CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLES OF AMERICANS AND JAPANESE

WITHIN CLOSE FRIENDSHIPS:

DIFFERENCES AND INTRIGUING SIMILARITIES

A THESIS SUBMITTED TO THE GRADUATE DIVISION OF THE
UNIVERSITY OF HAWAI'I IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT
OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF

MASTER OF ARTS

IN

COMMUNICATION

MAY 2003

By
Hideto Morita

Thesis Committee:

Gary Fontaine, Chairperson
Jeffrey Ady
Elizabeth Kunimoto

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to express my deepest gratitude to Dr. Fontaine for being such a wonderful chairperson and advisor throughout this project. He helped and encouraged me greatly. His continuous support and excellent advice contributed a great deal to the successful completion of this thesis.

My appreciation also goes to Dr. Ady and Dr. Kunimoto for their help as committee members. They gave their time and effort to read and respond to my paper. Their insightful comments were also valuable for the development and completion of my thesis.

I would also like to thank the people who participated in this project, my friends who helped collect data, and all my teachers and fellow students in the graduate program who gave me helpful suggestions for my study.

Finally, I would like to thank my family: my parents, Hirokazu and Yukiko Morita; and my brother, Shingo Morita. Their extraordinary support and understanding encouraged my life and studies in the United States.

ABSTRACT

The present study was designed to investigate cultural and gender influences on conflict management styles in close friendships. An interaction between culture and gender on the selection of the conflict strategies was also examined. The conflict styles were classified into integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising styles. This study employed a 2 x 2 factorial design for data analysis. Subjects were 76 American and 101 Japanese college students. They were given a conflict scenario and asked to rate scales measuring conflict styles. The instrument was based on Rahim's Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II). The results showed that there was significant cultural effect on the dominating and obliging styles; Americans reported the use of significantly higher degree of these two styles than Japanese. The significant gender effect on the dominating style was also found; males used this style significantly higher than females. Moreover, significant interaction between nationality and gender appeared on the integrating and dominating styles; Japanese females scored higher on the integrating style, and American males scored higher on the dominating style than other groups. It is believed by many scholars that there is a direct interaction between cultural values and communication behavior. However, this study also revealed that there were more similarities than differences between Americans and Japanese in conflict management styles with their close friends. For example, both groups reported that the integrating and compromising styles were preferable strategies for managing conflict within close friendships.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

INTRODUCTION

The importance of examining the relationship between conflict and culture has been pointed out by several authors (e.g., Chua & Gudykunst, 1987; Nadler, Nadler, & Broome, 1985; Tafoya, 1983). Ting-Toomey (1994) describes conflict as being inevitable in all phases of social and personal relationship development. According to Bell and Blakeney (1977), interpersonal conflict is defined as interaction between individuals expressing opposing interests, views, or opinions. In other words, conflicts occur when relational partners perceive incompatibility in such diverse areas as ideas, values, emotions, needs, and constraints on actions. Although people in Western cultures do not perceive conflict as a negative phenomenon, people in Asian cultures recognize conflict as a high-risk, costly relational phenomenon (Ting-Toomey, 1994).

When conflicts arise, some procedures are often chosen to manage the conflicts, and the choice is typically guided by cultural norms (Leung & Chen, 1999). A number of studies reveal how styles of conflict management are affected by culture (e.g., Elsayed-Ekhouly & Buda, 1996; Kozan, 1989; Ting-Toomey, Gao, Trubisky, Yang, Kim, Lin, & Nishida, 1991). These studies compared countries along certain cultural dimensions, such as an individualism-collectivism dimension and a low-high context communication dimension. However, there has been no research on the cultural influence in conflict management styles among close friends. Close friends may perceive conflict as a threat to the relationships, and they may not want to lose a source of emotional support, assistance, and shared activities. Collier (1991) states that, as

1

relationships become more intimate, cultural predictions decrease, and self-disclosure and certainty about partners increase. Bell (1981) also argues that friendships are developed on the basis of private interaction and the relationships are not imposed through cultural norms. Since there is no study concerning the cultural effects on conflict management styles among close friends, there is a need to examine whether people rely on their own predictions and rules of appropriate styles or whether they still rely on cultural predictions in conflict situations with their close friends.

Moreover, gender is one of the individual variables that has received much attention in conflict research (e.g., Berryman-Fink & Brunner, 1987; Levenson & Gottman, 1985). According to Berryman-Fink and Brunner (1987), men are more likely than women to compete in conflict, whereas women are more likely than men to use a compromising style in close relationships. In addition, Levenson and Gottman (1985) found that men are more likely than women to withdraw and avoid conflict. However, there has been no cross-cultural research on gender differences in the selection of conflict management styles with close friends, and there has been no comparative research focusing on Americans and Japanese.

The main objective of this study was to compare the conflict management styles of Americans and Japanese in situations of conflict with close friends. The effect of gender on the selection of the conflict strategies was also examined. By investigating into how cultural and gender differences affect individuals' tendencies to approach and manage conflict with close friends, we may gain new insights to improve our options in approaching and managing conflict differently.

2

LITERATURE REVIEW

This literature review will focus on (1) friendship and conflict, (2) types of conflict management styles, (3) influence of culture on conflict management styles, and (4) gender differences in conflict management styles.

The Nature of Friendship and Conflict

In general, when people choose a mate or select a friend, they choose a person very much like themselves (Bell, 1981). Similarity of age might be one of the most powerful factors of the friendship selection. Because people of similar age are also frequently similar in personal and social resources, they are equal and less likely to exploit one another. In addition to this, because the possibility of romance or sexuality is seen as a force that may weaken the friendship tie by moving toward a steady relationship, similarity of gender might be also a powerful influence on the formation of friendship.

There are four central definitions of friendship. First, friendship is a voluntary association. Second, there are few social rules for enacting the relationship (Wiseman, 1986). Third, several authors note the importance of equality and reciprocity in friendship (Hartup, 1992; Smollar & Youniss, 1982; Youniss, 1980). Fourth, friendship is characterized by mutuality (Rawlins, 1992). In addition, Paine (1969) observes that a basic meaning of friendship is the sense of worth one may get from it. He describes the friendship as follows:

Friendship says to the individual that someone is enjoying you,
and someone understands you. But a friend can also explain you
to yourself: alternatively, a person is able to see himself in his
friend (p.517).

Conflicts are serious because of unfavorable effect on the relationship.
Close friendships act as an important source for the identity development process
(Ting-Toomey, 1989) and frequently provide primary support (Collier, 1991). In
case of serious conflict between close friends, potential for the end of the
relationship may come up. Close friends may not want to encounter the conflict
that would bring risk of losing a source of emotional support, assistance, and
shared activities. However, there is always the possibility for conflict in a
friendship.

Bell (1981) states that friends develop their relationships and norms of the
friendship based on private negotiations without depending on cultural norms or
values. Collier (1991) also notes that, as friendships become closer, cultural
predictions decrease, and self-disclosure and certainty about the relational
partner as a unique individual increase. The conflict in the friendship may happen
when one or both friends find a break in the acceptable norms of friendship. One
of the major values of friendships is that each has a concern for the identity of the
other. Each wants to help the other maintain a high sense of personal worth.
Therefore, norms development in the friendship may help avoid or minimize
possible conflict. For example, Hepburn (1973) suggests a norm that would help
prevent conflict from occurring. That is, if one gets something the other would

have liked but did not get, the winner presents his or her achievements as attribute to luck or somewhat greater experience. It is obvious that successful conflict management is a prerequisite for lasting friendships.

