CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES IN TURKISH AND AMERICAN SPEECH COMMUNITIES: A SCHOOL SETTING

Nuray Alagozlu

Faculty of Education, Hacettepe University, Ankara, Turkey

nurayalagozlu@hacettepe.edu.tr

Miki Makihara

Queens College, Anthropology Department, CUNY, New York

miki.makihara@qc.cuny.edu

CONFLICT RESOLUTION STRATEGIES IN TURKISH AND AMERICAN SPEECH COMMUTIES: A SCHOOL SETTING

Nuray Alagozlu

nurayalagozlu@hacettepe.edu.tr

Miki Makihara

miki.makihara@qc.cuny.edu

Abstract

Conflicts in communication are very common in every culture. However, resolving them varies from one culture to another. Conflict management strategies in communication revolve around five solutions collaboration, compromise, avoidance, competition, and accomodation as stated by Kilman (1977). This study attempts to explore ways of terminating verbal conflicts in academic settings. In the study, first, we aim to evaluate the ways of solving conflicts in two settings: a Turkish and an American University. Secondly, taking a pragmatic perspective, a classification of speech acts used to end conflicts is targeted according to both Killman's strategies and a facework analysis. specifically, it is aimed to investigate:

- generally how Turkish and American speakers end conflicts in discourse and which strategies they use in order to resolve conflicts

- how "face" is reflected in those speech acts as categorized by Ting Toomey (1988, 1992).

- any differences between Turkish and American speakers styles

- any changes in conflict resolution due to power status in both cultures.

Results are valuable in that they add up to the knowledge about intercultural pragmatic language use and cultural cognitions. Moreover, as the research aims to reveal basic verbal and behavioural differences between two communities, it is likely to contribute to intercultural understanding.

1. Introduction

Intercultural conflict and resolution styles have fascinated researchers from different aspects. It is found complicated owing to perceived incompatibity of values, norms, face orientations, goals, scarce resources, processes, and/or outcomes between a minimum of two parties from two different cultural communities in an interactive situation (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001 p. 68).

The study of conflict resolution styles in intercultural communication is valuable as it helps getting a grasp of how different cultures engage in combat with the situations or topics of potential source of conflict and how they find a way out. Such knowledge may also be useful in establishing intercultural peace and welfare as it is an attempt to decipher an aspect of the codes of conduct adopted by different cultures.

With it, the existing disagreements may be repaired. Such knowledge can be used in the management of conflicts since a lack of knowledge on conflict resolution styles may escalate an intense conflict dynamic between contending parties (Ting-Toomey et al. 2000).

This present study attempts to explore ways of terminating conflict talk in academic settings in Turkish and American speech communities. This was a part of a large project ' Voices of New York' (VONY) conducted at the Linguistic Anthropology Department of City University of New York (CUNY), which was a collection of projects on language in society that specifically seek discoveries about how New Yorkers use language.

Specifically, it is aimed to investigate generally how Turkish and American speakers end conflicts in discourse and which strategies they use in order to resolve conflicts among those stated by Kilmann (1977), namely, collaboration, compromise, avoidance, competition, and accomodation .

- any changes in conflict resolution ways due to power status in both communities.

- how "face" is reflected in the speech acts used to resolve conflicts as categorized by Ting Toomey (1985, 1988).

2. Literature Review

2.1 Conflicts

Conflicts are generally seen as disagreements of two or more groups who are incompatible in views. Basing his compilation on many diverse definitions, Hammer (2005) pinpoints a general concensus on the core components of a conflict: Conflicts are primarily "perceived substantive disagreements" existing among contending parties. For example, for Ting-Toomey et al. (2000) "conflicts are intense disagreement processes between a minimum of interdependent parties when they perceived incompatible interest, viewpoints, processes and /or goals in an interaction episode" (p.48). Secondly, he sees conflicts as "affective or emotional reactions" as a result of a sort of antagonism based on perceived threat or interference" Groups or individuals might be linked with a form of antagonistic psychological relation.

Hocker and Wilmot (1991) define conflict as an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals , scarce sources and interferences from the other party in achieving their goals (p.12). To French and Albright (1998), culture, ethics and way of upbringing have immense effects on people's ways of approaching conflicts. If people are taught that it is ethical to value the individual over the other as opposed to the group, or the other over the individual, people's conflict style will be affected (Croucher, 2011 p. 40).

2.2 Conflict styles

An early typology of conflict resolution styles in intercultural settings were first roughly made by Cannon (1923) as fight-fight, cooperation-competition and by Horney (1945) as moving away, moving toward and moving against framework. In 1994, Rubin et al. classified conflict resolution styles as withdrawing, yielding, problem solving or inaction (as cited in Hammer, 2005).

Today, the most widespread taxonomy is based on Blake and Mouton's approach (1964). Conflict styles emerging from an individual's concern for self-interest against the interest of the other. Most remarkable categorization is made by Rahim (1983) who developed an instrument –ROCI-II- including five styles of conflict resolution: dominating style: high self/low other concern, obliging style: low self/high other concern, avoiding style: low self/other concern, integrating style: high self/other concern, and compromising style: moderate self/other concern. (Ting-Toomey, et al. 2000)

The weakness of all such measurements is that there is not a valid generalizable-etic-patterns of cultural difference that is applicable to the measurement of cultural difference. Therefore, Hammer (2005) develops an International Conflict Style Inventory (ICSI) to model conflict resolution styles across cultures. In this, he proposes a four quadrant intercultural conflict resolution styles as high/low level of directness and high/low level of emotional expressiveness. 1- discussion style (direct and emotionally restrained) 2- engagement style (direct and emotionally expressive), 3- accomodation style (indirect and emotionally restrained), and 4- dynamic style (indirect and emotionally expressive).

