

**Chinese Negotiators' Subjective Variations in Intercultural Negotiations**

Journal
Journal of Business Ethics
Publisher
Springer Netherlands
ISSN
0167-4544 (Print) 1573-0697 (Online)
DOI
10.1007/s10551-009-0300-0
Subject Collection
Humanities, Social Sciences and Law
SpringerLink Date
Wednesday, December 23, 2009

Add to marked items

Add to shopping cart
Add to saved items
Permissions & Reprints
Recommend this article

Online First

PDF (733.4 KB) Free Preview

Clyde A. Warden^{1, 2} and Judy F. Chen³

(1) Marketing Department, National Chung Hsing University, 250, Kuo Kuang Road, Taichung, Taiwan

(2) Institute for Retail Studies, University of Stirling, Stirling, Scotland, U.K.

(3) Business Administration Department, The Overseas Chinese University, 100 Chiao Kwang Road, Taichung, Taiwan

Published online: 23 December 2009

Abstract Chinese negotiators are known to have a negotiation emphasis that differs from their Western counterparts, especially in issues of face and conflict. These values, however, are not monolithic, and can change depending on the negotiation circumstance. This research examines how negotiation tactics changes when Chinese negotiators are faced with counterparts from near and distant cultures. An online conjoint simulation drew 351 respondents in Taiwan to test subjective perceptions of counterparts from the USA and Japan. Chinese respondents exhibited increased cultural accommodation when the counterpart's culture was more distant – paying more attention to sacrificing self-interest and saving face for the other side. Integration in the negotiation was emphasized across both near and distant cultures above that observed for negotiation with Chinese counterparts. Saving face, ignoring conflict, and domination tactics were consistently valued, irrelevant of culture. Masculinity among Chinese respondents was exhibited in a preference for integration with male counterparts, especially for Chinese male negotiators. Results indicate practical considerations when preparing for negotiation with a Chinese counterpart by considering inconsistencies in preferences while also considering consistent values.

Keywords confucianism - Chinese - negotiation - culture - conjoint - accommodation

✉ **Clyde A. Warden**

Email: cwarden@cwarden.org

✉ **Judy F. Chen (Corresponding author)**

Email: jfc@ocu.edu.tw

Fulltext Preview (Small, Large)

Chinese Negotiators' Subjective Variations in Intercultural Negotiations

Clyde A. Warden
Judy F. Chen

ABSTRACT. Chinese negotiators are known to have a negotiation emphasis that differs from their Western counterparts, especially in issues of face and conflict. These values, however, are not monolithic, and can change depending on the negotiation circumstance. This research examines how negotiation tactics changes when Chinese negotiators are faced with counterparts from near and distant cultures. An online conjoint simulation drew 351 respondents in Taiwan to test subjective perceptions of counterparts from the USA and Japan. Chinese respondents exhibited increased cultural accommodation when the counterpart's culture was more distant – paying more attention to sacrificing self-interest and saving face for the other side. Integration in the negotiation was emphasized across both near and distant cultures above that observed for negotiation with Chinese counterparts. Saving face, ignoring conflict, and domination tactics were consistently valued, irrelevant of culture. Masculinity among Chinese respondents was exhibited in a preference for integration with male counterparts, especially for Chinese male negotiators. Results indicate practical considerations when preparing for negotiation with a Chinese counterpart by considering inconsistencies in preferences while also considering consistent values.

KEY WORDS: confucianism, Chinese, negotiation, culture, conjoint, accommodation

Chinese negotiators' subjective variations in intercultural negotiations

When Mr. Chen meets Mr. Yang in Shanghai, both may expect common ground for building their negotiation. Even though one negotiator is from Beijing and the other from Taipei, they share a culture. What will be the result when Mr. Yang meets with Mr. Smith, or Mr. Kazuo, or Ms. Mariko? Confucian values are the underpinnings of

Chinese social relationships (Lo and Otis, 2003). Chinese negotiators inherit much from their Confucian roots (Deverge, 1986; Yan and Sorenson, 2004). Modern Chinese values, however, are fluid, adjusting to circumstance. The subjectively assumed cultural values of a negotiator's counterpart may cause such adjustments. Confucian principles of mutual support, co-existence, and cooperation help maintain relationships of trust that are a vital dynamic within the social collective (Cha, 2003; Chow and Ng, 2004). What happens when the negotiation counterpart does to hold those same values or even belong to the same collective?