The next section focuses on conflict management styles that people tend to use in the situation of disagreement with other persons.

Conflict Management Styles

Blake and Mouton (1964) first presented a conceptual scheme for classifying the styles for handling interpersonal conflicts into five types: problem-solving, smoothing, forcing, withdrawal, and sharing. Their scheme was reinterpreted and extended by Thomas (1976). He classified all conflict management strategies along two underlying dimensions: assertiveness, or the intent to pursue one's own attitudes, values, and beliefs; and cooperativeness, or the intent to help satisfy another person's attitudes, values, and beliefs.

Using a conceptualization similar to Blake and Mouton (1964) and Thomas (1976), Rahim (1983) depicts two dimensions, "concern for self" and "concern for others," as the bases for selecting five conflict management styles: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. The first dimension explains the degree to which a person attempts to satisfy his or her own concern, and the second dimension explains the degree to which a person wants to satisfy the concern for others (Rahim 1983). The five conflict management styles are described as follows:

Integrating Style: high concern for self and others

This is also known as collaborating. This style involves collaboration between the parties, such as openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach a solution acceptable to both parties (Rahim, 1992). The integrating style reflects a win-win strategy for the persons in conflict (Hellriegel, Slocum, & Woodman, 1995). Rahim (1992) states that this style has two distinctive elements: confrontation and problem solving. Confrontation involves open communication, clearing up misunderstanding, and analyzing the underlying causes of conflict. Problem solving involves identification of and solution to the real problems to provide maximum satisfaction of the concerns of both parties.

Obliging Style: low concern for self and high concern for others

This is also known as accommodating. This style is associated with attempting to play down the differences and emphasizing commonalities to satisfy the concern of the other party (Rahim, 1992). An obliging person takes a long-term strategy to encourage cooperation by others (Hellriegel et al., 1995).

Dominating Style: high concern for self and low concern for others

This is also known as competing. This style has been identified with a win-lose orientation or with forcing behavior to win one's position (Rahim, 1992). Hellriegel et al. (1995) also state that people who use the dominating style try to achieve their own goals without concern for others, and they feel one side must win and another side must lose.

Avoiding Style: low concern for self and others

This style is associated with buck-passing, staying away from conflicts, ignoring disagreement, or remaining neutral (Rahim, 1992). This style might reflect reluctant to face tension and frustration. As Hellriegel et al. (1995) state, the avoiding style may lead to negative results for the participants when unsolved conflicts affect goal accomplishment.

Compromising Style: intermediate in concern for self and others

This style is based on a give-and-take strategy to make a mutually acceptable decision (Rahim, 1992). It may mean exchanging concession or seeking a quick middle-ground position. This style may achieve moderate satisfaction but only partially for each party. Compared to the integrating style, the compromising style tends not to maximize joint satisfaction (Hellriegel et al., 1995).

Some instruments are available for measuring conflict management styles. These are designed by Blake and Mouton (1964), Hall (1969), Lawrence and Lorsch (1967), Rahim (1983), and Thomas and Kilmann (1974). Among these instruments, the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE Instrument (Thomas & Kilmann, 1974) and the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II; Rahim, 1983) are the two most well-known self-report instruments (Van de Vlient & Kabanoff, 1990). However, studies examining the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict MODE instrument indicated weak to moderate reliability, weak concurrent validity, limited evidence concerning content validity, questionable

predictive validity, and low social desirability (Ben-Yoav & Banai, 1992). In contrast, the ROCI-II has been reported to have satisfactory test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities (Ben-Yoav & Banai, 1992), and the five-style model characterized by Rahim has been shown to have factorial validity in non-Western cultures (Van de Vlient & Kabanoff, 1990; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). Using the ROCI-II, Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) provided evidence that national culture influences the styles of handling interpersonal conflict.

The next section will explore how culture affects the selection of the conflict management styles.

Cultural Influences on Conflict Management Styles

The study by Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) in five countries shows that the U.S. respondents indicated greater use of the dominating style than Japanese and Korean respondents. The Chinese and Taiwanese respondents reported greater use of the obliging and avoiding styles than the U.S. respondents. To explain these differences, some researchers examined relationships between the conflict management styles and cultural factors, such as an individualism-collectivism dimension and a low-high context communication dimension.

Individualism and Collectivism

Findings from cross-cultural comparisons of procedural norms have revealed systematic differences between individualists and collectivists (Leung & Chan, 1999). Such differences may be a result of the different conflict

8

management styles that individualists and collectivists use. Individualism refers to the broad value tendencies of people in a culture to emphasize individual identity over group identity, individual rights over group obligations, and individual achievements over group concerns (Hofstede, 1984). In contrast, collectivism refers to the broad value tendencies of people in a culture to emphasize group identity over individual identity, group obligations over individual rights, and group-oriented concerns over individual desires (Hofstede, 1984).

In dealing with conflict, individualists tend to use styles that are more *self-oriented, dominating, and competitive than those of collectivists who tend to use mutual face-saving, integrative, and compromising styles* (Ting-Toomey, 1997). Moreover, the styles of collectivists in task-oriented situations tend to be more accommodating and avoiding than those of individualists (Ting-Toomey, 1997).

Low and High Context Communication

In addition to the individualism-collectivism dimension, Ting-Toomey (1994) suggests that Hall's (1976) low and high context scheme of cultural variability may explain the styles of conflict management adopted by individuals from different cultures. "A high-context communication or message is one in which most of the information is either in the physical context or internalized in the person while very little is in the coded, explicit, transmitted part of the message" (Hall, 1976, p.79). In a low-context message, "the mass of the information is vested in the explicit code" (p.79). Chua and Gudykunst (1987)

9

state that, in low-context cultures, individuals are more efficient in separating the conflict issue from the person involved in a conflict over a task and yet remain friends. On the other hand, in high-context cultures, the instrumental issue is connected with the person who originated that issue (Chua & Gudykunst, 1987).

Chua and Gudykunst (1987) and Ting-Toomey (1986) examined the conflict management styles in members of low-context cultures and members of high-context cultures. They utilized Putnam and Wilson's (1982) Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) that measures three interpersonal conflict styles: non-confrontation, solution-orientation, and control. They found that members of low-context cultures utilized a solution-oriented style more than members of high-context cultures. Respondents from high-context cultures used non-confrontation more than respondents from low-context cultures. Solution-orientation involves the collaborating style that aims to find a solution to integrate the needs of both parties (Putnam & Wilson, 1982). Non-confrontation involves the avoiding style in conflict situations (Putnam & Wilson, 1982). Control reflects advocating one's position and competing to enforce one's views (Putnam & Wilson, 1982). According to Ting-Toomey (1994), low-context communication patterns have been typically found to be predominant in individualistic cultures, and high-context communication patterns have been found to be predominant in collectivistic cultures.

