Conflict Management Styles of Americans and Indonesians: Exploring the Effects of Gender and Collectivism/Individualism

By

Rizaladdin Su'udy

Submitted to the graduate degree program in Communication Studies
and the Graduate Faculty of the University of Kansas in partial fulfillment of the
requirements for the degree of Master of Arts.

_____

Chairperson: Dr. Yan Bing Zhang

Committee Members

_____

Committee Member: Dr. Donn Parson

_____

Committee Member: Dr. Thomas Beisecker

Date Defended: April 13, 2009

The Thesis Committee for Rizaladdin Su'udy certifies

that this is the approved Version of the following thesis:

Conflict Management Styles of Americans and Indonesians: Exploring the Effects

of Gender and Collectivism/Individualism

Committee:

_____

Chair: Dr. Yan Bing Zhang

_____

Dr. Donn Parson

_____

Dr. Thomas Beisecker

Date approved: April 27, 2009

Abstract

The study explored the effects of gender and collectivism/individualism on conflict management styles among Indonesians ($n= 271$) and Americans ($n= 243$). Findings indicated that Indonesians preferred the compromising and integrating styles the most, followed by the avoiding, obliging, and emotion styles. The next preferred styles were the third-party use and dominating styles. For Americans, the compromising and integrating styles were the most preferred, followed by the dominating and emotional expression styles. The next preferred style was the obliging style, followed by the avoiding and third-party help styles. The neglect style was the least preferred style in both groups, with male participants and Indonesians endorsed the style significantly more than females and Americans respectively. In addition, results revealed that Americans preferred the integrating, compromising, dominating, emotional expression, and obliging styles significantly more than Indonesians. Indonesians preferred the avoiding style significantly more than Americans. Participants preferred the third-party help style equally.

Findings showed that American males were significantly more individualistic than American females, Indonesian males, and Indonesian females. Collectivism was a positive predictor of the avoiding, integrating, compromising, emotional expression and obliging styles in both cultures. Additionally, collectivism was a positive predictor of the third-party help style among Americans. Individualism was a positive predictor of the dominating style in both

groups. Individualism was a positive predictor of the integrating, compromising, and emotional expression styles in the Indonesian sample. Individualism was a positive predictor of the neglect style in the American sample. Overall, these findings indicate that collectivism is a stronger predictor of the conflict styles than is individualism. Results are discussed in light of prior literature on conflict management style, gender, and culture.

Acknowledgement

First, I would like to thank God Almighty for destining me to finish this research. I am also very grateful to be blessed with such a wonderfully patient and profoundly insightful advisor as Dr. Yan Bing Zhang. Her remarkable knowledge in related studies as well as in statistics has played an immense role in the process of my study. I would also like to extend my gratitude to Dr. Thomas Beisecker and Dr. Donn Parson both of whom served as members of my thesis committee and kindly provided me with constructive critiques, comments, and suggestions.

Gratitude also goes to Kartika Riyandari, my muse and inspiration. Her constant support, encouragement, and humor have allowed me to go through even the hardest moments imaginable. She is the best wife a husband can ask. I also would like to thank my whole family, whose prayers and unconditional love have guided me through my entire scholastic journey.

Lastly, I would like to thank my friends for supporting me in the process of my study. I am particularly indebted to I Nyoman Aryawibawa, Panji Hadisoemarto, Agustina Kustulasari, Brian Pranata, Tsuroyya, Leilani Carver, and Jana Elliot for helping me with the translation and back-translation of the instrument used in the study. My sincere gratitude is also extended to Bayu Yulianto, Nasrul Chotib, Bambang Priyadi M.S., Astrid Villamil, Cheongmi Shim, and Makiko Imamura for their help in gathering the data for this research.

Table of Content

Conflict Management Styles of Americans and Indonesians: Exploring the Effects

of Gender and Collectivism/Individualism

Conflict is an ever-present human phenomenon and exists in all ethnic and

cultural groups. Ranging from intergroup to interpersonal friction, conflict

penetrates all forms of social relationships (Ting-Toomey, Yee-Joung, Shapiro,

Garcia, Wright, & Oetzel 2000). Conflict is oftentimes avoided and suppressed

since it is considered as problematic and invokes negative feelings. However, if

properly managed, conflict can increase individuals' innovativeness and

productivity (Uline, Tschannen-moran, & Perez, 2003). On the one hand, if

managed appropriately conflict offers "interpersonal relationship satisfaction,

creative problem solving, the growth of the global workforce, and domestic

workplace diversity" (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001, p. 3) and leads to "improved

efficiency, creativity, and profitability" (Axelrod & Johnson, 2005, p. 42). On the

other hand, mishandled conflict directly causes "organizational inefficiency,

reduced productivity, stymied innovation, and compromised profits" (Axelrod &

Johnson, 2005, p. 42). Additionally, studies show that effective cross-cultural

conflict management may enhance our understanding of the influences that

cultural differences have on multicultural problem-solving (Brown, 1983).

It is believed that cross-cultural conflict management is more challenging

than intra-cultural conflict since the former involves people with different

expectations of how the conflict should be handled (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel,

2001). Besides, the increased frequency of cross-cultural linkages and contacts in

an age of globalization suggests that the need for cross-cultural conflict management knowledge is not only important, but also urgent (Chen, 1996). Nevertheless, conflict management in the cross-cultural context has been understudied (Ma, 2007). Hence, the current study is designed to examine conflict management from the perspectives of Indonesians and Americans.

Conflict management strategies are not only influenced by personal characteristics, but also defined by socio-cultural norms (Haar & Krahé, 1999). What might be an appropriate way of managing disputes in one society may not be acceptable in the other due to different assumptions regarding behavioral natures, expectations, and values. Furthermore, there has been a blossoming interest regarding the study of cross-cultural communication and conflict management over the past two decades (Cai & Fink, 2002). For example, intercultural researchers have examined cross-cultural conflict management between Americans and Arabs (Elsayed-Elkhouly and Buda, 1996), Americans and Mexicans (Gabrielidis, Stephan, Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal 1997), Americans and Japanese (Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994), and Jordanians and Turkish (Kozan, 1990).

Unfortunately, this line of research seems to be focused on certain cultures and neglects others. For example, studies examining conflict styles between the US and Asian cultures have predominantly focused on individuals from East Asian countries such as Japan, China, Korea, and Taiwan (e.g., Leung & Wu, 1990; Ohbuchi, Fukushima, & Tedeschi, 1999; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001).

Though these studies provide insight on conflict management styles in Asia, the generalizability of their results might be compromised since they only involved participants from certain Asian countries. Extending prior research on cross-cultural conflict management, the current study examines interpersonal conflict management by considering the perspectives of Americans and Indonesians. Being the largest Asian Pacific country with rapid economic growth and market place internationalization (Benton & Setiadi, 1998), Indonesia has been an important place for Western firms to expand their businesses. As conflict is inevitable (Leung & Tjosvold, 1998), knowledge about appropriate conflict management styles is required to enhance mutual understanding between Indonesians and Americans.

Among the variables that have been examined in prior research in conflict management, gender constitutes an important variable that influences individuals' conflict styles. For example, prior studies found that ways of managing conflicts are different between male and female children in the United States and Indonesia (French, Pidada, Denoma, McDonald, & Allison, 2005), male and female adolescents in Western Finland (Lindeman, Harakka, & Keltikangas-Järvinen, 1997) and male and female employees in the United States (Papa & Natalle, 1989). That said, other studies argue that there is no significant gender effect on conflict management styles. For example, prior studies found that conflict management styles are similar between male and female adolescents in Germany and Indonesia (Haar & Krahé, 1999) and male and female adults in the United

States (Conrad, 1991; Duane, 1989; Sorenson, Hawkins, & Sorenson, 1995). To further explore the influence of gender on conflict management, the current study considers gender as a major independent variable.

In cross-cultural conflict management studies, researchers have used collectivism/individualism as a major independent variable that predicts individuals' conflict styles. Hui and Triandis' (1986) Individualism-Collectivism (INDCOL) and Rahim's (2001) Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) scales have been widely used in this line of research. In their study on cultural salience and conflict style in four US ethnic groups, Ting-Toomey et al. (2000) developed a more complete conflict style instrument by incorporating ROCI-II and adapted items from various other scales (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1990; Healey & Bell, 1990). They then labeled the instrument as the Conflict Style Dimension (CSD). This instrument is perceived to be applicable to the current study since it assesses three other conflict styles that are more sensitive to Asian cultures (i.e. third party help, neglect, and emotional expression).

From the perspectives of Indonesians and Americans, the present study aims to examine the effects of gender and participants' endorsement of collectivism/individualism on conflict management styles. This study begins with a literature review on the concept of collectivism/individualism, conflict management styles, the most frequently used scales to measure them, conflict management style and gender, and cross-cultural conflict management and

collectivism/individualism. Following the literature review, research questions and hypotheses are proposed.

Collectivism/Individualism

Individualism is defined as a communal concept which is found in society where ties among its members are loose, and people are expected to look after themselves (Hofstede, 1991). In addition, individualism conveys three major aspects: low sacrifice (low subordination of personal goal), self-reliance, and low extension (i.e., one's action is of little concern for others) (Bontempo, 1993). By contrast, collectivism is found in societies in which "we-ness" is considered as the most important (Hui, 1988), and group identity and ingroup-oriented concerns are strongly emphasized (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Furthermore, conceptualization of collectivism comprises seven major components: (a) Consideration of implications of one's own decisions and/or actions for other people; (b) Sharing of material resources; (c) Sharing of non material resources (i.e. time and effort); (d) Susceptibility to social influence; (e) Self-presentation and face-work; (f) Sharing of outcomes; and (g) Feeling of involvement in others' lives (Hui, 1988).

At the cultural level, collectivism is predominantly found in Southern Italy (Banfield, 1958), Greece (Triandis & Vasiliou, 1972), Asia, Africa, the Middle East, Central and South America, and the Pacific Islands (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), while Northern and Western Europeans and North Americans tend to be more individualistic (Inkeles, 1983; Stewart, 1966; Ting-Toomey & Oetzel,

2001). Before the development of INDCOL (Hui & Triandis, 1986), instrument

designed specifically to measure the construct is not available (Hui, 1988).

INDCOL is designed to measure collectivism as a personality dimension, assumes

that collectivism is multifaceted, and covers wide range of behaviors, attitudes,

behavioral intentions, and beliefs (Hui, 1988). The scale was developed to assess

individual's endorsement of collectivism by measuring attitudes and behaviors

toward various relational domains (Cai & Fink, 2002). Cross-cultural

communication scholars have frequently examined the association between

collectivism/individualism and conflict management styles (Komarraju,

Dollinger, & Lovell, 2008). The following section reports literature on conflict

management styles and the commonly used conflict measurement scales.

Conflict Management Styles

Though conflict is conceptualized differently depending on the

context in which it occurs, it is composed of major components such as

expressed struggle, interdependence, perceived incompatibility of goals,

perceived scarce rewards, and interference (Domenici & Littlejohn, 2001).

In light of those major components, conflict is defined as an expressed

struggle between two or more interdependent parties perceiving

incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from others in

achieving their goals (Hocker & Wilmot, 2001). Furthermore, conflict

management styles refer to individuals' characteristic modes of managing

disputes in various interaction episodes (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000).

In conceptualizing conflict management styles, a number of scholars have used the dual-concern model introduced by Blake and Mouton (1964) since it reflects "independent dimensions of interpersonal conflict behavior" (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977, p. 310). The model proposes that individuals' preferred conflict styles depend on some variations of two primary concerns (Ma, 2007); cooperation, which is the attempt to satisfy the other person's concerns, and assertiveness or competition, which is the attempt to satisfy one's own concern (Kilmann & Thomas, 1977).

