict resolution behaviors were found. This information is a useful starting point in describing conflict resolution behavior profiles for Chinese workers.
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CHAPTER ONE
INTRODUCTION

US business relations with China can be expected to grow dramatically in the near future due to China’s impending entry into the World Trade Organization. China’s ascension into the World Trade Organization ensures a reduction in trade barriers. In addition, the percentage of Chinese workers in the US workforce increased 69 percent between the years of 1988-1998, and is expected to increase another 40 percent by 2008 (Bureau of Labor Services, 2001). Research regarding cross-cultural conflict resolution is of primary import, as companies aim to effectively mobilize the resultant culturally diverse workforce. Where previously one may have thought of cross-cultural conflict occurring between two people residing in locations distant from one another, this type of conflict may occur as proximally as between two people of different cultures sharing an office space. Conflict resolution strategies are affected by a culture’s social norms which provide expectations of acceptable and unacceptable behaviors, essentially limiting the array of conflict management strategies an individual from a particular culture may choose (Brett, 2001). For example,
the social norms of one culture may dictate that a negotiation strategy that does not incorporate both parties' goals equitably is taboo, while another may embrace the strategy in the spirit of competition. Perhaps the degree to which a culture's social norms affect conflict resolution strategies depends on the extent to which an individual retains the values of their original culture. While some research has been done on conflict resolution styles in different countries, multinational companies could benefit from understanding how cultural value conservation affects conflict resolution behaviors. A second consideration for such companies is whether the culture of the other party (same or other) affects the conflict resolution behaviors chosen. This study attempted to investigate whether there were differences in the conflict behaviors chosen for members of the same culture versus members of a different culture when accounting for Chinese cultural value conservation.
CHAPTER TWO
LITERATURE REVIEW

Conflict Resolution Defined

Rahim broadly defines conflict "as 'an interactive state' manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or difference within or between social entities, i.e. individual, group, organization, etc." (1986, p. 13). He further classifies conflict on the bases of source and/or level. Some sources are incompatible feelings and emotions (affective conflict), scarcity of resources (conflict of interest), differing values or ideologies (conflict of values), different thought processes or perceptions (cognitive conflict), inconsistent preferred outcomes (goal conflict), and disagreements over tasks [substantive conflict] (Rahim, 1986). Levels at which conflict occurs are within one's self (intrapersonal), between two people (interpersonal), within a group (intragroup), and between two groups [intergroup] (Rahim, 1986). The sources and levels can be interwoven into many different types of conflict. Two different types of conflict likely to occur in multinational organizations will be examined in this research, person-based (an amalgamation of affective and value conflict between two people), and task-based (a
blend of cognitive and substantive conflict between two people). An example of a person-based conflict could be if a pushy manager tried to manipulate a shy subordinate. An example of a task-based conflict may be a disagreement between two people over which procedure to use for training employees on a new software system. Through investigating and understanding these two types of conflict, organizations can better develop cross cultural conflict prevention and intervention initiatives.

It seems that an array of conflict resolution tactics would exist to meet the needs of the vast mixtures of source and level of conflict, and this in fact is the case. However, previous conflict resolution research has attempted to classify behaviors into roughly five conflict resolution styles based on dimensions of concern for one’s self and concern for others (Blake & Mouton, 1964). The five styles and other names they have been called are: cooperative (problem solving, integrating), competitive (dominating), avoidance, accommodating (yielding, obliging), and compromising. The cooperative style attempts to address concerns for self and others, and may manifest in sharing information, direct communication, problem solving, creative solutions, and win-win situations (Davis, Capobianco, & Kraus, 2001; Rahim,
1986). The competitive style is characterized by a high concern for self and a low concern for others and may be displayed by forcing an outcome, a win-lose situation, and “ignoring the needs and expectations of the other party” (Rahim, 1986, p. 19). A low concern for both self and others results in the avoidance style, which can be shown through withdrawing from the situation; lose-lose situations, putting off resolution, or apathy (Rahim, 1986). The accommodating style observes a low concern for self and a high concern for others and is associated with trying to find a middle ground, yielding, self-sacrifice, obedience, lose-win situations, and primarily trying to meet the other party’s needs (Rahim, 1986). Compromising is an equal blend of concern for self and concern for others and can manifest in seeking middle ground, tit for tat, and no-win/no-lose solutions (Rahim, 1986). While five styles comprise the popular model of conflict resolution, they do not allow for behavior specific interpretations of conflict resolution, and hence some information on how individuals actually practice conflict management is lost (Davis et al., 2001). The richness of information on conflict resolution behavior is compromised as the subtleties and nuances of said behavior are compressed into only five styles. For example, the
competitive style may be employed in a given situation as trying to win at all costs, while in another as displaying anger, or as retaliating against or obstructing the other person. These different types of competitive conflict resolution behaviors may have drastically different implications and effects. A more detailed, behavior-based conflict resolution model may make understanding conflict resolution tactics and developing interventions to improve conflict resolution practices easier.

Davis et al. (2001) developed a model that attempts to tap conflict behaviors rather than styles as part of a 360-degree feedback tool. This model, called the Conflict Dynamics Profile (CDP), organizes conflict into behaviors which fall under two dimensions, each with two levels: constructive (does not escalate conflict further) versus destructive (feeds the conflict), and active (obvious action is taken in response to the conflict) versus passive (does not require action). In the CDP model, the four cells (constructive-active, constructive-passive, destructive-active, and destructive-passive) contain three to four behaviors each. Constructive-active behaviors include perspective taking, creating solutions, expressing emotions, and reaching out. Constructive-passive behaviors include reflective thinking, delaying responding, and
adapting. Destructive-active behaviors include winning at all costs, displaying anger, demeaning others, and retaliating. Destructive-passive behaviors include avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self-criticizing (Davis et al., 2001). These four categories of conflict and their respective behaviors are the basis from which the conflict resolution behavior measure for this research was developed.

Chinese Conflict Resolution

Conflict resolution behaviors specific to individuals from China are deeply entrenched in Chinese values. The importance of maintaining relationships is a primary value in Chinese culture that affects conflict resolution tactics chosen. For example, in Chinese joint ventures it is important to understand the dynamics of conflict resolution, as the cornerstones of its success are "relationships, relationships, relationships" (Hoon-Halbauer, 1999, Introduction ¶1). Since relationships that serve many interests are dominant in Asian countries, conflict resolution behaviors that allow continuation of relationships are preferred (Leung & Fan, 1997). The concept of guanxi refers to this relationship maintenance (Kirkbride, Tang, & Westwood, 1991). Maintaining harmony,
allowing for face-saving, collectivism, and tendency to rely heavily on contextual messages also shape preferred conflict resolution tactics, and Chinese have typically been found to prefer cooperative, compromising, or avoiding styles in order to adhere to these values, while shying away from open confrontation and openly competitive conflict resolution behaviors (Kirkbride et al., 1991; Leung & Fan, 1997). One caveat, however, involves the perceived differences in status or power between parties. Other tactics may be used when there is unequal power or status, but assertiveness will still be low due to the aforementioned values (guanxi, face-saving, and reciprocity) (Kirkbride et al., 1991). Other characteristics of Chinese conflict resolution include high levels of formalism, remaining vague and general for a longer period of time than normal, “using ‘shaming’ tactics to weaken the other party”, finalizing nothing until the end (a holistic approach rather than breaking negotiation into pieces), and tendencies not to see the finalized agreement as an end of the relationship (Kirkbride et al., 1991, p.380-381). Of particular interest in this research was the robustness of Chinese conflict resolution behaviors across conflicts with other cultures.
Previous research suggests that intracultural conflict resolution styles do not differ from intercultural conflict styles (Alder & Graham, 1989; Tse & Francis, 1994; Ohbuchi, Imazai, Sugawara, Tyler, & Lind, 1997). Tse and Francis (1994) reasoned that the global dissemination of a rational decision-making model (where a business deal is seen as such regardless of culture) would lead to an individual’s consistency in conflict resolution styles, regardless of the other party’s culture. That is, when managing conflict with a member of one’s own culture, one adopts the same conflict resolution style as when dealing with a member of another culture. They found that Canadian and Chinese (from the People’s Republic of China) executives did not alter their preferred conflict resolution style when choosing a strategy in dealing with potential joint venture candidates of the other culture. Ohbuchi et al. (1997), found that Japanese subjects demonstrated no difference in tactics chosen within or between culture conflict resolution. Alder and Graham (1989) only found significant differences in problem solving approaches as a function of within or between cultures for one out of four groups they studied, Francophones. They also studied US, Japanese, and Anglophone subjects and found no significant differences.
In contrast, another framework, the in-group--out-group phenomenon, implies that there would be differences in conflict style depending on the culture of the other person. The term in-group refers to the social category including the self, while out-group refers to the social category that excludes the self (Rothbart & Hallmark, 1988). The basic finding is that more favorable attributes are assigned to in-group versus out-group members (Rothbart, Dawes, & Park, 1984). Some research suggests that in-group--out-group membership can affect preferred conflict resolution behaviors. Tyler, Lind, Ohbuchi, Sugawara, and Huo (1998, p.139) proposed that identity (i.e. relational) concerns would more strongly influence conflict resolution behaviors and perception of outcomes if the individual was “dealing with someone with whom they already had a relationship or with whom they shared values.” While the authors did not look at what conflict behaviors were chosen, they tested perceptions of maintenance of the relationship during the conflict resolution process as well as acceptance of outcomes. They found that individuals were more concerned with relational issues when conflict occurred with a member of their own ethnic group than between a member of a different ethnic group. Individuals were also more accepting of the
outcomes if the other party was a member of their own ethnic group (Tyler et al., 1998).