Hofstede (1984) states that the U.S. is identified as a high individualistic culture and Japan is identified as a collectivistic culture. Thus, it might be predicted that, in situations of conflict with close friends, Americans tend to use

10

the dominating style, and Japanese tend to use the integrating and compromising styles. For Hall (1976), Germany, Switzerland, and the United States are identified as low-context cultures, and China, Japan, Korea, and Vietnam are identified as high-context cultures. Therefore, it might be said that Americans have a tendency to select the integrating style more than Japanese, and Japanese have a tendency to use the avoiding style more than Americans when managing interpersonal conflict.

However, considering arguments stated by Bell (1981) and Collier (1991), close friends may select certain conflict management strategies without following such cultural norms. In addition, Gudykunst and Nishida (1983) state that several cross-cultural studies on close friendships found that there were more similarities than differences between Americans and Japanese. For example, their literature review shows that both American and Japanese college students prefer to express dissatisfaction in a direct way to their friends. Moreover, Burgoon, Dillard, and Doran (1982) suggest that there are similarities between whites and Japanese in Hawaii in the mate selection process and in persuasive strategy selection. Thus, it might be said that, in dealing with conflict among close friends, Americans and Japanese use similar conflict management styles. Unfortunately, there has been no cross-cultural study examining cultural influence on conflict management styles utilized by close friends. Therefore, it is necessary to investigate the relationship between culture and the conflict management styles in such a particular situation.

Gender and Conflict Management Styles

There are a number of studies relating to gender differences on the styles of managing interpersonal conflict. However, the results are inconclusive. Rahim (1983) found that women used more integrating, avoiding, and compromising styles and less obliging style than male managers. These findings are somewhat consistent with the results reported by Kilmann and Thomas (1975) and Baron (1989). In addition, Neff (1986) reported that, although women were more compromising with their superior than men were, there were no gender differences among the other four styles.

Several studies have compared the conflict management styles of men and women in organizations with other instruments. Renwick (1977) used a single-item instrument to measure the styles, and he found no significant differences between men and women in their conflict management styles. Shockley-Zalabak (1981) also attempted to investigate the differences in the styles of men and women with Hall's (1969) Conflict Management Survey, and her findings were similar to that of Renwick. Like this, the relationships between gender and the conflict management styles are weak and inconsistent. A similar conclusion was stated by Wall and Blum (1991).

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

The literature review showed that there is a need to examine the conflict management styles of Americans and Japanese with their close friends. In this conflict situation, it is also necessary to survey the similarities and differences in the conflict management styles between males and females. Therefore, this study addressed the following three research questions:

RQ 1) Are there significant differences between Americans and Japanese in conflict management styles within close friendships?

RQ 2) Are there significant differences between males and females in conflict management styles within close friendships?

RQ 3) Is there any interaction between nationality and gender in conflict management styles within close friendships?

METHODOLOGY

Design

In order to investigate research questions, Two-way ANOVA, correlation analysis, and descriptive analysis were used in this study. Nationality and gender were treated as independent variables, while five conflict management styles were treated as dependent variables.

Subjects

One hundred seventy-seven subjects participated in this study. Of these, 76 (42.9%) were Americans, and 101 (57.1%) were Japanese. They included 39 (22.0%) American males, 37 (20.9%) American females, 55 (31.1%) Japanese males, and 46 (26.0%) Japanese females (see Table 1).

Table 1. Frequencies and Percentages of Subjects by Nationality and Gender

Nationality	Gender	Frequency	Percent
American	Male	39	22.0%
	Female	37	20.9%
	Total	76	42.9%
Japanese	Male	55	31.1%
	Female	46	26.0%
	Total	101	57.1%
Total	Male	94	53.1%
	Female	83	46.9%
	Total	177	100 %

In this study, all subjects were either undergraduate or graduate students. For American subjects, they had been enrolled in the Art, Communication, History, or Psychology Departments at the University of Hawaii at Manoa, or the Civil and Environmental Engineering Department at Stanford University. Japanese subjects had been studying in the Economics Department at Ritsumeikan University, the Human Science Department at Kobe Gakuin University, the International Relations Department at Kobe University, or the French Department at Konan Women's University. Using personal networks, the researcher conducted this survey at each university. The place of origin of the subjects breaks down as: 101 (57.1%) Japanese who were born and raised in Japan, 42 (23.7%) Americans who were born and raised in Hawaii, 25 (14.1%) Americans who were born and raised on the Mainland, and 9 (11.8%) Americans who were born and raised in other places (see Table 2). The subjects ranged in age from 17 to 51 and the mean age was 23.2 years ($\underline{sd}$ = 4.76).

Table 2. Demographic Information of Subjects

Place of Birth / Nationality	Frequency	Percent
Mainland / American	25	14.1%
Hawaii / American	42	23.7%
Other / American	9	5.1%
Japan / Japanese	101	57.1%
Total	177	100%

Instrument (See Appendix A & B)

The questionnaire used in this study was based on the 28-item ROCI-II (Rahim, 1983). The subjects were asked to completely answer the two parts in this questionnaire. The first part contained a conflict scenario and included 28 questions measuring the subjects' conflict management styles. The second part included 3 items surveying the subjects' demographic information, such as nationality, gender, and age. This part also included 4 items asking the nationality, gender, and age of the subjects' close friends and years they had been friends.

The questionnaire was translated from English to Japanese and then back-translated from Japanese to English. After the pre-testing, the English version of the questionnaire was distributed to American students, and the Japanese version of the questionnaire was distributed to Japanese students. It took approximately 10 minutes to answer the questionnaire.

Procedure

Two hundred forty questionnaires were distributed to American students who had been studying in the U.S. and Japanese students who had been studying in Japan. Subjects participated in this survey on voluntary basis, and they were assured that their anonymity and confidentiality would be insured. The subjects were given three weeks to fill out and submit the questionnaire.

Definition of Terms

- Close friends

Close friends were identified in this study as giving emotional support and mutual assistance to each other (Collier, 1991), and sharing mutual feelings of affection, loyalty, and frankness and spending their leisure time together (Hartup, 1975). The close friends were operationalized in this study as close friendships between Americans and Americans, and Japanese and Japanese. The subjects were asked to specify the initials, nationality, gender of their close friend, and years they had been friends as follows:

Please specify the initials of your close friend. ____ (only ONE person)

What is your close friend's nationality?
- □ American: born and raised on the Mainland
- □ American: born and raised in Hawaii
- □ American: other _____
- □ Japanese

What is your close friend's gender?
- □ Male
- □ Female

How long have you been a friend with him or her?
- ____ year(s) ____ month(s)

- Nationality (Independent Variable)

In this study, nationality was designated as whether the subject identifies himself or herself as American or Japanese. The subjects were asked to answer the following question:

What is your nationality?
- ☐ American: born and raised on the Mainland
- ☐ American: born and raised in Hawaii
- ☐ American: other _____
- ☐ Japanese

In addition, nationality operationalized the subject as whether he or she is a member of an individualistic culture or a collectivistic culture, and whether he or she is a member of a low-context culture or a high-context culture. According to Hofstede (1984), the U.S. is identified as a high individualistic culture and Japan is identified as a collectivistic culture. For Hall (1976), the U.S. is identified as a low-context culture, and Japan is identified as a high-context culture.

