

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin

<http://psp.sagepub.com/>

Conflict with Outsiders: Disputing within and Across Cultural Boundaries

Tom Tyler, E. Allan Lind, Ken-Ichi Ohbuchi, Ikuo Sugawara and Yuen J. Huo

Pers Soc Psychol Bull 1998 24: 137

DOI: 10.1177/0146167298242003

The online version of this article can be found at:

<http://psp.sagepub.com/content/24/2/137>

Published by:



<http://www.sagepublications.com>

On behalf of:



[Society for Personality and Social Psychology](#)

Additional services and information for *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin* can be found at:

Email Alerts: <http://psp.sagepub.com/cgi/alerts>

Subscriptions: <http://psp.sagepub.com/subscriptions>

Reprints: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsReprints.nav>

Permissions: <http://www.sagepub.com/journalsPermissions.nav>

Citations: <http://psp.sagepub.com/content/24/2/137.refs.html>

Conflict With Outsiders: Disputing Within and Across Cultural Boundaries

Tom Tyler

University of California, Berkeley

E. Allan Lind

Duke University

Ken-Ichi Ohbuchi

Tohoku University

Ikuo Sugawara

Fukushima University

Yuen J. Huo

University of California, Los Angeles

Two studies examine how people's reactions to conflict resolution efforts by third parties are affected by whether the conflict occurs within or across cultural boundaries. Both test the social categorization hypothesis of the relational model of authority: that third-party decisions will be evaluated more strongly through judgments about the treatment of disputants (relational concerns) in conflicts within groups and more strongly in terms of decisions favorability (instrumental concerns) in disputes across groups. The first study tests this hypothesis in a study of conflicts between American employees and their supervisors, whereas the second does so in a study of conflicts involving Japanese and Western teachers. The results of both studies support the predictions of the relational model. In both studies, relational concerns are more important in within-group disputes.

The development of the world economy has encouraged increasing cross-cultural research on conflict resolution. For the most part, past cross-cultural conflict research in social psychology has focused on understanding differences in the way people from different cultures handle disputes (see, e.g., Graham, 1993; Leung, 1987; Leung & Lind, 1986; Lind, Erickson, Friedland, & Dickenberger, 1978; Ohbuchi & Takahashi, 1994; Tung, 1982). These studies are based on the assumption that people's values, attitudes, and beliefs are shaped by the culture in which they live and that these cultural differences, in turn, shape the way people approach dispute resolution.

Although cross-cultural research on conflict resolution has frequently addressed the question of whether people's approach to conflict depends on their own culture, there has been relatively little research focused on whether people's approach to conflict changes depending on the relationship between their own culture and the culture of the person with whom they are disputing. This study seeks to fill this gap in the literature by comparing conflicts that occur within and across social categories. Our concern is not with the values or attitudes of the people within cultures. Instead, we are concerned with the changes that occur when people within one society, organization, or group categorize those with whom they are dealing as being within or outside of their group.

Specifically, we test predictions drawn from the relational model of reactions to authorities (Tyler & Lind, 1992). The relational model of authority predicts that people will approach conflict differently depending on whether the conflict is occurring within or across group boundaries. The core argument of the theory is that people are very concerned about the quality of their

Authors' Note: Address correspondence to Tom Tyler, Department of Psychology, New York University, Berkeley, 3210 Tolman Hall (MC1650), Berkeley, CA 94720-1650, e-mail tomtyler@socrates.berkeley.edu.

PSPB, Vol. 24 No. 2, February 1998 137-146

© 1998 by the Society for Personality and Social Psychology, Inc.

relationships with members of groups with which they identify and that they use their treatment by others within these groups to glean information about where they stand in the group. Using social interactions and procedures as sources of relational information is seen as a key component of intragroup behavior.

The primary type of evidence that has been used to support the relational model is evidence concerning what people care about when they deal with authorities. The theory posits that people attend closely to indications that process and procedures are free of discrimination (neutrality), for suggestions that other in-group members can be trusted to behave in a generally benevolent fashion (trustworthiness), and for indications that their status as an in-group member is respected (status recognition). These aspects of treatment by others are referred to as relational concerns because they communicate information about the individual's relationship to his or her in-group (Lind & Tyler, 1988; Tyler, 1989; Tyler & Lind, 1992). Across a wide variety of settings, research has found that people are strongly impacted by relational judgments about their experiences (see Tyler & Lind, 1992, for a review).

There is also other evidence that supports a relational model. One type of evidence comes from studies suggesting that people react more strongly to how they are treated by authorities who represent groups with which they more strongly identify. If people identify more strongly with groups, they draw more of their sense of self from those groups, so they care more about the identity-relevant information communicated to them through their treatment by group authorities. Tyler and Degoe (1995) demonstrated this effect in a study of deference to a local legal authority; Smith and Tyler (1996) showed it in a study of the willingness of the advantaged to defer to redistributive policies passed by Congress; and Huo, Smith, Tyler, and Lind (1996) demonstrated it in a study of the willingness of workers to defer to the decisions of their supervisors. In each case, identification with the organization an authority represented heightened the importance attached to judgments about the treatment participants received from that authority.