Lending additional support to differences in cross-cultural negotiation, in a role-playing study where business graduate students had to make business decisions within and across cultures, Hong Kong Chinese participants obtained higher gains in out-group negotiations than in negotiations within their own culture (Brett, 2001). In another study, Tzeng and Jackson (1994) found that participants from an Asian ethnic background who exhibited higher in-group bias had more hostile behavioral intentions toward out-groups (whites or blacks) than those with low or medium in-group bias. Also alluding to style differences as a function of the other party’s race, one study found that humor was used more in same race conflicts than in “other race” conflicts (Smith, Harrington, & Neck, 2000). Rothbart and Hallmark (1988) found that in hypothetical conflict between two nations, in-group members perceived coercive conflict resolution behaviors to be more effective than conciliatory behaviors in dealing with the other nation (the out-group) than with their own nation (the in-group). Participants perceived conciliatory behaviors to be more effective in dealing
with their own nation (in-group) than with the other nation (out-group).

While the previous research indicates that favoring the in-group is usually linked to discriminating against the out-group, Brewer (1999) cautions that favoring the in-group does not necessarily link to hating the out-group. Yet, Brewer suggests that feelings of moral superiority, power politics (e.g. guanxi networks) and hierarchical structure (all of which are present in Chinese society) may promote out-group hostility. Furthermore, Kawashima and Bond & Wang (referenced in Leung and Fan, 1997) found out-group conflict is often “associated with strong emotional antagonism and excessive violence in Japan and Chinese societies (p. 205-206). In light of the in-group--out-group framework, the aforementioned research provides support for the logical supposition that intra versus intercultural conflict resolution would differ.

Collectivism’s Link to In-groups and Conflict Resolution

A dimension that ties in-group--out-group differences in conflict resolution to culture is collectivism. Collectivism and individualism scores have often been used as a measure to differentiate cultures. Individualism has
been defined as "the tendency to be more concerned with one's own needs, goals, and interests than with group-oriented concerns, whereas collectivism refers to the tendency to be more concerned with the group's needs, goals, interests than with individualistic-oriented interests" (Trubisky, Tong-Toomey, & Lin, 1991, p. 67).

China has been characterized as a collectivistic culture, while the US has been classified as an individualistic culture. Brett (2001, p. 15) offers an explanation for the relationship between in-group and out-group status and collectivism: "In individualist cultures, self-identity is likely to consist of attributes that are independent of in-group membership... In collectivist cultures, self-identity is likely to be interdependent with in-group membership." The logical linkage to conflict resolution is that the collectivists' concern for the group makes in-group membership more important in resolving conflicts, in essence "it pays to be considerate of in-group members" when so many group activities are performed (Han & Park, 1995, p. 301).

Much research has pointed out that collectivism is related to stronger delineations of the in-group and out-group, and may also result in employment of different conflict resolution tactics (see Leung & Fan, 1997 for a
review; Triandis, 1988). In a study of conflict resolution in Korean children the dimension of individualism and collectivism was examined (Han & Park, 1995). The researchers found that children scoring high on collectivism discriminated more between in and out-groups than children scoring high on individualism, and also chose different conflict resolution behaviors for the in-group (family and friends) versus the out-group. Leung and Fan (1997, p. 206) further assert that “preferences in collectivistic societies for less confrontational styles of conflict resolution may be restricted to members of the in-group only, such as family and friends.” It is possible that such a preference extends to business in-groups as well since guanxi (the previously mentioned Chinese concept of relationship building), results in brokering influence within relationship networks. Guanxi may be built or maintained through exchanging favors and enhancing social status; this concept plays into why in-groups may be treated differently (Buttery & Leung, 1997). Gudykunst et al. (1992) found further support that collectivists' group membership affects communication with the in-group versus with the out-group (1992). Both Japanese and Hong Kong participants' group membership significantly affected ratings of the communication
variables of shared networks, such that shared network ratings were greater for the in-group than the out-group. Finally, when collectivists bargain with individualists, the possibility of clashing interests (collective versus self) may lead to tradeoffs or frustration as opposing values and interests lead to different outcomes (Brett, 2001). Based on this research, perhaps Chinese people (coming from a collectivistic culture) would elicit a more pronounced differentiation between in and out-group members, and would employ different conflict management strategies based on the culture of the other person.

Taking into account the focus on relationships in Chinese culture, another consideration is the nature of the conflict; perhaps conflict resolution strategies differ by type of conflict. As previously mentioned, person-based conflict is an amalgamation of affective and value conflict between two people, and task-based conflict is a blend of cognitive and substantive conflict between two people. Guetzkow and Gyr (1954) explain that resolution of different types of conflict demand different strategies. For example, in substantive conflict they found that amount of fact finding was instrumental to resolution, while in affective conflict, tackling discrete, simple agenda items, and limiting interpersonal
contact led to resolution; neither of these conditions held for the opposite type of conflict.

Tse and Francis (1994), in a study of executives' conflict resolution styles, found the Chinese (compared to Canadians) adopted more negative conflict resolution styles in managing person-based conflicts (i.e. discontinuing negotiation) and more positive styles when resolving task-based conflicts (i.e. being friendly or consulting their superior). In general, when dealing with task-based conflicts executives tended to use more informational strategies and when dealing with person-based conflict tended to use more behavioral recommendations. Lee and Rogan (1991) found that when Koreans (labeled collectivists) were resolving a task-based conflict they did not change their styles for in versus out-groups (1991). They attributed this to the emphasis on people in collectivist cultures and posited that there would have been differences had the conflict been person-based. In concurrence with this idea, Brett (2001) theorizes that face-saving and relationship issues are more important for in-groups than out-groups. Following this theory, a person-based conflict has the potential to be resolved differently based on in-group status.
Brett (2001) warns that task and procedural conflict may extend into interpersonal conflict, and Rahim and Bonoma (1979) state that interdependency (as in an international joint venture) and jurisdictional ambiguity can exacerbate other conflict types as well; clearly the lines between types of conflict are not drawn with permanent markers. Davis et al. (2001) proposed that employment of certain conflict resolution behaviors to one type of conflict could accelerate the process of that type of conflict leading to additional types of conflict. In sum, it is essential to study both types of conflict and their relationships to conflict resolution behaviors chosen.

Why Haven’t Cross Cultural Differences Been Found?

Given the aforementioned evidence, the question remains as to why research has not previously found intracultural versus intercultural conflict resolution differences. One possible reason is that the measures used to assess conflict resolution style were too broad to capture the variety of meanings of the different behaviors in cultures. The measures used in Alder and Graham’s study (1989) and Tse and Francis’s study (1994) were based on the five broad conflict resolution styles detailed
earlier: cooperative (integrating), accommodating (obliging), competitive (dominating), avoiding, and compromising (Rahim, 1983). Perhaps a more behavior-based measure would detect differences. Recall the earlier criticism of the five styles' weakness in measuring the complexity of conflict resolution behaviors, as subtleties and fine distinctions are compacted into only a few styles. In other words, within one style there could be differences in how that style is employed. The Conflict Dynamics Profile (CDP) measures 15 specific conflict resolution behaviors (Davis et al., 2001). While the CDP has been found reliable and valid, it was developed as part of a 360-degree feedback system for appraising employee performance, and was therefore used as a developmental tool for creating a behavior based measure (Davis et al., 2001).

