

The Effects of Compliance, Identification and Internalization on Conflict Management Styles

Yingying Qu, yingyiqu@cityu.edu.hk

Construction Dispute Resolution Research Unit, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering,
City University of Hong Kong

Miao Zhang, zmirene@gmail.com

Construction Dispute Resolution Research Unit, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering,
City University of Hong Kong

Sai On Cheung, SaiOn.Cheung@cityu.edu.hk

Construction Dispute Resolution Research Unit, Department of Civil and Architectural Engineering,
City University of Hong Kong

Abstract

Disputes and conflicts are common in construction projects. Researchers have studied five different styles to handling conflicts: integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. However, negotiating with different conflict management style may result in quite different outcomes. Some people seem to be very considerate, but do not really honor the promise. However, some individuals may appear to be very strong and tough, but once an agreement is reached, they will conform. Conflict management is a form of social influence among individuals. The outcomes of the conflict management are not only integrated into their own value system but highly dependent on the external social support system. In this context, three processes of social influence were distinguished-compliance, identification, and internalization. Thus this study explored the relationship between the three social influence processes and five styles of handling conflict. It is found that "Internalization" contributes to the conflict management styles of "Compromising" and "Integrating", "Identification" drives "Dominating" style and "Compliance" nurtures "Avoiding" and "Obliging" styles. The findings also indicate that rules, roles, and values are the three central components for individuals and groups negotiating in social environment. Negotiators must coordinate their actions with the counterpart respecting the rules, performing their roles and maximizing their values.

Keywords: Conflict Management Style, Compliance, Identification, Internalization, Negotiation

1. Introduction

Disputes and conflicts are common in construction projects. Conflict is defined as an “ interactive process manifested in incompatibility, disagreement, or dissonance within or between social entities” (Rahim, 1992, p.16). Researchers have studied five different approaches to handling conflicts (Blake and Mouton, 1984; Thomas, 1976). Rahim (1983) has classified conflict management styles as integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding, and compromising. Since then, a growing body of research on conflict management style reflected the immense interest of the dispute resolution community (Ting-Toomey et al., 1991; Rahim and Magner, 1995; Antonioni, 1998; Munduate et al., 1999; Gross and Guerrero, 2000; Cai and Fink, 2002). It is well recognised that negotiating with different conflict management style may result in quite different outcomes. Many negotiators may have this kind of experience. Some people appear to be very approachable, attentive and receptive to demands, but in fact do not honor the promises. On the other hand, some individuals may appear very strong and tough at first, but they will conform to the commitment after an agreement is reached.

Kelman (1996) pointed out that conflict management is a process of social influence among parties. The outcomes of the conflict management are not only integrated into their own value system but highly dependent on the external social support system. The explorations eventually distinguish three processes of social influence--compliance, identification, and internalization (Kelman, 2004). At the level of compliance, conflict management involves accommodating differences apparently, but it is not likely to promote parties to commit to the outcome, since there is no change in the parties' underlying briefs and no improvement for the quality of the relationship. At the level of identification, conflict management involves an accommodation of parties' self-maintenance, which generates support to the agreement reached. At the level of internalization, the parties become better more capable in engaging joint problem solving, generating agreements that meet their needs and elicit their commitment, and are therefore conducive to relatively stable and effective conflict management (Kelman, 1996). In this regard, if there also exist some relationships between conflict management style and social influence system, it will be reasonable for such a corresponding relationship between conflict styles and the conflict management outcomes.

What is the actual relationship between the three social influence processes and conflict management style? An overview of the respective research literatures on conflict management style and social influence might help clarifying the nature of this disjunction.

2. Literature Review

Kelman (1996) developed interactive problem solving, as an informal approach for resolution of international and inter-communal conflicts, and applied it to the other conflicts between groups. A notable example is the Israeli-Palestinian conflict. In his opinion, people's behaviour not only depends on their own underlying briefs and value system, but also on the external influence, for example from their counterparts. He applied three processes of social influence—compliance, identification, and internalization to conflict management research.