An additional type of evidence that supports the relational model is the demonstration that treatment by authorities influences people's self-esteem. As would be predicted by the relational model, being treated badly by authorities leads to lower self-esteem, whereas fair treatment enhances self-esteem (Koper, Van Knippenberg, Bouhuijs, Vermunt, & Wilke, 1993; Smith, Tyler, Huo, Ortiz, & Lind, 1997; Tyler, Degoe, & Smith, 1996; Tyler & Smith, *in press*; Vermunt, Wit, van den Bos, & Lind, 1993).

The relational model is further supported by evidence that the impact of the treatment people experience when dealing with authorities changes their feelings about

themselves and their behavior toward the group because it changes their social identities. Two identity-relevant judgments—pride and respect—are shown to mediate the impact of experience with authorities (Tyler, Degoe, & Smith, 1996; Tyler & Smith, *in press*) and to more generally shape group-related behaviors and judgments about the self (Smith & Tyler, 1996).

This study tests the social categorization argument that develops from the relational model. Based on the relational model, it is hypothesized that people will attend more to relational concerns during in-group interactions than during out-group interactions. There are two reasons for this prediction. First, in out-group interactions, the behavior of others does not carry as much of the social identity information that makes relational concerns so critical within groups. Second, people may well have greater difficulty in interpreting the behavior of out-group members, because their confidence in their judgments will be diminished by the possibility that the other is behaving according to some unknown cultural norm. Applied to disputing, the relational prediction is that people will be more concerned with relational aspects of disputing when they share some salient social category with the other person (or people) and/or the authority involved in the dispute (Lind, 1994).

Drawing on research on conflict management styles (Hocker & Wilmot, 1991; Ohbuchi & Takama, 1991), Ohbuchi, Chiba, and Fukushima (1994) have recently made a similar argument about the psychological dynamics underlying the choice of tactics used in disputing. Their multiple goals theory suggests that there are three potential goals in a conflict situation: resource, relations, and identity. Resource goals involve outcomes; relational goals involve the desire to maintain the relationship; and identity goals involve issues of social reputation, face, or self-esteem. It is identity goals that correspond to what the relational model refers to as relational concerns. Hence, both models suggest that an important concern is the impact of experience on social identity. And both models link the impact of experience on social identity to politeness.

The relational and multiple goals models differ in the area of differentiation between concerns over outcomes and relationship maintenance. The relational model does not make this differentiation, whereas multiple goals theory does. On the other hand, multiple goals theory links identity concerns primarily to politeness, whereas the relational model views a broader range of issues (voice, neutrality, trustworthiness, status recognition) as also linked to identity.

Multiple goals theory suggests that when people have a social relationship with others, they will be strongly motivated by social concerns such as the protection of face and the preservation of relationships. Further, the theory predicts that these concerns will shape the choice

of tactics used in resolving conflicts. Like the relational model, multiple goals theory suggests that concerns about identity will have a stronger influence on how people handle conflicts when they are dealing with someone with whom they already have a relationship or with whom they share values. Hence, this theory joins the relational model in predicting that people will be more concerned about such issues when dealing with an in-group member.

We tested the predictions of these two theories in two studies of real-world conflicts. In both studies, we evaluated the influence of cultural boundaries on people's reactions to disputes with others. Because we were interested in the effects of culture as a social category, we defined cultural boundaries in terms of salient, observable characteristics—ethnicity (Study 1) and nationality (Study 2). In these studies, we use culture as a group boundary. It is also possible to imagine other ways of defining group boundaries—for example, whether people share a common membership in a work organization. Hence, what is key about culture from our perspective is that cultures define group boundaries. Although there are many other elements of culture, such as distinctive value orientations, we do not focus on these within this analysis.

In the first study, a multiethnic sample of employees of a public-sector institution in California completed questionnaires about disputes with their supervisors. Each employee evaluated a conflict that occurred with his or her immediate work supervisor. In some instances, the supervisor was of the same ethnicity as the employee (a within-group conflict), and in other instances, the supervisor was of a different ethnicity (a between-group conflict). This analysis builds on a prior study that examined the role of identification in shaping decision acceptance among the subset of workers in this sample involved in a between-group conflict (Huo et al., 1996). In the second study, a sample of Western and Japanese teachers completed questionnaires that asked each subject to recall two conflicts: a conflict with another member of their nationality and a conflict with a member of the other nationality. The analysis used the subset of such disputes in which a third party was involved.

In both studies, we tested for differences attributable to the nationality or ethnicity of the subject, as well as for differences linked to the match or mismatch of the cultural categories of the disputing parties. Given the many differences that exist among those of varying cultures, such as differences in cultural values, we might expect to find direct effects of culture on the dependent variables. For this reason, we include culture in our analyses as a control. We believe, however, that there will also be independent effects of whether the conflict occurs within or between cultures.

STUDY 1

Study 1 used a survey framework to examine conflicts within and across cultural boundaries. This study takes advantage of a multiethnic workplace to examine conflicts between workers and supervisors who are of the same or a differing ethnicity. Four general ethnic categories were studied: African American, European American (Whites), Asian American, and Hispanic Latino. Respondents were placed into an ethnic category based on their self-reported ethnicity, using categories from the U.S. census. The conflict was coded as a match if the worker and his or her supervisor shared the same ethnicity and as a nonmatch if they differed in ethnicity (for example, an Asian American supervisor and an African American employee).