- Gender (Independent Variable)

Gender was defined as whether the subject identified himself or herself as male or female. The subjects were asked to answer the following question:

What is your gender?
- ☐ Male
- ☐ Female

18

- *Conflict Management Styles (Dependent Variable)*

Conflict management styles are types of conflict management strategies that a person tends to use in conflict situations. In this survey, conflict was operationalized by defining a conflict episode as an event in which a close friend said or did something that caused the individual to become dissatisfied with the relationship. The conflict management styles are classified into five categories: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. The integrating style reflects high concern for self and others. The obliging style reflects low concern for self and high concern for others. The dominating style reflects high concern for self and low concern for others. The avoiding style reflects low concern for self and others. And, the compromising style reflects intermediate in concern for self and others (Rahim, 1992).

This study examined the conflict management styles of Americans and Japanese in situations of disagreement among close friends. The questionnaire based on the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventories-II (ROCI-II; Rahim, 1983) was used to measure which of five conflict management styles the subjects selected in conflict situations with their close friends. The styles used by the subjects were measured by 28 questions on a 5-point Likert scale using ROCI-II (see Appendix A for complete questionnaire). The instrument has been reported to have satisfactory test-retest and internal consistency reliabilities (Ben-Yoav & Banai, 1992), and the five-style model has been shown to have factorial validity in non-Western cultures (Van de Vlient & Kabanoff, 1990; Ting-Toomey et al., 1991). The questions were classified into integrating questions, obliging questions, dominating questions, avoiding questions, and compromising

questions. The respondents were asked to answer the questions using the 5-point scale.

The scale is as follows:
1 = Strongly Disagree
2 = Disagree
3 = Not Sure
4 = Agree
5 = Strongly Agree

Integrating style was measured by the following questions.

1) I try to investigate an issue with my close friend to find a solution acceptable to us.	1	2	3	4	5
4) I try to integrate my ideas with those of my close friend to come up with a decision jointly.	1	2	3	4	5
5) I try to work with my close friend to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
12) I exchange accurate information with my close friend to solve the problem together.	1	2	3	4	5
22) I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.	1	2	3	4	5
23) I collaborate with my close friend to come up with decisions acceptable to us.	1	2	3	4	5
28) I try to work with my close friend for a proper understanding of the problem.	1	2	3	4	5

Obliging style was measured by the following questions.

2) I try to satisfy the needs of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
10) I accommodate the wishes of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
11) I give in to the wishes of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
13) I usually give concessions to my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
19) I often go along with the suggestions of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
24) I try to satisfy the expectations of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5

Dominating style was measured by the following questions.

8) I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.	1	2	3	4	5
9) I am very persuasive when I have to be in order to win in a conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5
18) I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.	1	2	3	4	5
21) I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.	1	2	3	4	5
25) I enjoy competitive situations and play hard to win.	1	2	3	4	5

Avoiding style was measured by the following questions.

3) I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my close friend to myself.	1	2	3	4	5
6) I avoid open discussion of my differences with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
16) I try to stay away from disagreement with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
17) I avoid confrontation with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
26) I try to keep my disagreement with my close friend to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
27) I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with close friend.	1	2	3	4	5

Compromising style was measured by the following questions.

7) I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.	1	2	3	4	5
14) I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.	1	2	3	4	5
15) I negotiate with my close friend so that a compromise can be reached.	1	2	3	4	5
20) I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.	1	2	3	4	5

RESULTS

To test the research questions, the scores on each conflict management style were analyzed with Two-way ANOVA treating nationality (American or Japanese) and gender (male or female) of the subjects as independent variables. Table 3 shows the means and standard deviations of the five conflict styles by nationality and gender. Some significant differences appeared in the integrating, obliging, and dominating styles.

Main Effect of Nationality

The main effect of nationality was significant in the obliging style and highly significant in the dominating style (see Table 4 & 5). For the obliging style, American subjects scored higher than Japanese subjects ($p < .01$). As the results indicate, Americans also reported the use of a significantly higher degree of the dominating style than Japanese ($p < .001$, see Table 3).

Main Effect of Gender

As can be seen in Table 5, the main effect of gender was highly significant in the dominating style. The results show that males used the dominating style significantly higher than females ($p < .001$, see Table 3). There were no significant differences in the other four conflict management styles.

Interaction between Nationality and Gender

An interaction of nationality and gender was significant in the integrating and dominating styles (see Table 5 & 6). Results in Table 3 show that American males reported the use of the dominating style significantly higher than other groups (p < .01), and Japanese females reported the use of the integrating style significantly higher than other groups (p < .05).

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations of the Five Conflict Styles by Nationality and Gender

		IN		OB		DO		AV		CO	
Nationality	Gender	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd	Mean	sd
American	Male	4.34	.48	3.52	.52	3.58**	.69	2.78	.97	4.05	.56
	Female	4.21	.48	3.45	.68	2.87	.79	3.09	.82	3.96	.59
	Total	4.28	.48	3.49**	.60	3.23***	.74	2.94	.89	4.01	.58
Japanese	Male	4.24	.52	3.28	.54	2.56	.72	2.74	.94	3.88	.57
	Female	4.43*	.45	3.21	.58	2.44	.55	2.80	.71	4.10	.57
	Total	4.33	.49	3.25	.56	2.50	.64	2.77	.83	3.99	.57
Total	Male	4.29	.51	3.40	.53	3.07***	.71	2.76	.96	3.97	.57
	Female	4.32	.47	3.33	.63	2.66	.67	2.95	.77	4.03	.58
	Total	4.31	.49	3.37	.58	2.87	.69	2.86	.87	4.00	.58

Note: IN=Integrating, OB=Obliging, DO=Dominating, AV=Avoiding, CO=Compromising

   * p<.05   ** p<.01   *** p<.001

24

Table 4. Results of Two-way ANOVA for the Obliging Style

	df	F	Sig.
Nationality	1	7.394	.007
Gender	1	.670	.414
Nationality x Gender	1	.001	.971
Error	173		
Total	177		

Table 5. Results of Two-way ANOVA for the Dominating Style

	df	F	Sig.
Nationality	1	48.066	.000
Gender	1	15.606	.000
Nationality x Gender	1	8.046	.005
Error	173		
Total	177		

Table 6. Results of Two-way ANOVA for the Integrating Style

	df	F	Sig.
Nationality	1	.526	.468
Gender	1	.177	.675
Nationality x Gender	1	4.650	.032
Error	173		
Total	177		

25

Other Findings

Correlations of Conflict Management Styles

Table 7 and 8 show means, standard deviations, and correlations among the five conflict management styles in American and Japanese groups. The results show that in the American group, there were positive correlations between the integrating and compromising styles (p < .01), and between the obliging and avoiding styles (p < .01). Negative correlations were also found between the integrating and avoiding styles (p < .05), and between the dominating and avoiding styles (p < .05). In the Japanese group, there were positive correlations between the obliging and avoiding styles (p < .01), and between the integrating and compromising styles (p < .01).