There are many different approches towards the variability of cultures in the study field of intercultural communication. Hall's (1976) low-context versus high-context scheme and Hofstede's (1980) four dimensions of cultural variability (individualism/collectivism, power distance/uncertainty avoidance, masculinity/femininity) have been extensively used in cross cultural studies and have been instrumental in the development of several theories of communication: Face Negotiation Theory, Conversational Constraints Theory, Anxiety/Uncertainty Management Theory, and Expectancy Violation Theory (Kim, 2012, p.121).

2.2.1. Individualism and Collectivism

Hofstede's (1980) individualism is a model of psychology where individuals self-oriented and autonomous. Collectivism describes a model in which actors are interdependent and inherently embedded within their social contexts and sacrifice their interests for the others. However, for a group of researchers the relationship between individualism and collectivism is not straightforward and there are other dimensions of I-C thay may vary according to situations, relationship and culture. Among these, Triandis (1995) formulated a more comprehensive I-C framework. To Triandis, individualism and collectivism emerge out of relational contexts. Status-equal (horizantal) versus status –unequal (hierarchical- vertical) relationship. Accordingly, Triandis model included four diverse dimensions: Horizantal-Vertical Individualism-Collectivism (HVIC). **Horizantal collectivism** refers to a cultural orientation where the self is perceived as equal toother in-group members and social harmoy is highly valued. **Vertical collectivism** stands for a cultural orientation where the self is in a hirarchy in the society and is to sacrifice his interests for the higher order ingroup members. **Horizantal individualism** describes an autonomous self which tend to be unique and socially equal. Finally, **Vertical individualism** also describes autonomous self, but fostered by competition and personal achievement (Vargas and Kemmelmeier, 2013 p.196).

2.2.2. Research on conflict resolution strategies

Cai and Fink (2002) investigated the fundamental beliefs regarding cross-cultural differences in conflict styles of 188 US and non-US students from 31 different countries residing in the U.S. To avoid a priori catergorization regarding the countries, they delivered both scales - Collectivism and Individualism Scales - The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II- Rahim-1986 scale (Hui & Triandis, 1986, cited in Cai and Fink (2002) to all the respondents.

Their findings indicated that assumptions regarding the relationship of culture to conflict style preferences may not be valid. Preference for using five conflict styles were measured: avoiding, obliging, integrating, compromising, and dominating. The integrating style is generally the most preferred; obliging and avoiding are next, followed by compromising and dominating. Avoiding is preferred by individualists rather than by collectivists. Individualists do not differ from collectivists in their preference for the dominating conflict style. They also found that collectivists prefer compromising and integrating more than individualists do,

whereas individualism-collectivism had no significant linear effect on preference for the obliging style.

Conflict styles are highly multidimensional for both individualists and collectivists. Even though the five conflict styles can be subsumed under four types, the items measuring the five styles cannot be generated from any two-dimensional typology. Finally, the meaning of four of the five styles is different for individualists and collectivists: Dominating is the only style interpreted similarly by both groups.

Of the studies that compare the rate of individualism and collectivism of American etnic/racial groups, a general finding centers on the idea that contemporary American minorities were found to have high level of collectivism than non minorities (Coon and Kemmelmeier, 2001). Asian Americans and Latino Americans are respective and family bound due to Catholicism wheras European Amerians are thought to be the cariers of individualism, reminiscient of their Protestant culture valuing personal development, individualism and autonomy (Barker and Carmen, 2000).

Vargas and Kemmelmeier (2013) compared African, Asian, Latino, and European Americans on horizantal-vertical individualism-collectivism through a meta analytic research conducted by both cross sectionally and longitudinally. They used both published and unpublished data consistently handled with a 32 item measurement- HVIC (Horizantal-Vertical Individualism-Collectivism) by Triandis (1995).

Due to the continuous flux of non-European populations, and their birth rate several investigations reveal that the number of european origined Americans do not seem to form the majority of the population any longer in the future.

Their question was if these demographic changes affect the cultural outlook of the US. and if these recent increases promote a convergence or (discontinuity) of cultural values for different ethnic racial groups.

The results showed that there were no ethical and racial differences in the mean scores of both variants of collectivism, although European Americans were higher in vertical individualism than African Americans and Latino Americans. The longitudinal perspective to the data indicated a convergence of cultural orientations, but the correlation of the four types of individualism-collectivism showed remarkable differences among the groups. All these show that it is plausible that an acculturation process works on the part of the immigrants to the US. A cultural convergence hypothesis is at work due to digital world and weakening cultural boundaries as the studies involved suggest that they do not have much different patterns of egaliterian and hierarchical values.

Based on their comprehensive meta-analyses in the field, Vargas and Kemmelmeier (ibid.) propose that the existing literature points to a doubt that European Americans are more individualistic than other ethnic groups in the US. Second, those groups may have some distinct reconciling strategies regarding individualism and collectivism. Third, so called ethnic groups must be investigated considering their socio histories and experiences in their past (or ancestry) like effect of the history of slavery and oppression on the African Americans orientation. In short, convergence or cultural discontinuity, then, is a everlasting question that awaits revelation through research.

In 1993, Lee and Kabasakal explored conflict resolution styles of Turkish and American university business students. Students received two cases describing an organizational setting. They were asked to put themselves in the situation of a member in conflict with a peer in the work environment. Rather than sticking to the Individualism-Collectivism dichotomy, taking

a situational/contingency approach, they concluded that situations have deterninative effects on the choices of conflict resolution styles across cultures.