Second, the degree to which Chinese values were conserved was not measured for subjects. Time spent in a foreign country is related to changes in cultural conservation. One study, measuring cultural contact and value change, had Chinese students residing in the US and China complete the Chinese Value Survey, measuring the importance of 40 Chinese values (Guan & Dodder, 2001). The authors found that after two years in the US, some values
decreased (having few desires, chastity in women, cultural superiority and respect for tradition) as compared to those with less than two years in the US. Overall, some values were higher for American Chinese students than for Chinese students in China. These included courtesy, harmony with others, reciprocation of greetings, favors and gifts, trustworthiness, resistance to corruption, and saving face. The authors speculated that American Chinese students adapted some values in order to function better in the US, and retained others to maintain their identity and stability (Guan & Dodder, 2001). In another study, Chiu and Kosinski (1994) found that for PRC Chinese, high conservation of the Chinese value of moral discipline was related to conflict resolution style, such that avoidance was chosen over competition or cooperation. Perhaps as conservation of Chinese values decreases, conflict resolution style will change as well.

Another related reason that conflict resolution differences have not been found as a function of the other party's culture is based on the possibility that student populations didn't conserve much of their culture (i.e. acculturated to the US), and therefore perceived intercultural relations to be the same as intracultural relations. Research on Hong Kong Chinese has found
participants to be less rigid in their sense of self identification (than PRC Chinese) and therefore posit that they may differentiate less between in and out-groups (Bond & Hewstone, 1988; Tse, Lee, Vertinsky, & Wehrung, 1988). Conceivably this can be extrapolated to time spent in the US for Chinese students. Research by Zhang and Rentz (1996) found that two years spent in the US was again a threshold for intercultural adaptation and satisfaction, and that those students exhibited less in-group--out-group differentiation. One consideration though is that this effect could depend on the amount of social isolation that students feel, which could increase in-group--out-group strength. Also, while cultures are often categorized as individualistic (e.g. the US) or collectivistic (e.g. China), one cannot assume that members of those countries retain the cultural values that would categorize them as such. Due to the complexity of the construct, cultural value conservation is an important variable to account for in cross-cultural conflict resolution research.

This Research

The focus of this study was to examine whether intracultural versus intercultural differences in conflict
resolution style exist for Chinese students while controlling for cultural value conservation, using a more sensitive measure, based on behaviors from the Conflict Dynamics Profile. It also strove to examine whether a second variable, type of conflict (task versus person related), affects conflict resolution behaviors.

The following hypotheses were investigated:

H1: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose different conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher scores on behaviors) for in-group (Chinese) versus out-group (US) based conflicts (main effect for culture).

H2: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose different conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher scores on behaviors) for task versus person-based conflicts (main effect for conflict type).

H3: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, in terms of conflict resolution behaviors chosen, there will be an interaction between type of conflict and culture of the other person.

H4: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose more constructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors
than destructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher mean scores for groups of behaviors) for in-group (Chinese) versus out-group (US) based conflicts (main effect for culture).

H5: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose more constructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors than destructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher mean scores for groups of behaviors) for task versus person-based conflicts (main effect for conflict type).

H6: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, in terms of constructive-passive versus destructive-passive conflict behaviors chosen, there will be an interaction between type of conflict and culture of the other person.
CHAPTER THREE

METHOD

Participants

Participants were recruited from the student populations of California State University, San Bernardino (CSUSB), California State University, Los Angeles (CSLA), University of California, Irvine (UCI), and University of California Los Angeles (UCLA). At each university, a variety of recruitment methods were employed and through international offices, professors, and various cultural clubs the surveys were administered during office visits, classes, and cultural events.

A total of 165 students (78 women and 87 men, mean age = 26.44 years, SD = 5.14), from Mainland China (n = 67), Hong Kong (n = 28), and Taiwan (n = 69) were solicited to participate in the study.

The mean amount of time the participants had spent in school in the US was 4.52 years (SD = 4.45). On average the participants had lived in the US for 5.56 years (SD = 5.20). Participants averaged 3.28 years of work experience (SD = 3.52), for which a mean of 1.38 years (SD = 2.06) had occurred in the US. Majors of study for participants were spread across business (21.5%),
information technologies (20.3%), engineering (16.5%), MBA (15.8%), physical science and math (8.2%), liberal arts (5.7%), behavioral science (4.4%), art (3.8%), communication (2.5%), and Chinese studies (1.3%).

The sample size necessary for this investigation was determined by using Tabachnick and Fidell’s (2001) normality recommendations and a preliminary power estimate for MANCOVA (using an effect size of .5 and a power level of .70). The initial recommendation was 200 participants; however, a slightly lower number of participants was obtained for the sample due to recruitment constraints. All of the participants were treated in accordance with the “Ethical Principles of Psychologists and Code of Conduct” (American Psychological Association, 1992).

It was assumed that time spent in US, and hence acculturation that had occurred, would vary among students. This factor was controlled for, as cultural value conservation was assessed as part of the experiment. As students are required to pass an examination of English skills before admittance into the university, it was assumed that cross-translation of directions, the scenario, the conflict resolution behaviors scale, and the Chinese Value Survey was unnecessary.
Experimental Design

A 2 X 2 between participants analog design with fifteen dependent variables was used to test the hypotheses. The between factors were as follows: 1) culture: in-group (Chinese)/out-group (US) and 2) type of conflict: task-based/person-based. Chinese value conservation was a covariate in all analyses. The dependent variables for the first analysis were scores on each the fifteen types of conflict behaviors chosen to resolve the conflict. For the second analysis the dependent variables were mean scores on the constructive-passive behavior category (comprised of reflective thinking, delaying responding, and adapting) and destructive passive behavior category (comprised of avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self criticizing).

Measures

The Chinese Value Survey

The Chinese Value Survey (henceforth referred to as the CVS) is a cultural value survey developed by Bond and a team of researchers termed the Chinese Cultural Connection (1987), whose main goal was to develop an Eastern measure of cultural value and compare the
dimensions yielded to a pre-existing Western measure, Hofstede's Work Value Survey. Hofstede's four primary cultural valuing dimensions are individualism, masculinity, power distance and uncertainty avoidance. The CVS was analyzed at an ecological (culture) level, across 22 countries and four emergent factor scores were compared to Hofstede's four values. Three factors correlated with Hofstede's dimensions, and one emerged as distinct to the CVS, which the researchers labeled Confucian Work Dynamism (The Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987). The researchers concluded that the CVS measured not only the dimensions contained in Hofstede's survey but also added value by tapping values specific to Chinese, and possibly other Eastern cultures (The Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987). As the survey was developed by Chinese researchers for Chinese culture it has the additional utility of considering values specifically representative of Chinese society. This study employed the 40 item CVS (refer to Appendix A) to obtain a mean cultural value conservation score. The CVS asks participants to rate each value on a scale of 1-9, nine meaning "of supreme importance" and one meaning "no importance at all", how important each of the concepts are to that individual.
Researchers have previously computed factor scores on the 40 item CVS and used those in comparisons between cultures or individuals and in estimating reliability and validity (Bond, 1988; The Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987; Guan & Dodder, 2001; Matthews, 2000; Shen & Yuan, 1999; Yuan & Shen, 1998). Matthews (2000) found alpha reliabilities within each of the four factors ranged from .57-.91, with a mean of .78 and a median of .82. Shen and Yuan (1999) found 11 factors with alpha reliabilities within each of those ranging from .50-.76, with a mean and median of .61. In terms of validity, the Chinese Cultural Connection (1987) compared factor scores for the CVS’s four resultant factors with Hofstede’s four value scores of power distance, individualism, masculinity, and uncertainty avoidance. The factor scores for the ‘integration’ factor (comprised of 11 values) correlated -.58 with Hofstede’s power distance scores and .65 with his individualism scores (power distance and individualism correlated -.77 with one another). The ‘moral discipline’ factor scores (5 values) correlated .55 with the power distance scores and -.54 with the individualism scores. The ‘human heartedness’ factor scores (comprised of 5 values) correlated .67 with Hofstede’s masculinity scores. The fourth factor scores, ‘Confucian work dynamism’ (8
values), did not correlate with any of Hofstede’s scores as previously mentioned, suggesting divergent validity. Following Hofstede’s attempt to validate his dimensions by correlating GNP with value scores, the authors also found that integration and moral discipline correlated significantly with GNP in 1984, $\gamma_{20}$’s = .68 and .46 respectively, and that Confucian work dynamism correlated significantly with Gross national growth spanning 1965-1984, $\gamma_{20}$ = .70. Qualitatively they also asserted that each of the four factors ordered countries on a “roughly Western-Eastern, developed-developing continuum, adding validity to the underlying construct” (p. 158).

Alpha reliability for the 40 item CVS in this study was .926.