The correlation analysis was also conducted for male and female groups (see Table 9 & 10). In the male group, positive correlations were found between the integrating and compromising styles (p < .01), and between the obliging and avoiding styles (p < .01). And there was a negative correlation between the integrating and avoiding styles in this group (p < .01). For the female group, positive correlations between the integrating and compromising styles (p < .01), and between the obliging and avoiding styles (p < .01) were found.

Table 7. Correlations among the Five Conflict Styles in the American Group

	Means	sd	IN	OB	DO	AV	CO
Integrating	4.28	.48	---				
Obliging	3.49	.60	.013	---			
Dominating	3.23	.74	-.062	-.139	---		
Avoiding	2.94	.89	-.244*	.436**	-.240*	---	
Compromising	4.01	.58	.670**	-.106	-.009	-.144	---

Note: IN=Integrating, OB=Obliging, DO=Dominating, AV=Avoiding, CO=Compromising

*   *Correlation is significant at the .05 level (2 tailed).*

**   Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed).

Table 8. Correlations among the Five Conflict Styles in the Japanese Group

	Means	sd	IN	OB	DO	AV	CO
Integrating	4.33	.49	---				
Obliging	3.25	.56	.028	---			
Dominating	2.50	.64	.174	-.069	---		
Avoiding	2.77	.83	-.175	.490**	-.072	---	
Compromising	3.99	.57	.480**	.081	-.029	.050	---

Note: IN=Integrating, OB=Obliging, DO=Dominating, AV=Avoiding, CO=Compromising

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed).

Table 9. Correlations among the Five Conflict Styles in the Male Group

	Means	sd	IN	OB	DO	AV	CO
Integrating	4.29	.51	---				
Obliging	3.40	.53	-.063	---			
Dominating	3.07	.71	.133	.057	---		
Avoiding	2.76	.96	-.306**	.473**	-.085	---	
Compromising	3.97	.57	.529**	.108	.035	.007	---

Note: IN=Integrating, OB=Obliging, DO=Dominating, AV=Avoiding, CO=Compromising

** *Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed).*

Table 10. Correlations among the Five Conflict Styles in the Female Group

	Means	sd	IN	OB	DO	AV	CO
Integrating	4.32	.47	---				
Obliging	3.33	.63	.097	---			
Dominating	2.66	.67	-.085	-.099	---		
Avoiding	2.95	.77	-.079	.507**	-.067	---	
Compromising	4.03	.58	.590**	-.090	-.027	-.110	---

Note: IN=Integrating, OB=Obliging, DO=Dominating, AV=Avoiding, CO=Compromising

** Correlation is significant at the .01 level (2 tailed).

DISCUSSION

Summary and Implications of Findings

Conflict management styles were classified into five categories by Rahim (1983): integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising styles. In the past, research on the conflict management styles has been investigated from a cultural perspective, such as the individualism-collectivism and the low-high context dimensions.

The main purpose of this study was to examine the extent to which the conflict strategies of Americans and Japanese in close relationships were influenced by cultural norms. Findings of this study showed that Americans indicated a stronger preference for the dominating style than Japanese. Rahim's (1983) conceptualization of the dominating style was based on the importance of satisfying self-needs. It was interesting that the American group also reported the use of a significantly higher degree of the obliging style than Japanese group. The obliging style was conceptualized as satisfying the needs of other sides (Rahim, 1983). It seems that these two styles take a contrary position in the conflict situations.

In the research of Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) that examined differences on conflict management strategies in five countries, the U.S. cultural group showed greater use of the dominating style than Asian cultural groups, and the Asian cultural groups showed greater use of the obliging style than the U.S. cultural group. One possible explanation for the results of the present study is that, in the conflict situations with close friends, Americans might be somewhat influenced

29

by the individualistic dimension, such as to emphasize individual rights and achievements. However, they might also consider that the obliging way would be appropriate to maintain good relationships with their close friends, so that they would not lose a source of emotional support and assistance from each other. For the Japanese group, they might also still be influenced by the collectivistic dimension, such as to maintain relational harmony rather than insist on self-concerns, so that they might avoid using the dominating style.

From the findings of Ting-Toomey et al. (1991), it was presumed that the Japanese group might have a tendency to use the obliging style more than the American group. However, as the present study found, the result was contrary in the situation of conflict with close friends. Lee (1990) found that especially in the context of collectivistic cultural systems, the use of obliging strategy is not appropriate to maintain "self-face." In the conflict settings, using the obliging style would mean "losing face." Influenced by such a cultural value, the Japanese subjects might not use this style in this conflict situation. For Americans, they may perceive that the use of the dominating style would contribute to maintaining self-face, and the use of the obliging style would be appropriate for maintenance of "other-face." However, the results of correlation analyses showed that a positive relationship between these two strategies was not found in the American group.

It should also be added that Japanese tend to use two different faces: "face toward outsiders" and "face toward insiders." They perceive that face maintenance is significant especially in the context of out-group relations. On the other hand, Americans do not worry about their face image in both in-group and

30

out-group context (Ting-Toomey, 1997). Since the context of in-group relationships entails close friendships, the face maintenance theory might be unsatisfactory for explaining differences in conflict styles between Americans and Japanese in this study.

The present study also examined differences between males and females on the selection of the conflict management styles. Analyses revealed that there was a significant gender effect only on the dominating style; males reported the use of a significantly higher degree on this style than females. This result is not consistent with former research (e.g. Baron, 1989; Kilmann & Thomas, 1975; Rahim, 1983). Stereotypically, women are considered to be kind, nurturing, relationally sensitive, and warm, whereas men are seen as dynamic, assertive, competitive (Deaux & Lewis, 1984). It might be said that through socialization processes, men would be presumed to be assertive and women would be perceived to be cooperative. However, it should be noted that, in the present study, the dominating style was not selected as a major strategy in the males group to deal with conflict among close friends. This style was ranked as fourth in the males group and fifth in the females group among the five styles. Therefore, it is hard to conclude that there was a significant difference between males and females in the selection of this strategy.

As the Two-way ANOVA analysis revealed, the interaction of nationality and gender was significant in the dominating and integrating styles. American males reported the use of a significantly higher degree on the dominating style than American females, Japanese males, and Japanese females. Collier (1991) refers that, in general, Anglo American males in the U.S. culture are viewed as

31

more competitive and forceful in conflict situations than Anglo American females. In the present study, American males ranked the dominating style as third, whereas the other three groups ranked it as fifth. From this result, it is possible to say that the American males are comparatively influenced by the individualistic values more than the American females. For the integrating style, the results showed that Japanese females scored significantly higher in this strategy than other groups. However, it should be noted that the mean scores on this style were very high among all groups; each group ranked the integrating style as the most preferable strategy. Therefore, it seems too weak to say that the interaction between nationality and gender was significant on this style.

Both American and Japanese groups, and both male and female groups scored higher in the integrating and the compromising styles in this study. Correlation analyses also indicated that these two styles were highly correlated with each other among all groups. According to Rahim (1983), the integrating style reflects collaboration between participants, such as openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach a solution acceptable to both sides, and the compromising style involves a give-and-take strategy to make a mutually acceptable decision. These two styles can be described as a solution-oriented style that aims to find a solution to integrate the needs of both parties.

