

2000

The Determinants of Conflict Management Among Chinese and Americans

Guo-Ming Chen

University of Rhode Island, gmchen@uri.edu

Kristen Ryan

University of Rhode Island

See next page for additional authors

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.uri.edu/com_facpubs

Terms of Use

All rights reserved under copyright.

Citation/Publisher Attribution

Chen, Guo-Ming, et al. "The determinants of conflict management among Chinese and Americans." *Intercultural Communication Studies*, vol. 9, no. 2, 2000, pp. 163-175. <https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/9-Guo-Ming-Chen-Kristen-Ryan.pdf>

Available at: <https://web.uri.edu/iaics/files/9-Guo-Ming-Chen-Kristen-Ryan.pdf>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by the Communication Studies at DigitalCommons@URI. It has been accepted for inclusion in Communication Studies Faculty Publications by an authorized administrator of DigitalCommons@URI. For more information, please contact digitalcommons@etal.uri.edu.

Authors

Guo-Ming Chen, Kristen Ryan, and Chaichin Chen

The Determinants of Conflict Management Among Chinese and Americans

Guo-Ming Chen

Kristen Ryan

University of Rhode Island

Chaichin Chen

Rhode Island Office of Library & Information Services

Abstract

This study investigated the determinants of conflict management through a comparison of 50 Americans and 48 Chinese students who reflected low-context and high-context cultures respectively. The results, based on in-depth interviews, indicated differences and similarities among factors pertaining to conflict management in the two groups.

Introduction

A number of studies have examined conflict management from different cultural perspectives. For example, Hall (1976) identified two types of cultural contexts influencing the way people handle conflict: high-context and low-context cultures. Low-context cultures tend to emphasize "I." and value "individual orientations, overt communication codes, and maintain a heterogeneous normative structure with low cultural demand/low cultural constraint characteristics;" while high-context cultures tend to emphasize "we" and value "group-identity orientation, covert communication codes, and maintain a homogeneous normative structure with high cultural demand/high cultural constraint characteristics" (Ting-Toomey, 1985, p. 76).

Ting-Toomey further indicated that low-context cultures feature several characteristics in a conflict situation: (1) individuals perceive the causes of conflict as instrumental, (2) conflicts occur when a person's normative expectations of the situation are violated, (3) individuals assume a confrontational, direct attitude toward conflicts, and (4) the tendency of individuals to use factual-inductive or axiomatic-deductive styles of conflict management. In contrast, in high-context cultures: (1) individuals perceive the causes of conflict as expressive, (2) conflicts occur when collective or cultural normative expectations of the situation are violated, (3) individuals assume a

non-confrontational, indirect attitude toward conflicts, and (4) they use affective-intuitive style of conflict management. Leung's (1988) study has identified the United States as a low-context culture, and China as a high-context culture.

Hsu (1953) examined the influence of culture on conflict and indicated that Chinese are more situation-centered and emotion-constrained, while Americans are more individual-centered and emotion-displayed. Nomura and Barnlund (1983) reported that the Japanese tend to show less dissatisfaction than Americans. Research by Ma (1990, 1992) consistently showed that North Americans are more explicit than Chinese in conflict situations. Chua and Gudykunst (1987) and Ting-Toomey (1988) found that low-context members tend to adopt direct and confrontation conflict styles, as opposed to indirect and avoidance styles adopted by high-context members. Ting-Toomey, Trubisky, and Nishida (1989) also found that Americans tend to use a dominating style, an integrating style, and a compromising style to a greater extent than the Japanese, and the Japanese use an avoidance style more than Americans. Other scholars have provided similar findings and concluded that the use of confrontation versus non-confrontation conflict style reflects a major difference in communication style between Chinese and Americans (Knutson, Hwang, & Deng, forthcoming; Lindin, 1974; Peng, He, & Zhu, forthcoming; Schneider, 1985; Wolfson & Norden, 1984; Yang, 1978). Although differences of conflict management between Western and Eastern people were attributed to cultural differences (Becker, 1986; Oliver, 1961; Yum, 1988), most studies in this line of research have focused on the differences of conflict management styles rather than the identification of causes for managing the conflict. This study therefore aimed to examine the determinants of conflict management in high-context and low-context cultures.