**Conflict Resolution Behaviors Scale**

The conflict resolution behaviors scale was developed using the Conflict Dynamics Profile’s fifteen dimensions (Davis et al., 2001). The dimensions are as follows: perspective taking, creating solutions, expressing emotions, and reaching out (all classified as constructive-active), reflective thinking, delaying responding, and adapting (all classified as constructive-passive), winning at all costs, displaying anger, demeaning others, and retaliating (all categorized
as destructive-active), and avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self criticizing (all categorized as destructive-passive). Using the descriptions of each dimensions outlined by Davis et al., a fifteen-item scale was developed for this project. To ensure that there were no cultural biases in the way it was written, a cross-cultural panel was used to pilot test whether the fifteen items corresponded with their respective behavior types. Each panel member (n = 7) was given a list of the fifteen items and the fifteen behavior types (refer to Appendix B) and asked to match each item with its proper behavior. As 100% agreement among panel members was reached on 11 behaviors and 86% agreement was reached on four behaviors (adapting, delay responding, perspective taking, & reflective thinking) all statements were retained in their original form.

Participants were asked prior to completing the conflict resolution behaviors scale to describe the behaviors they would employ in an open-ended question. While measures of conflict resolution behaviors came from the items on the conflict resolution behaviors scale, the open-ended question was aimed at providing a frame of reference for participants in order to prevent the scale from leading their responses. However, approximately 59.8%
(n = 98) of participants did not complete this part. The conflict resolution behaviors measure (refer to Appendix C) employed a four point Likert scale with endpoints of (1) definitely would not engage in this behavior and (4) definitely would engage in this behavior to assess the participants' choice of behaviors. See Table One for means and standard deviations for individual behaviors across the sample. In addition, after completing the scale, they were asked to rank the top five behaviors in order of importance (1 being the most important). Approximately 20% of participants did not understand the ranking directions, hence completing the ranking task incorrectly or failing to complete it entirely (n = 33).

Procedure

The Chinese Value Survey was the first piece of information that students were asked to complete. The following written instructions were given at the top of the survey and read before students complete the questionnaire: "Indicate on a scale of 1-9, nine meaning 'of supreme importance' and one meaning 'no importance at all', how important each of the concepts are to you personally" (The Chinese Cultural Connection, 1987).
Table 1. Mean and Standard Deviations for Continuous Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Resolution Behaviors</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Demeaning Others</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>1.85</td>
<td>0.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retaliating</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>0.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Displaying Anger</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.35</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reflective Thinking</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winning At All Costs</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yielding</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>2.51</td>
<td>0.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiding Emotions</td>
<td>163</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>0.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-criticizing</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.75</td>
<td>0.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delay Responding</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reaching Out</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>2.95</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expressing Emotions</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adapting</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>3.20</td>
<td>0.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating Solutions</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.23</td>
<td>0.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perspective Taking</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chinese Value Survey</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>6.41</td>
<td>0.97</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The second page consisted of answering the following demographic information: gender, age, years/months in school in the US, years/months lived in the US, major, years/months working experience, years/months working experience in US, and geographical area of origin (Mainland China—not Hong Kong, Hong Kong, or Taiwan) (refer to Appendix D). It was thought that these variables would be randomized through the random assignment of participants to scenarios; in order to verify this, they were considered in the analysis.
The Scenario

Using an experiment by Tse and Francis (1994) as the model for this research, students were asked to respond to a decision scenario based on evaluating a potential firm for a joint venture (JV). The process of integrating two companies in an international joint venture can be "perceived by Chinese staff as a major change ... changing of organizational structure, systems, processes, and cultural elements", one which could be a primary cause of conflict between the two companies' staffs (Hoon-Halbauer, 1999, Theoretical Framework ¶ 9). In light of this logic and Tse and Francis's research, conflict was operationalized in a joint venture setting. Culture was operationalized as whether the firm belonged to their home country (Chinese) or the other country (US). Type of conflict was operationalized by the description of the two potential JV firms: one with an arrogant and stubborn project manager who would cause person-related conflicts, and the other a firm that would cause task-related conflicts due to a difference in production technology. A set of questions was incorporated into the conflict behavior measure as a manipulation check. These questions assessed whether the participants correctly perceived the culture of the company as part of their in-group or as
part of their out-group, and whether they correctly perceived a task-based or person-based conflict.

Each participant was randomly assigned one of the following four scenarios to evaluate: Chinese firm/person-based conflict, Chinese firm/task-based conflict, US firm/person-based conflict, and US firm/task-based conflict. This differs from Tse and Francis’s study in that participants only evaluated one firm rather than two, as this study was concerned with overall differences, rather than individual differences.

Upon completing the demographics page, participants were asked to assume the role of a project manager in a large Chinese company and evaluate a potential joint venture (JV) firm based on a description of the firm, which included duration, purpose, return, and potential challenges [i.e. conflict descriptions] (Tse & Francis, 1994). In each of the conditions all of the information besides the culture of the other company and type of task was identical, to reduce confounds of the duration, purpose and return. The participants were told that "other members of the Planning Committee [are] evaluating other potential firms.... [In order] to reduce the motivation to make a choice" about retaining or rejecting the firm (Tse

Measurement of Conflict Behaviors

After evaluating the firm, students were asked to make a recommendation to the planning committee, first describing how they would resolve the conflict, and then using the conflict resolution behaviors scales to further detail what resolution behaviors they would choose, and finally ranking the top five behaviors they would choose.

Debriefing

Students were debriefed as to the purpose of the experiment and given the opportunity to view overall results (not individual results) when the study was completed.
CHAPTER FOUR

RESULTS

Data Screening

Prior to the main analyses of the fifteen conflict resolution behaviors and two conflict resolution behavior categories, SPSS FREQUENCIES was used to evaluate the assumptions of a multivariate analysis of covariance as prescribed by Tabachnick, and Fidell (2001). A total of 165 participants completed the survey. Upon examination of each participant’s responses, none of the variables contained values outside of the expected range. Data were missing from the demographics of 10 participants. Two participants failed to report their age (one in the Chinese-task condition, and one in the US-task condition), six participants failed to report their major (two in the Chinese-person condition, one in the Chinese-task condition, two in the US-person condition, and one in the US-task condition), one participant failed to report their years/months work experience (US-person condition), three participants failed to report their years/months work experience in the US (one in the Chinese-task condition, and two in the US-person condition), and one participant failed to report their area of origin (US-person
condition. The data collected from these participants was retained in all of the analyses.

Data were missing from the conflict behaviors measures of seven participants. Two participants failed to report a score on reflective thinking (one in the Chinese-task condition and one in the US-person condition), two participants failed to report a score on adapting (one in the Chinese-person condition and one in the US-person condition), two participants failed to report a score on yielding (one in the US-person condition and one in the US-task condition), and one participant failed to report a score on hiding emotions (US-person condition). The data collected from these participants was retained for all analyses.

Three univariate outliers were detected at \( \alpha = .001 \) \((z = 3.29)\). One outlier on the 'perspective taking' conflict resolution behavior score \((z = -3.36)\) was deleted from the entire analysis upon further inspection of the participant’s top five behavior ratings; it was suspected that the participant had reversed the scoring on the conflict resolution behaviors scale. This deletion reduced the sample size to 164 participants. The other two-univariate outliers, both on mean CVS scores \((z = -3.33 \text{ and } z = -4.076)\) were retained for all analyses.
upon further inspection. The participants had both resided in the US for longer periods of time (6 years, 9 months and 14 years respectively), making their low mean scores on the CVS (indicating less conservation of Chinese values) justifiable. However, the amount of time they had lived in the US was not the upper bound on the sample. No multivariate outliers were detected $\alpha = .001 \ (\chi^2 = 39.252)$.

Evaluation of Means and Standard Deviations of Continuous Variables

Refer to Table One for means and standard deviations of conflict resolution behaviors and the Chinese Value Survey. Note that the means for the conflict resolution behaviors are on a four-point scale and the means for the Chinese Value Survey are on a nine-point scale. The Chinese Value Survey score is slightly higher than expected in this sample, showing a higher level of Chinese value conservation in this population.

Manipulation Checks

Two measures were used to assess the manipulation of culture and conflict type. Participants who evaluated a Chinese company viewed the culture of the company as belonging to their own culture 26.6% of the time, either
their own or another culture 51.9% of the time, and as belonging to another culture 21.5% of the time.

Participants who evaluated the American company viewed the culture of the company as belonging to another culture 12.5% of the time, either their own or another culture 67.5% of the time, and as belonging to their own culture 20% of the time.

Participants who responded to a person-based conflict perceived the source of the conflict correctly 57.8% of the time, and incorrectly 42.2% of the time. Participants who responded to a task-based conflict perceived the source of the conflict correctly 52.3% of the time, and incorrectly 47.7% of the time.