Wielders (2011) has recently studied conflict management strategies that are used by Turkish and Dutch people living in The Netherlands. Turkish respondents were the first and second generation immigrants who have been exposed to Dutch culture for a length of time. She found that Turkish and Dutch informants did not differ in their self-orientations. Gender and the country of birth of the informant had no significant influence on their self-conceptions. Additionally, both parties are found to use the integrating style (individualistic), the avoidance style (collectivistic), and the emotional expression style (individualistic) mostly in the Netherlands. It is surprising that Turkish people are seen to use individualistic conflict styles. It is equally interesting to notice that while all Turkish respondents considered themselves to be Turkish or Turkish and Dutch, they still use the same types of conflict resolution strategies as the Dutch informants. The impact of education in Dutch culture and the duration of stay in the Netherlands or the period of exposure to Dutch culture are thought to account for this similarity in conduct.

Kozan&Ergin (1998) investigated the preference of individuals from Turkey and the US for third-party help during conflict using a prisoner's dilemma type game. The participants had the option to communicate directly with their adversary or through an intermediary. Turkish participants chose the intermediary, whereas US participants chose direct communication. It is concluded that this is consistent with conventional Individualism-Collectivism distinction. That is to say, the collectivist Turkish participants resorted to the third party in order to avoid conflict and preserve group harmony, whereas the individualistic US participants used direct communication to solve conflicts.

2.2.3. The concept of face in conflict resolution and face negotiation theory

In her theory, Ting-Toomey (1985, 1988) taps on the link between conflict styles and face orientations. She identifies and compares "facework" patterns in conflict situations in individualistic cultures and collectivist cultures. The theory incapsulates the cultural level dimension of individualism –collectivism and the individualism dimension of independent – interdependent self-construal with the concept of "facework"

To Goffman (1959), "face" is a speaker's sense of linguistic and social identity. Augsburger (1995) sees "face" as "the public self-image that every member (of society) wants to claim for himself". An embracing definition is by Carr (1993 p.90) who proposes "face" is a sort of 'sociodynamic valuation', a lexical hyponym of words meaning 'prestige; dignity; honor; respect; status'. For Yutang (2009), it is "a psychological image that can be granted, lost, fought for and presented as a gift." Face can be given by people and lost.

Ting-Toomey (1985, 1988) defines face as "the claimed sense of self-image in a "relational" (social network) situation" where people or cultures are in contact. It is the way we want others to see us and treat us. Using language, we can manage to ward off any attacks on our "face", we maintain, save and honor our or somebody else's face. "Face is a universal phenomenon as everyone would like to be respected; everyone needs a sense of self-respect. But how we manage strategies in maintaining, saving and honoring one's face differs across cultures"

The concept of face in cross cultural conflict studies has been widely studied by Ting-Toomey (1985,1988) under Face Negotiation Theory. Two facets to face-negotiation she mentioned are; face concern and face need. Face concern relates to the question of whose face a person is trying to save, his or her own or someone else's. (whose face?)

Face need deals with whether autonomy (space and privacy) is valued, or whether inclusion (respect and approval) is the primary concern. (autonomy or inclusion? –negative-positive face). Thus, two dimensions are highlighted: **self-other face and positive-negative face.**

Within the framework of this theory, four types of face are likely to be encountered in conflict resolution situations:

- *Face-Restoration or Self Negative-Face* is the need to give oneself freedom and space and to protect self from other's infringement on one's autonomy.

- *Face-Saving or Other Negative-Face* is the need to signal respect for the other person's need for freedom, space, and dissociation.

- *Face-Assertion or Self Positive-Face* is the need to defend and protect one's need for inclusion and association.

- *Face-Giving or Other Positive-Face* is the need to defend and support the other person's need for inclusion and association (Ng, 2008).

Ting-Toomey (1988, 1992) collects these differences in conflict management styles under two outstanding views: individualistic and collectivist cultures, pinpointing different societies have different face needs.

Individualists like European and American cultures tend to value autonomy (avoiding any impositions) and self-concern face needs, use more direct conflict styles (i.e. dominating and competing). They foster communication to find a win-win solution, mutually satisfying scenario, for everyone involved after problem solving and drafting agreements (Fisher and Ury, 1983).

Collectivists like Chinese, Korean, Japanese cultures and Mexicans tend to   use more indirect, styles other-face concern or mutual-concern face needs, therefore indirect conflict styles (i.e., avoiding and seeking third-party help). They emphasize approval, inclusion, respect and appreciation face needs and value harmony with others (Oetzel, Ting-Toomey &Masumoto 2001; Liang & Han, 2005; Ting-Toomey 2005). Mediation is valued and direct intervention might be taken very rude (Augsberger,1992).

2. Methodology

2.1 Setting and participants

Participants from Turkey and the USA who recalled a conflict situation completed a self-report questionnaire about their attitudes and conflict behaviors during a recalled conflict. Respondents in the US were university students and recruited in the study according to their age and birthplace. They had to be 18 or over and born in the US. In Turkey, similarly, university students participated in the study.

In the classrooms, instructor (who has given prior permission) distributed and collected the written questionnaires prepared by the researchers (See the Appendices). Answering the questionnaires did not take more than half an hour.

100 native speakers of Turkish from different departments with limited or no American English language knowledge and access to American English culture undergraduate students aged between 18-22 just like the Americans.

100 American university students from the departments at Queens College and Graduate Center of CUNY like Linguistics, Linguistic Antropology, Law, Educational Sciences. The University where the study is conducted has a very rich ethnic population. This urged us to

redefine the concept" American" as "people living in that culture" rather than sticking to their diverse ethnic and linguistic backgrounds. Fliers were posted on the boards of the Graduate center and the department to search for American English native speaker who were born in the US. Later while analysing the questionnaires, we filtered those who are born outside the US.