Numerous studies have been conducted to develop instruments assessing individuals' conflict management styles (e.g., Hall, 1969; Putnam & Wilson, 1982; Rahim, 2001; Ross-De wine, 1982; Thomas & Kilmann, 1974) based on Blake and Mounton's (1964) model (Womack, 1988). Among the instruments, Rahim's (2001) Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-II) is distinguished by "its emphasis on individual predisposition, its belief in maintaining a balance in the amount of conflict in the organization, and its concern for effectiveness in managing conflicts" (Weider-Hatfield, 1988, p.350). Based on the dual-concern model, Rahim (2001) classifies conflict management style into five: *integrating* (high concern for the self and high concern for others), *compromising* (moderate concern for the self and for others), *obliging* (low concern for the self and high concern for others), *dominating* (high

concern for the self and low concern for others), and *avoiding* (low

concern for the self and low concern for others).

Studies have also been conducted to test the validity and reliability

of the instrument (e.g., Rahim, 2001; Weider-Hatfield, 1988). Rahim

(2001) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis of the instrument in a

national sample and seven other random samples. Results of the analysis

provided evidence of convergent and discriminant validities of the scale.

He argues that the instrument is applicable in organizational diagnosis,

management training, teaching, and research. Focusing on ROCI-II's

theoretical underpinnings, its treatment of communication in conflict, its

psychometric properties, and its application in research and training,

Weider-Hatfield (1988) finds support for the construct, concurrent, and

predictive validity of the scale. She also sees the instrument as an effective

research tool. In addition, Rahim's (2001) conceptualization of conflict

management styles is used in the current study not only because of its

validity, but also because of its compatibility with the dimension of

collectivism/individualism (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000).

Incorporating items in ROCI-II and other items adapted from Disputing

Process Instrument (DPI) (Morril & Thomas, 1992), the Dissatisfaction in

Friendship Instrument (DFI) (Healey & Bell, 1990), and the Affective Orientation

Scale (AOS) (Booth-Butterfield & Booth-Butterfield, 1990), Ting-Toomey et al.

(2000) developed a more complete interpersonal conflict management instrument

and labeled it the Conflict Style Dimension (CSD) scale. In addition to the five conflict styles identified in ROCI-II, CSD consists of three new conflict factors: neglect, third-party help, and emotional expression. *Neglect* involves aggressiveness and responses that threaten the other party's image. To achieve their goals, individuals who use the neglect style are not only assertive and direct, as those using the dominating style, they also overtly and covertly harm the other person's image. *Third-party help* is characterized by seeking help from outsiders to mediate the conflict. *Emotional expression* emphasizes on the use of emotion during the conflict episode. Aside from being emotionally expressive, Individuals who use the emotional expression style rely heavily on their feelings to guide conflict behaviors. Even though their factor analysis showed that only seven out of the eight styles identified in Rahim's (2001) inventory met the criteria for interpretation, leaving out the obliging style, the present study will use the original version which captures all the eight styles.

Gender and Conflict Management Styles

Gender has been known as an important variable that influences conflict management styles. However, findings about the effect of gender on conflict management have been mixed (Putnam & Poole, 1987). While some studies found no differences between the two genders when approaching conflict, others studies demonstrated that males and females managed conflict significantly differently (Sorenson et al., 1995).

Lindeman et al.'s (1997) study of age and gender differences in adolescents' reaction towards conflict found that boys and girls behaved differently in conflict situations. Examining pre- (11-year-olds), mid- (14-year-olds), and late-(17-year-olds) adolescents in Western Finland, they found that females tended to be less aggressive than males in the school context. Similarly, results of the comparative study of Indonesian and American children by French et al. (2005) indicated that both genders used different styles in conflict. Their results showed that males used more physical aggression than females. In addition, Offerman and Beil (1992) found that females and males in the United States differed in their achievement orientation, and that females were less interested in competition. Furthermore, Papa and Natalle (1989) found strong support that sex affected conflict behaviors. Comparing male-male, female-female, and male-female dyads in the US, they specifically found that participants in male-male dyads were more assertive and used reason consistently, while those in female-female dyads shifted to bargaining method when high level of assertiveness and reason failed to resolve the conflict. Additionally, participants in male-female dyads used reason and bargaining consistently throughout the interactions.

Results of these studies indicate that males and females behave differently in conflict situations. They conclude that the main difference between males and females in conflict situations is that males prefer to act more competitively, whereas females tend to behave more cooperatively. However, other studies

suggest quite the opposite. A number of studies found that the effects of gender on conflict style were insignificant or, at best, unclear. For example, on their study on the effect of culture and gender on children's conflict styles in Indonesia and Germany, Haar and Krahé, (1999) found that even though culture had a significant effect on participants' conflict management styles, there was no gender effect. In addition, Duane (1989) conducted a comparative study of the conflict management styles of American female and male officials responsible for resolving employees' grievances. He found that females were less inclined to use the avoiding and accommodating styles and more inclined to use the competition style relative to males in grievance-related context. Furthermore, he found no gender differences in the preference of the collaborative and compromising styles.

Additionally, Conrad (1991) analyzed the relationship between conflict style preferences and communicative strategies in supervisor/subordinate conflicts. He found that both American male and female supervisors chose to use pro-social communicative strategies at the outset and then shifted to coercion when the initial strategy failed. The main difference between male and female supervisors was the point at which the strategy changed, in that males shifted to coercion faster than females.

Realizing the contradictory findings of studies about the effects of gender on conflict management styles, Sorenson et al. (1995) conducted a study to clarify the issue. They argued that the relationship between gender and conflict style preference was mediated by the psychological type (that females were

predominantly "feeler", while male were mostly "thinker"). However, their findings showed that while psychological type was proven to be a stronger predictor of conflict style preferences than gender, neither factor significantly predicted conflict style preferences.

Literature has shown that the effects of gender on conflict management styles remain questionable and need further clarification. In addition to gender, socio-cultural norms and values are also significant variables influencing individuals' conflict styles (Haar & Krahé, 1999). Collectivism/individualism is a construct that has been used in studies of cultural differences in conflict styles (Cai & Fink, 2002). The following section reviews literature about the effects collectivism/individualism has on conflict management styles.

Cross-Cultural Conflict Management and Collectivism/Individualism

As a cultural variability dimension, collectivism/individualism has been largely used in conducting cross-cultural research, especially in cross-cultural conflict management. Numerous studies have indicated that there are differences in conflict styles in individualistic and collectivistic cultures. However, there are mixed empirical findings regarding which styles are preferred by collectivists and individualists (Kim & Leung, 2000). A number of studies propose that Asians (collectivists) tend to use the accommodating and avoiding styles (Ma, 2007), while competition is perceived more desirably by Americans (individualists) (French et al., 2005). Ma's (2007) research of Chinese conflict styles involved two hundred senior undergraduate students in negotiation simulations. Conflict

management styles were measured using the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode instrument (MODE). Results suggested that the avoiding and compromising styles were preferred by the Chinese participants (collectivists). In addition, French et al. (2005) examined conflict styles used by 80 Indonesian and 67 American fourth and fifth grade children. Their findings indicated that Indonesian children frequently exhibited disengagement when faced with conflict, while European-Americans considered that conflicts were best directly addressed. Benton and Setiadi (1998) report that harmony is a concept that needs to be understood to comprehend Indonesians' perspectives on conflict. In order to achieve social harmony, any expressions of conflict are usually concealed in the Indonesian, especially in Javanese (the largest sub-culture in Indonesia), society (Benton & Setiadi, 1998). In addition, Ting-Toomey and Oetzel (2001) propose that the ideal way for Americans to manage conflict is "to talk it out and perhaps to brainstorm creative solution to the problem" (p. 31). In addition, Zhang, Harwood, and Hummert (2005) examined perceptions of conflict management styles used by the young adults in Chinese intergenerational dyads. They found that the younger participants considered the accommodating and problem-solving styles as equally appropriate, and that the older participants preferred the accommodating style to the problem-solving style. However, they also found that participants, regardless of their age, evaluated the competing and avoiding style negatively.

Cai and Fink (2002) examined the association between collectivism and individualism and conflict management styles with 188 participants consisting of

both American and international graduate students. They used a questionnaire which included a modified version of Hui and Triandis' (1986) index of the Individualism-Collectivism (INDCOL), the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) (Rahim, 2001), and demographic questions. The researchers first employed The INDCOL scale to measure participants' level of collectivism/individualism and then used ROCI-II scale to assess participants' preferred conflict styles. Interestingly, results showed that the avoiding style was preferred by individualists rather than collectivists. Likewise, Lee and Rogan (1991) found that their Korean participants (collectivists) preferred to use solution-oriented styles more than the American subjects, while their North American participants (individualists) chose to use the controlling or avoiding style more than the Koreans.

In conclusion, cross-cultural studies suggest the variation of conflict management styles preference across cultures. Recent scholars propose that there are eight different conflict management styles: integrating (collaborating), compromising, obliging (accommodating), dominating (competing), avoiding, neglect, third-party help, and emotional expression. Furthermore, using the collectivism/individualism dimension, studies found mixed results. On the one hand, a number of studies found that collectivistic cultures (e.g., Asian) preferred to use the avoiding, accommodating, and compromising styles, while people in individualistic cultures (e.g., the United States) tended to use conflict styles showing domination and competition (see Benton & Setiadi, 1998; French et al.,

2005; Ma, 2007). On the other hand, research also found that the avoiding style was used more frequently by individualists rather than collectivists (see Cai & Fink, 2002; Lee & Rogan, 1991) and could be perceived very negatively (e.g., inappropriate and ineffective) in some collectivistic cultures (Zhang et al., 2005).

Research Questions and Hypotheses

Drawing on results and discussion of previous studies, this research aims to address the following research questions and hypotheses:

RQ1: What are the preferred conflict management styles of Indonesians?

RQ2: What are the preferred conflict management styles of Americans?

RQ3: Will conflict styles vary with gender and culture?

H1: Participants' endorsement of collectivism/individualism will vary with gender and culture.

H1.1: Indonesians will be more collectivistic and less individualistic than Americans.

H1.2: Females will be more collectivistic and less individualistic than males.

H1.3: Indonesians will be more collectivistic than individualistic.

H1.4: Americans will be more individualistic than collectivistic.

H2: Participants' endorsement of collectivism/individualism will be associated with conflict management styles. Specifically, it is predicted that collectivism will be positively associated with the avoiding, compromising, accommodating, integrating, emotional expression, and third-party help styles, and that

individualism will be positively associated with the dominating, integrating, emotional expression, and neglect styles in both cultures.

Method

Participants

Five hundred and fourteen subjects participated in the study, including 271 Indonesians (Mage = 20.42, SD = 2.03, Age range = 18-33) and 243 Americans (Mage = 20.80, SD = 2.19, Age range = 18-32). Among the Indonesians 150 were females (55.4%) and 121 were males (44.6%). Among the Americans 139 were females (57.2%) and 104 were males (42.8%). The average years of education for the Indonesian subjects was 14.68 (SD = 1.82) and for the American subjects was 14.93 (SD = 1.73).

American participants were recruited from a medium sized mid-Western university. Indonesian participants were college students at two major public universities in the Eastern part of Java in Indonesia. Java is the most developed and populated island in Indonesia. All participants were recruited on a voluntary basis.

Procedure and Measures

One goal of the research was to compare conflict management styles and level of endorsement of collectivism/individualism between American and Indonesian subjects. The second goal was to explore the effects of gender and collectivism/individualism on conflict management styles in both cultures. Before completing the questionnaire, participants were asked to provide their

demographic information which included gender, age, and years of education.

Participants were assured that their responses would remain confidential. The

American participants answered all questions in English (Appendix A), while the

Indonesians completed the translated version of the instrument (Appendix B).

Two bilingual Indonesian graduate students studying in the United States and the

author translated the original version of the scale to Indonesian. The scale was

then back-translated to English by three other bilingual Indonesian graduate

students studying in the United States. The back-translation method is used since

it is capable of improving the reliability and validity of research instruments in

different languages given that the quality of a translation is verified by an

independent translator (Hambleton, 1993, 1994, 1995). Additionally, the back-

translated version of the scale was checked and compared with the original

version by two American doctoral students. Minor modifications were made to

the translated versions to improve clarity and accuracy.