The Determinants of Conflict Management

Previous literature suggested that six factors might affect conflict management: face, inter-relation, seniority, power, credibility, and severity of the conflict (Chen & Starosta, 1997-8; Chung, 1996; Hwang, 1987, 1997-8). "Face" refers to the projected image of a person's self in a relationship network (Ting-Toomey, 1988). It represents an individual's social position and prestige gained from the successful performance of one or more specific social roles that are well recognized by other members in the society (Hu, 1944). Orientation to the use of face work reflects the conflict style a person selects. According to Ting-Toomey (1988), low-context cultures emphasize self-face concern and negative-face need. In contrast, high-context cultures emphasize other-face concern and positive-face need.

Jia (1997-8) and Hwang (1987) indicated that in the Chinese society face management is a power game often played by Chinese people. It is not only

an important way to show off one's power, but also a method to manipulate "the allocator's choices of allocating resources to one's benefit" (p. 962). Losing one's face is to injure one's self-esteem which will result in emotional uneasiness or a serious conflict. Thus, in the Chinese society one has to utilize every kind of method to "earn face" (Chu, 1983), and to enhance another's face (Chiao, 1981). Lastly, Silin (1976) pointed out that Chinese frequently use the method to manage a modern social organization, and Chen and Xiao (1993) and Pye (1982) indicated that giving face is the key to successful negotiation with Chinese in business.

"Inter-relation" refers to the relationship between the two parties. The relationship may be as friends, family, supervisor/subordinate, or coworkers along with many other relationships. Waggenspack and Hensley (1989) indicated that college students prefer to establish relationships with those who show less argumentativeness and aggressiveness in conflict situations. Chen and Starosta (1997-8), and Leung (1988) confirmed that Chinese are more likely to pursue a conflict with a stranger than with a friend. According to Chiao (1982), Jacobs (1979), Hwang (1987, 1997-8), and Yang (1982), maintaining a proper relationship is a way for Chinese to avoid serious conflicts and embarrassing encounters. Further study by Chang and Holt (1991) indicated that inter-relation is not only a tool used to avoid conflicts, but also as a social resource such as resolving conflicts among people. In other words, inter-relations are "potential power in persuasion, influence, and control" (Chung, 1991, p. 9).

"Seniority" plays an important role in the social interaction of Eastern societies. Although the aged receive respect in most human societies, compared to Western society, people in the East show much more respect for the elder. The aged enjoy a high status in Japan (Carmichael, 1991), and seniority is a major determinant for status and authority in Japanese organizations (Nishiyama, 1971). Bond and Hwang (1986) and Chen and Chung (1997) specified that the Confucian tradition accords the senior member of a relationship a wide range of prerogatives and power. In a case analysis of the conflict between two factions of a ruling party in the 1990 Taiwanese presidential election campaign, Chung (1991) reported that seniority and inter-relation are the most discernible characters for the recruitment of mediators. The eight statesmen who served as conflict mediators in the case were between 78 and 92 years old.

"Power" refers to the control of resources valued by other party. According to Folger and Poole (1984), the power one exerts sustains moves and countermoves of the participants in conflict situations. Although the emphasis of power resources varies in different cultures, what is similar in most cultures is that power is the determinant of conflict styles individuals will select. Americans consider the control of material resources such as money

and information to be a source of power (Nadler, Nadler, and Broome, 1985), the Japanese associate power with seniority (Prosser, 1978), and Chinese use power as a dominant way to require foreigners to negotiate (Pye, 1982) or to gain compliance in decision making process (Chen, 1997b). In all these situations power is believed to be an influencing factor in a conflict situation.

"Credibility" refers to the degree of trust one person has for another. Trust may have a significant impact on the communication process. Deutsch (1968) found that perceived trust increases the amount of interpersonal communication. Griffin (1967) reported that an increase of trust produces changes in interpersonal relationships, including control over the interaction process and the increasing acceptance of others' influence. In particular, the degree of trust among people may determine whether the persons adopt a cooperative or competitive stance in negotiations or conflict situations (Chen, 1997a; Nadler, Nadler, & Broome, 1985).