To support the qualitative data, DCTs were delivered to 55 American and 55 Turkish respondents.

2.2 Instruments

Aiming at data triangulation, quantitative data for the research are gathered primarily from the Thomas-Kilmann Conflict Mode Instrument *(TKI)* (1977), *a questionnaire,* which contains items representing five strategies of conflict resolution: accomodation, avoidance, compromise, collaboration, competition as explained respectively by Thomas and Kilmann (1977):

Accommodation – surrender one's own needs and wishes to accommodate the other party. (harmonize with/tone in)

Avoidance – avoid or postpone conflict by ignoring it, changing the subject, etc. Avoidance nonverbally can involve severing a relationship or leaving a group.

Compromise–bring the problem into the open and have the third person present (kind of mediation). The aim of conflict resolution is to reach agreement .

Collaboration – work together to find a mutually beneficial solution. While the Thomas Kilmann views collaboration as the only win-win solution to conflict.

Competition – assert one's viewpoint at the potential expense of another. It can be useful when achieving one's objectives outweighs one's concern for the relationship. (assertive and dominating, noncooperative)

(from http://www.kilmann.com/conflict.html)

The qualitative data comes from the Discourse Completion Tests (DCTs) in which conflict situations at schools are presented to the participants and responses are elicited. As a first step, frequent conflict situations were asked to report and later eight scenarios among them were chosen considering relations of power among the speakers. The respondents were asked to fill in what they would say in response to the higher-status people and their peers in those situations.

Thus, situations include only the variable of power status. Probable scenarios for the DCTs were compiled through the first part of the questionnaires which the respondents are required to write two sample conflict situations they experienced. Scenarios in the DCTs were randomly selected among them.

DCTs were first prepared in Turkish, later translated into English, English version is proof-read and revised in language and compatibility to culture by a native speaker at Queens College.

Questionnaires and DCTs were delivered in three ways:

First, in the classroom settings, contacts were made through the instructors in the case of classroom based surveys.

Secondly, online surveys were conducted through http://www.kwiksurveys.com to collect information from the academic network of the colleges based on the availability to use the mail servers of the colleges.

And in the library setting, before or after they enter the library, the subjects were contacted and given questionnaires. On the voluntary basis, they were required to fill in the questionnaires.

In in-class surveys, the instructor handed out and collected the questionnaires with written consent cover pages attached. The participants were given time to read the page and if they decide to participate, they then filled out and returned the questionnaire and kept the cover page for their records (see attached). If online surveys were used, consent were given online on a web page before they started the questionnaire. Additionally, from the Graduate Center, IRB (CUNY Institutional Review Board) Consent was also taken for the research to be completed.

3. Data Analysis

A Likert scale on a 1 to 5 basis is used (never –seldom- sometimes-often- always) in the TKI. In the analysis, the scores of each dimension for each respondent were calculated and mean scores were compared through Independent Samples T-tests.

As for the DCTs, responses to the conflict situations in the DCTs are first checked out for five strategies by Thomas & Kilmann (1977), namely, Avoiding, Competing, Compromising, Accommodating, and Collaborating by two raters to establish interrater reliability. Agreed- on decision was included, the others were not considered for the study. made. Later, corresponding face behaviours in these five   strategies were determined according to Ting Toomey's classification (1988) based on the two dimensions:

- Self other face and Positive/Negative face. These two dimensions are mapped into four sub categories of face behaviours:

- Self- Centered positive face (self need for approval-inclusion Self centered negative face (self need for autonomy)

- Other centered   positive face (support others' need for approval-inclusion)

- Other centered negative face (respect for others need for autonomy)

4. Results

4.1 The Thomas-Killmann instrument: in-group comparisons

American students prefer the strategy of "collaboration" most frequently in solving conflicts both with peers, with higher status people (instructors and administrators). They rarely accomodate to their peers to solve conflicts as expected. They rarely compete with higher status people (13.49).

Turkish students are also seen to use the strategy of "collaboration " (with a mean of 19.77) most frequently towards their peers and higher status people (19.41). But they rarely avoid conflict resolution with peers, they are assertive with peers. They use "competition" the least with higher status people (15.63). (Tables 1-2)

In both groups, there are statistically significant differences between their attitudes to peers and to higher status (p<0,01), they both avoid and accomodate more in conflict resolution with higher status people than peers and less compete with them, which consolidates social power or status makes a difference in both communities.

Table 1. *Group Statistics and Independent Samples T-test for American Students Conflict Resolution Strategies with Peers and Higher Status People.*

Americans to Peers&HS	n	Mean	Std.Dev.	df	Sig..(2-tailed)
Avoidance	100	15,6000	3,84550		
	100	**17,9100**	**3,70938**	198	,000
Competition	100	15,6600	3,83292		
	100	**13,4900**	**4,31463**	**198**	,000
Comromise	100	17,0500	3,55725		
	100	**16,2600**	**3,88371**	198	,135
Accomodation	100	14,8900	3,63178		
	100	**17,4200**	**4,00045**	**198**	,000
	100	**18,1900**	3,81039		
Colloboration	100	**18,2000**	**3,97721**	198	,986

Note: The highest score for each section is 25 in all the tables. The highest mean score shows the most prefered strategy.Higher Status scores are in bold.