The participants were employees at the University of California, Berkeley. They spanned all types of jobs and all levels of jobs, including managers and administrators. Each participant described a recent conflict with his or her work supervisor. They were asked to think about a situation in which they had spoken to their supervisor about any of a number of issues, including "making decisions or settling disagreements about how work should be done," "discussing issues of pay, promotion, work hours, or similar issues," "getting help in resolving a dispute with a customer, a co-worker, or with the supervisor," or "other issues and problems." The key framework given participants was to "think about the last time you went to your supervisor for help in resolving a work-related problem, conflict, or disagreement about an issue that mattered to you." Participants were also asked to indicate their own ethnicity and the ethnicity of their supervisors.

The participants were then asked to make two sets of judgments about the behavior of the supervisor during the conflict: instrumental judgments (e.g., "Did you gain or lose?") and relational judgments (e.g., "Was the supervisor polite, respectful, etc.?"). These two judgments were used to predict the employee's willingness to voluntarily accept the supervisor's decision. The relational model and multiple goals theory hypotheses would be supported if relational judgments showed stronger regression coefficients in the ethnic-match condition.

Method

PARTICIPANTS

The participants were employees at a public-sector organization. Because we wanted participants who identified strongly with their ethnic groups, we mailed questionnaires to members of four ethnically based work associations. The employees were asked to describe a problem or conflict that they had discussed with their work supervisors. Completed surveys were received from

29% of employees, leading to a sample of 305 respondents (117 Asian American, 58 Chicano/Latino, 56 European American, 45 African American, 25 dual ethnic heritage, and 4 who did not indicate their entirety). Different data from this sample are reported in studies by Tyler, Degoe, and Smith (1996) and Huo et al. (1996).

The survey approach used was chosen to develop a multiethnic data set. Although our use of a mail questionnaire led to a low response rate (29%), those who responded had several desired characteristics. First, they did indeed identify with their ethnic group membership. Respondents were asked to agree or disagree with the statement "I am proud to think of myself as a member of my ethnic group" (1 = *agree strongly* to 4 = *disagree strongly*). The average rating was 1.32 ($SD = 0.64$), indicating high identification. In fact, the respondents indicated that they identified more with their ethnic subgroup than with their work organization. When asked the same question about pride in thinking of themselves as members of their work organization, the average rating was 1.63 ($SD = 0.71$), a significantly lower level of identification, $t(292) = 5.56, p < .001$. As would be expected, minorities are more likely to indicate that they identify strongly with their ethnic group (mean 1.18, as opposed to 1.96 for Whites), $t(292) = 9.09, p < .001$. In addition, the respondents felt strongly about their experiences with their supervisors. Although respondents were free to mention either positive or negative experiences, most indicated negative feelings about their experiences; large proportions of the respondents indicated feeling frustrated (54%), irritated (45%), and angry (40%) as a result of the conflict.

QUESTIONNAIRE

Although early theories defined control as a central issue in reactions to authorities (see Thibaut & Walker, 1975), recent research has suggested that it is unclear whether process control (*voice*) ought to be considered an instrumental or a relational judgment (see Lind, Kanfer, & Earley, 1990; Shapiro & Brett, 1993; Tyler, 1989). For this reason, we do not use process control in either factor in this study. This omission should not cause a problem, because recent studies have indicated that the effects of voice are entirely mediated by other relational issues (see Lind, Tyler, & Huo, 1997).

Instrumental judgments. A five-item instrumental scale was constructed using the following items: "How favorable was the outcome to you?"; "How does your outcome compare to the outcome you expected when you first contacted your supervisor?"; "How much better or worse off were you compared to the situation you were in before you went to your supervisor?"; "How does your

outcome compare to the outcomes other people generally receive when they go to your supervisor with similar problems?"; and "In terms of your outcome, did you gain or lose?" The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.85.

Relational judgments. A nine-item relational index was constructed. Items included the following: "How politely were you treated?"; "How much concern was shown for your rights?"; "How hard did your supervisor try to bring issues into the open?"; "How honest was your supervisor?"; "How much of an opportunity were you given to describe your problem?"; "How consistent was what happened to you with rules in your organization about how such problems should be handled?"; "How hard did your supervisor try to do the right thing by you?"; "How dignified was your treatment?"; and "How hard did your supervisor try to take account of your needs?" The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.95.

Willingness to voluntarily accept the decision. Three items were used to assess willingness to accept the decision: "How willing were you to voluntarily accept the decision?"; "How likely is it that the way your problem was handled would lead to a lasting solution?"; and "If this problem were to occur again in the future, how willing are you to see it be resolved in a similar way?" The coefficient alpha for this scale was 0.81.

Results

Each dispute was classified as between or within group, depending on the match of the ethnicity of the employee and the supervisor. Four ethnicities were differentiated for this analysis, and the dispute was classified as within-group only if the employee and the supervisor matched in ethnicity within these four groups. Four example, a Hispanic supervisor and an African American worker would be considered a mismatch. Of those interviewed, 195 were mismatches, 85 were matches, and 20 could not be coded and were excluded from the analysis. The correlation between all items is shown in Appendix A.