In the first section of the questionnaire, participants were asked to think of

how they generally manage conflict with their peers. Then participants completed

a 66-item questionnaire developed by Ting-Toomey et al. (2000). The scale was

based on the modified Rahim's (1983) Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI-

II) which measured five interpersonal conflict styles, including the avoiding (e.g.,

"I try to stay away from disagreement with my peers"), the integrating (e.g., "I

would meet with my peers to see if we could work out a resolution to our

conflict"), the compromising (e.g., "I try to find a middle course to resolve an

impasse"), the dominating (e.g., "I use my influence to get my ideas accepted"),
and the accommodating/obliging styles (e.g., "I generally try to satisfy the need of
my peers"). Other items were added to Rahim's (1983) ROCI-II to measure three
additional conflict styles, including third-party help style (e.g., "I would generally
ask a third person to intervene on our dispute and settle it for us"), emotional
expression style (e.g., "I would be emotionally expressive in the conflict
situation"), and neglect style (e.g., "When we discuss the problem, I would refuse
to cooperate"). Participants were asked to respond to the items in the
questionnaire on a 7-point Likert-type scale, with 7= strongly agree and 1=
strongly disagree, in which higher number indicated higher level of endorsement.
Reliabilities of the subscales for each conflict style within each group were
computed. The Cronbach's alphas for the Indonesian subjects ranged from .60 to
.85, and from .74 to .90 for the American participants (see Table 1).

In the second section, participants were asked to respond to a 32-item
questionnaire drawn from Triandis' (1995) INDCOL scale. Participants
responded to the items on a 7-point Likert-type scale with 7= strongly agree and
1= strongly disagree, in which higher number indicated higher level of
endorsement. Items in the questionnaire showed either endorsement to
individualism (e.g., "I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk to people") or
collectivism (e.g., "My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those
around me"). The Cronbach's alpha for collectivism items for the Indonesian
participants was .82 and .74 for the American participants. The Cronbach's alpha

for individualism items was .80 for Indonesian subjects and .78 for the American subjects (see Table 1).

Table 1

Cronbach's alpha for the Conflict Management Styles and Collectivism/individualism scales

	Indonesians	Americans	All participants
Avoiding	.82	.90	.86
Integrating	.80	.87	.84
Third-party help	.85	.90	.87
Neglect	.81	.86	.84
Compromising	.60	.80	.67
Dominating	.78	.79	.81
Emotion	.69	.78	.74
Accommodating/Obliging	.69	.80	.74
Collectivism	.82	.74	.77
Individualism	.80	.78	.78

Results

RQ1: Conflict Management Styles of Indonesians

The first research question inquired conflict style preference of the Indonesian participants. A series of paired-samples *t* tests were conducted to examine conflict management styles preferences of Indonesians. Twenty-eight comparisons were analyzed with significance level set to .002 (.05/28). Results

indicated that the compromising and integrating styles were the most preferred conflict styles of Indonesians (no difference between the two styles), followed by the avoiding, accommodating/obliging, and emotion styles (no difference among the styles). The next preferred styles were the third-party use and dominating styles (no significant difference between the styles). Finally, the least preferred style among the Indonesian participants was the neglect style.

RQ2: Conflict Management Styles of Americans

The second research question asked about the preferred conflict management styles of Americans. Paired-samples *t* tests were conducted to examine conflict management styles preferences of Americans. Twenty-eight comparisons were analyzed with significance level set to .002 (.05/28). Results showed that Americans preferred the compromising and integrating styles the most (no difference between the two styles), followed by the dominating and emotional expression styles (no difference between the styles). The next preferred style was the accommodating/obliging style, followed by the avoiding and third-party help styles. Finally, the least preferred style was the neglect style.

RQ3: Gender, Culture Groups, and Conflict Styles

RQ3 inquired whether conflict styles would vary with gender and culture. A 2 (gender) x 2 (culture) multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was conducted to determine the effects of participants' gender and cultural backgrounds (Indonesia and America) on the eight conflict styles (the avoiding, integrating, third-party help, neglect, compromising, dominating, emotional

expression, and accommodating/obliging styles). Results indicated significant main effects for gender ($F(8, 410) = 4.03$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .07$) and culture ($F(8, 410) = 31.85$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .38$). Culture by participant gender interaction effect was not significant ($F(8, 410) = .68$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$). Univariate ANOVAs were conducted at .006 (.05/8) as follow-up tests to the significant MANOVA. For the gender main effects, univariate tests showed significant difference only for the neglect style ($F(1, 417) = 19.48$, $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .04$), but not for the avoiding ($F(1, 417) = .28$, $p > .01$, $\eta^2 = .01$), integrating ($F(1, 417) = 2.57$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .006$), third-party help ($F(1, 417) = 4.49$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .012$), compromising ($F(1, 417) = 2.09$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .005$), dominating ($F(1, 417) = 4.75$, $p > .01$, $\eta^2 = .011$), emotional expression ($F(1, 417) = 1.78$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .004$), and the accommodating/obliging styles ($F(1, 417) = .17$, $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .00$). Analysis for the gender effects indicated that male participants ($M = 3.09$, $SD = 1.25$) endorsed the neglect style significantly more than female participants ($M = 2.57$, $SD = 1.15$) (see Table 2).

Table 2

Means and Standard Deviations of Males and Females Conflict Styles

	Males		Females	
Conflict Style	*M*	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Avoiding	4.06[a]	.92	4.09[a]	.92
Integrating	4.99[a]	.88	5.13[a]	.87
Third-party help	3.74[a]	1.15	3.50[a]	1.18

Neglect	3.09^a	1.25	2.57^b	1.15
Compromising	5.06^a	.82	5.17^a	.84
Dominating	4.55^a	1.10	4.34^a	1.22
Emotion	4.44^a	.98	4.56^a	.94
Accommodating/Obliging	4.42^a	.83	4.46^a	.82

Note. Means with different superscripts differed significantly in rows.

For culture main effect, univariate tests were significant for the avoiding ($F(1, 417) = 23.63, p < .001, \eta^2 = .05$), integrating ($F(1, 417) = 15.79, p < .001, \eta^2 = .04$), neglect ($F(1, 417) = 22.41, p < .001, \eta^2 = .05$), compromising ($F(1, 417) = 10.90, p < .006, \eta^2 = .02$), dominating ($F(1, 417) = 97.30, p < .001, \eta^2 = .19$), emotional expression ($F(1, 417) = 31.15, p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$), and the accommodating/obliging styles ($F(1, 417) = 29.74, p < .001, \eta^2 = .07$), but not for the third-party help style ($F(1, 417) = 1.44, p > .05, \eta^2 = .003$). As presented in table 3, the American participants preferred the integrating, compromising, dominating, emotional expression, and the accommodating/obliging styles significantly more than the Indonesian subjects. Indonesians preferred the avoiding and neglect styles significantly more than the American subjects. Participants did not differ in their preference of the third-party help style.

Table 3

Means and Standard Deviations of Indonesians and Americans Conflict Styles

Conflict Style	Indonesians		Americans	
	M	*SD*	*M*	*SD*
Compromising	4.99[a]	.84	5.26[b]	.79
Integrating	4.90[a]	.90	5.25[b]	.82
Avoiding	4.28[b]	.84	3.86[a]	.96
Emotion	4.26[a]	.96	4.79[b]	.88
Accommodating/Obliging	4.23[a]	.82	4.67[b]	.77
Dominating	3.95[a]	1.18	4.97[b]	.90
Third-party help	3.67[a]	1.13	3.52[a]	1.21
Neglect	3.06[b]	1.25	2.51[a]	1.12

Note. Means with different superscripts in rows indicate a significant difference.

H1: Collectivism/Individualism, Gender, and Culture Groups

H1.1 and H.1.2: Collectivism/Individualism across Gender and Culture Groups

  H1.1 predicted that Indonesian participants would be more collectivistic and less individualistic than American participants. In addition, H.1.2 predicted that female participants would be more collectivistic than male participants. To test these hypotheses, a 2 (gender) x 2 (cultures) MANOVA with participants' endorsement of collectivism/individualism as dependent variables was conducted.

Results revealed a gender main effect ($F(2, 447) = 11.46 \, p < .001, \eta^2 = .05$), a culture main effect ($F(2, 447) = 4.71 \, p < .05, \eta^2 = .02$), and a culture by gender interaction effect ($F(2, 447) = 7.59 \, p < .01, \eta^2 = .03$). For the gender main effect, univariate test showed a significant difference for participants' endorsement of individualism ($F(1, 448) = 13.59 \, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$), but not for collectivism ($F(1, 448) = 2.62 \, p > .05, \eta^2 = .006$). Analysis showed that male participants ($M = 5.02$, $SD = .78$) had higher endorsement of individualism than female participants ($M = 4.76, SD = .72$).

For the culture main effect, univariate tests were neither significant for collectivism ($F(1, 448) = 3.62 \, p > .05, \eta^2 = .008$) nor individualism ($F(1, 448) = 2.61 \, p > .05, \eta^2 = .006$). The analysis indicated that Indonesian ($M = 5.07, SD = .74$) and American participants ($M = 4.94, SD = .62$) were equally collectivistic. The analysis also showed that the American subjects ($M = 4.90, SD = .70$) and Indonesian participants ($M = 4.84, SD = .80$) were equally individualistic. Univariate tests for the interaction effect were significant for individualism ($F(1, 448) = 14.35 \, p < .001, \eta^2 = .03$), but not for collectivism ($F(1, 448) = .08 \, p > .05, \eta^2 = .000$). Table 4 presents means and standard deviations for the endorsement of individualism in the Indonesian and American samples.

Gender and Culture Interaction Effect for Individualism

Simple main effects of gender were analyzed within each cultural group. There was no gender difference among Indonesians ($F(1, 232) = .009 \, p > .05, \eta^2 = .000$), whereas there was significant gender effect in the American sample ($F(1,$

235) = 33.49 $p < .001$, $\eta^2 = .12$). American males ($M = 5.20$, $SD = .68$) were

significantly more individualistic than American females ($M = 4.69$, $SD = .63$).

Simple main effects of culture were examined within gender. Analysis showed

that American females and Indonesian females endorsed individualism equally

($F(1, 270) = 2.83$ $p > .05$, $\eta^2 = .01$), while there was a significant difference in the

endorsement of individualism among the male participants ($F(1, 197) = 11.47$ $p <$

$.01$, $\eta^2 = .06$). American male participants ($M = 5.20$, $SD = .68$) were significantly

more individualistic than Indonesian males ($M = 4.83$, $SD = .78$).

Table 4

Means and Standard Deviations of the Endorsement of Individualism

	Culture				
	Indonesians			Americans	
Gender	*M*	*SD*		*M*	*SD*
Male	4.83[a]	.78		5.20[b]	.68
Female	4.84[a]	.79		4.69[a]	.63

Note. Means with different superscripts differ significantly both in rows and in

columns.

H1.3: Level of Collectivism/Individualism of Indonesians

      H1.3 predicted that Indonesians would be more collectivistic than

individualistic. A paired-samples *t* test was conducted to evaluate the hypothesis.

Results confirmed the hypothesis, indicating that Indonesian participants were

significantly more collectivistic ($M = 5.07$, $SD = .74$) than individualistic ($M =$

4.84, $SD = .78$), t (222) = 4.74, $p < .001$. The 95% confidence interval for the difference in means ranged from -.33 to -.14.

H1.4: Level of Collectivism/Individualism of Americans.

H.1.4 predicted that Americans would have higher level of endorsement of individualism than collectivism. A paired-samples t test was conducted to test the hypothesis. Results did not confirm the hypothesis, indicating that there was no significant difference between American participants' endorsement of individualism ($M = 4.90, SD = .70$) and collectivism ($M = 4.94, SD = .62$), t (228) = -.51, $p > .05$, with the 95% confidence interval for means differences ranging from --.15 to -.09.