Table 2. *Group Statistics and Independent Samples T-test for Turkish Students Conflict Resolution Strategies with Peers and Higher Status People.*

Turks to Peers&HS	n	Mean	Std.Dev.	df	Sig..(2-tailed)
Avoidance	100	15,0500	4,35165		
	100	**17,2600**	**4,77286**	198	,001
Competition	100	17,2500	4,13014		
	100	**13,4900**	**4,33369**	**198**	,007
Compromise	100	15,6300	3,57346		
	100	**18,7700**	**4,45143**	198	,264
Accomodation	100	15,2100	4,17858		
	100	**16,8300**	**4,62111**	**198**	,010
	100	**19,7700**	4,08460		
Collaboration	100	**19,4100**	**4,47461**	198	,553

4.2 The Thomas-Killmann instrument: inter-group comparisons

To solve conflicts with peers, American and Turkish students showed statistical differences in terms of "collaboration" ($p<0.05$), compromise" and competition" ($p<0.01$). This means Turkish students compete with their peers more than American students. They compromise and collaborate more than American students, which contradicts the case of the collectivist cultures **(Table 3 and 4).**

Table 3. *Group Statistics and Independent Samples T-test for American and Turkish Students' Conflict Resolution Strategies with Higher Status People*.

Ame & Turks to HS	n	Mean	Std.Dev.	df	Sig..(2-tailed)
Avoidance	100 100	17,9100 **17,2600**	3,70938 **4,77286**	198	,001
Competition	100 100	13,4900 **15,6300**	4,31463 **4,33369**	**198**	,000
Compromise	100 100	16,2600 **18,7700**	3,88371 **4,45143**	198	,336
Accomodation	100 100 100	17,4200 **16,8300** 18,2000	4,00045 **4,6211** **3,97721**	**198**	,010
Collaboration	100	**19,4100**	**4,47461**	198	,045

In resolving conflicts with higher status people, American and Turkish students are found to be statistically different in "collaboration" (p<0.05), compromise" and competition" (p<0.01), which means Turkish students compete with higher status people more than American students. They compromise and collaborate significantly more than American students in conflicts with higher status people.

Table 4. *Group Statistics and Independent Samples T-test for American and Turkish Students' Conflict Resolution Strategies with Peers.*

Ame & Turks to HS	n	Mean	Std.Dev.	df	Sig..(2-tailed)
Avoidance	100 100	15,600 **15,0500**	3,84550 **4,35165**	198	,345
Competition	100 100	15,6600 **17,2500**	3,83292 **4,13014**	**198**	,005
Compromise	100 100	17,0500 **19,4100**	3,55725 **3,57346**	198	,000
Accomodation	100 100 100	14,8900 **15,2100** 18,9100	3,63178 **4,17858** 3,81039	**198**	,564
Collaboration	100	**19,7700**	**4,08460**	198	,005

4.3 Discourse completion tests (DCTs)

When Turkish and American respondents are compared, Turkish respondents are found to compete, compromise and colloborate significantly more than American respondents. The rate of competition with peers and higher status people in the DCTs also verified this (19/45 and 44/45), which is as many as the American respondents (15/55 peers versus 40/53 HS) (Table 5)

Table 5. *Discourse Completion Tests Conflict Solving Strategies used by the students either to peers or to the higher status people.*

	To peers		To Higher Status	
	Turkish	**American**	**Turkish**	**American**
Avoidance	15	25	-	-
Competition	19	15	44	40
Compromise	4	1	-	8
Accomodation	1	12	-	2
Collaboration	8	2	1	3
Total	44	55	45	53

5.Conclusion/Discussion

A great deal of research on intercultural conflict resolution has generally indicated that individualistic cultures mostly use the integrating style, the compromising style, the dominating style, and emotional expression) unlike collectivistic cultures who use the obliging style, the avoiding style, and third party help (Wielders, 2011). In contrast, our data show that Turkish students included in our research do not reflect features of collectivist cultures in conflict resolution since strategies "collaboration" and competition" "compromising" are given as the characteristics of individualistic cultures.

Specificaly, the most prefered strategy by both Turkish and American groups to peers and higher status people is "**Collaboration"** which corresponds to Self - Other Negative face or mutual face concern in which parties work together to reach win-win solutions, through open and direct problem solving.

When Turkish and American respondents are compared, Turkish respondents are found to **compete, compromise and collaborate significantly** more than American respondents. The rate of competition with peers and higher status people in the DCTs also verified this (19/45 and 44/45), which is as many as the American respondents (peers 15/55 vs. HS 40/53). As for face concerns, **competition** is a conflict resolution style which corresponds to self negative face and the need to protect self negative face. Valueing autonomy, those who prefer this style have direct and autonomous conflict styles , protecting self from the infringement of the others. Collaboration and competition are given as the features of individualistic cultures. **Compromise** as a conflict resolution style supports mutual-oriented or self – other positive negative face concern. (sometimes seeking a third party help) This strategy is reported to be a characteristic of collectivist cultures.

In both Turkish and American data, it is seen that **power status** is a determinant factor in the selection of conflict resolution strategies as both communities calibrate their resolution styles to higher status people. Both **avoid** and **accomodate** more in conflict resolution with higher status people than peers and less **compete** with them**,** which consolidates social power or status makes a difference in both communities.

Perhaps more data and participants are needed to reach a thorough decision, but these results do suggest that cultural differences in conflict resolution styles must be mapped onto further dimensions that can be tailored to all cultures so as not to cause stereo types.

References

Ausberger, G. (1995). *Conflict Mediation Across Cultures*. Louisville,KY: John Knox Press

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

Cai,D and Fink, E (2002). Conflict style differences between individualists and collectivists, *Communication Monographs*, 69:1, 67-87

Carr, M. (1993). "Chinese "Face" in Japanese and English (Part 2)", *The Review of Liberal Arts* 85:69-101.