The first issue addressed is whether the instrumental and relational indexes outlined form two distinct factors. A factor analysis led to the rotated two-factor solution shown in Table 1. All factor loadings are shown, with the loadings used to construct scales shown in bold. The results support the division of the items into two separate factors, one instrumental and one relational.

Simultaneous regression analyses were used to test the hypothesis that the weight of instrumental and relational judgments in determining reactions to disputes differed for the within- and between-group disputants. The dependent variable in the analyses was decision acceptance (i.e., whether the worker was willing to voluntarily accept

TABLE 1: Factor Analysis of Independent Variables, Study 1

	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>
Comparison with expectation	.26	.72
Comparison with other	.19	.69
Outcome favorable?	.42	.73
Gain/lose?	.22	.80
Comparison with prior situation	.39	.76
Politeness	.81	.20
Concern for rights?	.85	.31
Try to bring issues into open?	.70	.37
Honest?	.85	.18
Rule-based outcome	.62	.28
Consideration of views?	.77	.45
Try to do right thing?	.79	.41
Dignified treatment?	.83	.26
Try to account for needs?	.80	.39
Eigenvalue	8.38	1.37
Percentage of variance	60	10

NOTE: The results shown are the result of a rotated factor solution, using Varimax rotation. The number of factors was not constrained. Numbers in bold indicate the items included in the scale reflecting each factor.

the decision the supervisor made to resolve the dispute). Decision acceptance was predicted using six independent variables: instrumental judgments about the experience; relational judgments about the experience; the interaction of instrumental judgments and the within-/between-group distinction; the interaction between relational judgments and the within-/between-group distinction; and the main effects of (a) whether the dispute was within or between ethnicities and (b) whether the employee was or was not White. Simultaneous regressions were used, with all independent variables entered at one time.

The results of the regression analysis are shown in Table 2. Prior studies suggest that reactions to authorities will be influenced by relational judgments (Tyler & Lind, 1992), and that prediction is supported by the findings of this analysis. Relational judgments significantly influence willingness to accept decisions ($\beta = .54, p < .001$), as do instrumental judgments ($\beta = .34, p < .001$). The significant interaction effect of the relational judgment and within-/between-group categorization ($\beta = .11, p < .05$) indicates that the role of relational concerns differs in reactions to within- and between-group conflicts. The role of instrumental concerns does not differ ($\beta = -.05, ns$).

Table 3 shows separate regression analyses for the between-group disputes and the within-group disputes. The overall interaction analysis presented in Table 2 indicates that people put differential weight on relational indexes in the two conditions. An examination of the subgroup regressions indicates the nature of this effect. As predicted, people are more concerned about

TABLE 2: Regression Test of the Interaction Effect, Study 1

<i>Independent Variable</i>	<i>Beta Weight (b/SE)</i>
Instrumental judgment	.34 (.32/.06)***
Relational judgment	.54 (.51/.06)***
Interaction of instrumental judgment with ethnic match	-.05 (-.10/.11)
Interaction of relational judgment with ethnic match	.11 (.23/.11)*
Ethnic match	.02 (.05/.09)
Ethnicity of employee	.05 (.13/.11)
Adjusted R^2	.70***

NOTE: Entries are the beta weights, reflecting the relative independent influence of each independent variable when all variables are simultaneously entered into the equation. The adjusted R^2 reflects the total proportion of variance explained by all variables in the equation. Numbers in parentheses are the unstandardized regression coefficient and its standard error.

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

TABLE 3: Regression Analysis Within Dispute Types, Study 1

	<i>Between-Culture Interactions</i>	<i>Within-Culture Interactions</i>
	<i>Beta Weight (b/SE)</i>	<i>Beta Weight (b/SE)</i>
Instrumental judgments	.29 (.27/.06)***	.24 (.25/.09)**
Relational judgments	.60 (.56/.06)***	.69 (.71/.06)***
Ethnicity of employee (White/nonwhite)	.09 (.43/.20)	.03 (.05/.12)
Adjusted R^2	.70***	.73***

NOTE: Entries are the beta weights, reflecting the relative independent influence of each independent variable when all variables are simultaneously entered into the equation. The adjusted R^2 reflects the total proportion of variance explained by all variables in the equation. Numbers in parentheses are the unstandardized regression coefficient and its standard error.

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

how they are treated by their supervisors when the dispute is within their group.

Discussion

Study 1 provides some support for the prediction advanced in this article. Respondents describing within-ethnicity disputes with their supervisors placed more emphasis on relational concerns in deciding whether or not to accept the supervisors' decision than those describing between-ethnicity disputes.

There are some methodological limitations of Study 1 that make additional testing of the hypotheses desirable. The most obvious limitation has to do with the way in which the within- and between-culture group categorization was constituted. Whether a particular respondent fell in one group or the other depended, in part, on the respondent's own ethnicity. Because many more of the supervisors in the organization were European Americans than any other group, it was more likely that respon-

dents in the within-group classification were themselves European American and that respondents in the between-group classification were from the other ethnic groups. Study 2 sought to unconfound respondents' culture and dispute type and to explore in considerably more detail the role of relational and instrumental concerns in disputing.