In compliance process, an individual's concern focuses on the rule for conflict management (Kelman, 2006). In conflict management, each party is subject to being persuaded by becoming convinced that a particular result ought to be accepted because it is fair; because the law requires it; or because it is consistent with precedence, industry practice, or sound policy considerations (Fisher, 2001). This is the power of legitimacy (French and Raven, 2001). Compliance can be said to occur when an individual accepts influence in order to follow the "harmony and legitimacy" rule and avoid disagreement from the counterparts. Thus the satisfaction derived from compliance is due to the external effects, for example disagreement avoidance. Trubisky et al. (1991) and Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) pointed out that obliging style and avoiding style tend to emphasize the value for compliance and for maintaining relational harmony in conflict interactions. Obliging style has the effect of playing down differences and emphasizing commonalities to satisfy the concern of the counterpart (Rahim, 1992). Avoiding style is associated with withdrawal. It may take the form of postponing an issue until a better time or simply withdrawing from a threatening situation (Cai and Fink, 2002). There is an element of low concern on self with these two styles. This is because, in compliance process, disputants' concern focuses on disagreement avoidance and tries to enhance harmony. So if there is an chance to avoid disagreement by giving in to the other party's interest, they will attempt to accept the decisions the counterpart makes, deliver conceding statements and fail to express their own needs as what an obliging negotiator would do (Hocker and Wilmot, 1991; Rubin et al., 1994). If the benefit in yielding to the counterpart's needs is small and the conflict is unlikely to get a satisfactory solution, the party would withdraw from the threatening situation (Pruitt and Rubin, 1986). Like a "conflict absorber", avoiding style has low concern on self and others, known as suppression, which is associated with buck-passing, sidestepping, or "see no evil, hear no evil, and speak no evil" situations (Gross and Guerrero, 2000).

Hypothesis 1: Compliance nurtures avoiding and obliging styles.

Identification reflects an orientation to the role, not just as a set of behavioural requirements, but as an important part of their self-definition. Identification process nurtures people's self-maintenance in negotiation (Kelman, 2006). For example, Rahim (1986) described the styles of conflict management of an organizational member were affected by his or her referent role, ie. superior, subordinate or peer, since the hierarchical role between organizational members plays an important part in conflict management. He found that people were primarily obliging with superiors, but if failed, they would use dominating style to resolve the conflict. The tendency to strike back with a conflict move to deny or neutralize the challenge may be viewed as self-defense, a necessary self-maintenance mechanism (Vuchinich, 1987). Thus the satisfaction derived from identification is due to the self-maintenance. Ting-Toomey et al. (1991) found that self-maintenance was associated strongly with dominating conflict style. They assert their rights and defend a position. Sometimes they would aim to win at any cost, by using his or her position power to impose his or her will on the counterpart, including confrontational remarks, accusations, personal criticism, rejection, hostile imperatives or threats, antagonistic jokes or teasing, aggressive questions, presumptive remarks, and denial of responsibility at the expense of the other person (Pruitt and Rubin, 1986; Hocker and Wilmot, 1991; Gross and Guerrero, 2000; Cai and Fink, 2002).

Hypothesis 2: Identification motivates dominating style.

Internalization encourages people to maintain the congruence of actions and beliefs with their own value system. He accepts the idea because it is intrinsically rewarding (Kelman, 2006). Value congruence takes either the form of cognitive consistency, where the behaviour is perceived as conducive to the maximization of the person's own value, or the form of affective appropriateness, where the behaviour is perceived as continuous with the person's self-concept (Kelman, 2006). Fisher (2001) introduced two different kinds of commitments: affirmative and negative. Affirmative commitment was defined as an offer of what a person will agree to, or an offer of what, failing agreement, a person will do under certain conditions. Negative commitment was defined that a person was unwilling to make certain agreements, even though they would be better for him than no agreement, or that, failing agreement, a person will still engage in certain negative conduct, even though to do so would be worse for him than a simple absence of agreement. The affirmative commitment benefits from the relationship and is consistent with the person's own value system. Thus the satisfaction derived from internalization is due to the affirmative commitment. Thus at the level of internalization, the involved parties are more likely to exchange information openly, clear misunderstanding with each other, concern each other's interests and achieve mutually acceptable solution in conflict management (Rahim, 2001). It is found that people in integrating style and compromising style are more likely to develop trust, engage in constructive exchange of information, clearing up misunderstanding, making every effort to pursue a solution that will be mutually acceptable and seeking to understand one another's perspective (Pruitt and Carnevale, 1993; Gross and Guerrero 2000). They are more likely to uncover possibilities for trade-off or sharing whereby both parties give up something to seek a solution (Rubin et al., 1994; Cai and Fink, 2002).