A Chinese negotiator may identify more strongly with his or her own Confucian values when facing a counterpart whose own culture shares these assumptions, such as the case of Mr. Kazuo. Although Japanese culture differs from Chinese culture, assumptions about commonality may reinforce a belief of belonging to an ingroup: affirmation. An assumed larger cultural distance (Mr. Smith) actually encourages a shift toward the out-group position: accommodation (Bond, 1983; Bond and Hwang, 1986; Miles, 2003; Ng et al., 1982; Yang and Bond, 1980). These differential shifts in cultural value emphasis can impact a cross-cultural negotiation (Stewart et al., 1999). Specifically, Chinese expectations of relationships within the negotiation context will change, dependent on the perceived cultural values of the negotiator's counterpart (Thompson and Hastie, 1990). The research question guiding this experiment asks what the nature of that shift is and what parts of the negotiation are most influenced?

Early in a negotiation, perceptions play an important role in assumptions of social interactions. This influences a negotiation's emphasis on integration (win/win) or distribution (win/lose) (Pruitt and

Rubin, 1986; Watson and McKersie, 1965). Collectivists will tend to seek interpersonal relationships that encourage an integrative approach (Ma et al., 2002). Matsudaira (2003) emphasized the underlying similarities that exist between Chinese and Japanese society in their collectivist values. In contrast, American culture is described as highly individualistic. Chinese and American values often are at odds, as in Hofstede’s topography of four cultural dimensions (not including the Confucian-specific Long-Term Orientation). For example, the two cultures consistently appear in opposite quadrants (see Table I) in Hofstede’s cluster analysis results.

Chinese values and Japanese values also differ, only occurring in the same cluster once, but falling in the same quadrants three times and sharing at least one quadrant three times. These three nationalities were selected for testing because all three cultures are classified within Hofstede’s results as generally not in the same cluster – making them all somewhat different from each other. Additionally, there is a generally accepted belief in Taiwan of a likeness between Japanese and Chinese values. This supplies a sample frame that includes differences and similarities. A common emphasis on face considerations in conflict situations does exist between Chinese and Japanese cultures as well as a commonality of Taoist, Buddhist, and Confucian traditions (Oetzel and Ting-Toomey, 2003). For these reasons, Japanese and Chinese negotiator’s cultural and ethnic values would be perceived by Chinese respondents as more closely aligned than those of American negotiators, triggering affirmation in the first case and accommodation in the second.¹

Proposition 1: Chinese respondents will show cross-cultural accommodation to American negotiators.

Proposition 2: Chinese respondents will show the same amount of ethnic affirmation to Japanese and Chinese negotiators.

Autonomy expectations are closely related to the independence or interdependence of a culture (Gudykunst and Ting-Toomey, 1988; Hofstede, 1980). Traditional Confucian societies tend to accept that high status individuals are usually afforded more power, rights, and respect (Leung, 1996; Tinsley, 1997). This emphasis on status and the distribution of power is known as Power Distance (PDI) (Hofstede, 1980), leading to our next proposition:

TABLE I
Cultural dimensions contrasted between American and Chinese cultures (Hofstede, 2005)

	Power distance and individualism	Power distance and masculinity	Masculinity and individualism	Masculinity and uncertainty avoidance	Uncertainty avoidance and individualism	Power distance and uncertainty avoidance
USA	Small power distance/ individualist	Small power distance/ masculine	Individualist/ masculine	Weak uncertainty avoidance/ masculine	Weak uncertainty avoidance/ individualist	Small power distance/weak uncertainty avoidance
Taiwan	Large power distance/ collectivist	Large power distance/ feminine	Collectivist/ feminine	Strong uncertainty avoidance/ feminine	Strong uncertainty avoidance/ collectivist	Large power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance
Japan	Large power distance/ collectivist	Large power distance/ masculine	Collectivist/ masculine	Strong uncertainty avoidance/ masculine	Strong uncertainty avoidance/ collectivist	Large power distance/strong uncertainty avoidance

Proposition 3: Chinese respondents will show a higher tendency towards integrating with high status negotiators than low status negotiators.