H2: Collectivism/Individualism and Conflict Management Styles

H2 predicted that collectivism/individualism would be associated with conflict management styles. Specifically, it was predicted that collectivism would be positively associated with the avoiding, compromising, accommodating, integrating, emotional expression, and third-party help styles, and that individualism would be positively associated with the dominating, integrating, emotional expression, and neglect styles. A series of multiple hierarchical regression analyses were conducted. On the first model, participants' demographics including age and years of education were entered, while participants' levels of endorsement of collectivism/individualism were entered in the second model. Table 5 presents the relationships between demographics, collectivism/individualism, and conflict management styles.

Table 5

Relationships between Demographics, Collectivism/Individualism and Conflict Styles

	Culture					
	Indonesians			Americans		
Variables	R^2 change	β	sr^2	R^2 change	β	sr^2
A. Avoiding						
1. Demographics	.06*			.00		
Age		-.11	.00		-.04	.00
Years of education		-.16	.01		-.03	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.12**			.03*		
Collectivism		.40**	.11		.16*	.02
Individualism		-.11	.00		-.08	.00
B. Integrating						
1. Demographics	.00			.00		
Age		-.03	.00		.03	.00
Years of education		-.03	.00		-.10	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.20**			.06*		
Collectivism		.29**	.06		.26**	.06
Individualism		.22*	.03		.00	.00
C. Third-Party Help						
1. Demographics	.02			.01		
Age		.01	.00		.11	.00
Years of education		-.14	.01		-.04	.00

2. Collectivism/Individualism	.03			.05*		
Collectivism		.19	.02		.21*	.04
Individualism		-.11	.01		.09	.00

D. Neglect

1. Demographics	.00			.02		
Age		.08	.00		.07	.00
Years of education		-.04	.00		.10	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.02			.09**		
Collectivism		-.16	.02		-.06	.00
Individualism		.12	.01		.30**	.08

E. Compromising

1. Demographics	.03			.00		
Age		-.23	.03		.04	.00
Years of education		.15	.01		-.09	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.24**			.10**		
Collectivism		.30*	.06		.31**	.10
Individualism		.26*	.05		-.04	.00

F. Dominating

1. Demographics	.00			.00		
Age		-.05	.00		.08	.00
Years of education	.	.07	.00		-.07	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.13**			.20**		
Collectivism		.01	.00		-.06	.00
Individualism		.35**	.09		.45**	.20

G. Emotional Expression

	R^2 change	β	sr^2	R^2 change	β	sr^2
1. Demographics	.03*			.03		
Age		-.14	.01		-.11	.00
Years of education		-.05	.00		-.06	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.16**			.03*		
Collectivism		.19*	.02		.17*	.03
Individualism		.17*	.02		.04	.00
H. Accommodating/Obliging						
1. Demographics	.03			.00		
Age		-.16	.01		.05	.00
Years of education		-.03	.00		-.09	.00
2. Collectivism/Individualism	.16**			.13**		
Collectivism		.40**	.11		.36**	.13
Individualism		.00	.00		-.03	.00

Note. $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$.

Avoiding

    In the Indonesian sample both demographics as a group of variables ($R =$ .25, adjusted $R^2 = .05$, R^2 change = .06, F change(2, 185) = 6.02, $p < .01$) and collectivism/individualism ($R = .43$, adjusted $R^2 = .17$, R^2 change = .12, F change(2, 183) = 13.89, $p < .001$) significantly predicted the avoiding style. However, neither age ($\beta = -.11$, $t(185) = -1.20$, $p > .05$) nor years of education ($\beta = -.16$, $t(185) = -1.64$, $p > .05$) were significant predictors of the avoiding style. Participants' endorsement of collectivism was a positive predictor ($\beta = .40$, $t(183) = 5.03$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .11$), indicating that the more collectivistic Indonesian participants were, the more they used the avoiding style.

Among Americans, demographic variables as a group did not predict the avoiding style ($R = .07$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change(2, 213) $= .52$, $p > .05$), while the collectivism/individualism did ($R = .19$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $= .03$, F change(2, 211) $= 3.57$, $p < .05$). Collectivism was a positive predictor ($\beta = .16$, $t(213) = 2.37$, $p < .05$, $sr^2 = .02$). The more collectivistic American subjects were, the more they preferred the avoiding style.

Integrating

Demographic variables as a group did not predict the preference of the integrating style for Indonesian participants ($R = .05$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change(2, 192) $= .25$, $p > .05$). The second set of variables significantly predicted Indonesian subjects' endorsement of the integrating style ($R = .45$, adjusted $R^2 = -.19$, R^2 change $= .20$, F change(2, 190) $= 23.84$, $p < .001$). The significant effect can be attributed to both the endorsements of collectivism ($\beta = .29$, $t(190) = 3.72$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .06$) and individualism ($\beta = .22$, $t(190) = 2.89$, $p < .05$, $sr^2 = .03$). The more collectivistic and individualistic Indonesian subjects were, the more they preferred the integrating style.

Similarly, demographics did not predict the integrating style among the American subjects ($R = .08$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change(2, 224) $= .82$, $p > .05$), while the second set of variables ($R = .27$, adjusted $R^2 = .06$, R^2 change $= .06$, F change(2, 222) $= 7.66$, $p < .05$) did. Endorsement of collectivism was a positive predictor ($\beta = .26$, $t(224) = 3.90$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .06$), indicating that

the more collectivistic American subjects were, the more they endorsed the integrating style.

Third-party Help

For Indonesian subjects, both demographic variables ($R = .14$, adjusted $R^2 = .00$, R^2 change $= .02$, F change$(2, 187) = 1.74$, $p > .05$) and collectivism/individualism ($R = .21$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $= .03$, F change$(2, 185) = 2.52$, $p > .05$) failed to predict the third-party help style. Demographic variables as a group also did not predict the third-party help style among Americans ($R = .09$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change$(2, 220) = .84$, $p > .05$). However, variables in the second model predicted the third-party help in the American sample ($R = .24$, adjusted $R^2 = .04$, R^2 change $= .05$, F change$(2, 218) = 6.01$, $p < .05$). The endorsement of collectivism was a positive predictor in the second set of variables ($\beta = .21$, $t(218) = 3.16$, $p < .05$, $sr^2 = .04$). The more collectivistic the American subjects were, the more they preferred the third-party help style.

Neglect

Both demographics ($R = .06$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change$(2, 192) = .33$, $p > .05$) and collectivism/individualism ($R = .15$, adjusted $R^2 = .00$, R^2 change $= .02$, F change$(2, 190) = 1.81$, $p > .05$) did not predict the neglect style for Indonesian participants. For Americans, demographic variables ($R = .16$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $= .02$, F change$(2, 222) = 2.78$, $p > .05$) did not predict the neglect style, while variables in the second model ($R = .34$,

adjusted $R^2 = .10$, R^2 change $= .09$, F change$(2, 220) = 10.88$, $p < .001$) predicted the style. The significant effect was due to the endorsement of individualism ($\beta = .30$, $t(220) = 4.60$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .08$). The more American subjects endorsed individualism, the more they used the neglect style.

Compromising

Demographic variables as a group did not predict the use of compromising style for Indonesian subjects ($R = .17$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $= .03$, F change$(2, 193) = 2.90$, $p > .05$). Variables in the second model, however, predicted Indonesian subjects' preference of the compromising style ($R = .52$, adjusted $R^2 = .25$, R^2 change $= .24$, F change$(2, 191) = 31.22$, $p < .001$). Collectivism ($\beta = .30$, $t(191) = 4.03$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .06$) and individualism ($\beta = .26$, $t(191) = 3.52$, $p < .05$, $sr^2 = .05$) were positive predictors of the compromising style. The more collectivistic and individualistic Indonesian subjects were, the more they use the compromising style.

For American subjects, demographic variables as a group did not predict the preference of compromising style ($R = .07$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change $= .00$, F change$(2, 223) = .54$, $p > .05$). Variables in the second model significantly predicted the use of the compromising style for American participants ($R = .32$, adjusted $R^2 = .08$, R^2 change $= .10$, F change$(2, 221) = 11.88$, $p < .001$). Collectivism was a positive predictor of compromising style ($\beta = .31$, $t(221) = 4.85$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .10$). The more collectivistic Americans were, the more they used the compromising style.

Dominating

In the Indonesian sample, demographics did not predict the dominating style ($R = .05$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change = .00, F change(2, 188) = .25, $p > .05$). Endorsement of collectivism/individualism significantly predicted the dominating style ($R = .36$, adjusted $R^2 = .11$, R^2 change = .13, F change(2, 186) = 13.62, $p < .001$). Individualism was a significant positive predictor ($\beta = .35$, $t(186) = 4.33$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .09$). The more individualistic Indonesian subjects were, the more they used the dominating style.

Similarly, demographic variables as a group did not predict the dominating style for American participants ($R = .06$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change = .00, F change(2, 218) = .40, $p > .05$), while collectivism/individualism predicted the style ($R = .45$, adjusted $R^2 = .18$, R^2 change = .20, F change(2, 216) = 26.56, $p < .001$). Individualism was a positive predictor for the style ($\beta = -.45$, $t(216) = 7.26$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .20$), indicating that the more individualistic American subjects were, the more they used the dominating style.

Emotional Expression

Both demographics ($R = .18$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change = .03, F change(2, 189) = 3.09, $p < .05$) and collectivism/individualism ($R = .36$, adjusted $R^2 = .11$, R^2 change = .10, F change(2, 218) = 10.39, $p < .001$) significantly predicted the emotional expression style for Indonesian subjects. However, both age ($\beta = -.14$, $t(189) = -1.44$, $p > .05$) and years of education ($\beta = -.05$, $t(189) = -.56$, $p > .05$) were not significant predictors of the style. Collectivism ($\beta = .19$,

$t(218) = 2.33, p < .05, sr^2 = .02$) and individualism ($\beta = .17, t(218) = 2.04, p < .05,$

$sr^2 = .02$) were significant positive predictors of the emotional expression style.

The more collectivistic and individualistic Indonesian subjects were, the more

they used the emotional expression style.

For American subjects demographic information did not predict the

emotional expression style ($R = .16$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $= .03$, F

change$(2, 222) = 2.96, p > .05$). The variables in the second set significantly

predicted American subjects' choice of the emotional expression style ($R = .24$,

adjusted $R^2 = .04$, R^2 change $= .03$, F change$(2, 220) = 3.70, p < .05$). Collectivism

($\beta = .17, t(220) = 2.62, p < .05, sr^2 = .03$) was a significant positive predictor of

the emotional expression style. The more collectivistic American subjects were,

the more they were emotionally expressive during conflict.

Accommodating/Obliging

For Indonesian participants demographics as a group did not predict the

accommodating/obliging style preference ($R = .18$, adjusted $R^2 = .02$, R^2 change $=$

$.03$, F change$(2, 190) = 3.04, p = .05$). Collectivism/individualism significantly

predicted the use of the accommodating/obliging style for the Indonesian sample

($R = .44$, adjusted $R^2 = .18$, R^2 change $= .16$, F change$(2, 198) = 18.83, p < .001$).

Significant effect for variables in the second model can be attributed to

participants' endorsement of collectivism ($\beta = .40, t(198) = 5.10, p < .001, sr^2 =$

$.11$). The more collectivistic Indonesian participants were, the more they preferred

to use the accommodating/obliging style.

Demographics as a group of variables did not predict the use of accommodating/obliging style for American subjects ($R = .07$, adjusted $R^2 = -.00$, R^2 change = 00, F change(2, 215) = .53, $p > .05$). The second set of variables significantly predicted the choice of accommodating/obliging style for American subjects ($R = .36$, adjusted $R^2 = .12$, R^2 change = .13, F change(2, 213) = 15.66, $p < .001$). Collectivism was a positive predictor for the preference of accommodating/obliging style ($\beta = .36$, $t(213) = 5.58$, $p < .001$, $sr^2 = .13$). The more collectivistic American subjects were, the more they used the accommodating/obliging style.