Hypothesis 3: Internalization drives integrating and compromising styles.

The relationship between compliance, identification and internalization and conflict management styles are shown in *Table 1*.

Table 1: Relationship between compliance, identification, internalization and conflict management styles

	<i>Social Influence Processes</i>		
	<i>Compliance</i>	<i>Identification</i>	<i>Internalization</i>
<i>Power Influence</i>	<i>Rule</i>	<i>Role</i>	<i>Value Congruence</i>
<i>Motivation/Concern</i>	<i>Disagreement Avoidance</i>	<i>Self-maintenance</i>	<i>Affirmative Commitment</i>
<i>Conflict Management Styles</i>	<i>Obliging, Avoiding</i>	<i>Dominating</i>	<i>Integrating, Compromising</i>

3. Method

A questionnaire survey was used to collect data. Two types of data were to be collected from each response: conflict management styles and social influence processes. The respondents were asked to

complete the questionnaire with reference to one of their recent two-party negotiation cases. For data on conflict management style, 35-item Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II) was used as the instrument (Rahim, 2001). Participants responded to each of the 35 items on a seven-point Likert-type scale from "Strongly Disagree" to "Strongly Agree". A high score represents a greater preference. As for the second type of data, it is based on the literature review of three social influence processes in conflict management (Kelman, 1996, 2006). Each factor consisted of 8 items, and the respondents were also asked to assess each of the eight items on a seven-point Likert scale.

A total of 250 questionnaires were sent to construction professionals holding senior positions in Hong Kong. 107 respondents completed questionnaires and returned to the research team. The response rate was 42.8% (107/250) of the respondents have more than ten-year experience in construction. As for employing organization, 14 responses were received from government, 7 from developers, 41 from consultant firms, 34 from main contractor firms and 11 from subcontractor firms. The respondents include 8 architects, 14 engineers, 52 surveyors, 24 project managers, 8 managers and one from other profession.

4. Results

Principle Component Factor Analysis (PCFA) is used to test the authenticity of the instruments to measure conflict management style and social influence process. Interpretation of variables can be accomplished by summarizing the data according to the developed constructs (Hair et al., 1998). Before performing PCFA, the suitability of the data was first assessed by using the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy. The KMO value for the data of conflict management style and social influence processes are 0.683 and 0.718 respectively, which are above the threshold requirement of 0.5 (Cheung and Yeung, 1998; Cheung et al., 2000). In addition, the low significance (0.00) of the Bartlett test of Sphericity for both the data of conflict management style and social influence processes suggests the adequacy of the data set to perform PCFA.

The most commonly used eigenvalue-greater-than 1 principle was applied to select factors. Factors with eigen-value greater than 1 are considered as significant, factors with eigen-value less than one were discarded. Five conflict management styles, "Compromising", "Dominating", "Integrating", "Obliging", and "Avoiding" were identified from the Principal Component Factor Analysis. The final factor matrix for conflict management styles after Varimax rotation is given in Table 2. Three social influence processes "Internalization", "Identification", and "Compliance" were also identified by the Principal Component Factor Analysis. The final factor matrix after Varimax rotation is given in Table 3.

Table 2: Rotated factor matrix for conflict management styles

	<i>Factor</i>				
	<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>	<i>4</i>	<i>5</i>