"Severity of the conflict" refers to the size of the potential gain or loss in a conflict. Leung (1988) indicated that people are more likely to pursue a dispute when a high stake is involved. The size of loss in a dispute significantly affects an individual's likelihood of pursuing the conflict (Chen, 1997a). A similar argument was also reported by Gladwin and Walter (1980) regarding the effect of the severity involved in conflict resolution strategies in multinational corporations.

These six factors, then, are deemed important for examining conflict management in both low-context and high-context cultures. Because the emphasis on each factor may vary in different cultural contexts, it was hypothesized that significant differences exist among Chinese and Americans in terms of the six factors. In addition to the hypothesis, this study as well examined whether differences exist among Chinese and Americans regarding the way they resolve the conflict and elements that affect the conflict management in the hypothetical conflict situation. Gender difference was also investigated.

Method

Data were collected by interviewing subjects from the two nations. The format of the interview was semi-structured which allowed the interviewers to use follow-up and probing questions. The definitions of all the concepts were clearly explained before the questions were posed. The following are three sample questions:

- (1) If you were the leader in this situation, what would you do? (The question was given after the interviewee asked to read a hypothetical conflict situation)

- (2) If you were the leader in this situation, what would be the major factors that affect the way you manage the conflict?
- (3) Would you please rate the following questions on a 1 to 7 scale with 1 representing "not at all," 4 "not decided," and 7 representing "very much?" First, does the concept "face" affect the way you manage the conflict (followed by inter-relation, seniority, power, credibility, and severity of the conflict)?

Participants and Procedure

Ninety-eight students in a midsize northeastern public university were recruited for the purpose of this study. Fifty of them were American students ($M = 24$, $F = 26$) with a mean age of 26.83. Forty-eight were Chinese students ($M = 25$, $F = 23$) with a mean age of 28.62. Two trained research assistants, including an American and a Chinese, conducted the interviews; the American assistant interviewed the American students in English. The Chinese assistant interviewed Chinese students by using both English and Mandarin whenever the situation required bilingualism. Each participant was interviewed individually, and each interview lasted from 30 to 75 minutes with an average of 40 minutes.

Although the interviewers took notes in the interview, except for those who disagreed, the interviews were also taped and confidentiality and anonymity were assured to all subjects. All the interviews were completed within two months. To solicit subjects' responses on conflict management, Baxter's (1984) hypothetical scenario was adopted in this study with a slight revision. Participants were asked to describe what they would do and what would affect their way to manage the conflict if they were in the scenario. A 2 by 2 factorial design was used to test the nation and gender differences.

Results

MANOVA was used to examine the effect of nation and gender on the six factors. MANOVA produced a significant main effect for nation [$F(4,44) = 2.95$, $p < .05$]. The results of univariate tests indicated that Americans substantially scored higher on the factor of severity of the conflict than Chinese in the conflict situation, and Chinese scored significantly higher than Americans on the factors of seniority and face (see Table 1). Although the univariate tests also showed that male scored significantly higher than female on the factor of power, the multivariate tests do not reveal a significant main effect for gender.

Table 1. National and Sex Differences on the Six Factors

Factors	Nation		Gender	
	American (N = 50)	Chinese (48)	Male (49)	Female (49)
	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)	Mean (SD)
Severity	*6.22 (.99)	5.56 (.83)	6.12 (.97)	5.67 (1.63)
Credibility	5.28 (1.34)	5.02 (1.65)	5.18 (1.34)	5.12 (1.65)
Relation	5.12 (1.46)	5.19 (1.57)	5.06 (1.37)	5.25 (1.65)
Power	4.14 (1.82)	4.40 (1.69)	*4.61 (1.66)	3.91 (1.80)
Seniority	*3.76 (1.59)	4.52 (1.84)	4.08 (1.70)	4.18 (1.82)
Face	*3.44 (1.73)	4.23 (1.80)	3.76 (1.85)	3.90 (1.77)

Note. * $p < .05$.