As Chua and Gudykunst (1987) and Ting-Toomey (1986) revealed, the solution-oriented style was found in low-context cultures. The low-context communication style is one in which information is often exchanged explicitly or directly (Hall, 1976). It is possible to say that when conflicts occur in close

relationships, participants feel the need to resolve problems speedily so that the relationship would not be harmed. Therefore, the participants might prefer to have an open discussion and bring all out concerns on both sides in the conflict situations to achieve joint satisfaction immediately. In addition, Bell (1981) notes that close friendships that can tolerate a conflict of values without the relationship being severely threatened are probably least subject to the conflict. Close friends may be strongly motivated to ease their value differences in the hopes of easing any strain. The give-and-take strategy, therefore, might be used for reducing the divergence of values in the close relationships. If the participants have an approximately equal emotional stake in the relationship, this is likely to occur through mutual accommodations of their values.

Moreover, the correlation analysis revealed that the negative correlations were significant or comparatively significant between the avoiding and integrating styles, or between the avoiding and compromising styles in this study. Wilmot (1987) says that negative responses would escalate interpersonal conflicts and damage the relationships. The definition of what comprises negative conflict behaviors varies across studies. However, as Hellriegel et al. (1995) stated, the avoiding strategy may bring negative results for the participants in the conflict situations; participants may perceive that, using this style, the conflicts would be ignored, and the unsolved problems would hazard their relationships.

In this way, the present study found more similarities than differences in the selection of conflict management styles between Americans and Japanese. Both

33

groups ranked the integrating style as the first and compromising style as the second for preferable strategies when they deal with conflicts among close friends. And, the dominating and avoiding styles were ranked as the fourth or the fifth. It is possible to say that one of the primary values within close friendships is that each has a willingness to provide satisfaction to the concerns of the other. It would be obvious that participants can maximize joint satisfactions especially with the integrating style that involves both high self-concern and high other-concern.

Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

There were some limitations in this study. First, due to time and cost considerations, the data for American subjects was mostly collected in Hawaii. Sixty-one Americans (80.3%) out of 76 had been studying at University of Hawaii at Manoa. The subjects in this study were simply classified as Americans or Japanese by the demographic information, such as nationality and the place of birth. Out of 76 American subjects, 42 (55.3%) were born and raised in Hawaii. Because of Hawaii's unique cultural characteristics, the American subjects in Hawaii may have quite different tendencies for the use of conflict management strategies compared to Americans in other states on the U.S. mainland.

Second, nationality and gender were used as variables that were assumed to affect the conflict management styles among close friends. However, there are other variables that may affect the tendencies toward conflict strategies, such as age, social status, and level of intimacy with close friends. In addition, similarity

of gender in close relationships might be an important factor for the conflict management. In this study, only 27 subjects (15.3%) out of 177 reported their close friends' gender as opposite. It would be suggested for future research to compare the conflict management styles between same-gender and opposite-gender friendships.

A third limitation involved two underlying dimensions of conflict management styles: "concern for self" and "concern for others." Whereas individualists tend to see themselves as autonomous and they tend to worry about whether they present their independent-self credibly and competently in front of others, collectivists tend to see themselves as an interdependent-self and they tend to be more reflective of what others think of their face image in the context of in-group or out-group relations (Ting-Toomey, 1997). Thus, it can be said that individualists and collectivists perceive conflict situations with different self-concepts. Therefore, Rahim's conflict constructs such as "concern for self" and "concern for others" need to be developed more systematically in terms of a functional equivalence in different ethnic and cultural groups.

A fourth limitation was about the scenario used in this survey. This study focused on conflicts in a particular situation, namely, close friendships. The subjects were asked to imagine the given conflict episode that may happen in their relationships, and report their preferable conflict management strategies. Some concerns about the construct validity might be present in this method. Therefore, it is recommended to provide experimental conditions in future research that would examine the same variables.

A fifth limitation was that, in the present study, the American subjects

35

scored higher than the Japanese subjects on four conflict management styles (obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising). Only for the integrating style did Japanese score higher than Americans. Ohbuchi, Fukushima, and Tedeschi (1999) state that in cross-cultural research, it has been often found that scores of one cultural group are higher than those of another cultural group across all response categories. They also mention that, in general, individualists tend to choose more extreme values on scales than collectivists.

In the overall analyses, the present study found many similarities between Americans and Japanese in the use of conflict management styles with their close friends. It might be interesting to examine the conflict strategies among close relationships in cross-cultural settings, such as close friendships between Americas and Japanese. Although, this study had some limitations, it is hoped that the findings from this survey will be useful for the research on competence in managing intercultural conflict between Americans and Japanese.

APPENDX A

Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire (English Version)

This study asks questions about your conflict management style in situations of conflict with your close friend. It will take about 10 minutes to answer all the questions. To insure your anonymity, no names or identifying information will be used on your questionnaire. There will be no benefit to you. However, your participation will help contribute to a better understanding of the skills necessary in managing intercultural conflict between Americans and Japanese.

Part 1: Conflict Management Styles

< Conflict Episode >

You and your close friend are planning to travel abroad during the summer vacation. You gathered information from traveling books and found a country where you would be able to enjoy a pleasant climate, sightseeing, and shopping. Hearing about this, your close friend also showed interest in this country. Since your close friend was busy, you undertook to make reservations for plane tickets and hotels, and to make plans for the travel. To put together a plan, you spent a lot of time and carefully considered your limited budget and vacation time. However, as soon as your close friend glanced over the plans, he/she asked you to modify them. It seems that your close friend is not agreeable your ideas. If you try to satisfy all the demands of your close friend, you would need to greatly change your plans. You believed that your proposal was the best plan for this travel. You and your close friend are looking forward to visiting the country, and both of you want to enjoy this travel...

How do you manage this situation?

After reading the conflict episode, please think of a very close **American friend** with whom you share emotional support and needed assistance at times, and whom you also spend a lot of leisure time with. Please keep this person in mind as you answer the questions.

Please specify the initials of your close friend. _____ (only ONE person)

Please circle most appropriate answer for each statement.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
1) I try to investigate an issue with my close friend to find a solution acceptable to us.	1	2	3	4	5
2) I try to satisfy the needs of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
3) I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my close friend to myself.	1	2	3	4	5
4) I try to integrate my ideas with those of my close friend to come up with a decision jointly.	1	2	3	4	5
5) I try to work with my close friend to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.	1	2	3	4	5
6) I avoid open discussion of my differences with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
7) I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.	1	2	3	4	5
8) I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.	1	2	3	4	5
9) I am very persuasive when I have to be in order to win in a conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5
10) I accommodate the wishes of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
11) I give in to the wishes of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
12) I exchange accurate information with my close friend to solve the problem together.	1	2	3	4	5
13) I usually give concessions to my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
14) I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.	1	2	3	4	5
15) I negotiate with my close friend so that a compromise can be reached.	1	2	3	4	5
16) I try to stay away from disagreement with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
17) I avoid confrontation with my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
18) I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.	1	2	3	4	5
19) I often go along with the suggestions of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
20) I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.	1	2	3	4	5
21) I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.	1	2	3	4	5
22) I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that the issues can be resolved in the best possible way.	1	2	3	4	5
23) I collaborate with my close friend to come up with decisions acceptable to us.	1	2	3	4	5
24) I try to satisfy the expectations of my close friend.	1	2	3	4	5

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Not Sure	Agree	Strongly Agree
25) I enjoy competitive situations and play hard to win.	1	2	3	4	5
26) I try to keep my disagreement with my close friend to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.	1	2	3	4	5
27) I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with close friend.	1	2	3	4	5
28) I try to work with my close friend for a proper understanding of the problem.	1	2	3	4	5

Part 2: Background Information

(Please fill in the blanks and check appropriate answers.)