Gender can play a role in negotiation, especially in increasingly masculine cultures (Salacuse, 1998; Stuhlmacher and Walters, 1999). Masculinity (MAS) (Hofstede, 1998) is defined as the traditional masculine work role model of male achievement, control and power, with Japanese rating highest on Hofstede's MAS scale. While both genders will tend to be more masculine oriented in a high MAS culture, an interesting side effect is the gap between the genders is larger in high MAS cultures than low MAS cultures. In a high MAS culture, males will be more sensitive to a subjective difference between male and female counterparts. According to Hofstede's data, Chinese culture ranks more feminine than both the extreme Japanese and the moderately masculine USA culture. Thus, a Chinese negotiator's negotiation tactics (whether male or female) should not be different when faced with a male or female counterpart, leading to our next two propositions:

Proposition 4: Chinese male respondents will show an equal tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with men and women.

Proposition 5: Chinese female respondents will show an equal tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with men and women.

Long-Term Orientation (LTO) specifically addresses Confucian values and has been increasingly included in Hofstede's (2005) dimensions. The highest ranking countries of this dimension were China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Japan, in that order. The USA occupies the 18th place on Hofstede's LTO index out of the 23 countries surveyed. This leads to our last proposition:

Proposition 6: Chinese respondents will show a stronger tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with a negotiator who shows a higher Long-Term Orientation.

Methodology

To investigate our research propositions, we adopted the constructs of self-face and other-face in Chinese

negotiation, as elaborated by Ting-Toomey (1998). Conjoint analysis was employed so that each variable could be ranked based on its level of influence within a simulated negotiation. An additional advantage of conjoint is the capability to combine unrelated and non-continuous variables. The variables under study and their manipulations have an uncertain relationship. The focus of this study is on the subjective judgment of Chinese respondents only. We did not address the reality or absolute values of any of the variables. The attributes of PDI, MAS, and LTO were each broken down into two distinct levels, while nationality was represented by three levels. Pre-testing on the presentation of the attribute levels was undertaken with 22 MBA students in Taiwan, including actual scenario ratings to confirm the manipulations of attribute levels. Adjustments were made based on pre-testing until levels displayed the expected responses. Table II shows the levels of each independent variable.

The maximum number of attribute combinations totaled 24 ($2 \times 2 \times 2 \times 3$), which was reduced to eight cases with an orthogonal design. Two additional holdout cases were included for reliability checking – totaling 10 negotiation scenarios. Six dependent questions were derived from Ting-Toomey's (1998) Face Negotiation Theory (see Table III) with responses ranging from Strongly Agree to Strongly Disagree on a six-point Likert scale, avoiding a middle response we and others have found Chinese respondents tend toward (Lee et al., 2002).

Respondents were told they were entering a described negotiation process. The computer-based survey then generated the specifics of the negotiation (manipulating the attribute levels), presenting one negotiation case at a time with the dependent variables' questions. Respondents entered values with a mouse. In order to emphasize the negotiation counterpart's role, the screen presented a picture of the negotiator's counterpart and a written description of the independent variables' attribute levels: managerial rank (PDI), gender (MAS), closing offer (LTO), and nationality. To avoid biasing from the included photographs, pictures were randomly presented (with the exception of gender) without repeats, except for the holdouts. Half the photos were drawn from a photo bank with Asian features, and half with European features. To further avoid

TABLE II
Independent attribute levels

Attribute	Attribute levels
Power distance (PDI)	Manager (high) Employee (low)
Masculinity (MAS)	Male (high) Female (low)
Long-term orientation (LTO)	Co-operative offer (high) Mistrusting offer (low)
Culture	American (distant) Japanese (close) Chinese (same)

TABLE III
Dependent variables and survey questions

Dependent variable	Survey question
1. Interdependent face	I am willing to sacrifice my self-interest for the benefits of our relationship
2. Other-face	I am concerned with helping the other person to maintain his/her credibility
3. Self-face	I am concerned with protecting my self-image
4. Avoiding	I will try to ignore conflict and behave as if nothing has happened
5. Dominating	I will dominate the argument until the other person understands my position
6. Integrating	I will give and take so that a compromise can be made

biasing from the photos, they were blurred so figures were recognizable, but with little detail (see Figure 1). In other words, pictures of the counterparts were not certain to match ethnic features with a specific scenario description, while blurring made facial details difficult to make out. This approach allowed a more realistic simulation, while avoiding biasing due to details of the photos or even ethnicity cues within the photos.