Table 1 also indicates the rank order of the six factors. The results revealed a great similarity of rank order between the two groups. Nevertheless, Americans scored high on severity of conflict, credibility, and inter-relation, medium on power, seniority, and face. The Chinese scored high on severity of conflict, inter-relation, and credibility, and medium on seniority, power, and face. The mean scores as well indicate that the six factors show an impact on the conflict management for the two groups.

Participants' answers were analyzed to examine the differences among Chinese and Americans on the way they resolved the conflict and elements that affect the conflict management in the hypothetical situation. Table 2 reports the order of the five methods used most often by the groups. The results revealed that both groups emphasized the importance of giving assistance to their counterparts in order to complete the job. However, Americans more focused on giving help by themselves, while Chinese more focused on searching for help from group members. This indicates that the Chinese tended to be more group oriented in the conflict situation.

Table 2. Methods Subjects Used to Resolve the Conflict

Americans	Chinese
1. Explain	1. Members' Assistance
2. My Assistance	2. My Assistance
3. Members' Assistance	3. Explain Situation
4. Discuss with Professor	4. Give Low Grade
5. Ask to Re-do	5. Ask to Re-do

Table 3 reports the elements that affect participants' management of the conflict in the hypothetical conflict situation. The results demonstrated that Americans showed a less authoritarian tendency in the conflict situation, and both groups used a dominating style when their counterparts showed negative or uncooperative attitudes or behaviors toward the assignment. Group interests were also a factor influencing the decision of using a dominating style in both groups.

Table 3. Elements That Affect Conflict Management

Americans	Chinese
1. Time Constraint	1. My Authority
2. Don't Care the Project	2. I'm Right
3. Grade on the Line	3. Affect Group Interest
4. Poor Performance	4. Grade on the Line
5. Lack of Cooperation	5. Lack of Cooperation
6. Negative Attitude	6. Poor Performance
7. Laziness	7. Don't Care the Project
8. Refuse to Re-do	8. Time Constraint
9. Frustrated/Angry	9. Lose My Face
10. Members Don't Help	10. Negative Attitude
11. Affect Group Interest	11. Members Don't Help
12. My Authority	12. Not Trustworthy

Discussion

This study investigated Chinese and Americans regarding how they manage a conflict. Several implications can be drawn from the results. First, Chinese scored significantly higher than Americans on face and seniority, while Americans scored significantly higher than Chinese on severity of conflict. The findings were consistent with the distinctions between people of low-context and high-context cultures, and with research on the differences

between Chinese and American cultural values (Chen, 1992; Hwang, 1987, 1997-8; Stewart, 1972; Yum, 1988).

The results also showed that Chinese were more likely to use an authoritarian style to manage the conflict when they were empowered. When Chinese perceived that they had the legitimate authority, they tended to use a dominating style to manage the conflict. The results were consistent with Meade and Whittaker's (1967) findings that Chinese students were more authoritarian than American students. According to Wen (1988), the integration of power and authoritarianism in the Chinese culture originated from Confucius' idea of the hierarchical structure of sex, age, and generation.

Second, the universal nature of perceptions and feelings was shown in conflict situations. Although both groups of participants showed significant differences in three of the six factors, the results indicated an overwhelming similarity in the rank order of the six variables. According to Schwartz (1990) and Schwartz and Sagiv (1995), the dichotomous classification of cultural orientation is often misleading. The dichotomy implicitly leads people to believe that the two cultural values are in polar opposition to one another. Schwartz has argued that many universal values such as achievement, security, and hedonism are emphasized in both kinds of culture. The similarity found in the two groups in the conflict management indicated that people of different cultures might share similar values.

Finally, two considerations for future research should be noticed when interpreting the results of this kind of study. First, the personal biases of participants towards a positive presentation of self might affect the results. The Chinese emphasis on face work, for instance, might cause the problem. Second, the length of time Chinese interviewees stayed in the United States might also affect the results. Those who have been in the United States for long periods might have been acculturated in a degree that would significantly influence their response patterns.