Discussion

The primary goals of the current study were to examine conflict management styles, participants' endorsement of collectivism/individualism, and the effects of collectivism/individualism and gender on conflict management styles among Americans and Indonesians. Regarding conflict management styles, findings indicated that the Indonesian young participants preferred the compromising and integrating styles the most (no difference between the two styles), followed by the avoiding, accommodating/obliging, and emotion styles. The next preferred styles were the third-party help and dominating styles (no significant difference between the styles). The least used style among the Indonesian participants was the neglect style. For the American participants, the compromising and integrating styles were the most preferred (no difference between the two styles), followed by the dominating and emotional expression

styles (no difference between the styles). The next preferred style was the accommodating/obliging style, followed by the avoiding and third-party help styles. The least preferred style was the neglect style. Obviously, young adults in both cultures preferred to use the compromising and integrating styles the most and the neglect style the least.

The comparison of conflict style preferences between Americans and Indonesians revealed cultural differences in conflict management styles with peers. Specifically, analysis showed that Indonesians preferred the avoiding and neglect styles significantly more than Americans, whereas Americans preferred the integrating, compromising, dominating, and emotional expression, and accommodating/obliging styles significantly more than Indonesians. Participants from both cultures did not differ in their preference of the third-party help style. Furthermore, analysis showed that there were no significant interaction effects between gender and culture in the preference of all conflict styles and that gender has played a limited role in conflict styles. Among the eight major conflict styles, gender has a significant effect on the neglect style only, with male participants endorsing the style more than females.

Regarding endorsement of collectivism/individualism, findings showed a significant gender by culture interaction effect for individualism, but not for collectivism. Further analysis revealed a simple main effect of gender for the endorsement of individualism in the American sample, with American males being significantly more individualistic than American females. Additionally,

analysis indicated a simple main effect of culture for male participants, with American males endorsing individualism significantly more than Indonesian males. In conclusion, it was found that American males were the most individualistic among the gender and cultural groups.

Examination of the effects of collectivism/individualism revealed that collectivism was a positive predictor of the avoiding, integrating, compromising, emotional expression and accommodating/obliging styles in both samples. Furthermore, collectivism was a positive predictor of the third-party help style in the American sample. Individualism was a positive predictor of the dominating style in both culture groups. In addition, individualism was a positive predictor of the integrating, compromising, and emotional expression styles in the Indonesian sample and a positive predictor of the neglect style in the American sample.

In summary, the study has found that Americans and Indonesians differed in their preference of most of the conflict styles but did not differ in their endorsement of collectivism/individualism. This study also found gender differences in the preference of the neglect style and the endorsement of individualism. Additionally, results indicated that collectivism is a stronger predictor of the conflict styles than is individualism. These findings are discussed in light of previous research on culture, gender, and conflict management.

Collectivism/Individualism

Analyses of collectivism/individualism found support for H1.2 and H1.3, predicting that females will be more collectivistic and less individualistic than

males, and that Indonesians will be more collectivistic than individualistic.

However, analyses did not found support for H1.1 and H1.4, predicting that

Indonesians will be more collectivistic and less individualistic than Americans,

and that Americans will be more individualistic than collectivistic. Consistent

with the argument that collectivism is more prevalent than individualism in Asian

cultures (e.g., Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001), this study found that Indonesians

were more collectivistic than individualistic. Religious orientation in Indonesia,

especially in Java, the area in which the study took place, is predominantly

Islamic. It is an Islamic ideal to de-accentuate individualism and prioritize

obligations and responsibility for the community (Ali, 1992). Furthermore, the

study found that Americans are equally individualistic and collectivistic. This

does not support the argument that individuals from North America are mostly

individualistic (Farver, Welles-Nystrom, Frosch, Wimbarti, & Hoppe-Graff's,

1997). Analysis failed to show significant differences between Indonesians and

Americans in their endorsement of collectivism/individualism. These findings can

be explained in several ways. First, collectivism/individualism is considered as

two distinct constructs rather than a uni-dimensional construct, suggesting that

individuals can be both collectivistic and individualistic simultaneously.

Individuals' collectivistic and individualistic attitude can be activated as a

function of situational and relational contexts (Triandis, 1995). The measurement

used in the study assessed global collectivism in various relational domain (i.e.,

with family members, co-workers, or neighbors), and it is possible that a person is

individualistic in one relational context, while more collectivistic in the others.

Individuals' collectivist cognition tends to be activated in a narrow social group

(i.e., family) and less stimulated in a larger group (i.e., workplace) (Triandis,

1995). Indeed, people can be individualistic and collectivistic concurrently.

Second, results indicated that the American young adults are

simultaneously and equally collectivistic and individualistic, which contradict

previous findings that portray the American culture as predominantly

individualistic. However, an earlier study suggests that Americans differ in their

endorsement of collectivism/individualism. Ranking states in terms of their

collectivism and individualism, Vandello and Cohen (1999) found that individuals

across the United States differed in their level of collectivism and individualism.

They also found that American Great Plains, the region in which the location of

the study was categorized into, was not the most individualistic region in the

United States.

Findings revealed gender differences in the endorsement of

collectivism/individualism in the American sample but not in the Indonesian

sample. This is in line with the argument that gender differences are stronger in

cultures with greater progress toward gender equality (Guimond, et al., 2007). In

addition, consistent with prior literature, the current study found that American

young women are more collectivistic than American young men. Cross and

Madson (1997) argued that women had higher interdependent self-construal than

men, indicating that women stressed on the importance of maintaining

connectedness with others. Likewise, Schwartz and Rubel (2005) found that their female participants emphasized universalism and benevolence values more than men did. Universalism and benevolence values imply appreciation, protection, and preservation of important others.

Collectivism/Individualism and Conflict Management Styles

Results of the study extended previous research on collectivism/individualism and conflict management styles and showed partial support for the second hypothesis, which predicted that collectivism would be positively associated with the avoiding, compromising, accommodating, integrating, emotional expression, and third-party help styles, and that individualism would be positively associated with the dominating, integrating, emotional expression, and neglect styles in both cultures. Studies of conflict management styles argue that as a collectivistic culture, Indonesians consider avoidance as the best way to manage conflict (Wirawan, 1991), while Americans, as individualists, prefer conflicts to be directly addressed (French et al., 2005).

Consistent with previous research, the current study found that Indonesians preferred the avoiding style significantly more than Americans and that collectivism was positively correlated with the style. This is not surprising, since collectivistic cultures value harmony maintenance (Thomas & Pekerti, 2003) and perceive conflict as "an abnormal eruption disturbing the harmonious relationship" (Augsburger, 1992, p.237) that needs to be avoided. This finding supports studies arguing that the avoiding style is more prevalently used in

collectivistic cultures (i.e., Benton & Setiadi, 1998; French et al., 2005; Ma, 2007) and is contradictory to research proposing the opposite (i.e., Cai & Fink, 2002).

However, it is surprising to find that Indonesians preferred the neglect style significantly more than their American counterparts. The neglect style assumes low concern for others (Ting-Toomey, et al., 2000), which is commonly reported to be associated with individualism. This style is conceptualized as most face threatening and was added to the conflict style inventory to make the measurement more sensitive to the Asian culture. This finding might be due to the fact that the neglect style does not reflect the Americans' conflict management behaviors. In other words, the lower ratings provided by the young American participants simply reflected their unfamiliarity with the style. It might be an uncommon practice for Americans to damage the other party's face or reputation in the conflict situations with peers.

The present study found that Americans preferred the integrating and accommodating/obliging styles significantly more than Indonesians, which contradicts some of the previous findings. For example, Elsayed-Elkhouly and Buda (1996) found that collectivists (Arab participants) preferred the integrating style significantly more than individualists (American participants). Another study also found that Taiwanese (collectivists) used the integrating style more than Americans (Individualists) (Trubitsky, Ting-Toomey, & Lin, 1991). In addition, the accommodating/obliging style has been associated with collectivistic culture (Oetzel, 1998). One possible explanation for this finding might be that in

general Indonesians are less engaging and more avoiding in conflict situations.

Furthermore, findings indicated that in the Indonesian sample, the integrating

style was predicted by individualism. Integrating style is considered to be

assertive and direct (Oetzel, 1998) and, therefore, for members of collectivistic

culture, the style requires a conscious attempt to be assertive. Thus, for

Indonesians to be able to use the style, they have to possess individualistic

personality.

The findings also showed that Americans used the dominating and

compromising styles more than Indonesians. In addition, it was found that the

dominating style was positively predicted by individualism in both samples, and

that the compromising style was predicted by individualism in the Indonesian

sample. Both the dominating and compromising styles are associated with

assertiveness and directness (Oetzel, 1998). Thus, the findings are consistent with

view that the individualists tend to use assertive, active, and competitive strategies

for resolving conflicts (Itoi, Ohbuchi, & Fukuno, 1996; Trubisky, Ting-Toomey,

& Lin, 1991).

It was surprising to find that Americans used the emotional expression

significantly more than Indonesians since the style is attributed to collectivists

(Markus & Lin, 1999). However, this finding is consistent with the argument that

disagreement in any forms should be concealed in Indonesia (Benton & Setiadi,

1998). In addition, people from collectivistic cultures tend to emphasize the

importance of discretion when making their feelings known (Ting-Toomey,

1988). While some items measuring the style indicate participants' reliance on feeling when dealing with conflicts (i.e., "I would use my feelings to guide my conflict behaviors"), other items imply that participants overtly show that they are involved in a conflict situation (i.e., "I would be emotionally expressive in the conflict situation"). This indicates that the style involves a level of openness and directness. Furthermore, the style is predicted by individualism in the Indonesian sample. This suggests that it requires individualistic personality for Indonesians to be able to use the style. Therefore, Indonesian participants' tendency not to use the style as much as the Americans is attributed to their inclination not to reveal the conflict and be open and direct in conflict.

Although there was an insignificant difference in the preference of the third-party help style between the two groups, it was unexpected that the style was the second least preferred for the Indonesian participants, with no difference compared to the dominating style. In managing conflicts, Indonesians commonly involve third parties in the process of reaching mutually satisfying agreements (Moore & Sentosa, 1995). Plausible explanations for the low endorsement of the third-party style might be due to participants' age. Participants of the present study were young students with ostensibly high confidence of self-competence. Referring to a third-party to resolve conflict implies a certain level of incompetence (Khakimova, 2008), and thus participants were less inclined to use the style. Alternatively, being young students, it is speculated that participants had high self-esteem, and individuals with high self-esteem are likely to feel confident

of the correctness of their views (O'Keefe, 2002). Since asking help from third-party assumes a level of doubt of self-correctness, participants chose not to use the style. In summary, the lack of preference of the use of third-party help may be due to the fact that participants in the current study were predominantly young students. Finally, the study found that collectivism was a stronger predictor of the conflict styles than was individualism. The conceptualization of collectivism involves putting greater importance on maintaining relationship, while individualism assumes greater importance on personal gain (Komarraju, et al., 2008). It is speculated that in the context of peer-conflict, the conceptualizations of conflict styles are more consistent with collectivism than with individualism.

Gender and Conflict Management

The analysis of gender effects on conflict styles indicated that males in both cultures preferred the neglect style significantly more than females. The neglect style is characterized by assertiveness and low concern for others. In addition, the style involves overt and covert behaviors of harming the other person's image. Previous studies confirm that relative to females, males tend to use styles with low concern for others. For instance, Offerman and Beil (1992) found support that in dispute resolution males were more interested in competitive approach than females. In addition, data from Papa and Natalle's (1989) study indicated that males tended to approach conflict situation assertively. Possible explanations for these findings relate to participants' psychological type and communication skills. In contrast to men whose psychological types are

predominantly 'thinker', females are found to be mostly 'feeler' (Sorenson et al., 1995). Individuals with 'feeler' psychological type use subjective and personal value as a guide, while 'thinker' individuals rely on logic and reasoning. In relation to conflict styles, research found that compared to 'thinker' individuals, 'feelers' tended to use styles which assume moderate to high concern for others (Mills, Robey, & Smith, 1985).