All components of the computer survey were presented in Mandarin Chinese, first tested in a back-translation task and then pretesting. A popular search portal in Taiwan (Yam.com) hosted a link to

Figure 1. Example survey instrument.

the survey site administered on the lead researcher's own server. Yam.com was chosen for its frequent use by businesspeople and office workers – the preferred sample frame. To test for the possibility of gender influences on the gender variable, another link was hosted within Yam.com where increased numbers of females were reported by Yam.com to visit. Respondents were offered shopping vouchers as incentive for participation. The survey began with a presentation of the negotiation scenario, followed up with three questions from the scenario. The number of questions answered correctly was recorded in the database, and any respondents unable to answer all three questions correctly were later dropped from the analysis. Each conjoint case was presented, one at a time, with all six questions answered each time (the order of cases was random).

Results

A total of 435 respondents completed the online survey, with 351 correctly answering the three

scenario questions (insuring involvement with the scenario), made up of 67% female – confirming the success of our attempt to attract female respondents. Respondents ranged from 18 to 65 years old, with an average age of 28.5. Full-time employed respondents totaled 58%, students represented 31 and 10% were between jobs or self-employed. Eighty-four percent of the sample held undergraduate or higher degrees.

Part-worth utility scores were generated for each of the six dependent variables, with the six Pearson's *R*s ranging from 0.87 to 0.99 between observed and actual preferences, and the Kendall's tau statistics ranging from 0.64 to 1, all statistically significant at the 0.05 level. Analysis of variance tests showed significant differences across the three national groups for three of the six questions (Interdependent-face, Other-face, and Integrating-face). Multiple comparisons (Least Significant Difference) demonstrated the American profiles stand out from both Japanese and Chinese profiles (Table IV). The statistically significant differences with the American counterpart's consistently higher part-worth utility values support Proposition 1 (Chinese respondents will show cross-cultural accommodation to American negotiators). Japanese and Chinese profiles showed very similar part-worth utility means with no statistically significant differences, except in the case of Question 6: Integrating. In

the case of integration, American and Japanese were statistically the same, thus Proposition 2 is only partially supported (Chinese respondents will show the same amount of ethnic affirmation to Japanese and Chinese negotiators).

For the remaining independent variables (PDI, MAS, and LTO), a paired two-tailed *t*-test was employed between the two attribute levels of each variable's part-worth utility value (see Table V). Managerial rank displayed no statistically significant differences, rejecting Proposition 3 (Chinese respondents will show a higher tendency toward integrating with high status negotiators than low status negotiators).

Masculinity scores statistically differed for Questions 2 and 6 (Other-face and Integrating), favoring male profiles. Breaking out the female and male respondents shows for both questions, male respondents preferred male counterparts to female counterparts, and in the case of integrating, the difference was statistically significant, rejecting Proposition 4 (Chinese male respondents will show an equal tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with men and women). Chinese females did not present a similar gender preference for counterparts, supporting Proposition 5 (Chinese female respondents will show an equal tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with men and women). Long-term orientation of the

TABLE IV
Nationality part-worth values

Dependent variables	Independent variable: nationality				
	USA	Japanese	Chinese	<i>F</i> -value	<i>Post hoc</i>
Interdependent-face	9.20	-4.79	-4.41	7.30*	U > J ^{0.36} , U > C ^{0.34}
Other-face	9.97	-4.08	-5.89	8.66*	U > J ^{0.38} , U > C ^{0.43}
Self-face	4.20	-0.87	-3.32	2.13	
Avoiding	3.01	-0.94	-2.07	0.69	
Dominating	0.00	-1.97	1.97	0.58	
Integrating	7.75	3.12	-10.87	8.81*	U > C ^{0.44} , J > C ^{0.36}

Significance of part-worth utility means tested with a paired *t*-test.

Values in superscript are Cohen's *d* effect size.

Least significant difference paired comparison.