29) How long have you been a friend with him/her?	_____ year(s) _____ month(s)
30) Your Gender	☐ Male ☐ Female
31) Your Close Friend's Gender	☐ Male ☐ Female
32) Your Age	_____ years old
33) Your Close Friend's Age	_____ years old
34) Your Nationality	☐ American: born and raised on the Mainland ☐ American: born and raised in Hawaii ☐ Other: _____
35) Your Close Friend's Nationality	☐ American: born and raised on the Mainland ☐ American: born and raised in Hawaii ☐ Other: _____

APPENDX B

Conflict Management Styles Questionnaire (Japanese Version)

「対立処理スタイル」調査のためのアンケート

このアンケートは日本人学生とアメリカ人学生を対象に、親友との間でコンフリクト(対立)が起こった時の対処方法を調査するためのものです。すべての質問に答えていただくのにおよそ１０分かかります。あなたの個人情報を守るため、名前もしくは身分が容易に証明されるような情報を聞くことはありません。このアンケートは直接あなたに利益をもたらすものではありませんが、この調査により得られた結果が日米間のコンフリクト・マネジメントについてのさらなる研究に役立つものと信じています。ご協力よろしくお願いします。

Ｐａｒｔ１：対立処理スタイルについて

＜コンフリクト・エピソード＞

あなたとあなたの親友は夏休みを利用した海外旅行を計画しています。色々と情報を集めた結果、あなたは気候が良く観光やショッピングも楽しめそうな国を見つけました。あなたの親友に提案したところ、彼／彼女もその国を旅行することに大変興味を示しました。親友はとても忙しくしていたので、飛行機のチケットやホテルの予約、またその国での滞在中の計画などすべてをあなたが引き受けることになりました。旅行プランが出来上がり親友に見せにいくと、どうやら彼／彼女はあなたの計画に不満があるようです。あなたは多くの時間を費やして限られた予算や滞在日数を考慮して綿密にプランを立てたのですが、そんなことはお構いなしにあなたの親友はすぐさまその計画の変更を求めてきました。親友の希望をすべて満たすとなると、予算や日数の関係から当初のあなたの計画は大幅に変更されることになります。あなたは当初の旅行計画がベストだと信じています。あなたも親友もこの旅行をとても楽しみにしていて、すばらしい旅の思い出を作りたいと考えているのですが...
さて、このような状況の時あなたはどうしますか？

　　上記のエピソードを踏まえたうえで質問に答えていただきますが、問題に答える間、互いに精神的支えとなり多くの時間を一緒に過ごしたりするようなあなたの「日本人」の親友１人を思い浮かべてください。そして、それぞれの質問で適切だと思われる回答を１から５の中から１つを選び〇をつけてください。

41

親友のイニシャルを書いてください。：_____　　（その人物を思い描きやすくするためです）

	まったく そう 思わない	そう 思わない	わから ない	そう思う	強く そう思う
1）二人にとって好ましい計画を作るために、親友と一緒にこの計画の問題点を調べようとする	1	2	3	4	5
2）親友の要求を満たそうとする。	1	2	3	4	5
3）親友を困らせるようなことは避け、意見の不一致があってもそれを自分の中に押し止めようとする。	1	2	3	4	5
4）二人で協力して計画を立てるために自分と親友の意見を融合させようとする。	1	2	3	4	5
5）双方の希望を満たす解決策を親友と一緒に見つけようとする。	1	2	3	4	5
6）親友との意見の相違点についての率直な話し合いは避ける。	1	2	3	4	5
7）計画の行き詰まりを打開するために双方の折衷案を探し出そうとする。	1	2	3	4	5
8）自分の計画を通すために親友に対して自分の影響力を用いる。	1	2	3	4	5
9）親友を自分の計画に従わせたい時、私はとても説得力のある説明ができる。	1	2	3	4	5

	まったく そう思わ ない	そう思わ ない	わから ない	そう思う	強く そう思う
１０）親友の望みがかなう計画 にする。	1	2	3	4	5
１１）親友が言う通りの計画に 任せる。	1	2	3	4	5
１２）親友と一緒に問題を解決 するためにお互いに正確な情 報を交換し合う。	1	2	3	4	5
１３）親友の意見に譲歩する。	1	2	3	4	5
１４）計画の膠着状態を終らせ るために親友に対してお互い の意見の中間点を提案する。	1	2	3	4	5
１５）妥協点を見つけ出すため に親友と話し合う。	1	2	3	4	5
１６）親友との意見の不一致を 避けようとする。	1	2	3	4	5
１７）親友とは衝突しないよう にする。	1	2	3	4	5
１８）自分好みの計画になるよ うに自分の専門知識を用いる。	1	2	3	4	5
１９）親友の提案に同意して計 画を作り直す。	1	2	3	4	5
２０）親友とは互いの意見の歩 み寄りを目指す「ギブ・アン ド・テイク」の方法をとる。	1	2	3	4	5
２１）自分の計画を実行するた めに親友に対して強硬な態度 でいる。	1	2	3	4	5
２２）この問題を一番いい方法 で解決するために、双方の関心 事すべてを話し合いに出すよ うにする。	1	2	3	4	5
２３）親友と協力してお互いに 好ましい計画を作り出す。	1	2	3	4	5

	まったく そう思わ ない	そう思わ ない	わから ない	そう思う	強く そう思う
２４）親友の希望が満たされる ように計画を変更する。	1	2	3	4	5
２５）私はこの対立状況を楽し み、かつ自分の計画を押し通す ための努力を惜しまない。	1	2	3	4	5
２６）対立して嫌な思いをした くないので、私は親友と意見の 不一致があったとしてもそれ を隠しておく。	1	2	3	4	5
２７）親友とは不愉快な思いを させるような意見交換は避け る。	1	2	3	4	5
２８）この計画の問題点につい て正しい理解ができるように 親友と話し合う。	1	2	3	4	5

Ｐａｒｔ２：一般質問
（空欄をうめ、また適切なものにチェックを入れてください。）

２９）二人が親しくなってからの期間	＿＿＿＿年　＿＿＿＿ヶ月
３０）あなたの性別	□　男性 □　女性
３１）親友の性別	□　男性 □　女性
３２）あなたの年齢	＿＿＿＿歳
３３）親友の年齢	＿＿＿＿歳

REFERENCES

Baron, R. A. (1989). Personality and organizational conflict: Effects of the Type
A behavior pattern and self-monitoring. *Organizational Behavior
and Human Decision Process, 44,* 281-296.