Despite the implementation of four scenarios that were created to produce a perception of same or different cultures and person-based or task-based conflict types, the manipulation checks clearly indicated that participants did not perceive the scenarios as intended. Participants were expected to view the Chinese company as belonging to their own culture and the American company as belonging to another culture. In terms of conflict type, participants were expected to view the conflict with the stubborn project manager as a person-based conflict and the difference in strategy and production technology as a
task-based conflict. The failures of these manipulations should be recognized while considering the results and findings of this research project.

Evaluation of Statistical Assumptions

Results of the evaluation of normality were satisfactory. Sample sizes were unequal for the four conditions (n = 41 for Chinese-person; n = 41 for Chinese-task; n = 51 for US-person; n = 31 for US-task). Homogeneity of variance-covariance matrices was confirmed using Box's test of equality of covariance matrices, which yielded non-significant results in both MANCOVA analyses (For the first analysis Box's M = 464.29, F(360, 41,145.89) = 1.055, p = .228 and for the second analysis Box's M = 7.52, F(9, 187,542.6) = .816, p = .601 respectively). In addition, the largest to smallest variance ratios for all conflict resolution behavior scores across conditions were less than 10:1 (ranging from 1.24:1 for winning at all costs to 1.94:1 for avoiding), indicating homogeneity of variance. Multivariate normality was assumed since the smallest number of participants per cell (n = 31) did not exceed the number of dependent measures (DV = 15), thus achieving a case to variable ratio of 2.07:1. In light of this ratio, it was noted
prior to analysis that there was an indication that power for the multivariate test would be low. SPSS MANOVA completed the main analysis, providing support for the absence of multicollinearity and singularity. The covariate, CVS score was found to be reliable (α = .926). Results of the evaluation of homogeneity of regression were satisfactory for the last two steps of the analysis. The overall pooled within cell correlation was significant, λ = .931, \( F(4,314) = 2.88, p = .023 \); while the pooled within cell correlations for constructive-passive and destructive-passive were not significant \( F(2,163) = 2.34, p = .100 \) and \( F(5,163) = 1.35, p = .245 \) respectively).

Analyses of Fifteen Conflict Resolution Behaviors

Using SPSS MANOVA, a \( 2 \times 2 \) between subjects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), with an evaluation of univariate effects was performed on fifteen dependent variables (scores on the following conflict resolution behaviors): perspective taking, creating solutions, expressing emotions, reaching out, reflective thinking, delaying responding, and adapting, winning at all costs, displaying anger, demeaning others, retaliating, avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self
criticizing. In all analyses mean scores on the CVS were used as a covariate. Culture (In-group/Chinese versus Out-group/US) served as one between-subjects independent variable. Type of Conflict (Person-based versus Task-based) served as the other between-subjects independent variable treated multivariately. An alpha level of .05 was used for all statistical tests unless otherwise noted.

The covariate, mean scores on the CVS, adjusted at the level of \( p = .055 \) (\( \Lambda = .843, F(15,138) = 1.711, \eta^2 = .157, \) observed power = .899). The covariate explained only 15.7\% of the variance. After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, no significant differences in conflict resolution behaviors were found between Chinese and US conditions using Wilks' criterion, \( \Lambda = .914, F(15,138) = .867, p = .602, \eta^2 = .086, \) observed power = .549. Only 8.6\% of the variance was explained by culture. Therefore the first hypothesis was not supported, H1: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose different conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher scores on behaviors) for in-group (Chinese) versus out-group (US) based conflicts (main effect for culture).
No significant mean differences were found between person-based conflict and task-based conflict conditions when conflict resolution behaviors were compared across groups after adjusting for Chinese value conservation, \( \lambda = .944, F(15,138) = .541, p = .913, \eta^2 = .056 \), observed power = .335. Only 5.6% of the variance was explained by conflict type. Therefore, hypothesis 2 was not supported. 

**H2:** After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose different conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher scores on behaviors) for task versus person-based conflicts (main effect for conflict type).

No significant mean differences in conflict resolution behaviors were found as the result of an interaction between culture and conflict type after adjusting for Chinese value conservation, \( \lambda = .913, F(15,138) = .875, p = .593, \eta^2 = .087 \), observed power = .554. Only 8.7% of the variance was explained by the interaction of culture and conflict type. Therefore, hypothesis 3 was not supported.

**H3:** After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, in terms of conflict resolution behaviors chosen, there will be an interaction between type of conflict and culture of the other person.
To further probe the relationship between Chinese value conservation and individual conflict resolution behaviors, a strict critical value (Bonferroni adjustment, \( p < .003 \)) was used to assess significant relationships. A significant relationship was observed between delaying responding and mean CVS scores, \( F(1,152) = 10.805, \) \( p = .001, \eta^2 = .066, \) observed power = .904, explaining only 6.6% of the variance.

Analyses of Two Conflict Resolution Behavior Categories

Using SPSS MANOVA, a 2 X 2 between subjects multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA), with planned comparisons was performed on two dependent variables: mean scores on the constructive-passive and destructive-passive conflict resolution behavior categories. The constructive-passive category was comprised of the mean scores for reflective thinking, delaying responding, and adapting behaviors, while the destructive-passive category was comprised of the mean scores for avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self criticizing behaviors. In all analyses mean scores on the CVS were used as a covariate. Culture (In-group/Chinese versus Out-group/US) served as one between-subjects independent variable. Type of Conflict (Person-based
versus Task-based) served as the other between-subjects independent variable treated multivariately.

The covariate, mean scores on the CVS, adjusted at the level of $p < .001 (\Lambda = .905, F(2,158) = 8.29, \eta^2 = .095$, observed power = .96). The covariate only explained 9.5% of the variance. After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, no significant mean differences between constructive-passive and destructive-passive categories of conflict resolution behaviors were found between conflicts with Chinese and US cultures, using Wilks' criterion, $\Lambda = 1.00$, $F(2,158) = .031, p = .969, \eta^2 = .000$, observed power = .055. Less than one tenth of a percent of the variance was explained by culture. Therefore the fourth hypothesis was not supported,

H4: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose more constructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors than destructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher mean scores for groups of behaviors) for in-group (Chinese) versus out-group (US) based conflicts (main effect for culture).
No significant mean differences were found between person-based conflict and task-based conflict conditions when constructive-passive and destructive passive categories of conflict resolution behaviors were compared across groups after adjusting for Chinese value conservation, $\lambda = .990$, $F(2,158) = .810$, $p = .447$, $\eta^2 = .010$, observed power = .187. Only one percent of the variance was explained by conflict type. Therefore, hypothesis five was not supported.

H5: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, Chinese participants will choose more constructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors than destructive-passive conflict resolution behaviors (as indicated by higher mean scores for groups of behaviors) for task versus person-based conflicts (main effect for conflict type).

No significant mean differences in constructive-passive and destructive-passive categories of conflict resolution behaviors were found as the result of an interaction between culture and conflict type after adjusting for Chinese value conservation, $\lambda = .998$, $F(2,158) = .152$, $p = .859$, $\eta^2 = .002$, observed power = .073. Only two tenths of one percent of the variance was explained by the interaction between culture
and conflict type. Therefore, hypothesis six was not supported,

H6: After adjusting for Chinese value conservation, in terms of constructive-passive versus destructive-passive conflict behaviors chosen, there will be an interaction between type of conflict and culture of the other person.

To further investigate the relationship between Chinese value conservation and conflict resolution categories, a strict critical value was adopted (Bonferroni adjustment, \( p < .025 \)). A significant relationship was observed between the constructive-passive behavior category and mean CVS scores, \( F(1,159) = 16.284, p < .001, \eta^2 = .093, \) observed power = .980. Only 9.3% of the variance was explained by the constructive-passive behavior category.
CHAPTER FIVE

DISCUSSION, LIMITATIONS, AND IMPLICATIONS

The focus of this study was to examine whether intracultural versus intercultural differences in conflict resolution style existed for Chinese students while adjusting for cultural value conservation, using a more sensitive measure, based on behaviors from the Conflict Dynamics Profile. It also examined whether a second variable, type of conflict (task versus person related), affected conflict resolution behaviors. Previous research on cross cultural conflict resolution has been equivocal in nature, leaning toward a consistent conflict resolution style across cultures. Based on a different framework (in-group/out-group), a more sensitive conflict resolution measure, and adjusting for value conservation, this research hypothesized that differences would be found as a function of culture, conflict type, and their interaction.