U = USA; J = Japan; C = Chinese.

**p* < 0.05.

TABLE V
PDI, MAS, and LTO part-worth values

Dependent variables	Independent variables				
	PDI	MAS overall	MAS female (respondent)	MAS male (respondent)	LTO
Interdependent-face	2.49	2.97	1.86	4.86	2.59
Other-face	2.66	3.36*	2.08	5.67	1.76
Self-face	0.52	1.05	1.78	0.27	2.80
Avoiding	2.26	0.75	1.60	0.74	1.32
Dominating	1.77	2.26	0.94	4.53	1.87
Integrating	2.73	3.55*	1.02	8.18*	1.18

Significance of part-worth utility means tested with a paired *t*-test.

**p* < 0.05.

TABLE VI
Relative importance of independent variables

Dependent variables	Independent variables				Total (%)
	PDI	MAS	LTO	NAT	
Interdependent-face	18.26	20.09	20.37	36.30	≈100
Other-face	18.51	19.20	19.27	36.99	≈100
Self-face	20.29	20.60	19.09	36.18	≈100
Avoiding	17.78	20.58	21.24	36.64	≈100
Dominating	19.92	19.66	20.90	36.76	≈100
Integrating	19.37	18.18	19.72	39.20	≈100

counterpart does not influence any of the dependent variables, leading us to reject Proposition 6 (Chinese respondents will show a stronger tendency to adopt interdependent negotiation tactics with a negotiator who shows a higher long-term orientation).

The relative importance of the independent attributes shows that nationality ranged from 36.18 to 39.20% (see Table VI). These percentages were consistently higher than the other three independent attributes. PDI ranged from 17.78 to 20.29%, MAS 18.18 to 20.09%, and LTO 19.09 to 21.24%. These three attributes show similar relative importance percentages, showing that their impact on respondent preferences did not differ. Nationality, on the other hand, considerably overshadowed the other three attributes.

Discussion

Results show that negotiators from a Chinese culture exhibit more cultural accommodation for a distant culture (American) than a near culture (Japanese) – paying more attention to sacrificing self-interest (interdependent-face) and saving face for the other side (other face). For both close and distant cultures, an emphasis on finding an integrative solution is obvious, with more stress on compromise, than a corresponding negotiation with Chinese counterparts. Irrelevant of the counterpart's nationality, saving face, ignoring conflict, and domination tactics are consistently valued by the negotiator. This emphasis is consistent with observations of Chinese negotiators' tendency to open negotiations

with self-face concerns and dominating tactics (Miles, 2003). These core values appear to be consistent – not affected by any framing of the negotiator’s counterpart.

Chinese respondents, simulating a negotiation, do not consider their counterpart’s rank as important enough to shift negotiation tactics, nor is a stated emphasis of a long-term relationship. However, when the counterpart is male, there is an increased emphasis on saving the counterpart’s face than when the counterpart is female. More interesting, a male counterpart encourages a shift toward integrative negotiation on the part a male Chinese negotiator. Put another way, a male Chinese negotiator is less likely to stress integrative negotiation tactics when facing a female than a male counterpart – irrespective of nationality. This is not the case for female Chinese negotiators, who show no difference in tactics among counterpart genders. Ko (1994) points to the Confucian gender ethic of Thrice Following, which states that a woman should be submissive to her father, husband, and son. Contemporary feminist values have certainly been adopted in China, Hong Kong, Taiwan, and Singapore, yet issues still exist for professional woman (Cheung and Liu, 1999; Fung, 2000; Kurman, 2001; Lee, 1999; Yeung et al., 1999), and the current results show an imbalance between Chinese male and female attitudes.

Recommendations

Overall, it is clear that the nationality of the negotiator’s counterpart is the most important factor studied here, and one that clearly has a role to play in actual negotiations. The sample frame was not experienced negotiators, but represented a cross-section of professionals in Taiwan. If a bias is strong across this sample, it is likely to influence not only negotiators, but also business transactions at many levels. Appearing similar to a country of origin effect, the counterpart’s nationality may be exploitable to gain a more favorable outcome. Yet such an issue is potentially complex, as in Warden’s (2002) findings that product descriptions in a Chinese environment when in English obtain a boost in ratings (language of origin effect) for more homogeneous products, but not for heterogeneous products. Potentially, a negotiator from a distant culture benefits when the topic is simple

or the negotiation is just beginning. In such a case, the Chinese negotiator may try the negotiation in English, which potentially activates higher levels of cultural accommodation, as in Bond’s (1983) findings. However, for longer or more complex negotiations, Chinese language may be used and translators employed, and the accommodation effect reduced. These issues are open for further exploration.