The current study attempted to explore the effects of gender and collectivism/individualism on peer-conflict management styles in American and Indonesian cultures. The current research assumes no power distance between the disputants and inter-gender conflicts. Future research should aim to investigate different conflict styles used in conflicts with different power distribution among the disputants. In addition, future research should also consider evaluating different conflict styles used in inter-gender conflict management. For example, Papa and Natalle (1989) compared male-male, female-female, and male-female conflicts. They found that participants in same-sex conflicts used different strategies than those in different-sex conflicts. Though suggestive, the study involved participants from a Western culture and was conducted two decades ago. Research that explores inter-gender conflict across cultures will definitely enhance our understanding of cross-cultural conflict management.

Limitations

The first limitation of the study is the generalizability of the findings. The United States and Indonesia are diverse cultures with an array of sub-cultures.

The current study involved participants from a particular region in the United States and Indonesia. Therefore, results of the study may be restricted to the areas in which the participants were recruited. Future research of a similar vein should include a more representative sample.

The second limitation concerns with a relatively low reliability for the compromising style. It implies participants' lack of understanding of the items measuring the style. It might also indicate an unclear distinction between the conceptual definitions of the compromising style and other similar styles (i.e., the integrating and accommodating styles). This problem has been identified in previous research. For example, Van de Vliert and Kabanoff (1990) found that the compromising style assumed high concern for others and moderate concern for self, rather than moderate concern for self and others. This indicates that the compromising style is almost identical with the integrating style, which assumes high concern for both self and others.

The final limitation is that the findings and their implications are derived from participants' attitudes toward conflicts style and not their actual behaviors. Considering the questionable association between attitudes and behaviors, it is uncertain that these attitudes will be translated into actual behaviors. For instance, the accommodating and compromising styles are conflict styles with ostensibly the most social acceptance, and participants' preference of the styles might imply that they wanted to appear pro-social.

Regardless of the limitations, the current research has extended prior literature in cross-cultural conflict management by involving Indonesians, a culture group that has been understudied. Although Indonesia holds a prominent role in Asia, particularly in South-East Asia, it has not been a venue for empirical studies. The current study has provided meaningful data for studies of cross-cultural communication and conflict management in Indonesia and the United States.

References

Ali, A. J. (1992). Islamic work ethic in Arabia. *The Journal of Psychology*, *126(5)*, 507-519.

Augsburger, D., W. (1992) *Conflict mediation across cultures*. Louisville, KY: John Knox Press.

Axelrod, L., & Johnson, R. (2005). *Turning conflict into profit: A roadmap for resolving personal and organizational disputes*. Alberta: The University of Alberta Press.

Banfield, E. (1958). *The moral basis of the backward society*. Glencoe,Ill.: Free Press.

Benton, S., & Setiadi, B. (1998). Mediation and conflict management in Indonesia. In K. Leung, & D. Tjosvold (Eds), *Conflict Management in the Asia Pacific: Assumptions and Approaches in Diverse Cultures* (pp. 223-253). Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.

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

Bontempo, R. (1993). Translation fidelity of psychological scales: An item response theory analysis of an individualism-collectivism scale. *Journal of Cross-cultural Psychology, 24,* 149-166.

Booth-Butterfield , M., & Booth-Butterfield, S. (1990). Conceptualization affect as information in communication production. *Human Communication Research, 16*, 451-476.

Brown, L., D. (1983). *Managing conflict at organizational interfaces.* Reading, Mass: Addison-Wesley.

Cai, D.A., & Fink, E.L. (2002). Conflict style differences between individualists and collectivists. *Communication Monograph*, *69(1),* 67-87.

Chen, B.C. (1996). *Negotiating with the Chinese*. Brookfield, VT: Dartmouth.

Conrad, C. (1991). Communication in conflict: Style-strategy relationships. *Communication Monographs, 58,* 135-155.

Cross, S. E., & Madson, L. (1997). Models of the self: Self-construals and gender. *Psychological Bulletin, 122,* 5–37.

Domenici, K., & Littlejohn, S. W. (2001). *Mediation: Empowerment in conflict management* (2nd ed.). Long grove, IL: Waveland Press.

Duane, M. J. (1989). Sex differences in styles of conflict management. *Psychological Reports, 65,* 1033-1034.

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

Farver, J.A.M.,Welles-Nystrom, B., Frosch, D. L.,Wimbarti, S., & Hoppe-Graff, S. (1997). Toy stories: Aggression in children's narratives in the United States, Sweden, Germany, and Indonesia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *28*, 393-420.

French, D. C., Pidada S., Denoma J., McDonald K., & Allison Lawton. (2005). Reported Peer Conflicts of Children in the United States and Indonesia. *Social Development*, *14(3),* 458-472.

Gabrielidis, C., Stephan, W. G., Ybarra, O., Pearson, V. M., & Villareal, L. (1997). Preferred styles of conflict resolution: Mexico and the United States. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 28,* 661-667.

Guimond, S., Branscombe, N. R., Brunot, S., Buunk, A. P., Chatard, A., Desert, M., et al. (2007). Culture, gender, and the self: Variations and impact of social comparison processes. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 92,* 1118–1134.

Haar, B. F. & Krahe, B. (1999). Strategies for resolving interpersonal conflicts in adolescence: A German–Indonesian comparison. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, *30*, 667–684.

Hall, J. (1969). *Conflict Management Survey: A survey on one's characteristic reactions to and handling of conflicts between himself and others.* Conroe, TX: Teleometrics.

Hambleton, R. K. (1993). Translating achievement tests for use in cross-national studies. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 9*, 57-68.

Hambleton, R. K. (1994). Guidelines for adapting educational and psychological tests: A progress report. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 10*, 229-244.

Hambleton, R. K., & Kanjee, A. (1995). Increasing the validity of cross-cultural assessments: Use of improved methods for test adaptation. *European Journal of Psychological Assessment, 11*, 147-157.

Healey, J., & Bell, R. (1990). Assessing alternative responses to conflicts in friendship. In D. Cahn (Ed.), *Intimates in conflict: a communication perspective*. Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum.

Hocker, J. & Wilmot, W. (2001). *Interpersonal conflict* (6th ed.). Dubuque, IA: W.C. Brown.

Hofstede, G. (1991). *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind*. London: McGraw-Hill.

Hui, C. H. (1988). Measurement of individualism-collectivism. *Journal for research in Personality, 22*, 17-36.

Hui, C.H., & Triandis, H.C. (1986). Individualism and collectivism: A study of cross-cultural researchers. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 17,* 225–248.

Inkeles, A. (1983). The American character. *Center Magazine,* November/December, pp. 25-39.

Itoi, R., Ohbuchi, K., & Fukuno, M. (1996). A cross-cultural study of preference of accounts: Relationship closeness, harm severity, and motives of account making. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, *26*, 913-934.

Khakimova, Leysan (2008). Conflict management styles among young male Arabs and Americans: Exploring the effects of ethnic identity and self-

construal. M.A. dissertation, University of Kansas, United States --

Kansas. Retrieved March 20, 2009, from Dissertations & Theses @

University of Kansas database. (Publication No. AAT 1458418).

Kilmann, R., H., & Thomas, K.W. (1977). Developing a forced-choice measure of

conflict-handling behavior: the "mode" instrument. *Educational and*

Psychological Measurement, *37,* 309-325.

Kim, M.-S., & Leung, T. (2000). A multicultural view of conflict management

styles: Review and critical synthesis. In M.E. Roloff & G.D. Paulson

(Eds.), *Communication yearbook 23* (pp. 227–269). Beverly Hills, CA:

Sage.

Komarraju, M.,. Dollinger, S. J., & Lovell, J. L. (2008). Individualism-

collectivism in horizontal and vertical directions as predictors of conflict

management styles. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 19(1),*

20-35.

Kozan, M. K. (1990). Relationships of hierarchy and topics to conflict

management styles: A comparative study. In Rahim, M., A. (ed.), *Theory*

and research in conflict management (pp. 105-108). New York, NY:

Praeger.

Lee, H.O., & Rogan, R.G. (1991), "A cross-cultural comparison of organizational

conflict management behaviors", *International Journal of Conflict*

Management, *2(3),*181-99.

Leung, K., & Tjosvold, D. (1998). Introduction: Conflict management in the Asia Pacific. In K. Leung, & D. Tjosvold (Eds), *Conflict Management in the Asia Pacific: Assumptions and Approaches in Diverse Cultures* (pp. 223-253). Singapore: John Wiley & Sons.

Leung, K., & Wu, P.-G. (1990). Dispute processing. A cross-cultural analysis. In R.W. Brislin (Ed.), *Applied cross-cultural psychology* (pp. 209-231). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindeman, M., Harakka, T., & Keltikangas-Järvinen, L. (1997). Age and gender differences in adolescents' reaction to conflict situations: Aggression, prosociality, and withdrawal. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence, 26(3)*, 339-351.

Ma, Z. (2007). Chinese conflict management styles and negotiation behaviours: An empirical test. *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management, 7(1),* 101–119.

Markus, H.R., & Lin, L.R. (1999). Conflictways: Cultural Diversity in the Meanings and Practices of Conflict. In D.A. Prentice & D.T. Miller (Eds.), *Cultural divides: Understanding and overcoming group conflict* (pp. 302-333). New York, NY: Russell Sage Foundation.

Mills, J., Robey, D., & Smith, L. (1985). Conflict handling and personality dimensions of project-management personnel. *Psychological Reports, 57,* 1135-1143.

Moore,C., & Sentosa, M. A. (1995). Developing Appropriate Environmental Conflict Management Procedures in Indonesia. *Cultural Survival Quarterly*, *19*(3), 23.

Morrill, C., & Thomas, C. K. (1992). Organizational conflict management as disputing process: the problem of social escalation. *Human Communication Research, 18*, 400-428.

Oetzel, J. G. (1998). The effects of self-construals and ethnicity on self-reported conflict styles. *Communication Reports, 11(2),* 133-144.

Offerman, L. R., & Beil, C. (1992). Achievement styles of women leaders and their peers. *Psychology of Women Quarterly, 16,* 37-56.

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(1), 51-71.

Ohbuchi, K., & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Cultural styles of conflict management in Japanese and Americans: Pasivity, covertness, and effectiveness of strategies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 24*, 1345-1366.

O'Keefe, D. J. (2002). *Persuasion: Theory and Research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Papa, M. J., & Natalle, E. J. (1989). Gender, strategy selection, and discussion satisfaction in interpersonal conflict. *Western Journal of Speech Communication, 53,* 260-272.

Putnam, L. L., & Poole, M. S. (1987). Conflict and negotiation. In F. M. Jablin, L. L. Putnam, K. H. Roberts, & L. W. Porter, (Eds.), *Handbook of organizational communication* (pp. 549-599). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Putnam, L. L., & Wilson, C. (1982). Communicative strategies in Organizational Conflict: Reliability and validity of a measurement scale. In M. Burgoon (Ed.), *Communication Yearbook 6* (pp. 629-652). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

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

Rahim, M. A. (2001). *Managing conflict in organizations* (3rd ed.). Westport, CT: Quorum Books.

Ross, R., & De wine, S. (1982). Interpersonal Conflict: Measurement and Validation. Paper presented at the Speech Communication Association, Louisville, KY.

Schwartz, S. H., & Rubel, T. (2005). Sex differences in value priorities: Cross-cultural and multimethod studies. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 89,* 1010–1028.

Sorenson, P. S., Hawkins, K., & Sorenson, R. L. (1995). Gender, psychological type and conflict style preference. *Management Communication Quarterly, 9(1),* 115-126.

Stewart, E. (1966). The simulation of cultural differences. *Journal of Communication, 16*, 291-304.

Thomas, K. W., & Kilmann, R. H. (1974). *Thomas-Kilmann conflict MODE instrument*. Tuxedo, NY: Xicom.