STUDY 2

Study 2 again tests the prediction that relational concerns will be more important in conflicts occurring within, as opposed to conflicts across, cultural boundaries. These predictions are evaluated by examining the disputants' willingness to voluntarily accept decisions made by a third party about how to resolve the conflict. In each case, the importance of relational concerns (neutrality, trustworthiness, status recognition) is contrasted with the importance of instrumental concerns (i.e., concerns about receiving desired, favorable, outcomes).

In contrast to Study 1, which used ethnicity as a cultural category, Study 2 used nationality. Study 2 used samples of Japanese and Western teachers living in Japan. The Western teachers were all native English speakers—and most were from the United States, Canada, Australia, and Great Britain. The respondents were interviewed about their experiences in dealing with both within- and between-nationality conflicts. Each subject was asked to describe how he or she had handled a conflict involving a Japanese and a conflict involving a Westerner.

Methods

PARTICIPANTS

The participants were Japanese ($n = 124$) and Western ($n = 91$) teachers in an English teaching program in Japan. Each respondent was asked to describe a within-nationality and a between-nationality conflict, for a total of 430 possible conflicts. However, not all participants reported having experienced the kind of conflicts they were asked to describe. In the case of between-nationality conflicts, 39% (84 participants) indicated that they had not had a recent conflict with someone of the same nationality. In the case of within-nationality conflicts, 36% (77 participants) reported no recent conflict with someone of another nationality. Hence, the effective sample size was 138 within- and 131 between-nationality conflicts ($N = 269$). Finally, only those conflicts in which one or both participants used a third party are considered. This involved 60 conflicts for between-group conflicts and 64 conflicts for within-group conflicts. Hence, a total of 124 conflicts involving third parties (out of 269 total conflicts) were actually considered in this study. Each respondent received questionnaires in their native language (English or Japanese).

Respondents were asked to describe two conflicts, one within and one between nationality. However, each respondent did not necessarily go to a third party about both disputes. Hence, in some cases, a respondent is included in both the within and between conditions, and in some cases, they are in only one condition. Of the 124 conflicts described, 54 (44%) involved a person who went to a third party about both a within- and a between-nationality conflict (e.g., 27 respondents did so, leading to 54 of the 124 disputes). The other 70 disputes were described by respondents who reported only either a within- or a between-nationality dispute for which they sought third-party intervention. Although it is difficult to conduct a full statistical analysis comparing the 27 within- and 27 between-nationality disputes described by the same people to the 70 disputes in which a person only described one dispute, an examination of the correlations between relational concerns and the willingness to accept decisions in within- and between-nationality disputes among these two subgroups suggests that the pattern is similar among the two groups. Hence, the groups were combined into a single sample in the analyses outlined.

QUESTIONNAIRE AND MEASURES

The questionnaire asked the participants a number of questions about a recent conflict. Each respondent first completed all of the items asking about the between-nationality dispute and then answered the same questions about the within-nationality dispute. For example, Western participants were first asked about "an overt dispute with someone Japanese in a work setting" and were then asked about a dispute with someone "in your home country in a work setting." Although the ethnicity of the other party to the dispute is known, the ethnicity of the third party was not assessed.

Instrumental judgments. Disputants were asked about the degree to which they "received favorable outcomes," "were able to change the other person's behavior," and "won the dispute" (alphas = .78 for within and .76 for between).

Relational judgments. Disputants were asked six questions about the behavior of the third party: "How seriously were your views considered?"; "How politely were you treated?"; "How much concern was shown for your rights?"; "How honest was the third party?"; "How much concern was shown for your needs?"; and "How much respect was shown to your social face?" (alphas = .89 for within and .92 for between).

Basis for accepting decisions—willingness to accept decisions. Disputants were asked how "willingly" they accepted the solution the third party proposed, how "easy" they found it to act in accord with the solution, and the

degree to which they willingly “went along” with the solution (α s = .82 for between and .94 for within).

DESIGN AND ANALYSIS

As in Study 1, simultaneous regression analysis was used to explore the antecedents of decision acceptance. Again, it was used to determine the influence of instrumental and relational factors on the willingness to accept decisions. In this analysis, the nationality of the subject was included as a control variable. As before, the goal was to identify patterns of effects in between- versus within-nationality disputes that were distinct from any influence of the nationality of the respondent.

Results

As in Study 1, the first issue addressed is whether the instrumental and relational indexes outlined form two distinct factors. Separate factor analyses were conducted for judgments about the within- and between-nationality disputes. The results, shown in Table 4, indicate that in both cases, a two-factor solution emerged. As before, all loadings are shown. They indicate two distinct factors in each case.

THE BASIS FOR ACCEPTING SOLUTIONS

Simultaneous regression analysis was used to test the influence of instrumental and relational indicators on the willingness to accept decisions for conflicts within and across cultural boundaries. Because the data in Study 2 are potentially within-subject data, a different approach to examining the regression analysis is required. In each case, the question addressed is whether relational indexes make a significant contribution to the ability to understand the willingness to accept decisions beyond the contribution made by instrumental judgments.