Coon, H. M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2001). Cultural orientations in theindividualism–collectivism: 100 years of solidarity and community.*Journal of Management*, 24, 265–304.

Fisher, R. and W. Ury (1983). Getting to Yes –Negotiating Agreement without Giving in. NewYork: Penguin

Goffman, E. (1959). *The Presentation of Self in Everyday Life* .NewYork: Doubleday.

French,W & D. Albright (1998). Resolving a Moral Conflict through Discourse. *Journal of Business Ethics*. 17, 177-194.

Hall, E. T. (1976). *Beyond Culture. Anchor Books.*

Hammer, M.R. (2005). The Intercultural Conflict Style Inventory: A Conceptual Framework and measure of intercultural conflict resolution approaches. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. Volume 9, Issue 6, pp.675-695.

Hocker, J.L. & Wilmot, W.W. (1991). *Interpersonal Conflict*. Dubuque, IA: Wm. C.Brown.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Cultural dimensions. Retrieved June 25th, 2013, from:http://www.geert-hofstede.com/.

Kilmann, R. H., and K. W. Thomas, (1977). "Developing a Forced-Choice Measure of Conflict-Handling Behavior: The MODE Instrument," *Educational and Psychological Measurement,* Vol. 37, No. 2 (1977), 309-325 http://www.kilmann.com/conflict.html

The Thomas-Kilmann Instrument http://www.cerritos.edu/anagao/Conflict_Scale.pdf

Kim, Y.Y. (2012). Comparing InterculturalCommunication. In *The Handbook of Comparative Communication Research*" Frank Esser&Thomas Hanitzsch (Eds.) pp. 119-133. Handbook Series. Routledge.

Kozan, MK and Ergin, C. (1998). Preference for third party help in conflict management in the United States and Turkey: An experimental study. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 29: 525–539.

Lee Agee, M. & H.E. Kabasakal, (1993) Exploring Conflict Resolution Styles: A Study of Turkish and American University Business Students. *International Journal of Social Economics* 20 (9), pp.3 - 14.

Liang G. & Han J. (2005) A Contrastive Study on Disagreement Strategies for Politeness between American English & Mandarin. *Asian EFL Journal 7*(1)

Ng, John (2008). The Four Faces of Face http://www.mediate.com/articles/the_four_faces_of_face.cfm

Croucher, S.M. (2011). Religion and onflict: An Emerging Field of Inquiry in "The Handbook of Conflict Communication" J.G. Oetzel&S.T.Toomey (eds.) . (Chapter 21). Sage Publications.

Oetzel, J. G., Ting-Toomey, S., Masumoto, T., Yokochi, Y., Pan, X., Takai, J., & Wilcox, R. (2001). Face and facework in conflict: a cross-cultural comparisonof China, Germany, Japan, and the United States. *Communication Monographs*, *68*, 235-258.

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

Ting-Toomey, S Theory Reflections: Face Negotiation Theory Retrieved on June 26th, 2013 from http://www.nafsa.org/_/File/_/theory_connections_facework.pdf

Ting-Toomey, S. (1985). Toward a Theory of Conflict and Culture. In *Communication, Culture, and Organizational Processes*, eds. W. B. Gudykunst, L. B. Stewart, and S. Ting-Toomey. pp. 71-86.   Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (1988). Intercultural Conflicts: A Face-Negotiation Theory. In *Theories in Intercultural Communication,* eds. Y. Y. Kim and W. B. Gudykunst. pp. 213–235. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S., Yee-Jung, K., Shapiro, R., Garcia, W., Wright, T., & Oetzel, J. G. (2000). Cultural/ethnic identity salience and conflict styles. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 23, 47-81.

Ting-Toomey, S and Oetzel, JG. (2001).*Managing intercultural conflict effectively*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2005). The Matrix of Face: An Updated Face-Negotiation Theory. In *Theorizing about   Intercultural Communication*, ed. W. B. Gudykunst. 71-92. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Triandis,H.(1995).*Individualism and collectivism*. Boulder,CO:Westview.

Vargas, J.H. and M. Kemmelmeier (2013) Ethnicity and Contemporary America Culture: A meta-analytic investigation of horizantal –vertical individualism-collectivism. *Journal of Cross cultural Pscyhology* 44(2) 195-222 Sage Publications.

APPENDIX I

THE THOMAS-KILLMANN INSTRUMENT IN ENGLISH

Dear Participant,

This study probes into verbal conflict resolution styles at school. This is a part of international research which scrutinizes intercultural cognitive and linguistic differences. Please think of two different situations where you have a conflict, disagreement, argument, or disappointment with your peers (Situation 1) and with your instructors/administrators (Situation 2) at school. Briefly describe the situation without giving any identifier in the blanks first. Then, fill in your scores for situation 1 and situation 2. Thus, for each question, you need to score twice. Thank you.

Situation 1 _____

Situation 2 _____

Please score the following using this scale

1= never 2 = seldom 3 = sometimes 4 = often 5 = always

1. ___|___ I avoid being "put on the spot"; I keep conflicts to myself.

2. ___|___ I use my influence to get my ideas accepted.

3. ___|___ I usually try to split the difference to resolve an issue.

4. ___|___ I generally try to satisfy the others' needs.

5. ___|___ I try to investigate an issue to find a solution acceptable to us.

6. ___|___ I usually avoid open discussion of my differences with the other.

7. ___|___ I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.

8. ___|___ I try to find a middle course to resolve an impasse.

9. ___|___ I usually accommodate to the other's wishes.

10. __|___ I try to integrate my ideas with the other's to come up with a joint decision.

11. __|___ I try to stay away from disagreement with the other.