<i>Factor 1: Compromising</i>						
<i>Q21</i>	<i>I negotiate with the counterpart so that a compromise can be reached.</i>	.77				
<i>Q20</i>	<i>I usually propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.</i>	.68				
<i>Q19</i>	<i>I try to play down our differences to reach a compromise.</i>	.63				.39
<i>Q5</i>	<i>I give some to get some.</i>	.53			.41	
<i>Factor 2: Dominating</i>						
<i>Q18</i>	<i>I argue my case with the other to show the merits of my position.</i>		.74			
<i>Q8</i>	<i>I usually hold on to my solution to a problem.</i>		.69			
<i>Q24</i>	<i>I use my expertise to make a decision in my favour.</i>	-.45	.38			
<i>Q11</i>	<i>I use my authority to make a decision in my favour.</i>		.36		-.41	
<i>Factor 3: Integrating</i>						
<i>Q15</i>	<i>I exchange accurate information with the counterpart to solve a problem together.</i>			.74		
<i>Q29</i>	<i>I collaborate with the counterpart to come up with decisions acceptable to us.</i>			.66		
<i>Q6</i>	<i>I try to work with the counterpart to find solutions to a problem with satisfy our expectations.</i>			.59		
<i>Q1</i>	<i>I try to investigate an issue with the counterpart to find a solution acceptable to us.</i>			.59		
<i>Q4</i>	<i>I try to integrate my ideas with those of the counterpart to come up with a decision jointly.</i>	.58		.47		
<i>Factor 4: Obliging</i>						
<i>Q2</i>	<i>I generally satisfy the needs of the counterpart.</i>				.76	
<i>Q16</i>	<i>I sometimes help the counterpart to make a decision in his favour.</i>				.68	
<i>Q17</i>	<i>I usually make concessions to the counterpart.</i>				.61	
<i>Q30</i>	<i>I try to satisfy the expectations of the counterpart.</i>				.48	
<i>Factor 5: Avoiding</i>						
<i>Q34</i>	<i>I generally avoid argument with the counterpart.</i>					.73
<i>Q7</i>	<i>I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with the counterpart.</i>					.63
<i>Q22</i>	<i>I try to stay away from disagreement with the counterpart.</i>					.48
<i>Q32</i>	<i>I try to keep my disagreement with the counterpart to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.</i>					.41
<i>Q3</i>	<i>I attempt to avoid being “put on the spot” and try to keep my conflict with the counterpart to myself.</i>					.41

Table 3: Rotated factor matrix for social influence processes

		<i>Factor</i>		
		<i>1</i>	<i>2</i>	<i>3</i>

<i>Factor 1: Compliance</i>				
<i>Q22</i>	<i>How much I contribute to cooperation is directly linked to how much I am rewarded.</i>	<i>.69</i>		
<i>Q17</i>	<i>Unless I get some reward for that concession, otherwise I see no reason to spend extra effort on it.</i>	<i>.58</i>		
<i>Q19</i>	<i>Sometimes I try to satisfy the expectation of counterpart in order to avoid being “punished”.</i>	<i>.56</i>		
<i>Q20</i>	<i>I often go along with the counterpart to keep up my interest.</i>	<i>.53</i>		
<i>Q18</i>	<i>I feel worried and embarrassed when I argue with others.</i>	<i>.49</i>		
<i>Q23</i>	<i>Sometimes, my private views have to be yielded to what I express and behave outwardly.</i>	<i>.41</i>		
<i>Q21</i>	<i>I fear to open discussion on my disagreement, when the other party has strong power.</i>	<i>.37</i>		
<i>Factor 2: Internalization</i>				
<i>Q5</i>	<i>Only if the counterpart’s statements are truthful and valid, the proposal could be worthy of consideration.</i>		<i>.79</i>	
<i>Q7</i>	<i>I will feel angry and disappointed if I feel my needs are not treated properly and fairly.</i>		<i>.79</i>	
<i>Q4</i>	<i>What I behave is consistent with what I believe.</i>		<i>.73</i>	
<i>Q8</i>	<i>I care about that very much whether the parties can exchange information with each other.</i>	<i>.38</i>	<i>.62</i>	
<i>Q3</i>	<i>I can’t stand if there is no collaboration between parties.</i>	<i>.51</i>	<i>.52</i>	
<i>Q6</i>	<i>I would like to use “give and take” strategy to concern my interest and those of the counterpart’s.</i>	<i>.46</i>	<i>.52</i>	
<i>Factor 3: Identification</i>				
<i>Q13</i>	<i>It is very important to show my authority and position.</i>			<i>.78</i>
<i>Q10</i>	<i>A conflict is not resolved unless the presenting relationship or interaction changed.</i>			<i>.76</i>
<i>Q9</i>	<i>I am proud to tell the counterpart my opinion and decision.</i>			<i>.75</i>
<i>Q16</i>	<i>I rarely care about the appropriateness in relational level.</i>			<i>.72</i>
<i>Q11</i>	<i>Self-face maintenance is quite important to me.</i>			<i>.69</i>
<i>Q15</i>	<i>I refuse if it is inconsistent with my value judgement.</i>			<i>.67</i>
<i>Q14</i>	<i>I argue to show the merits of my position.</i>			<i>.62</i>
<i>Q12</i>	<i>I feel heard and understood are the basic right.</i>			<i>.56</i>

The authenticity of the instruments for measuring conflict management and social influence processes were examined by comparing the items included for each factor with those indicated by the designer. The items retrieved for the five conflict management factors were identical to the original design of the instrument (Rahim, 2001). The interpretation of the factor classifications for the three social influence processes was fit well with the characteristics summarized in Table 1. As such, it is reasonable to use these instruments to measure conflict management styles of construction professionals and their social influence processes.