References

- Baxter, L.
1984 An investigation of compliance-gaining as politeness. *Human Communication Research, 10*, 427-456.
- Becker, C. B.
1986 Reasons for the lack of argumentation and debate in the Far East. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 10*, 75- 92.
- Bond, M. B., & Hwang, K.

- 1986 The social psychology of Chinese people. In M. H. Bond (Ed.), *The psychology of the Chinese people* (pp. 213-266). Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Carmichael, C. W.
1991 Intercultural perspectives of aging. In L. A. Samovar & R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 128-135). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Chang, H., & Holt, G. R.
1991 More than relationship: Chinese interaction and the principle of Guan-hsi. *Communication Quarterly*, 39, 251-271.
- Chen, G. M.
1997a *An examination of PRC business negotiations*. Paper present at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, November, Chicago, Illinois.
- Chen, G. M.
1997b *Seniority and superiority: A case of Chinese conflict resolution..* Paper present at the annual convention of the National Communication Association, November, Chicago, Illinois.
- Chen, G. M.
1992 The change of Chinese family value orientations in the United States. *Journal of Overseas Chinese Studies*, 2, 111-121.
- Chen, G. M., & Chung, J.
1997 The five Asian dragons: Management behaviors and organizational communication. In L. A. Samovar and R. E. Porter (Eds.), *Intercultural communication: A reader* (pp. 317-328). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J.
1997-8 Chinese conflict management and resolution. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 7, 1-16.
- Chen, G. M., & Xiao, X.
1993 *The impact of "harmony" on Chinese negotiations*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of Speech Communication association, November, Miami Beach, Florida.
- Chiao, C.
1981 *Chinese strategic behavior: Some central principles*. Paper presented at the Conference on Content of Culture, Claremont, California.
- Chiao, C.
1982 Guanxi: A preliminary conceptualization. In K. S. Yang and C. I. Wen (Eds.), *The Sinicization of social and behavioral science research in China* (pp. 345-360). Taipei: Academia Sinica.
- Chu, R. L.

- 1983 *Empirical researches on the psychology of face*. Doctoral dissertation, Taipei, Taiwan: National Taiwan University.
- Chua, E. & Gudykunst, W. B.
1987 Conflict resolution style in low- and high-context cultures. *Communication Research Reports*, 4, 32-37.
- Chung, J.
1991 *Seniority and particularistic ties in a Chinese conflict resolution process*. Paper presented at the annual conference of the Eastern Communication Association, April, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania.
- Chung, J.
1996 Avoiding a "Bull Moose" rebellion: Particularistic ties, seniority, and third-party mediation. *International and Intercultural communication annual*, 20, 166-185.
- Deutsch, M.
1968 The effects of cooperation and competition upon group process. In D. Cartwright & A. Zander (Eds.), *Group dynamics*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Folger, J. P., & Poole, M. S.
1984 *Working through conflict: A communication perspective*. Glenview, IL: Scott, Foresman.
- Gladwin, T. N., & Walter, I.
1980 *Multinationals under fire: Lessons in the management of conflict*. New York: John Wiley.
- Griffin, K.
1967 Interpersonal trust in small-group communication. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 53, 224-234.
- Hall, E. T.
1976 *Beyond Culture*. Garden City, NY: Anchor.
- Hsu, F. L. K.
1953 *Americans and Chinese: Two ways of life*. New York: Abelard-Schuman.
- Hu, H. C.
1944 The Chinese concept of 'face.' *American Anthropology*, 46, 45-64.
- Hwang, K. K.
1987 Face and favor: The Chinese power game. *American Journal of Sociology*, 92, 944-974.
- Hwang, K. K.
1997-8 Guanxi and Mientze: Conflict resolution in Chinese society. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 7, 17-42.
- Jacobs, B.