12. __|___ I use my expertise to make a decision that favors me.

13. __|___ I propose a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.

14. __|___ I give in to the other's wishes.

15. __|___ I try to work with the other to find solutions that satisfy both our expectations.

16. __|___ I try to keep my disagreement to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.

17. __|___ I generally pursue my side of the issue.

18. __|___ I negotiate with the other to reach a compromise.

19. __|___ I often go with the other's suggestions.

20. __|___ I exchange accurate information with the other so we can solve a problem together.

21. __|___ I try to avoid unpleasant exchanges with the other.

22. __|___ I sometimes use my power to win the argument.

23. __|___ I use "give and take" so that a compromise can be made.

24. __|___ I try to satisfy the other's expectations.

25. __|___ I try to bring all our concerns out in the open so that issues can be resolved.

<center>
APPENDIX II

THE THOMAS-KILLMANN INSTRUMENT IN TURKISH

ÇATIŞMA ÇÖZÜMLEME STRATEJİLERİ
</center>

Değerli katılımcı, bu çalışma akademik ortamda karşılaştığınız çatışmaları çözmeye yönelik sözel çözüm stratejilerini araştırmaktadır. Bu araştırma kültürler arası bilişsel ve dilselfarklılıkları ortaya çıkarmayı amaçlayan uluslararası bir çalışmanın bir bölümünü oluşturacaktır. Katkılarınız için teşekkür ederiz.

Akademik ortamda/okulda öğretmenleriniz ve arkadaşlarınızla sıklıkla yaşadığınız iki farklı çatışma durumunu örnekler misiniz? Bu çatışmalardan birisi arkadaşlarınızla diğeri de öğretmeniniz veya okul yönetimi ile ilgili olmalıdır. Lütfen, anlattığınız bu iki durumu düşünerek bu çatışmaları çözümleme tarzınızı belirleyin.

A – (Öğretim Elemanı/Üyesi)

B- (Arkadaş)

Lütfen aşağıdaki ölçeği kullanarak anketi tamamlayın

1 = asla, 2 = nadiren, 3 = bazen, 4 = sıklıkla, 5 = daima

A | B

1.___|___Zor durumda kalmaktan kaçınırım; çatışma ve fikir ayrılıklarını kendime saklarım.

2.___|___ Fikirlerimin kabul edilmesi için tüm gücümü/etkimi kullanırım.

3.___|___Genellikle bir konuyu çözmek için fikir ayrılığını ortadan kaldırmaya çalışırım

4.___|___ Genellikle karşı tarafın ihtiyaçlarını /duygularını karşılamaya çalışırım.

5.___|___ Her iki taraf için de kabul edilebilir bir çözüm bulmaya çalışırım

6.___|___ Genellikle fikir ayrılıklarımı diğerleriyle açıkça tartışmaktan kaçınırım.

7.___|___ Gücümü kendi lehimde karar vermek için kullanırım.

8.___|___ Bir problemi çözmek için bir ara yol bulmaya çalışırım.

9.___|___ Diğerlerinin isteklerine genellikle uyum gösteririm.

10 ___|___ Ortak bir karar almak için fikirlerimi karşı tarafınkiyle birleştiririm.

11.___|___ Karşı tarafla fikir çatışmasından uzak durmaya çalışırım.

12.___|___ Uzmanlığımı/bilgilerimi lehime olan kararlar vermek için kullanırım.

13.___|___ Çıkmazları çözmede ortak bir yol öneririm.

14.___|___ Diğerlerinin isteklerine boyun eğerim.

15.___|___Tartışmada her iki tarafın da beklentilerini karşılayacak çözümler bulmak için birlikte çaba gösteririm.

16.___|___ Küskünlük ve kırgınlığı engellemek için karşı fikirlerimi kendime saklarım.

17.___|___ Genellikle konunun beni ilgilendiren kısmıyla ilgilenirim.

18.___|___ Orta yol bulmak için karşı tarafla uzlaşırım.

19.___|___ Sıklıkla karşı tarafın önerilerine uyarım

20.___|___ Sorunu çözmek için karşı tarafla doğru bilgi paylaşımında bulunurum

21.___|___ Karşı tarafla hoş olmayan atışmalardan kaçınmaya çalışırım.

22.___|___ Tartışmayı kazanmak için kimi zaman sosyal gücümü kullanırım.

23.___|___ Orta yol bulmak için karşılıklı özveri yöntemini kullanırım.

24.___|___ Diğerlerinin beklentilerini gerçekleştirmeye çalışırım.

25.___|___ Sorunların işbirliği ile çözülmesi için her konuyu açıkça dile getirmeye çalışırım.

APPENDIX III

DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST IN ENGLISH

The following are eight conflict scenarios which you may experience at school. Please write out what you are to SAY to solve the problem or conflict in these situations.