The relationship between conflict management style and social influence process were explored by the use of multiple regression analysis (MRA). Multiple Regression analysis is a statistical method to describe a functional relationship between a dependent variable and one or more independent variables. The general equation of regression model is shown as follows:

$$Y_i = \beta_{0i} + \beta_{1i} X_{1i} + \beta_{2i} X_{2i} + \beta_{3i} X_{3i} + \varepsilon_i$$

The dependent variable Y_i represents conflict management styles, where $i=1,2,..5$. The independent variables X_{1i}, X_{2i}, X_{3i} represent three social influence processes β_{0i} is unknown constant, and $\beta_{1i}, \beta_{2i}, \beta_{3i}$ are three coefficients for independent variables. ε_i is defined as random error.

The results of multiple regression analysis are shown in Table 4. R^2 value represented the combined effect of the entire variate in prediction and range from 0.697 to 0.946. As an illustration, the variable “integrating” and “compromising” are significantly related to the “internalization”, with coefficient 0.579 and 0.570 respectively. Dominating style is recommended to the effect of identification influence, with the coefficient value 0.987 in Table 4. The variable “compliance” is strongly contributed to avoiding and obliging styles, with the coefficient value 0.750 and 0.555 respectively. The results strongly support the hypothesis that compliance nurtures avoiding and obliging styles, identification motivates dominating styles, and internalization drives integrating and compromising styles.

5. Discussion

Kelman (1996) pointed out that conflict management is a process of social influence among parties. At the level of compliance, the conflict management involves an accommodation of the parties’ disagreement apparently, but it is not likely to promote parties to be committed to the outcome, since there is no change for parties’ underlying beliefs and no improvement for the quality of the relationship. Compliance nurtures avoiding and obliging conflict management styles. People of these two styles tend to be self-sacrificing and withdrawal, since these two styles tend to emphasize the value for compliance and for maintaining relational harmony in conflict interactions. Papa and Canary (1995), Gross and Guerrero (2000) found that the obliging style and avoiding style were ineffective in handling conflict. However Rahim (1986) pointed that obliging style may be appropriate when the issue is more important to the other party, and the avoiding style may be appropriate if the issue is minor or if a cooling-off period is needed to resolve the conflict. At the level of identification, the conflict management involves an accommodation of parties’ self-maintenance, which generates support to the agreement reached. Identification motivates dominating style. That’s why people of dominating style tend to be competitive because their conflict-handling behaviour is based on self-maintenance, and more unlikely to compromise. However Papa and

Table 4: Multiple regression analysis result

<i>Dependent variables (conflict management style)</i>	<i>Independent variables (social influence process)</i>	<i>R²</i>	<i>Standardized regression coefficients</i>	<i>Unstandardized regression coefficients</i>
<i>Integrating</i>		<i>0.697</i>		<i>10.628</i>
	<i>Internalization</i>		<i>0.579</i>	<i>0.935</i>
	<i>Identification</i>		<i>-0.034</i>	<i>-0.036</i>
	<i>Compliance</i>		<i>-0.313</i>	<i>-0.652</i>
<i>Avoiding</i>		<i>0.852</i>		<i>-3.388</i>
	<i>Internalization</i>		<i>0.226</i>	<i>0.387</i>
	<i>Identification</i>		<i>0.029</i>	<i>0.033</i>
	<i>Compliance</i>		<i>0.750</i>	<i>1.599</i>
<i>Dominating</i>		<i>0.946</i>		<i>0.224</i>
	<i>Internalization</i>		<i>-0.087</i>	<i>-0.150</i>
	<i>Identification</i>		<i>0.987</i>	<i>1.122</i>
	<i>Compliance</i>		<i>-0.10</i>	<i>-0.021</i>
<i>Obliging</i>		<i>0.700</i>		<i>-0.749</i>
	<i>Internalization</i>		<i>0.320</i>	<i>0.333</i>
	<i>Identification</i>		<i>0.105</i>	<i>0.072</i>
	<i>Compliance</i>		<i>0.555</i>	<i>0.746</i>
<i>Compromising</i>		<i>0.747</i>		<i>9.552</i>
	<i>Internalization</i>		<i>0.570</i>	<i>0.770</i>
	<i>Identification</i>		<i>0.062</i>	<i>0.055</i>
	<i>Compliance</i>		<i>-0.378</i>	<i>-0.660</i>