Limitations

Both power distance (PDI) and LTO results show patterns consistent with existing theory, although the online-simulated conjoint experiment may not have accurately reflected a real negotiation situation to produce statistically significant results. Although this is a limitation of the current research, the statistically significant results obtained show at least a strong cognitive bias influenced by nationality of the negotiator’s counterpart. Another limitation is the use of only one standardized negotiation context. As previously mentioned, different scenarios may have varying effects. Finally, the online graphic design may have diluted responses. To improve involvement levels, photos were included in the conjoint experiment – feedback from pretesting pointed to such photos being important. However, to avoid biasing, the photos were blurred and randomized, which may have lessened subconscious emotional reactions. Future research may attempt more detailed scenarios such as more realistic photos or even video.

Note

¹ According to Hofstede’s raw scores, Japanese, American, and Chinese values, before cluster analysis, show a mixed ranking, with Taiwan > Japan > USA in PDI and LTO, USA > Japan > Taiwan in IDV, Japan > USA > Taiwan in MAS, and Japan > Taiwan > USA in UAI.

Acknowledgments

National Science Council, Republic of China and Research Center for the Humanities and Social Sciences, National Chung Hsing University.

References

- Bond, M. H.: 1983, 'How Language Variation Affects Inter-Cultural Differentiation of Values in Hong Kong Bilinguals', *Journal of Language and Social Psychology* **2**, 57–66.
- Bond, M. H. and K. K. Hwang: 1986, *The Psychology of the Chinese People* (Oxford University Press, Hong Kong).
- Cha, S. H.: 2003, 'Modern Chinese Confucianism: The Contemporary Neo-Confucian Movement and Its Cultural Significance', *Social Compass* **50**(4), 481–491.
- Cheung, M. and M. Liu: 1999, 'The Self-Concept of Chinese Women and the Indigenization of Social Work in China', *International Social Work* **47**(1), 109–127.
- Chow, H. S. and I. Ng: 2004, 'The Characteristics of Chinese Personal Ties (Guanxi): Evidence from Hong Kong', *Organization Studies* **25**(7), 1075–1093.
- Deverge, M.: 1986, 'Negotiating with the Chinese', *Euro-Asia Business Review* **5**(1), 34–36.
- Fung, A.: 2000, 'Feminist Philosophy and Cultural Representation in the Asian Context', *Gazette* **62**(2), 153–165.
- Gudykunst, W. and S. Ting-Toomey: 1988, 'Culture and Active Communication', *American Behavioral Scientist* **31**, 384–400.
- Hofstede, G.: 1980, *Cultures Consequences* (Sage, Newbury Park, CA).
- Hofstede, G.: 1998, "Masculinity/Femininity as a Dimension of Culture", *Masculinity and Femininity: The Taboo Dimension of National Cultures* (SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA), pp. 3–28.
- Hofstede, G.: 2005, *Cultures and Organizations: Software of the Mind* (McGraw-Hill, London).
- Ko, D. Y.: 1994, *Teacher of the Inner Chambers: Women and Culture in China* (Stanford University Press, Stanford, CA), pp. 1573–1722.
- Kurman, J.: 2001, 'Self-Regulation Strategies in Achievement Settings: Culture and Gender Differences', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* **32**(4), 491–503.
- Lee, Z. N.: 1999, 'Korean Culture and Sense of Shame', *Transcultural Psychiatry* **36**(2), 181–194.
- Lee, J. W., P. S. Jones, Y. Y. Mineyama and X. E. Zhang: 2002, 'Cultural Differences in Responses to a Likert Scale', *Research in Nursing & Health* **25**(4), 295–306.