The results of separate regression analyses of the within-nationality and between-nationality disputes are presented in Table 5. First, consider the within-nationality conflicts. Decision acceptance is significantly influenced both by relational judgments ($\beta = .46, p < .001$) and by instrumental judgments ($\beta = .50, p < .001$). In other words, relational concerns independently contribute to willingness to accept decisions, after the influence of instrumental factors is taken into account. In contrast, in between-nationality conflicts, decision acceptance is linked only to instrumental judgments ($\beta = .52, p < .01$) and not to relational issues ($\beta = 0.11, ns$). In this condition, relational judgments make no independent contribution to the prediction of the willingness to accept decisions.

An alternative approach to testing our hypothesis is to directly compare the magnitude of the influence of relational judgments on the willingness to accept deci-

TABLE 4: Factor Analysis, Study 2

	<i>Between Culture</i>		<i>Within Culture</i>	
	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>	<i>Factor 1</i>	<i>Factor 2</i>
Got favorable outcome	-.09	.80	-.30	.82
Changed other's actions	-.10	.83	-.02	.79
Won	-.03	.83	-.06	.86
Consider views?	.92	-.13	.80	-.27
Treat politely?	.85	.02	.84	-.19
Show concern for rights?	.81	-.15	.87	-.05
Honest?	.78	-.20	.82	-.17
Show concern for needs?	.85	-.02	.91	-.12
Respect for social face?	.78	-.01	.82	.04
Eigenvalue	4.36	1.95	4.73	1.84
Percentage of variance	48	22	53	20

NOTE: Factors were identified using Varimax rotation. The number of factors was not constrained. Numbers in bold indicate the items included in the scale reflecting each factor.

TABLE 5: Antecedents of Reactions to Third-Party Decisions, Study 2

	<i>Between Nationality</i>	<i>Within Nationality</i>
	<i>Beta Weight (b/SE)</i>	<i>Beta Weight (b/SE)</i>
Instrumental judgments	.52 (.43/.12)**	.50 (.59/.16)***
Relational judgments	.11 (.12/.16)	.46 (.76/.21)***
Subject nationality	-.07 (-.09/.19)	-.05 (-.09/.25)
Adjusted R^2	.23***	.47***

NOTE: Entries are the beta weights, reflecting the relative independent influence of each independent variable when all variables are simultaneously entered into the equation. The adjusted R^2 reflects the total proportion of variance explained by all variables in the equation. Numbers in parentheses are the unstandardized regression coefficient and its standard error.

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

sions. According to our predictions, that influence should be greater for within-nationality conflicts. The magnitude of the relational influence in the two situations can be directly compared by the use of an r -to- z transformation on the correlations between relational judgments and the willingness to accept decisions (Blalock, 1972). For between-nationality disputes, the correlation between relational concerns and acceptance is $r = .18$; for within-nationality disputes, $r = .54$. A comparison of these two correlations indicates that they are significantly different ($z = 2.29, p < .05$). Although this finding supports our suggestion that relational concerns are more important in within-nationality settings, it is important to note that the ratings in the two situations are not necessarily completely independent, an assumption of the r -to- z test, because they are sometimes made by the same individuals (in 44% of the cases), rating two different disputes. However, an examination of the ratings made of the two disputes by the same people (see Appendix A) suggests very little correlation between ratings of the characteristics of the within- and between-

nationality disputes. The average correlation between ratings of instrumental, relational characteristics and willingness to accept decisions was $r = .12$. Hence, participant's ratings of the two disputes appear to be largely independent.

OVERALL DISCUSSION

The overall pattern of differences found in both studies supports the predictions of the relational model. In Study 1, relational concerns had a stronger influence on acceptance of the outcome of within-ethnicity disputes than was the case in between-ethnicity disputes. This finding was replicated in Study 2. The replication of the basic findings across different disputing contexts and operationalizations of cultural boundaries gives us greater confidence in the robustness of the phenomenon.

The findings outlined provide further support for the relational perspective on authority. As we noted in the introduction, the relational perspective has been supported by four types of evidence: (a) the importance that people are found to place on treatment by authorities, (b) the finding that people care more about treatment when they identify more strongly with the group an authority represents, (c) the finding that treatment influences self-esteem, and (d) the finding that the impact of treatment is mediated by changes in the identity-related judgments of pride and respect. This study adds a fifth type of support. It demonstrates that social categorization shapes the psychology of authority. Whether people regard their dispute as occurring within or across group boundaries shapes the psychology of disputing. As predicted by the relational model, people are more concerned about relational issues with disputes occurring within their group.

Taken together, these findings suggest a need to expand our conception of authority relations. In addition to their concerns about resource exchange, people have concerns about their self-image and self-worth. These identity concerns are important in people's reactions to their experiences with authorities. People are more willing to defer to the decisions of authorities if they feel treated with dignity and respect. However, these treatment effects occur because people are drawing identity-relevant information from treatment. Hence, they are stronger when identity issues are salient. One factor that shapes that salience is whether there is common group membership. Common group membership encourages people to draw identity-relevant implications from their treatment, because authorities represent the group and express group values (Tyler & Lind, 1992). Consequently, people care more about how they are treated when in-group norms are relevant.