Bell, E. C., & Blakeney, R. N. (1977). Personality correlates of conflict
resolution modes. *Human Relations, 30,* 849-857.

Bell, R. R. (1981). *Worlds of friendship.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ben-Yoav, O., & Banai, Moshe. (1992). Measuring conflict management styles: A
comparison between the MODE and ROCI-II instruments using self
and peer ratings. *The Journal of Conflict Management, 3,* 237-247.

Berryman-Fink, C., & Brunner, C. (1987). The effects of sex of source and target
on interpersonal conflict management styles. *Southern Speech
Communication Journal, 53,* 38-48.

Blake, R. R., & Mouton, J. S. (1964). *The managerial grid.* Houston, TX: Gulf
Publishing.

Burgoon, M., Dillard, J., & Doran, N. (1982). Cultural and situational influences
on the process of persuasive strategy selection. *International Journal
of Intercultural Relations, 6,* 85-100.

Chua, E. G., & Gudykunst, W. B. (1987). Conflict resolution styles in low- and
high-context cultures. *Communication Research Reports, 4,* 32-37.

Collier, M. J. (1991). Conflict competence within African, Mexican, and Anglo
American friendships. In S. Ting-Toomey, & F. Korzenny.
Cross-cultural interpersonal Communication (pp. 132-154).
Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Deaux, K., & Lewis, L. L. (1984). The structure of gender stereotypes:
Interrelationships among components and gender label. *Journal of
Personality and Social Psychology, 46,* 991-1004.

Elsayed-Ekhouly, S. M., & Buda, R. (1996). Organizational conflict: A
comparative analysis of conflict styles across cultures. *The
International Journal of Conflict Management, 7,* 71-81.

Gudykunst, W. B., & Nishida. T. (1983). Social penetration in Japanese and
American close friendships. In R. Bostrom (Ed.). *Communication
yearbook 7* (pp. 592-610). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond culture.* New York: Doubleday.

Hall, J. (1969). *Conflict management survey: A study of one's characteristic
reaction to and handling conflict between himself and others.* Canoe,
TX: Teleometrics International.

Hartup, W. W. (1975). The origins of friendships. In M. Lewis, & L. A.
Rosenblum (Eds.). *Friendship and peer relations.* New York: Wiley.

Hartup, W. W. (1992). Conflict and friendship relations. In C. U. Shantz & W. W.
Hartup (Eds.). *Conflict in child and adolescent development*
(pp.186-215). New York: Cambridge University Press.

Hellriegel, D., Slocum, J. W., & Woodman, R. W. (1995). *Organizational
behavior* (7th ed.). St. Paul, MN: West Publishing Company.

Hepburn, J. R. (1973). Violence behavior in interpersonal relationships. *Sociological Quarterly, Summer* (pp. 419-429).

Hofstede, G. (1984). Hofstede's cultural dimensions: An independent validation using Rokeach's value survey. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 15*, 417-433.

Kilmann, R. H., & Thomas, K. W. (1975). Interpersonal conflict-handling behavior as reflections of Jungian personality dimensions. *Psychological Reports, 37*, 971-980.

Kozan, M. K. (1989). Cultural influences on styles of handling interpersonal conflicts: Comparisons among Jordanian, Turkish, and U.S. managers. *Human Relations, 42*, 787-789.

Lawrence, P. R., & Lorsch, J. W. (1967). *Organization and environment.* Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey.

Lee, C. W. (1990). Relative status of employees and styles of handling interpersonal conflict: An experimental study with Korean managers. *The International Journal of Conflict Management, 1*, 327-340.

Leung, K., & Chan, D. K. S. (1999). Conflict management across cultures. In J. Adamopoulos, & Y. Kashima. *Social psychology and cultural context* (pp. 177-188). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Levenson, R. W., & Gottman, J. M. (1985). Psychological and affective predictors of change in relationship satisfaction. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*, 85-94.

Nadler, L. B., & Nadler, M. K., & Broome, B. J. (1985). Culture and the management of conflict situations. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.). *Communication, culture, and organizational process* (pp. 71-86). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Neff, E. K. (1986). *Conflict management styles of woman administrators in the twelve sate universities in Ohio.* OH: Bowling Green State University.

Ohbuchi, K., Fukushima, O., & Tedeschi, J. T. (1999). Cultural values in conflict management: Goal orientation, goal attainment, and tactical decision. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 30,* 51-71.

Paine, R. (1969). In search of friendship: An exploratory analysis in middle class culture. *Man, December,* 505-524.

Putnam, L., & Wilson, C. (1982). Communication strategies in organizational conflicts: reliability and validity of measurement. In M. Burgoon (Ed.). *Communication yearbook 6* (pp. 629-652). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Rahim, M. A. (1983). A measure of styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *Academy of Management Journal, 26,* 368-376.

Rahim, M. A. (1992). *Managing Conflict in Organizations* (2nd ed.). Westport, CT: Praeger.

Rawlins, W. K. (1992). *Friendship matters: Communication, dialectics, and the life course.* Hawthorne, NY: Aldine.

Renwick, P. A. (1977). The effects of sex differences on the perception and

    management of superior-subordinate conflict: An exploratory study.

    Organizational Behavior and Human Performance, 19, 403-415.

Shockley-Zalabak, P. (1981). The effects of sex differences on the preference for

    utilization of conflict styles of managers in a work setting: An

    exploratory study. *Public Personnel Management, 10,* 289-295.

Smollar, J., & Youniss, J. (1982). Social development through friendship. In K. H.

    Rubin & H. S. Ross (Eds.). *Peer relationships and social skills in*

    children (pp. 270-298). New York: Springer-Verlag.

Tafoya, D. (1983). The roots of conflict: A theory and typology. In W. B.

    Gudykunst (Ed.). *Intercultural communication theory* (pp. 205-238).

    Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Thomas, K. (1976). Conflict and conflict management. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.).

    Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology (pp.

    889-935). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.

Thomas, K., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE*

    instrument. New York: XICOM.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1986). Conflict styles in black and white subjective cultures. In

    Y. Y. Kim (Ed.). *Current research in interethnic communication.*

    Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1994). Managing conflict in intimate intercultural relationships.

    In D. D. Chan (Ed.). *Conflict in personal relationships* (pp. 47-77).

    Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1997). Intercultural conflict competence. In W. R. Cupach, & D. J. Canary. *Competence in interpersonal conflict* (pp. 121-147). New York: McGraw Hill.

Thing-Toomey, S. et al. (1991). Culture, face maintenance, and conflict styles. *The International Journal of Conflict Management 2,* 257-296.

Van de Vliert, E., & Kabanoff, B. (1990). Toward theory-based measures of conflict management. *Academy of Management Journal, 33,* 199-209.

Wall, J. A., & Blum, M. W. (1991). Negotiations. *Journal of Management, 17,* 273-303.

Wilmot, W. W. (1987). *Dyadic communication* (2nd. Ed.). New York: Random House.

Wiseman, J. P. (1986). Friendship: Bonds and binds in a voluntary relationship. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 3,* 191-211.

Youniss, J. (1980). *Parents and peers in social development.* Chicago: University of Chicago Press.