- Leung, K.: 1996, 'The Role of Beliefs in Chinese Culture', in M. H. Bond (ed.), *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology* (Oxford University Press, Hong Kong), pp. 247–253.
- Lo, M. C. and E. M. Otis: 2003, 'Guanxi Civility: Processes, Potentials, and Contingencies', *Politics & Society* **31**(1), 131–162.
- Ma, Z., X. Wang, A. Jaeger, T. Anderson, Y. Wang and D. Saunders: 2002, 'Individual, Perception, Bargaining Behavior, and Negotiation Outcomes: A Comparison across Two Countries', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* **2**(2), 171–184.
- Matsudaira, T.: 2003, 'Cultural Influences on the Use of Social Support by Chinese Immigrants in Japan: "Face" as a Keyword', *Qualitative Health Research* **13**(3), 343–357.
- Miles, M.: 2003, 'Negotiating with the Chinese: Lessons from the Field', *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* **39**(4), 453–472.
- Ng, S. H., A. B. M. Akhtar-Hoosain, P. Ball, M. H. Bond, K. Hayashi, S. P. Lim, M. P. O'Driscoll, D. Sinha and K. S. Yang: 1982, 'Human Values in Nine Countries', in P. Rath, H. S. Ashanta, D. Sinha and J. B. P. Sinha (eds.), *Diversity and Unity in Cross-Cultural Psychology* (Swets and Zeitlinger, Lisse, The Netherlands), pp. 196–205.
- Oetzel, J. G. and S. Ting-Toomey: 2003, 'Face Concerns in International Conflict: A Cross-Cultural Empirical Test of the Face Negotiation Theory', *Communication Research* **30**(6), 599–624.
- Pruitt, D. G. and J. Z. Rubin: 1986, *Social Conflict, Escalation, Stalemate and Settlement* (Random House, New York).
- Salacuse, J. W.: 1998, 'Ten Ways That Culture Affects Negotiating Style: Some Survey Results', *Negotiation Journal* **14**(3), 221–240.
- Stewart, S. M., M. H. Bond, O. Deeds and S. F. Chung: 1999, 'Intergenerational Patterns of Values and Autonomy Expectations in Cultures of Relatedness and Separateness', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* **30**(5), 575–593.
- Stuhlmacher, A. F. and A. E. Walters: 1999, 'Gender Differences in Negotiation Outcome: A Meta-Analysis', *Personnel Psychology* **52**(3), 653–677.
- Thompson, L. and R. Hastie: 1990, 'Social Perception in Negotiation', *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes* **47**, 98–123.
- Ting-Toomey, S.: 1998, 'Intercultural Conflict Styles: A Face-Negotiation Theory', in Y. Y. Kim and W. B. Gudykunst (eds.), *Theories in International Communication* (Sage, Newbury Park, CA), pp. 213–235.
- Tinsley, C. H.: 1997, 'Understanding Conflict in a Chinese Cultural Context', *Research on Negotiation in Organizations* **6**, 209–225.
- Warden, C., M. K. Lai and W. Y. Wu: 2002, 'How World-Wide Is Marketing Communication on the World Wide Web?', *Journal of Advertising Research* **42**(5), 72–84.
- Watson, R. E. and R. B. McKersie: 1965, *A Behavioral Theory of Labor Negotiations* (McGraw-Hill, New York).

Chinese Negotiation Variation

- Yan, J. and R. L. Sorenson: 2004, 'The Influence of Confucian Ideology on Conflict in Chinese Family Business', *International Journal of Cross Cultural Management* **4**(1), 5–17.
- Yang, K. S. and M. H. Bond: 1980, 'Ethnic Affirmation by Chinese Bilinguals', *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology* **11**, 411–425.
- Yeung, A., C. M. Ruby and W. K. Yu: 1999, 'Managing Social Exclusion', *International Social Work* **47**(4), 503–513.

Clyde A. Warden
Marketing Department,
National Chung Hsing University,
250, Kuo Kuang Road, Taichung, Taiwan
E-mail: cwarden@cwarden.org

Institute for Retail Studies,
University of Stirling,
Stirling, Scotland, U.K.

Judy F. Chen
Business Administration Department,
The Overseas Chinese University,
100 Chiao Kwang Road, Taichung, Taiwan
E-mail: jfc@ocu.edu.tw
(Corresponding author)