Implications for Disputing

The picture of disputing that emerges from these studies reveals a quite distinct pattern of frames of evaluation for within-culture and between-culture disputes. The findings demonstrate that people react to decisions in a different way when they are in conflict with someone within their own social category. In other words, people use different criteria to evaluate the outcomes and to decide whether or not to accept them. Although the participants came from several different nations and ethnic groups, in these analyses, it was the nature of the situation, not the participants' nationality or ethnicity, that was responsible for the effects observed. This is most strongly demonstrated in Study 2, in which it is often the same participants who are rating conflicts differently based on who the disputants are.

The findings show strong, and quite interesting, trans-cultural patterns. When they were disputing with other members of their own cultural category, the participants in both studies showed stronger relational concerns. Relative to the immediate, material outcome of the dispute, judgments about treatment become a more important factor in the participants' choices about whether or not to accept the outcome of the dispute.

Although both studies find the predicted interaction between social categorization and the importance of relational concerns, it is important to note that they do not reach the same conclusion regarding the basis on which people decide whether to accept decisions. Study 1 finds that in both within- and between-ethnicity conflicts, relational judgments are the primary factor shaping reactions to third-party decisions. Study 2 finds that instrumental factors dominate decisions about how to react to third-party decisions. Why might these differences have emerged? Those interviewed in Study 1 indicated strong identification with their work organization. In contrast, those interviewed in Study 2 were teaching in a short-term program. Hence, they were less identified with their organization.

These findings suggest the need to broaden the study of conflict resolution to consider the importance of noninstrumental goals in disputing. If other data support our findings, it is arguable that many negotiation researchers—who have traditionally been very concerned with instrumental goals, tactics, and outcomes (see Bazerman & Neale, 1992)—have been studying only a subset of what drives disputing behavior. The traditional literature on disputing may, in its attention to immediate outcomes and instrumental concerns, be neglecting some of the strongest concerns of people, at least in within-group disputes. This is particularly true when disputes are occurring within the context of a common group, organization, or society.

When managing within-group disputes, authorities should be especially sensitive to the concerns of disputants with their identity. For example, people in such situations focus more heavily on the politeness and respect they experience from the other party and the authority. That politeness is a statement about their position within the group and hence is relevant to their identity and feelings of self-worth. Knowing this, those managing disputes can focus their attention not only on the outcomes they provide to others but on the manner in which they treat those with whom they deal.

The concept that in some situations disputing behavior will be influenced by relational concerns has a substantial theoretical basis, as we noted above. The relational model of authority (Tyler & Lind, 1992) and the multiple goals theory of disputing behavior (Ohbuchi et al., 1994) predict that relational concerns will be especially important in situations in which treatment conveys information about social standing. The results reported above support the general perspective shared by these models. When people are dealing with someone from their own social group, that person's behavior provides them with information about their standing within their group. On the other hand, conflicts with strangers, especially with strangers with whom one does not even share

a common cultural category, provide much less information about status.

We have argued (e.g., Lind, 1994; Tyler & Lind, 1992) that reliance of immediate outcomes as a mode of evaluating social interaction occurs primarily when richer and generally preferred relational information is not available or when its validity is suspect. Results in both studies show that this greater perceived importance of relational information is translated into actions as people decide whether or not to accept the outcome of the dispute. The findings support the argument that relational issues play a relatively more important role in decision acceptance for within-group conflicts.

The findings of these studies have some important implications for the ease with which conflicts within and between cultural boundaries can be resolved. We have noted elsewhere that the successful resolution of conflicts or interest and values is facilitated by people's willingness to shape their judgments and actions in response to relational criteria, rather than instrumental criteria (Tyler, Boeckmann, Smith, & Huo, 1997; Tyler & Smith, 1997; Tyler, Smith, & Huo, 1996). Relational concerns can transcend even high conflict of interest and permit satisfactory resolution of disputes when there is little opportunity to trade off immediate out-

APPENDIX

Correlation Matrix for Study 1

	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.
Instrumental judgments	2.27	0.63				
Relational judgments	1.95	0.87	.69***			
Ethnicity match	0.30	0.46	-.10	-.16*		
Ethnicity of employee	0.18	0.39	.03	-.10	.57***	
Dependent variable	2.15	0.95	.72***	.80***	-.08	.01

NOTE: All entries are Pearson correlations. Ethnicity match is a dichotomous variables indicating whether or not the worker and supervisor shared ethnic group membership. Ethnicity was a dichotomous variable coded White/not White.

* $p < .05$. *** $p < .001$.

Correlation Matrix for Study 2

	M	SD	Between			Within	
			Instrumental	Relational	Willingness to Accept	Instrumental	Relational
Between nationality							
Instrumental	0.86	.77					
Relational	1.46	.57	.16				
Willingness to accept	1.61	.64	.53***	.18			
Within nationality							
Instrumental	0.90	.74	.01	.10	.06		
Relational	1.39	.54	.13	.24	.62**	.18	
Willingness to accept	1.81	.88	.01	.33	.03	.56***	.54***

NOTE: Not all participants described both a between- and a within-nationality dispute. Hence, the intercorrelations between the two disputes are based on the subset of participants who discussed both types of disputes. All entries are Pearson correlations.