To further our understanding of cross cultural conflict resolution, fifteen conflict resolution behaviors (perspective taking, creating solutions, expressing emotions, reaching out, reflective thinking, delaying responding, adapting, winning at all costs, displaying
anger, demeaning others, retaliating, avoiding, yielding, hiding emotions, and self criticizing) were rated as part of a prospective self-report (role-play) involving a scenario which participants responded to using the conflict resolution behaviors scale. Chinese value conservation was also assessed for each participant.

The scenarios were as follows: Chinese company/person-based conflict, Chinese company/task-based conflict, US company/person-based conflict, or US company/task-based conflict). However, upon analysis of the manipulation checks, participants did not perceive the scenarios as intended. Participants were expected to view the Chinese company as belonging to their own culture and the US company as belonging to another culture. One possible explanation is that perhaps participants were attempting to respond in a socially desirable manner. Inclusion of a social desirability measure could have assessed this. Another possible explanation is that the in-group out-group paradigm may not extend to Chinese culture. Campbell, Graham, Jolibert, and Meissner (1988) only found support for the in-group--out-group phenomenon among American subjects when studying intercultural buyer/seller relationships in France, Germany, the United Kingdom, and the US. Despite participants perceiving both
companies belonging to either their own or another culture most frequently, this research still provides a glimpse of how individuals might be expected to interact with people who do not entirely belong to their culture.

In terms of conflict type, participants were expected to view the conflict with the stubborn project manager as a person-based conflict and the difference in strategy and production technology as a task-based conflict. The differences between correct and incorrect perceptions of conflict type were marginal. Perhaps the delineation between person and task-based conflicts is imprecise in actual conflict situations or the descriptors given were insufficient, as suggested by the 22.1% of participants who chose 'not sure' and the 6.1% who chose 'none of these' when asked to specify the source of the conflict. In the case that this ambiguity mirrors actual conflict situations, the results of this research may still be of some utility. Recall that Brett (2001) warned that task and procedural conflict may extend into interpersonal conflict and Davis et al. (2001) proposed that employment of certain conflict resolution behaviors to one type of conflict could accelerate the process of that type of conflict leading to additional types of conflict. The failures of these manipulations should be recognized while
considering the results and findings of this research project.

In the first analysis, which looked for differences in individual conflict resolution behaviors, support was not found for any of the three hypotheses addressing culture, conflict type and the interaction (H1, H2, and H3). These results could be due to the lack of discrimination between conditions previously assessed by the manipulation checks. Another possible explanation involves power. In terms of strength as a covariate, Chinese value conservation was weak, only approaching significance when the power was extremely high (.899), and still only accounting for 15.7% of the variance. In further analyses, only one behavior: delaying responding was significantly related to Chinese value conservation, and this accounted for only 6.6% of the variance. Kirkbride et al. (1991) described that remaining vague and general for a longer period of time as well as a desire to maintain harmony were characteristic of Chinese conflict resolution. The insignificant results for the first three hypotheses are not surprising when the observed power is evaluated. The power for the samples tested was extremely low: H1 = .549, H2 = .335, and H3 = .554. Apparently the
sample sizes were not large enough; perhaps an increase in sample size would have yielded significant results. Still, the effect sizes were small, so the sample size may not have been the only limitation. For example, a post hoc power analysis for H1 incorporating the small effect size ($\eta^2 = .056$) and power (observed power = .335) showed that in order to find a significant effect for culture, a sample of 1,930 subjects would have been needed. Yet another possibility is that no differences as a function of culture exist. Bear in mind that much previous research had found no differences between intracultural conflict resolution styles and intercultural conflict styles (Alder & Graham, 1989; Tse & Francis, 1994; Ohbuchi, Imazai, Sugawara, Tyler, & Lind, 1997).

In the second analysis, which combined the appropriate individual conflict resolution behaviors into their respective categories of constructive-passive and destructive-passive in order to look at the same independent variables (culture, conflict type, and their interaction), a lack of support was found for hypotheses 4, 5, and 6. As the combined variables are comprised of individual behaviors these findings are not surprising. The culprits of the insignificant effects could be similar to those for H1, H2, and H3: manipulation check issues and
power. In these three hypotheses, Chinese value conservation only accounted for 9.5% of the variance, (again a weak covariate), but the power was extremely high (.96), which explains the significance level of $p < .001$. In further analyses, the constructive-passive category's relationship to cultural conservation accounted for 9.3% of the variance, still a small amount. The power was extremely low for testing H4 (.055), H5 (.187), and H6 (.073), so the hope for finding significance with the sample in this study was unfeasible.

Although the results of this research did not support the logic of in-group--out-group affecting cross cultural conflict resolution behaviors, two pieces unique to this research show promise: assessing Chinese value conservation and using a behaviorally based measure versus a style based measure. While Chinese value conservation was a weak covariate, it still did account for a piece of the variance between which conflict resolution behaviors were chosen. This speaks to the persistence of a culture's social norms on conflict resolution behaviors even after the person has left their own country. The behavior based measure also played an interesting part in this study. Had broad styles been used, perhaps the relationship between Chinese value conservation and delaying responding would
not have been detected. One could argue that combining the variables into the four categories (constructive-active, constructive-passive, destructive-active, and destructive-passive) is akin to using a broad style based measure; however, the breakdown of behaviors in those categories seems to be a more useful tool in interpretation. For example, in the relationship between constructive-passive behaviors and Chinese value conservation: reflective thinking, delaying responding, and adapting or any combination of these behaviors could be employed by Chinese people as a function of how much of their values are conserved. The specific pinpointing of relevant behaviors is a more useful tool for multinational organizations in assessing and preventing communication problems.

While the results for all of the hypotheses were insignificant, mean conflict resolution behavior scores and ratings can be used in a descriptive manner, and in terms of profiling Chinese conflict resolution behaviors for these situations. As previously mentioned, the mean conflict resolution scores for the entire sample can be looked at as a profile of the likelihood that Chinese people will engage in certain behaviors when involved in a conflict whose source is ambiguous with a company that
does not entirely belong to their culture. Referring to Table one, it is noted that perspective taking, creating solutions, adapting, and expressing emotions are among the most likely behaviors to be employed, while demeaning others, retaliating, and displaying anger are among the least likely to be employed. Of interest again is the sensitivity of using a behavioral measure. Previous Chinese conflict resolution literature has stated that Chinese tend to use an avoiding, cooperative, or compromising style and to rely heavily on contextual messages while shying away from open confrontation and openly competitive conflict resolution behaviors (Kirkbride et al., 1991; Leung & Fan, 1997). With the behavioral measure used in this research, it was revealed that for this sample, avoiding is actually 12th out of 15 on the span of behaviors, while expressing emotions openly is 4th out of 15. In terms of compromising and cooperating, it appears that this sample is open to the confrontation as well by trying to create solutions (2nd out of 15), expressing emotions (4th out of 15) and reaching out (5th out of 15). In conclusion, the more sensitive measure can be utilized by sample to tease out nuances in conflict resolution tactics where broad styles
could not and may have improperly characterized the sample's preferred tactics.

Limitations

Scenarios

As neither of the manipulation checks was successful, future research should attempt to create scenarios with a more clear depiction of culture and conflict type. Perhaps the title of the company and name of the person in conflict were insufficient to correctly perceive the culture. A more detailed description of the company, with more American or Chinese indications, or perhaps a snapshot of that culture's employees could have potentially improved the depiction of culture. In terms of task, perhaps it could be specified for each conflict type that the other type of conflict does not exist. For example, in the person-based conflict specifying that the manager has similar thought processes and agrees about how to accomplish the tasks, would have led to better delineation of the conflict source among participants.

Another limitation of the proposed study is that it is a prospective self-report, so it may or may not have external validity. Had the hypotheses been supported, a logical extension of the research would be to develop and
test a creative version of the experiment in an organizational setting. The study is also limited in that the type of conflict may not generalize to other settings (i.e. the conflict may be situation specific). For example, the conflict behaviors chosen in a person-based conflict in assessing a potential joint venture firm may not be the same behaviors chosen in a person-based conflict among members of an established team. Other avenues for research should investigate these hypotheses using different scenarios for task and person-based conflicts.

**Sample Size**

As discussed in the previous section, power was an issue in all of the analyses. A larger sample was required of this research. In terms of effect sizes, if national differences existed, larger effect sizes may have been observed if a larger sample were recruited and partitioned into Mainland Chinese, Taiwanese, and Hong Kong nationalities. As participants' recruitment was challenging due to the length of the survey and the availability to recruit Chinese international students from multiple sources, it is suggested that future efforts involve a shortened, web-based survey which could be completed online.
Participants

The sample plays a critical role in the ability to generalize the results. Clearly, university students do not represent the full range of Chinese employees. Even the subset of students who choose to study in the US could have affected the results. There is the possibility that a sojourner effect exists, where those who choose to migrate to the US behave differently than those who choose to stay in China. Conducting this research using employees from actual Chinese or multinational companies would have been optimal, but posed some concerns. For instance, English proficiency was of concern, and using a university sample guarded against language confounds. Therefore, based on the ease of sampling, the likelihood that these participants would enter an organizational setting at some point, and translation issues, university students were sampled.