Thomas, D. C., & Pekerti, A. A. (2003). Effect of culture on situational determinants of exchange behavior in organizations: A comparison of New Zealand and Indonesia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 34(3),* 269-281.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural conflict styles: a face negotiation theory. In Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Intercultural Communication* (pp. 213-235). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J.G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively.* Thousands Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Joung, K. K., Shapiro, R. B., Garcia, W., Wright, T. J., Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 24*, 47-81.

Triandis, H. C. (1995). *Individualism and Collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.

Triandis, H.C., & Vasiliou, V. (1972). A comparative analysis of subjective culture. In H. C. Triandis (ed.). *The analysis of subjective culture* (pp. 299-338). New York: Wiley.

Trubitsky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., & Lin, S-L. (1991). The influence of

individualism-collectivism and self-monitoring on conflict styles.

International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 15, 65-84.

Uline, L. C., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Perez, L. (2003). Constructive Conflict:

How Controversy Can Contribute to School Improvement. *Teachers*

College Record, 105(5), 782-816.

Van de Vliert, E., & Kabanoff, B. (1990). Toward theory-based measures of

conflict management. *Academy of Management Journal, 33,* 199–209.

Vandello, J. A., & Cohen, D. (1999). Patterns of individualism and collectivism

across the United States. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

77(2), 279-292.

Weider-Hatfield, D. (1988). Assessing the Rahim Organizational Conflict

Inventory-II (ROCI-II). *Management Communication Quarterly,1*(3), 350-

366.

Wirawan (1991). The relationship between power bases and conflict management

styles of Indonesia's formal leaders. Ed.D. dissertation, Western Michigan

University, United States -- Michigan. Retrieved March 20, 2009, from

Dissertations & Theses: Full Text database. (Publication No. AAT

9211829).

Womack, D., F. (1988). A review of conflict instrument in organizational settings.

Management Communication Quarterly,1(3), 437-445.

Zhang, Y. B., Harwood, J., Hummert, M. L. (2005). Perceptions of conflict

management styles in Chinese intergenerational dyads. *Communication*

Monographs, 72(1), 71-91.

Appendix A: *English Questionnaire*

Subject # _____

Thank you for participating in the study. This questionnaire is anonymous, and there are no right or wrong answers. There are two sections in the questionnaire, assessing your conflict management styles and your level of endorsement of collectivism-individualism respectively. Before proceeding with the questionnaire, please answer the following demographic questions by checking applicable boxes and/or filling in the blanks.

- **Your gender**   Male ☐   Female ☐

- **Age**   _____

- **Years of education**   _____

  (*Please count all the years you spent in primary school to high school, and any college or university*)

- **Your completed education**

  - High school ☐

  - Undergraduate degree ☐

  - Masters degree ☐

  - PhD degree ☐

  - Other ☐

  If other, please specify

  _____

- **Your religion/ belief**

  - Christianity ☐
  - Judaism ☐
  - Islam ☐
  - Buddhism ☐
  - Hinduism ☐
  - Other ☐

  If other, please specify

  _____

Section 1

      Instruction: Think of how you generally manage conflict with your peers. Please indicate the extent to which you agree or disagree with each statement by circling a corresponding number (7 =strongly agree and 1 = strongly disagree). Higher numbers indicate higher level of agreement. Please choose only one answer for each statement.

		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
1.	I attempt to avoid being "put on the spot" and try to keep my conflict with my peers to myself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	I generally try to satisfy the needs of my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I try to stay away from disagreement with my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	I usually accommodate the wishes of my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	I would give some to get some in order to reach a compromise.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	I give in to the wishes of my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	I would win some and lose some so that a compromise could be reached.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I avoid an encounter with my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree					**Strongly Agree**	

12. I would argue my case with my peers to show the merits of my position.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

13. I usually allow concessions to my peers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

14. I try to keep my disagreement with my peers to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

15. I use my expertise to make a decision in my favor.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

16. I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

17. I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with my peers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

18. I am generally firm in pursuing my side of the issue.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

19. I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with my peers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

20. I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

21. I often go along with the suggestions of my peers.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

22. I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

23. I would sit down with my peer to negotiate a resolution to his/her objectionable behavior.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

24. I would generally ask a third person to intervene in our dispute and settle it for us.

1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree	
25.	I try to satisfy the expectations of my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	I would be emotionally expressive in the conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	I would ask a third party to make a decision about how to settle the dispute between myself and my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	I would rely on a third person to negotiate a resolution to the conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	I would generally "grin and bear it" when my peers did something I did not like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	I would typically leave my peers alone.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	I would ask a third person for advice in settling the dispute.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	I would meet with my peers to see if we could work out a resolution to our conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	I would use my feelings to guide my conflict behaviors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	I would prefer my peers to be emotionally expressive with me in the conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
35.	I would generally endure actions by my peers that I did not like.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
36.	I try to integrate my ideas with those of my peers to come up with a decision jointly.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
37.	I would typically go through a third party to settle our conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
38.	I would meet with my peers to bargain for a resolution to our conflict.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
39.	I would appeal to a person at a higher level to settle my conflict with my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
40.	I would use my feelings to determine what I should do in the conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
41.	I try to work with my peers to find solutions to a problem which satisfy our expectations.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
42.	I would ask another person to help negotiate a disagreement with my peer about his/her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
43.	I would try to tolerate our disagreement and not make waves.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
44.	I would be patient and hope my peer would change his/her behavior.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
45.	I would use my feelings to determine whether to trust my peers.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree					**Strongly Agree**	
46.	I would usually bear my resentment in silence.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
47.	I would attempt to solve our problems by talking things over in a calm and polite manner.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
48.	I would say nothing and wait for things to get better.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
49.	I would generally keep quiet and wait for things to improve.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
50.	When we discuss the problem, I would refuse to cooperate.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
51.	I would listen to what my "gut" or "heart" says in the conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
52.	I would try to get us to work together to settle our differences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
53.	Out of anger, I would say things to damage my peers' reputation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
54.	I would say nothing and deal with the situation by adopting a strategy of forgive and forget.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
55.	I would make sure my peers realized that resolving our differences was important.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
56.	I would hope that the situation would solve itself.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
57.	I would say nasty things about my peers to other people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
58.	I would let my peer know that I did not want him/her to ever talk to me again.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
59.	I would usually let my anger be known in a conflict situation.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
60.	I negotiate with my peers so that a compromise can be reached.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
61.	I would allow things to cool off rather than taking any actions.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62.	I would tell my peers that there were problems and suggest that we work them out.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63.	I would say and do things out of anger to make my peers feel bad.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64.	While in the presence of my peer, I would act as though he/she did not exist.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65.	I would tell my peer what was bothering me and ask for his/her opinions on the matter.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66.	I would talk openly and honestly about our differences.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Section 2

The following statements are designed to measure the extent to which individuals relate to others.

Instruction: Read the following statements and mark how much you agree or disagree with each sentence by circling a corresponding number (7 =strongly agree and 1 = strongly disagree). Higher numbers indicate higher level of agreement. Please choose only one answer for each statement.

		Strongly Disagree						Strongly Agree
1.	I prefer to be direct and forthright when I talk to people.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	My happiness depends very much on the happiness of those around me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	I would do what would please my family, even if I detested that activity.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Winning is everything.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	One should live one's life independently of others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	What happens to me is my own doing.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
7.	I usually sacrifice my self-interest for the benefit of my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	It annoys me when other people perform better than I do.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree					Strongly Agree	
9.	It is important for me to maintain harmony within my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	It is important to me that I do my job better than others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	I like sharing little things with my neighbors.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	I enjoy working in situations involving competition with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	We should keep our aging parents with us at home.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	The well-being of my co-workers is important to me.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	I enjoy being unique and different from others in many ways.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	If a relative were in financial difficulty, I would help within my means.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
17.	Children should feel honored if their parents receive a distinguished award.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	I often do "my own thing."	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Competition is the law of nature.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	If a co-worker gets a prize I would feel proud.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	I am a unique individual.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	To me, pleasure is spending time with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Strongly Disagree					**Strongly Agree**	
23.	When another people does better that I do, I get tense and aroused.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	I would sacrifice an activity that I enjoy very much if my family did not approve it.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	I like my privacy.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Without competition it is not possible to have a good society.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
27.	Children should be taught to place duty before pleasure.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	I feel good when I cooperate with others.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	I hate to disagree with others in my group.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	Some people emphasize in winning; I am not one of them.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	Before taking a major trip, I consult with most members of my family and many friends.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	When I succeed, it is usually because of my abilities.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix B: *Translated Questionnaire*

Subjek # _____

    Terima kasih atas partisipasi Anda dalam studi ini. Kuisioner ini bersifat anonim dan tidak ada jawaban yang benar atau salah. Kuisioner ini terbagi menjadi dua bagian. Pernyataan-pernyataan dalam kuisioner ini bertujuan untuk mengukur gaya manajemen konflik dan tingkat individualisme-kolektivisme Anda. Sebelum mengisi kuisioner ini, mohon jawab pertanyaan-pertanyaan demografi dibawah ini dengan cara memberikan tanda silang (X) dan/atau mengisi kolom yang tersedia:

- **Jenis kelamin**   Pria ☐   Wanita   ☐

- **Usia**   _____

- **Tahun pendidikan**   _____

  (*mohon hitung jumlah tahun yang Anda tempuh mulai pendidikan dasar hingga menengah atas, dan pendidikan tinggi*)

- **Pendidikan terakhir**   ■ **Agama/ kepercayaan**

  - Menengah atas   ☐   • Islam   ☐

  - Strata satu   ☐   • Kristen   ☐

  - Magister   ☐   • Katolik   ☐

  - Doktoral   ☐   • Buddha   ☐

  - Lainnya   ☐   • Hindu   ☐

     Jika Anda memilih lainnya,   • Lainnya   ☐

     mohon jelaskan   Jika memilih lainnya, mohon

     _____   jelaskan

                                         _____

Bagian 1

Instruksi: Pikirkan kecenderungan Anda ketika menghadapi konflik dengan rekan (misalnya, dengan seseorang yang sebaya dengan anda. Orang tersebut bisa jadi rekan sekelas, sejawat, dan/atau kenalan anda). Mohon indikasikan tingkat kesetujuan atau ketidaksetujuan Anda terhadap setiap pernyataan yang diberikan dengan cara melingkari angka yang tersedia (angka 1 = sangat tidak setuju, sampai angka 7 = sangat setuju). Semakin tinggi angka menunjukkan tingkat kesetujuan yang semakin tinggi pula. Mohon lingkari _satu_ angka untuk tiap pernyataan.