** $p < .01$. *** $p < .001$.

comes. If we are right in this assertion, both of the studies described here suggest that conflicts are more difficult to resolve when they occur across cultural boundaries, because the potential for relational mechanisms to handle conflict is diminished when people dispute with "outsiders."

REFERENCES

- Bazerman, M. H., & Neale, M. A. (1992). *Negotiating rationally*. New York: Free Press.
- Blalock, H. M. Jr. (1972). *Social statistics*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Graham, J. L. (1993, April). The Japanese negotiation style: Characteristics of a distinct approach. *Negotiation Journal*, pp. 123-140.
- Hocker, J. L., & Wilmot, W. W. (1991). *Interpersonal conflict*. Dubuque, IA: William C. Brown.
- Huo, Y. J., Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1996). Superordinate identification, subgroup identification, and justice concerns: Is separatism the problem; is assimilation the answer? *Psychological Science*, 7, 40-45.
- Koper, G., Knippenberg, D., Bouhuijs, F., Vermunt, R., & Wilke, H. (1993). Procedural fairness and self-esteem. *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 21, 630-650.
- Leung, K. (1987). Some determinants of reactions to procedural models for conflict resolution. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53, 898-908.
- Leung, K., & Lind, E. A. (1986). Procedural justice and culture: Effects of culture, gender, and investigator status on procedural preferences. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 50, 1134-1140.
- Lind, E. A. (1994). Procedural justice and culture: Evidence for ubiquitous process concerns. *Zeitschrift für Rechtssoziologie*, 15, 24-36.
- Lind, E. A., Erickson, B. E., Friedland, N., & Dickenberger, M. (1978). Reactions to procedural models for adjudicative conflict resolution: A cross-national study. *Journal of Conflict Resolution*, 22, 318-341.
- Lind, E. A., Kanfer, R., & Earley, C. (1990). Voice, control, and procedural justice: Instrumental and noninstrumental concerns in fairness judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 59, 952-959.
- Lind, E. A., & Tyler, T. R. (1988). *The social psychology of procedural justice*. New York: Plenum.
- Lind, E. A., Tyler, T. R., & Huo, Y. J. (1997). Procedural context and culture: Variation in the antecedents of procedural justice judgments. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 73, 767-780.
- Ohbuchi, K., Chiba, S., & Fukushima, O. (1994). *Mitigation of interpersonal conflicts: Politeness and time pressure*. Unpublished manuscript, Tohoku University.
- Ohbuchi, K., & Takahashi, Y. (1994). Cultural styles of conflict. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 24, 1345-1366.
- Ohbuchi, K., & Takama, K. (1991). Effectiveness of power strategies in interpersonal conflict among Japanese students. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 131, 791-805.
- Shapiro, D. L., & Brett, J. (1993). Comparing three processes underlying judgments of procedural justice: A field study of mediation and arbitration. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 65, 1167-1177.
- Smith, H. J., & Tyler, T. R. (1996). Justice and power: Can justice motivations and superordinate categorizations encourage the advantaged to support policies which redistribute economic resources and encourage the disadvantaged to willingly obey the law? *European Journal of Social Psychology*, 26, 171-200.
- Smith, H. J., Tyler, T. R., Huo, Y. J., Ortiz, D. J., & Lind, E. A. (1997). *Group membership, self-esteem, and procedural justice*. Unpublished manuscript, University of California, Berkeley.
- Thibaut, J., & Walker, L. (1975). *Procedural justice*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tung, R. L. (1982). China trade negotiations: Practices, procedures, and outcomes. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 13, 25-38.
- Tyler, T. R. (1989). The psychology of procedural justice: A test of the group value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 57, 830-838.
- Tyler, T. R., Boeckmann, R. J., Smith, H. J., & Huo, Y. J. (1997). *Social justice in a diverse society*. Boulder, CO: Westview.
- Tyler, T. R., & Degoe, D. (1995). Collective restraint in a social dilemma situation: The influence of procedural justice and community identification on the empowerment and legitimacy of authority. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 69, 482-497.
- Tyler, T. R., Degoe, P., & Smith, H. J. (1996). Understanding why the justice of group procedures matters: A test of the psychological dynamics of the group-value model. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70, 913-930.
- Tyler, T. R., & Lind, E. A. (1992). A relational model of authority in groups. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 115-191). New York: Academic Press.
- Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (1997). Social justice and social movements. In D. Gilbert, S. T. Fiske, & G. Lindzey (Eds.), *Handbook of social psychology* (Vol. 2, 4th ed., pp. 595-629). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tyler, T. R., & Smith, H. J. (in press). Justice, social identity and group processes. In T. R. Tyler, O. John, & R. Kramer (Eds.), *The psychology of the social self*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Tyler, T. R., Smith, H. J., & Huo, Y. J. (1996). Member diversity and leadership effectiveness: Procedural justice, social identity, and group dynamics. *Advances in Group Processes*, 13, 33-66.
- Vermunt, R., Wit, A., van den Bos, K., & Lind, E. A. (1993, July). *The effect of inaccurate procedure on protest: The mediating role of perceived unfairness and situational esteem*. Paper presented at the fourth International Conference on Social Justice, Trier, Germany.

Received April 23, 1997

Revision accepted August 6, 1997