Canary (1995) found that the dominating style might be somewhat effective in organizational contexts, if an individual uses power strategies and aggression to effectively accomplish a production-related goal, even though these strategies may be seen as inappropriate at a relational level. At the level of internalization, the parties become better able to engage in joint problem solving, generating agreements that meet their needs and elicit their commitment, and are therefore conducive to relatively stable and effective conflict management (Kelman, 1996). Internalization drives integrating and compromising styles. Therefore people of integrating style and compromising style are found to be provided each disputant with access to the other person's perceptions of incompatible goals, and enabled them to find a solution that integrates the goals and needs of both parties (Spitzberg et al., 1994; Gross and Guerrero, 2000). It was also found that integrating style was effective in achieving the functional negotiation outcomes, which is defined as problem solving, relationship maintained, and conflict reduction (Rahim, 1986), and the use of comprising style was proved as a practical approach in resolving a dispute (Cheung et al., 2006). This research integrates currently isolated lines

of research on social influence theory on the one hand, and conflict management styles on the other hand. Compliance represents adherence to rule in conflict management. Identification reflects an orientation to the negotiator's self-role. Internalization reflects an orientation to the value congruence, which encourages people to maintain the congruence of actions and beliefs with their own value system. Rules, roles, and values are the three central components in the process of conflict management. Negotiators must coordinate their actions with the counterpart respecting the rules, performing their roles and maximizing their values.

Different underlying social influences produce different patterns of styles of conflict management. It is found that the correlations between compromising and integrating, and the incompatibility occurs between avoiding and integrating style, and between dominating and obliging style, since compliance nurtures avoiding and obliging styles, identification motivates dominating style, and internalization drives integrating and compromising styles. Similar with the patterns of styles in this study, Weider-Hatfield (1988) concluded that "although the conflict literature has historically embraced the 'five-style' paradigm, recent evidence indicates that individuals might select among three, not five, distinct conflict styles" (p.364). Hocker and Wilmot (1991) summarized three conflict styles as (1) avoidance, (2) competitive (distributive) and (3) collaborative (integrative).

6. Conclusion

Construction is of long-duration, high value and dispute-prone. This study examines the relationship between three social influence processes and five styles of handling conflict. The results show that compliance nurtures avoiding and obliging styles, identification motivates dominating styles, and internalization drives integrating and compromising styles. This research integrates currently isolated lines of research on social influence theory on the one hand, and conflict management styles on the other hand. Compliance represents adherence to disagreement avoidance in conflict management. Identification reflects an orientation to the negotiator's self-maintenance. Internalization reflects an orientation to the value congruence, which encourages people to maintain the congruence of actions and beliefs with their own value system. The findings also indicate that rules, roles, and values are the three central components in the process of conflict management.

7. Acknowledgements

The work described in this paper was fully supported by Grants from HKSAR RGC GRF Project (No. 111709).

8. References

Antonioni, D., (1998) Relationship between the Big Five Personality Factors and Conflict Management Styles. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 9, No. 4, 336-355.