- 1979 A preliminary model of particularistic ties in Chinese political alliances: 'Kanchin' and 'Kuan-hsi' in a rural Taiwanese township. *China Quarterly*, 78, 237-273.
- Knutson, T. J., Hwang, J. C., & Deng, B. C.
in press Perception and management of conflict: A comparison of Taiwanese and US business employees. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 9.
- Koberg, C. S., & Chusmir, L. H.
1989 Relationship between sex role conflict and work-related variables: Gender and hierarchical differences. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 129, 779-791.
- Kohls, R.
1984 *The values Americans live by: Introduction*. D.C.: Meridian House International.
- Leung, K.
1988 Some determinants of conflict avoidance. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 19, 125-136.
- Lindin, O. G.
1974 Harmony with nature in Chinese thought and opposition to nature in Western thought. *The Journal of Intercultural Studies*, 1, 5-9.
- Ma, R.
1990 An exploratory study of discontented responses in American and Chinese relationships. *The Southern Communication Journal*, 55, 305-318.
- Ma, R.
1992 Contexts of discontented responses in Canadian and Chinese cultures. *Journal of Asian and African Studies*, 27, 263-270.
- Meade, R. D., & Whittaker, J. O.
1967 A cross-cultural study of authoritarianism. *Journal of Psychology*, 72, 3-7.
- Nadler, B. N., Nadler, M. K., & Broome, B. J.
1985 Culture and the management of conflict situations. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *Communication, culture, and organizational processes* (pp. 87-113). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Nishiyama, K.
1971 Interpersonal persuasion in a vertical society--The case of Japan. *Speech Monographs*, 38, 148-154.
- Nomura, N., & Barnlund, D.

- 1983 Patterns of interpersonal criticism in Japan and the United States. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 7, 1-8.
- Oliver, R. T.
1961 The rhetorical implications of Taoism. *Quarterly Journal of Speech*, 47, 27-35.
- Peng, S., He, Z., & Zhu, J. H.
in press Conflict Management Styles among Employees of Sino-American, Sino-French, and State-owned Enterprises in China
- Prosser, M. H. (Ed.)
1978 *The cultural dialogue: An introduction to intercultural communication*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.
- Pye, L.
1982 *Chinese commercial negotiation style*. Cambridge, MA: Oelgeschlager, Gunn & Hain.
- Roloff, M. E.
1981 *Interpersonal communication: The social exchange approach*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Schneider, M. J.
1985 Verbal and nonverbal indices of the communicative performance and acculturation of Chinese immigrants. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 9, 271-283.
- Schwartz, W.
1990 Individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 21, 139-151.
- Schwartz, W., & Sagiv, L.
1995 Identifying culture-specifics in the content and structure of values. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 26, 92-116.
- Silin, R. H.
1976 *Leadership and values: The organization of large-scale Taiwanese enterprise*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.
- Stewart, E. C.
1972 *American cultural patterns: A cross-cultural perspective*. IL: Intercultural Network.
- Ting-Toomey, S.
1985 Toward a theory of conflict and culture. In W. B. Gudykunst, L. P. Stewart, & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *Communication, culture, and organizational processes* (pp. 71-86). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S.

- 1988 Intercultural conflict style: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication* (pp. 213-235). Newsbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Trubisky, P., & Nishida, T.
1989 *An analysis of conflict styles in Japan and the United States*. Paper presented at the annual convention of the Speech Communication Association, November, San Francisco, California.
- Waggenspack, B. M., & Hensley, W. E.
1989 Perception of the argumentativeness trait in interpersonal relationship situation. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 17, 111-120.
- Wen, C. I.
1988 An investigation of Chinese national character: A value orientation perspective. In I. U. Lee and K. S. Yang (Eds.), *The Chinese character* (pp. 49-90). Taipei, Taiwan: Kwei Kwan.
- Wolfson, K., & Norden, M. F.
1984 Measuring responses to filmed interpersonal conflict: A rules approach. In W. B. Gudykunst & Y. Y. Kim (Eds.), *Methods for intercultural research* (pp. 155-166). Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Yang, H. J.
1978 *Communicative competence in Formosan sociable events: A participant observation study*. Dissertation Abstracts International, 39, 2622A.
- Yang, K. S.
1982 "Yuan" and its functions in contemporary life. *Chinese Cultural Renaissance*, 15, 19-42.
- Yum, J. O.
1988 The impact of Confucianism on interpersonal relationships and communication patterns in East Asia. *Communication Monographs*, 55, 374-388.