Implications

The results of this research help address equivocal findings in past literature on cross cultural conflict resolution, supporting previous research of a consistent cross-cultural conflict resolution style. In terms of the Chinese value survey, future research should aim to relate
Chinese value conservation to conflict resolution behaviors when responding to other conflict situations. Other measures of value conservation should be explored in this manner as well. Future research should also include a measure of social desirability to assess its impact on responses.

Organizations can benefit from understanding the complex profile of conflict resolution behaviors chosen by Chinese workers during a conflict involving someone not entirely from their own culture and of an ambiguous source. The behavior based conflict resolution measure could be used to create conflict resolution profiles for other countries and perhaps additional research would show which country’s profiles overlap with one another. With this information, organizations could offer training aimed at preventing communication breakdowns due conflict resolution behaviors and perceptions of the other culture. They could develop strategies for building and maintaining the cross-cultural relationships that are so important in the success of international joint ventures. Lastly, they could better create plans for resolving impasses in cross-cultural negotiations, by having a framework to use in diagnosing where and why the negotiations have broken down.
APPENDIX A

THE CHINESE VALUE SURVEY
The aim of this first questionnaire is to find out what matters are important or unimportant to people. You will find on this and the next page a list of 40 items. Please indicate how important each of the 40 items is to you.

To express your opinions, imagine an importance scale that varies from 1 to a maximum of 9, where 1 stands for "no importance to me at all", and 9 stands for "supreme importance to me." In other words, the larger the number, the greater the degree of importance that item has for you. Circle one number (either 1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8, or 9) for each item to express how important that item is to you personally.

You can concentrate better by asking yourself the following question when you rate an item: "How important is this item to me personally?" Repeat the same question when you rate the next item. Thank you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No importance to me at all</th>
<th>Medium importance to me</th>
<th>Supreme importance to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Filial piety (Obedience to parents, respect for parents, honoring of ancestors, financial support for parents).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Industry (Working hard).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Tolerance of others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Harmony with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Humbleness.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Loyalty to superiors.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Observation of rites and social rituals.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Reciprocation of greeting, favors, and gifts.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Kindness (Forgiveness, compassion).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Knowledge (Education).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Solidarity with others.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No importance to me at all</th>
<th>Medium importance to me</th>
<th>Supreme importance to me</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Moderation, following the middle way.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Self-cultivation.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Ordering relationships by status and observing this order.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Sense of righteousness.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Benevolent authority.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Non-competitiveness.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>Personal steadiness and stability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Resistance to corruption.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>Patriotism.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Sincerity.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>Keeping one's self disinterested and pure.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Thrift.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>Persistence (Perseverance).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Patience.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Repayment of both the good or the evil another person has caused you.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>A sense of cultural superiority.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Adaptability.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>Prudence (Carefulness).</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Trustworthiness.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Having a sense of shame.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Courtesy.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No importance to me at all</td>
<td>Medium importance to me</td>
<td>Supreme importance to me</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33. Contentedness with one's position in life.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34. Being conservative.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35. Protecting your &quot;face.&quot;</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36. A close, intimate friend.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37. Chastity in women.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38. Having few desires.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39. Respect for tradition.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40. Wealth.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX B

PILOT TEST FOR EVALUATING CONFLICT RESOLUTION BEHAVIOR ITEMS
# Pilot Test for Evaluating Conflict Resolution Behavior Items

Please match the behavior items to types of behaviors by assigning one behavior type number to each behavior item. Each item should only correspond to one behavior type, so each of the numbers will be used only once, and all numbers will be used. Also please include any comments regarding the appropriateness of the items.

**Behavior Items**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Behavior Item</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I would put myself in the other person's position and try to understand their point of view.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I would brainstorm with the other person, asking them questions and trying to create a solution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I would talk openly and truthfully with the other person, expressing my feelings and thoughts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I would reach out to the other person, making the first move, or try to make amends.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I would think about the best response, analyzing the situation and weighing the pros and cons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I would wait things out, let matters settle down, or take a time-out when emotions were running high.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I would stay flexible and try to make the best of the situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I would argue vigorously for my own position, and try to win at all costs.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I would express anger, or raise my voice, or use harsh, angry words.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I would laugh at the other person, or make fun of their ideas, or use sarcasm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>I would obstruct the other person or retaliate against them, or try to get revenge later.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>I would avoid or ignore the other person, or act distant or aloof.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>I would give in to the other person in order to avoid further conflict.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>I would conceal my true emotions even though I was upset.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>I would replay the incident over in my mind later and criticize myself for not handling it better.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Types of Behaviors
1. Adapting
2. Avoiding
3. Creating Solutions
4. Delay Responding
5. Demeaning Others
6. Displaying Anger
7. Expressing Emotions
8. Hiding Emotions
9. Perspective Taking
10. Reaching out
11. Reflective Thinking
12. Retaliating
13. Self-criticizing
14. Winning at all costs
15. Yielding
APPENDIX C

CONFLICT RESOLUTION BEHAVIORS

MEASURES
Part One

Please briefly describe what you would do in this situation.

Part Two

Based on your earlier description, please complete the following survey. Keep in mind that based on different types of conflict situations, different behaviors may be most effective in resolving a conflict. Please rate the behaviors most effective in resolving the conflict in this situation by circling one number, 1 through 4, for each behavior (with one meaning 'I would definitely not engage in this behavior', two meaning 'I would probably not engage in this behavior', three meaning 'I would possibly engage in this behavior' and four meaning 'I would definitely engage in this behavior').
1. I would put myself in the other person's position and try to understand their point of view.

2. I would brainstorm with the other person, asking them questions and trying to create a solution.

3. I would talk openly and truthfully with the other person, expressing my feelings and thoughts.

4. I would reach out to the other person, making the first move, or try to make amends.

5. I would think about the best response, analyzing the situation and weighing the pros and cons.

6. I would wait things out, let matters settle down, or take a timeout when emotions were running high.

7. I would stay flexible and try to make the best of the situation.

8. I would argue vigorously for my own position, and try to win at all costs.

9. I would express anger, or raise my voice, or use harsh, angry words.

10. I would laugh at the other person, or make fun of their ideas, or use sarcasm.

11. I would obstruct the other person or retaliate against them, or try to get revenge later.

12. I would avoid or ignore the other person, or act distant or aloof.

13. I would give in to the other person in order to avoid further conflict.

14. I would conceal my true emotions even though I was upset.

15. I would replay the incident over in my mind later and criticize myself for not handling it better.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>Definitely would engage</th>
<th>Probably would engage</th>
<th>Possibly would engage</th>
<th>Definitely would engage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I would put myself in the other person's position and try to understand their point of view.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I would brainstorm with the other person, asking them questions and trying to create a solution.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I would talk openly and truthfully with the other person, expressing my feelings and thoughts.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I would reach out to the other person, making the first move, or try to make amends.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I would think about the best response, analyzing the situation and weighing the pros and cons.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I would wait things out, let matters settle down, or take a timeout when emotions were running high.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I would stay flexible and try to make the best of the situation.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I would argue vigorously for my own position, and try to win at all costs.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I would express anger, or raise my voice, or use harsh, angry words.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I would laugh at the other person, or make fun of their ideas, or use sarcasm.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. I would obstruct the other person or retaliate against them, or try to get revenge later.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. I would avoid or ignore the other person, or act distant or aloof.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. I would give in to the other person in order to avoid further conflict.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. I would conceal my true emotions even though I was upset.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15. I would replay the incident over in my mind later and criticize myself for not handling it better.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part Three

Please rank the top five behaviors you would choose, one being the strongest.

____ I would put myself in the other person’s position and try to understand their point of view.

____ I would brainstorm with the other person, asking them questions and trying to create a solution.

____ I would talk openly and truthfully with the other person, expressing my feelings and thoughts.

____ I would reach out to the other person, making the first move, or try to make amends.

____ I would think about the best response, analyzing the situation and weighing the pros and cons.

____ I would wait things out, let matters settle down, or take a time-out when emotions were running high.

____ I would stay flexible and try to make the best of the situation.

____ I would argue vigorously for my own position, and try to win at all costs.

____ I would express anger, or raise my voice, or use harsh, angry words.

____ I would laugh at the other person, or make fun of their ideas, or use sarcasm

____ I would obstruct the other person or retaliate against them, or try to get revenge later.

____ I would avoid or ignore the other person, or act distant or aloof.

____ I would give in to the other person in order to avoid further conflict.

____ I would conceal my true emotions even though I was upset.

____ I would replay the incident over in my mind later and criticize myself for not handling it better.
Part Four.

Please circle one number for your answer.