- Blake, R. R., Mouton, J. S., (1984) *Solving costly organizational conflicts*, San Francis, Jossey-Bass.
- Cai, D. A., Fink, E. L., (2002) Conflict Style Differences Between Individualists and Collectivists. *Communication Monographs*, Vol. 69, No. 1, pp 67–87.
- Cheung, S. O., Yeung, Y. W., (1998) The Effectiveness of the Dispute Resolution Advisor System: A Critical Appraisal. *The International Journal of Project Management*, 16(6), 367 -374.
- Cheung, S. O., Tam, C. M., Ndekugri, I., Harris, F. C., (2000) Factors affecting clients' project dispute resolution satisfaction in Hong Kong. *Construction Management and Economics*, 18(3), 281- 294.
- Cheung, S. O., Yiu, T. W., Yeung, S. F., (2006) A Study of Styles and Outcomes in Construction Dispute Negotiation. *Journal of Construction Engineering and Management*, Vol. 132, 8: 805-814.
- Fisher, R., (2001) Negotiating Power: Getting and Using Influence, In: Asherman, I. G., Asherman, S. V. (Eds.), *The Negotiation Sourcebook*, 2nd edition, HRD Press, Amherst.
- French Jr., J. R. P., Raven, B., (2001) The Bases of Social Power, In: Asherman, I. G., Asherman, S. V. (Eds.), *The Negotiation Sourcebook*, 2nd edition, HRD Press, Amherst.
- Gross, M. A. and Guerrero, L. K., (2000) Managing Conflict Appropriately and Effectively: An Application of the Competence Model to Rahim's Organizational Conflict Styles. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 11, No. 3, pp. 200-226.
- Hair, J. R., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., and Black, W. C., (1998) *Multi-variate data analysis*, 5th Ed., Prentice Hall, Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Hocker, J. L., Wilmot, W. W., (1991) *Interpersonal conflict (3rd ed.)*, Dubuque, IA: Brown.
- Kelman, H. C., (1996) Negotiation as Interactive Problem Solving. *International Negotiation*, 1: 99-123
- Kelman, H. C., (2004) Reconciliation as identity change: a social-psychological perspective. In: Bar-Siman-Tov, Y. (Eds.), *From Conflict Resolution to Reconciliation*, Oxford: Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 111–24.
- Kelman, H. C., (2006) Interests, Relationship, Identities: Three Central Issues for Individuals and Groups in Negotiating Their Social Environment. *Annual Review Psychology*, 57, 1-26.
- Munduate, L., Ganaza, J., Peiró, J. M. and Euwema, M., (1999) Patterns of Styles in Conflict Management and Effectiveness. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 10, No. 1, pp. 5-24.

- Papa, M. J., & Canary, D. J., (1995) Conflict in organizations: A competence-based approach. In: Nicotera, A. M. (Eds.), *Conflict and organizations: Communicative processes*, Albany, NY: State University of New York Press, pp. 153-179.
- Pruitt, D. G., Carnevale, P. J., (1993) *Negotiation in social conflict*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.
- Pruitt, D. G., Rubin, J. Z., (1986) *Social conflict*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Rahim, M. A., (1983) A Measure of Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict. *Academy of management Journal*, Vol.26, 2: 368-376.
- Rahim, M. A., (1986) Referent role and styles of handling interpersonal conflict. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol 126(1), 79-86.
- Rahim, M. A., (1992) *Managing conflict in organizations (2nd ed.)*, Westport, CT: Praeger.
- Rahim, M. A., (2001) *Managing conflict in organizations, 3rd Ed*, Quorum Books, Westport, Conn.
- Rahim, M. A. and Magner, N. R., (1995) Confirmatory Factor Analysis of the Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict: First-Order Factor Model and Its Invariance Across Groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 80, No. 1,122-132.
- Rubin, J. Z., Pruitt, D. G., Kim, S. H., (1994) *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement*, New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Spitzberg, B. H., Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R., (1994) A competence-based approach to the study of interpersonal conflict. In: Cahn, D. (Eds.), *Conflict in Personal Relationships*, Hillsdale, NJ: Erlbaum, pp. 183-202.
- Thomas, K. W., (1976) Conflict and conflict management. In: Dunnette, M. D. (Eds.), *Handling of industry and organization psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, 889–935.
- Ting-Toomey, S., Gao, G., Trubisky, P., Yang, Z., Kim, H. S., Lin, S. L., and Nishida, T., (1991) Culture, face Maintenance, and Styles of handling Interpersonal Conflict: A Study in Five Cultures. *The International Journal of Conflict Management*, Vol. 2, No. 4, pp. 275-296.
- Trubisky, P., Ting-Toomey, S., Lin, S. L., (1991) The Influence of Individualism-Collectivism and Self-monitoring on Conflict Styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, Vol.15, 65-84.
- Vuchinich, S., (1987) Starting and Stopping Spontaneous Family Conflicts. *Journal of Marriage and Family*, Vol. 49, No. 3, pp. 591-601.
- Weider-Hatfield, D., (1988) Assessing the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II). *Management Communication Quarterly*, I, 350-366.