		Sangat Tidak Setuju					Sangat Setuju	
1.	Saya mencoba untuk menghindari bersikap "terang-terangan" dan mencoba memendam konflik yang terjadi antara saya dan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
2.	Saya seringkali mencoba untuk memenuhi kebutuhan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
3.	Saya mencoba untuk menghindari perselisihan/ perbedaan pendapat dengan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
4.	Saya seringkali memenuhi keinginan-keinginan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
5.	Saya akan merelakan sesuatu demi mendapatkan yang lain untuk mencapai kompromi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
6.	Saya mengalah demi kepentingan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Sangat Tidak Setuju					**Sangat Setuju**	

7.	Saya memanfaatkan pengaruh yang saya miliki agar ide saya diterima.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
8.	Saya berusaha menemukan jalan tengah untuk memecahkan kebuntuan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
9.	Saya memanfaatkan wewenang yang saya miliki untuk meraih keputusan yang menguntungkan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
10.	Saya akan memenangkan sesuatu dan merelakan yang lain agar kompromi dapat tercapai.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
11.	Saya menghindar untuk bertemu dengan rekan yang memiliki masalah dengan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
12.	Saya akan berargumen dengan rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya untuk menunjukkan bahwa saya adalah pihak yang benar.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
13.	Saya seringkali membiarkan rekan saya mengambil keputusan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
14.	Saya berusaha untuk memendam perselisihan pendapat dengan rekan saya untuk menghindari rasa sakit hati.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
15.	Saya memanfaatkan keahlian yang saya miliki untuk meraih keputusan yang menguntungkan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
16.	Saya seringkali mengusulkan jalan tengah untuk memecahkan kebuntuan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Sangat Tidak Setuju						Sangat Setuju
17.	Saya berusaha untuk menghindari diskusi yang dapat menimbulkan masalah dengan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
18.	Saya seringkali bersikap ulet dalam memperjuangkan pendapat saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
19.	Saya seringkali menghindari diskusi terbuka dengan rekan saya mengenai perbedaan diantara kami.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
20.	Saya kadangkala memanfaatkan kekuasaan yang saya miliki untuk memenangkan persaingan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
21.	Saya seringkali menyetujui saran rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
22.	Saya menggunakan prinsip "saling memberi dan menerima" agar kompromi dapat tercipta.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
23.	Saya akan duduk dengan rekan yang memiliki konflik dengan saya dan menegosiasikan solusi atas perilakunya yang tidak berkenan.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
24.	Saya biasanya meminta pihak ketiga untuk campur tangan dalam perselisihan yang saya hadapi dan menyelesaikan perselisihan tersebut.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
25.	Saya berusaha untuk memenuhi harapan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
26.	Saya seringkali ekspresif secara emosional di dalam situasi konflik.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Sangat Tidak Setuju					Sangat Setuju	
27.	Saya akan meminta pihak ketiga untuk memutuskan bagaimana menyelesaikan perselisihan antara saya dan rekan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
28.	Saya akan bergantung pada pihak ketiga untuk merundingkan penyelesaian konflik yang saya hadapi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
29.	Saya biasanya akan "tersenyum dan menahan diri" ketika rekan saya melakukan sesuatu yang tidak saya sukai.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
30.	Saya biasanya menjauhi rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
31.	Saya akan meminta saran dari pihak ketiga untuk menyelesaikan perselisihan yang saya hadapi.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
32.	Saya akan menemui rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya untuk mencari tahu apakah kami dapat merundingkan resolusi perselisihan yang sedang berlangsung.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
33.	Saya akan menggunakan perasaan untuk menentukan sikap saya dalam menghadapi konflik.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
34.	Saya lebih suka jika rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya ekspresif secara emosional kepada saya dalam situasi konflik.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

		Sangat					**Sangat**	
		Tidak Setuju					**Setuju**	

35.	Saya biasanya mentoleransi segala perilaku rekan yang tidak saya sukai.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
36.	Saya mencoba untuk menggabungkan ide-ide saya dengan ide-ide rekan saya untuk mencapai keputusan bersama.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
37.	Saya biasanya menyelesaikan konflik yang saya hadapi melalui pihak ketiga.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
38.	Saya akan menemui rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya untuk merundingkan penyelesaian konflik yang kami hadapi.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
39.	Saya akan meminta seseorang dengan status yang lebih tinggi untuk menyelesaikan konflik antara saya dan rekan saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
40.	Saya akan menggunakan perasaan saya untuk menentukan langkah yang harus saya ambil dalam situasi konflik.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
41.	Ketika menghadapi masalah, saya mencoba untuk bekerjasama dengan rekan saya untuk menemukan solusi yang sesuai dengan keinginan bersama.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
42.	Saya akan meminta orang lain untuk membantu merundingkan perselisihan yang saya hadapi dengan rekan saya mengenai perilakunya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Sangat					**Sangat**	
		Tidak Setuju					**Setuju**	

43.	Saya akan berusaha untuk mentoleransi perbedaan-perbedaan yang ada dan tidak akan mempengaruhi siapapun.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
44.	Saya akan bersabar dan berharap agar rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya akan mengubah sikapnya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
45.	Saya akan menggunakan perasaan saya untuk menentukan akan mempercayai rekan saya atau tidak.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
46.	Saya biasanya akan menahan amarah dengan cara berdiam diri.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
47.	Saya biasanya berusaha untuk menyelesaikan perselisihan antara saya dan rekan saya dengan cara membahas segala sesuatu dengan sopan dan tenang.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
48.	Saya biasanya tidak berkata apapun dan menunggu agar keadaan menjadi baik.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
49.	Saya seringkali diam dan menunggu sampai suatu masalah membaik dengan sendirinya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
50.	Ketika terlibat dalam diskusi suatu masalah, saya menolak untuk bekerjasama.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
51.	Saya akan mengikuti apa yang dikatakan "nurani" atau "hati" saya ketika menghadapi konflik.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Sangat		**Sangat**
		Tidak Setuju		**Setuju**

52.	Saya akan mencoba bekerjasama untuk mengatasi perbedaan-perbedaan yang ada.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
53.	Ketika sedang marah, saya akan mengatakan hal-hal yang dapat merusak reputasi rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
54.	Saya akan diam membisu dan mengatasi masalah dengan menerapkan strategi "memaafkan dan melupakan."	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
55.	Saya akan memastikan rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya menyadari bahwa mengatasi perbedaan diantari kami adalah hal yang penting.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
56.	Saya akan berharap bahwa situasi akan membaik dengan sendirinya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
57.	Saya akan mengatakan hal-hal yang buruk mengenai rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya kepada orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
58.	Saya akan membuat rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya tahu bahwa saya tidak akan mau berbicara dengannya lagi.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
59.	Saya seringkali membiarkan kemarahan saya diketahui dalam situasi konflik.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
60.	Saya bernegosiasi dengan rekan saya untuk mencapai kesepakatan.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Sangat Tidak Setuju						Sangat Setuju
61.	Saya lebih suka untuk membiarkan situasi mendingin dengan sendirinya daripada melakukan tindakan apapun.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
62.	Saya akan mengatakan kepada rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya mengenai adanya suatu masalah dan menyarankan untuk memecahkannya bersama.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
63.	Saya akan mengatakan dan melakukan sesuatu dengan penuh amarah agar rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya merasa tidak enak.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
64.	Ketika rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya ada disekitar saya, saya akan bersikap seolah-olah dia tidak ada.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
65.	Saya akan mengatakan kepada rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya mengenai masalah yang sedang mengganggu saya dan meminta opininya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
66.	Saya akan jujur dan terbuka tentang perbedaan antara saya dan rekan yang berkonflik dengan saya.	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Bagian 2

Kuisioner berikut disusun untuk mengukur seberapa jauh hubungan Anda dengan orang lain. **Instruksi:** Mohon indikasikan tingkat kesetujuan atau ketidaksetujuan Anda terhadap setiap pernyataan yang diberikan dengan cara melingkari angka yang tersedia (angka 1 = sangat tidak setuju, sampai angka 7 = sangat setuju). Semakin tinggi angka menunjukkan tingkat kesetujuan yang semakin tinggi pula. Mohon lingkari _satu_ angka untuk tiap pernyataan.

		Sangat **Tidak Setuju**					**Sangat** **Setuju**

1.	Saya lebih memilih untuk jujur dan berterus-terang ketika saya berbicara dengan orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
2.	Kebahagiaan saya sangat bergantung pada kebahagiaan orang lain yang berada di sekitar saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
3.	Saya akan melakukan hal yang dapat membuat keluarga saya senang, walaupun saya tidak menyukai hal tersebut.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
4.	Kemenangan adalah segalanya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
5.	Seseorang harus menjalani hidupnya tanpa menggantungkan diri pada orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
6.	Apa yang terjadi kepada saya adalah akibat dari perbuatan saya sendiri.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
7.	Saya biasanya mengorbankan kepentingan pribadi saya untuk kepentingan kelompok saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
8.	Saya merasa sangat terganggu jika orang lain melakukan sesuatu lebih baik dari saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
9.	Bagi saya sangat penting untuk menjaga harmoni di dalam kelompok saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Sangat			**Sangat**
		Tidak Setuju			**Setuju**

10.	Bagi saya sangat penting untuk melakukan pekerjaan saya lebih baik dari orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
11.	Saya senang berbagi hal-hal kecil dengan tetangga.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
12.	Saya menyukai bekerja di dalam situasi yang melibatkan kompetisi dengan orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
13.	Kita sebaiknya merawat orang tua kita yang berusia lanjut di rumah kita.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
14.	Kesejahteraan rekan kerja saya merupakan hal penting bagi saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
15.	Saya menyukai menjadi seseorang yang unik dan berbeda dari orang lain dalam banyak hal.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
16.	Jika seorang kerabat berada dalam kesulitan keuangan, saya akan membantu semampu saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
17.	Seorang anak seharusnya merasa bangga jika orang tuanya menerima penghargaan bergengsi.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
18.	Saya seringkali melakukan segala sesuatu dengan cara saya sendiri.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
19.	Kompetisi adalah hukum alam.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
20.	Jika seorang rekan kerja memperoleh penghargaan, saya akan merasa bangga.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

		Sangat Tidak Setuju						Sangat Setuju

21.	Saya adalah seorang individu yang unik.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
22.	Bagi saya, kesenangan adalah meluangkan waktu bersama orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
23.	Ketika orang lain melakukan sesuatu lebih baik dari saya, saya menjadi gelisah dan terpacu.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
24.	Saya akan mengorbankan kegiatan yang sangat saya sukai jika keluarga saya tidak menyetujui kegiatan tersebut.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
25.	Saya menyukai privasi yang saya miliki.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
26.	Tanpa kompetisi, tidak mungkin terbentuk masyarakat yang berkualitas.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
27.	Anak-anak seharusnya diajarkan untuk mendahulukan kewajiban sebelum kesenangan.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
28.	Saya merasa senang ketika bekerjasama dengan orang lain.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
29.	Saya tidak suka berbeda pendapat dengan orang lain di dalam kelompok saya.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
30.	Sebagian orang mengutamakan kemenangan; namun saya tidak termasuk salah satu dari mereka.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
31.	Sebelum melakukan perjalanan jauh, saya meminta saran dari sebagian besar keluarga saya dan banyak teman.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7
32.	Ketika saya memperoleh keberhasilan, seringkali itu disebabkan oleh kemampuan saya sendiri.	1 2 3 4 5 6 7

Appendix C: *Correlations among Major Variables in the American sample.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1									
2	-.21**	1								
3	.24**	.04	1							
4	.00	-.38**	.16*	1						
5	.19**	.67**	.10	-.29**	1					
6	-.17*	.17**	.09	.26**	.07	1				
7	-.04	.24**	.04	.15*	.11	.31**	1			
8	.47**	.32**	.24**	-.10	.50**	.09	.31**	1		
9	-.10	.02	.12	.31**	-.02	.44**	.03.	-.02	1	
10	.16*	.27**	.20**	-.07	.31**	-.06	.19**	.35**	.03	1

Note. 1 = the avoiding style, 2 = the integrating style, 3 = the third-party help style, 4 = the neglect style, 5 = the compromising style, 6 = the dominating style, 7 = the emotional expression style, 8 = the accommodating/obliging style, 9 = individualism, 10 = collectivism; $*p < .05$, $**p < .01$.

Appendix D: *Correlations among Major Variables in the Indonesian sample.*

	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1	1									
2	.05	1								
3	.35**	.21**	1							
4	.34**	-.19**	.33**	1						
5	.28**	.42**	.04	-.06	1					
6	.29**	.12	.25**	.43**	.35**	1				
7	.50**	.18**	.36**	.37**	.30**	.34**	1			
8	.48**	.36**	.26**	.09	.47**	.35**	.40**	1		
9	.09	.39**	.01	.00	.41**	.37**	.26**	.28**	1	
10	.35**	.42**	.11	-.12	.45**	.20**	.30**	.41**	.54**	1

Note. 1 = the avoiding style, 2 = the integrating style, 3 = the third-party help style, 4 = the neglect style, 5 = the compromising style, 6 = the dominating style, 7 = the emotional expression style, 8 = the accommodating/obliging style, 9 = individualism, 10 = collectivism; **$p < .01$.