1. To what extent do you perceive that the company you evaluated belongs to your culture?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>The company definitely belongs to my culture</th>
<th>The company mostly belongs to my culture</th>
<th>The company could belong to either my culture or another culture</th>
<th>The company mostly belongs to another culture</th>
<th>The company definitely belongs to another culture</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please circle one or more answers.

2. Is the conflict the result of:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incompatible feelings and emotions</th>
<th>Differing values or ideologies</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Different thought processes or perceptions</td>
<td>Disagreement over a task</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>Not sure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
APPENDIX D

DEMOGRAPHIC INFORMATION
Demographic Information

1. Please circle your gender: Male          Female

2. What is your age? ________

3. How many years and months you have been in school in the US
(example: 1 year, 2 months) _____ yr ______ months

4. How many years and months have you lived in the US?
_____ yr _____ months

5. What is your major (please list concentration as well)? __________________________

6. How many years and months of work experience do you have?
_____ yr _____ months

7. Of this work experience how much has been in the US?
_____ yr _____ months

8. Please circle where you are originally from:
   Mainland China (not Hong Kong)       Hong Kong       Taiwan
Demographic Information

1. Please circle your gender: Male     Female

2. What is your age? _______

3. How many years and months you have been in school in the US (example: 1 year, 2 months) _____ yr _____ months

4. How many years and months have you lived in the US? _____ yr _____ months

5. What is your major (please list concentration as well)? ___________________

6. How many years and months of work experience do you have? _____ yr _____ months

7. Of this work experience how much has been in the US? _____ yr _____ months

8. Please circle where you are originally from:

   Mainland China (not Hong Kong)     Hong Kong     Taiwan
APPENDIX E

SCENARIOS
US Company, Person-based

You will be asked to pretend you are a project manager in a large Chinese company and evaluate a company as follows. This joint project involves designing, developing, and managing the beginning stages of the production line for a new product. The project will last for two years. The project involves working with the partner and making many joint decisions. This project is estimated to provide an average return compared to other projects the company is involved in. Each partner in the joint project will provide an equal capital share.

A preparatory committee has selected a number of firms and highlighted some key points. Your task is to evaluate one of these selected firms as potential partners in the joint project. You are asked to report your recommendations to the planning committee using the following forms. Other potential partners firms will also be examined for the project. Please evaluate the firm now.

Firm name: U.S. Cleaning Products

Key Points of the Firm

- U.S. Cleaning Products is a stable American company, which has been in existence for over 20 years. They have a history of excellent product line and great customer service.

- The company is of similar size to ours, but is growing in number of employees.

- The project manager you would be working with, John Smith, may present some difficulties. While competent, John Smith has a reputation as being arrogant and close-minded. He appears stubborn and may be intimidating and resistant to change. He has been known to clash with individuals on a variety of levels.
US Company, Task-based

You will be asked to pretend you are a project manager in a large Chinese company and evaluate a company as follows. This joint project involves designing, developing, and managing the beginning stages of the production line for a new product. The project will last for two years. The project involves working with the partner and making many joint decisions. This project is estimated to provide an average return compared to other projects the company is involved in. Each partner in the joint project will provide an equal capital share.

A preparatory committee has selected a number of firms and highlighted some key points. Your task is to evaluate one of these selected firms as potential partners in the joint project. You are asked to report your recommendations to the planning committee using the following forms. Other potential partners firms will also be examined for the project. Please evaluate the firm now.

Firm name: U.S. Cleaning Products

Key Points of the Firm

- U.S. Cleaning Products is a stable American company, which has been in existence for over 20 years. They have a history of excellent product line and great customer service.

- The company is of similar size to ours, but is growing in number of employees.

- In preliminary discussion with members of this company, it became apparent that they held different perceptions on how to accomplish the design, development and management of the new product.

- In addition, their production technology is different than ours, which may present some challenges.
Chinese Company, Person-based

You will be asked to pretend you are a project manager in a large Chinese company and evaluate a company as follows. This joint project involves designing, developing, and managing the beginning stages of the production line for a new product. The project will last for two years. The project involves working with the partner and making many joint decisions. This project is estimated to provide an average return compared to other projects the company is involved in. Each partner in the joint project will provide an equal capital share.

A preparatory committee has selected a number of firms and highlighted some key points. Your task is to evaluate one of these selected firms as potential partners in the joint project. You are asked to report your recommendations to the planning committee using the following forms. Other potential partners firms will also be examined for the project. Please evaluate the firm now.

Firm name: Chinese Cleaning Products

Key Points of the Firm

- Chinese Cleaning Products is a stable Chinese company, which has been in existence for over 20 years. They have a history of excellent product line and great customer service.

- The company is of similar size to ours, but is growing in number of employees.

- The project manager you would be working with, Ching Zhang, may present some difficulties. While competent, Ching Zhang, has a reputation as being arrogant and close-minded. He appears stubborn and may be intimidating and resistant to change. He has been known to clash with individuals on a variety of levels.
Chinese Company, Task-based

You will be asked to pretend you are a project manager in a large Chinese company and evaluate a company as follows. This joint project involves designing, developing, and managing the beginning stages of the production line for a new product. The project will last for two years. The project involves working with the partner and making many joint decisions. This project is estimated to provide an average return compared to other projects the company is involved in. Each partner in the joint project will provide an equal capital share.

A preparatory committee has selected a number of firms and highlighted some key points. Your task is to evaluate one of these selected firms as potential partners in the joint project. You are asked to report your recommendations to the planning committee using the following forms. Other potential partners firms will also be examined for the project. Please evaluate the firm now.

Firm name: Chinese Cleaning Products

Key Points of the Firm

- Chinese Cleaning Products is a stable Chinese company, which has been in existence for over 20 years. They have a history of excellent product line and great customer service.
- The company is of similar size to ours, but is growing in number of employees.
- In preliminary discussion with members of this company, it became apparent that they held different perceptions on how to accomplish the design, development and management of the new product.
- In addition, their production technology is different than ours, which may present some challenges.
APPENDIX F

INFORMED CONSENT
PARTICIPANT INFORMED CONSENT FORM

The research you are about to participate in is designed to investigate the relationship between conflict resolution and culture. Lisa Grech is conducting this study under the supervision of Dr. Janelle Gilbert, Professor of Psychology. This study has been approved by the Psychology Department Human Subjects Review Board, California State University San Bernardino. The University requires that you give your consent before participating in a research study.

In this study, you will answer a series of questions about your values, and then respond to a pretend conflict situation by answering some questions regarding how you would resolve the conflict. The questionnaire will take approximately 20 minutes to complete.

Your anonymity will be maintained at all times. Please be assured that any information you provide will be held in strict confidence by the researcher. At no time will your name be reported along with your responses. At the study’s conclusion, you may receive a report of the results. All data will be reported in group form only.

Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There are not any foreseeable risks associated with participation in this study, and withdrawal from this study is possible at any time without any penalty. Additional questions concerning this study should be directed to Lisa Grech at (909) 880-5587. If you have any questions about any research subjects’ rights, contact the University’s Institutional Review Board at (909) 880-5027.

By placing a mark in the space provided below, I acknowledge that I have been informed of, and understand, the nature and purpose of this study, and I freely consent to participate. By this mark I further acknowledge that I am at least 18 years of age.

Give your consent to participate by making a check or ‘X’ mark here: ________

Today’s date is ___________________
APPENDIX G

DEBRIEFING STATEMENT
DEBRIEFING STATEMENT

The main purpose of the current study was to investigate cultural differences in the way people deal with conflict resolution. Your responses to the questionnaires are anonymous, and at no time was your name requested along with your responses. Please be assured that any information you provided will be held in strict confidence by the researcher, and all data will be reported in group form only. If you have any questions or concerns about this study, or you would like to discuss the results, please feel free to contact Lisa Grech at (909) 880-5587. Results of the study will be available in the Fall of 2002. It is not anticipated that participants will experience negative emotional or psychological symptoms as a result of completing this questionnaire. However, if you should feel a need to seek counseling service, you may contact the CSUSB Counseling Center at (909) 880-5040. To ensure the integrity of this study, I ask that you do not reveal information about this study to other prospective participants.

Thank you very much for your participation.
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