Your Age:____   Hometown: _____   Mother tongue(s):_____

Scenario 1.
Your friends feel that you should go out for a change. Group members propose different suggestions, then try to push for their own ideas, but you don't agree; you don't go for any of them. But you should make a decision. In response, you'd say:

Scenario 2.
At your friend's party, you mention that you are thinking of taking a certain course next semester. Someone says,   "Yes, I've heard of that course. It's difficult and boring". However, you have learned from a friend that the course is very easy and interesting, and you believe your friend. In response, you say: (taken from LIANG Guodong & HAN Jing, 2005)

Scenario 3.
For a certain course, you must form groups, fulfill certain criteria and then share the topics in a class presentation so that you can get a passing grade. But some of the group members are not willing to do their best and are reluctant to do the job assigned. They say if the work is completed, it doesn't matter who did it. In response, you say:

Scenario 4.
You failed a course last term. The program requires that you repeat the course, but this course conflicts with another course you must take in the program. Knowing that you are not allowed to take two courses at the same time, you relate this problem to the administration (Department Chair) and learn they cannot change the course hours. In response, you say:

Scenario 5.
You forgot to bring your dictionary to class, which is a must for writing classes. In response, the instructor asks you to leave the classroom as a disciplinary measure. You thought his attitude was arrogant and his action was extreme. Since you didn't want to miss the whole class, you refused to leave. You relate this incident to the Department Chair. He indicates that the instructor was absolutely right. In response, you say:

Scenario 6.
You had difficulty understanding a certain topic during class, and have a number of questions. You wanted some clarification from your instructor, but did not get a satisfactory response. Instead, she states that it is your responsibility to research the answers. Though you agree to some extent, you feel that she should at least provide you with some direction. In response, you say:
Scenario 7
Your instructor wanted the whole class to conduct a project by the end of the term. The requirements of the project were orally explained by the instructor beforehand, and all the students were sure that they understood what was required. However, as the project due date approaches, s/he wants you to include additional details which s/he never mentioned before. In response, you say:
Scenario 8.
Although your grades were quite high in a course, you end up failing. The instructor tells you "I'm sorry, but I do not feel that you earned a passing grade in this course due to your absences " However you believe that you attended class regularly and that there must be some sort of error or misunderstanding. In response you say:

APPENDIX IV- DISCOURSE COMPLETION TEST IN TURKISH

Okulda karşılaşabileceğiniz kimi durumlar aşağıda anlatılmıştır. Lütfen kendinizi aşağıda verilen durumlardaki konuşmacıların yerine koyunuz ve bu durumlarda problemi ya da çatışmayı çözmek için ne söyleyeceğinizi yazınız.

Yaşınız:__   Doğum Yeri/Memleket:_____   Anadiliniz:_____

1. Durum
Arkadaşlarınızla değişiklik olsun diye dışarıda bir yerlere gitmek istiyorsunuz. Ortak bir karar vermek durumundasınız. Herkes farklı fikirler ortaya atıyor ve kendi fikrini kabul ettirmeye çalışıyor. Hiçbiri ile aynı fikirde değilsiniz ve fikirlerin hiçbirinden hoşlanmadınız. Onlara diyorsunuz ki,
……………………………
2. Durum
Bir arkadaş toplantısında , bir sonraki dönem belli bir hocadan bir ders almak istediğinizi söylüyorsunuz. Birisi, o hocanın ve dersinin çok sıkıcı ve zor olduğunu söylüyor. Ancak siz aslında dersin kolay ve zevkli olduğunu bir dostunuzdan öğrendiniz ve arkadaşınıza güveniyorsunuz. Ona diyorsunuz ki,
……………………
3. Durum
Bir derste geçer not alabilmek için, grup oluşturmanız, konuları paylaşmanız ve sorumluluklarını yerine getirmeniz gerekmektedir. Ancak, grup arkadaşlarınız ellerinden geleni yapma konusunda çok isteksiz ve gönülsüzler. İçlerinden biri iş yapılsın da kim yaparsa yapsın diyor. Ona diyorsunuz ki,
………………………………
4. Durum
Bir önceki dönemde bir dersten kalıyorsunuz. Dersi tekrar etmeniz gerekiyor. Ancak tekrar etmeniz gereken ders o dönem almanız zorunlu olan başka bir dersle çakışıyor. Tüm dersleri almak ve geçmek istiyorsunuz. Aynı saatlerde iki derse giremeyeceğiniz için bölüm başkanına probleminizi anlatıyorsunuz. Size ders programını değiştiremeyeceklerini söylüyor. Ona diyorsunuz ki,
……………………………
5. Durum
Yazma dersinde getirilmesi zorunlu olan sözlüğünüzü evde unuttunuz. Öğretmen ceza olarak sınıfı terk etmenizi söyledi. Bunu çok kaba ve ayrıca gereksiz buldunuz çünkü dersi tamamen kaçırmak istemiyorsunuz. Bu durumu bölüm başkanına anlatıyorsunuz. Size öğretmeninizin kesinlikle haklı olduğunu söylüyor. Ona diyorsunuz ki,

……………………………

6. Durum

Öğretmenin verdiği bir karara karşısınız. Kendi çözümünüzü önerdiniz. Sizin tepkinizi gözardı etti ve kendi söylediğinin doğru olduğunu sınıftaki tek otoritenin kendisi olduğunu söylüyor. Üstelik bu kararın bölümdeki herkes tarafından onaylandığını söylüyor. Ona diyorsunuz ki,

……………………………

7. Durum

Öğretmeniniz tüm sınıfa dönem sonunda hazırlanması için bir proje verdi. Ödevin ayrıntıları öğretmeniniz tarafından önceden sözel olarak açıklandı. Herkes ödevi nasıl hazırlayacağını anladığından emin. Ancak, ödev teslim tarihi geldiğinde, ödevin daha önce hiç bahsedilmeyen bir şekilde yapılması gerektiğini öğreniyorsunuz. Ona diyorsunuz ki

……………………………

8. Durum

Bir dersteki notlarınız oldukça yüksek ancak devamsızlık yüzünden sınıfta kalıyorsunuz. Öğretmeniniz üzgünüm bu dersten geçmeyi hak etmiyorsun diyor. Sen tüm derslere düzenli devam ettiğini düşünüyorsun ve bir yanlış anlama ya da devamsızlıkların yanlış kayıt edildiğini savunuyorsun. Öğretmene diyorsunuz ki

……………………………