

National Research University Higher School of Economics

as a manuscript

Batkhina Anastasia

**Behavioral strategy choice in intercultural conflict: the role of values and
interaction context**

PhD Dissertation Summary
for the purpose of obtaining academic degree
Doctor of Philosophy in Psychology HSE

Academic supervisor:
Nadezhda Lebedeva
Prof., Doctor of Science

Moscow 2019

GENERAL DESCRIPTION OF THE DISSERTATION

The relevance of the research problem

Modern society in many countries is undergoing global sociocultural changes. Such processes as globalization, forced and voluntary migration, the development of international relations, an increase in the number of immigrants, more and more diverse and cultural heterogeneity and number of intercultural contacts (Gudykunst, 2002; Kim, 2005; Matsumoto & Hwang, 2015). As Stella Ting-Tumi notes: "... because of the rapid changes in the global economy, technology, transport and immigration policy, our world is turning into a small one, in which the community is also involved, and we find ourselves increasingly in contact with people from other cultures" (Ting-Toomey, 2010, p. 10). Unfortunately, mass interactions between different cultures, ethnic groups and denominations are often accompanied by the emergence of cultural misunderstandings, prejudices and conflicts (Blockand, 2003; Clark, 2012; Giannakos, 2008). In the 21st century, social problems such as local wars, genocide and discrimination, racial and ethnic segregation, xenophobia and violence are still relevant.

Interethnic tension in society manifests itself not only at the level of social groups but at the individual level, influencing how a particular member of society behaves in relation to representatives of other ethnocultural groups. Despite the fact that a large number of scientific works are devoted to the features of intercultural interaction and ways to improve it, the attention of researchers is usually drawn to the study of such phenomena as negative attitudes, prejudices and stereotypes, at that time how the behavioral aspect is not well understood (Bekerman, Zembylas, & McGlynn, 2009; Canetti et al., 2017). Such behavioral aspects include the behavior of participants in an intercultural conflict and its socio-psychological regulators, which have long been considered at the level of a theoretical construct and was not empirically substantiated (Ting-Toomey, 2010). However, like any other intercultural interaction, intercultural conflict has a number of features, and understanding the causes and motives of its participants is complicated by various factors (Bar-Tal et al., 2012; Kimmel, 2014). In

order to develop tools for the peaceful settlement of intercultural conflicts, it is necessary to understand the causes of their occurrence, the characteristics of the course and the specific behavior of their participants. Studying the predictors of the behavior of the parties to the conflict will help, on the one hand, broaden the understanding of the nature of intercultural conflicts and relations in general and establish the relationships between these predictors, and on the other hand, will help to understand what parameters should be considered when resolving conflicts of this kind.

Thus, the **problem** of the study is the lack of systematic psychological ideas about the predictors of strategies for conflict behavior in intercultural conflict, coupled with a high practical demand for studying this topic. This work aims to fill the existing gap and gain knowledge about the predictors of the choice of strategies for conflict behavior in intercultural conflict at different contextual levels - individual, situational and cultural.

The degree of scientific development of the problem

The study was based on the following theories: socio-ecological theories of intercultural conflict (Kim, 2005; Oetzel, Ting-Toomey, & Rinderle, 2006), the theory of individual values of Schwartz Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz et al, 2012, theories of intergroup anxiety (Stephan, 2014) and intercultural communication apprehension (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997).

In modern literature, intercultural conflict is defined as an interpersonal conflict arising in the process of intercultural communication due to cultural differences. Within the framework of the socio-ecological perspective to the study of intercultural conflicts, the necessity of studying this phenomenon at all four levels of social interaction - interpersonal, organizational, public, international, taking into account the predictors of these levels, is justified.

The contextual theory of interethnic communication by Kim (Kim, 2005) assumes the existence of a certain continuum of intercultural interaction, consisting of several contextual layers: behavior, personality traits of interaction participants, situational context, and sociocultural environment. The subject of intercultural communication can move around the context of the continuum and treat another person as either unique (for example, as a friend) or as a generalized member of an ethnic group (for example, as a

Mexican immigrant), respectively. Thus, the two poles of this continuum represent the ability of the subject of intercultural interaction to the individual and generalized perception of another participant in the interaction.

Within the framework of the “face negotiation” theory, S. Ting-Tumi (Ting-Toomey, 1988; 2004) intercultural conflict is understood as a situation requiring active management of the “face”, that is, social image, of two interdependent participants. The author of this theory also says that the participant’s desire to take care of his own “face” or “face” of a partner is influenced by factors of different contextual levels: cultural variability, individual characteristics and situational factors.

All studied predictors of strategy choice in a conflict can be divided into three large groups: personal factors (personality characteristics and traits, motivation, attitudes, gender, age, type of activity of the participant), situational factors (context of the situation, social roles, image of conflict and the other party) and sociocultural factors (normative, value, cultural components), which corresponds to different levels of interaction within the framework of socio-ecological theories. Based on a number of current studies (Anwaret et al., 2012; Antonioni, 1998; Moberg, 2001; Park & Antonioni, 2007; Barbuto et al., 2010), it can be assumed that the choice of strategy of behavior in a conflict is a product of socialization, cultural and individual values and norms affect, but in each specific situation contextual factors may also influence the choice of strategies of conflict behavior.

As a predictor of the first level (that is, the level of the communicator), we have chosen individual values. Values are functional motives of behavior, they define its goals and guide it (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Bilsky & Schwartz, 1994; Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1992; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014; Schwartz et al., 2017; Torres, Schwartz, & Nascimento, 2014). Thus, there is every reason to believe that it is the values, and not any other personality constructs, that will determine the strategies of behavior in intercultural conflict.

One of the most common and empirically proven theories of individual values is the theory of S. Schwartz (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Schwartz, 1992). Originally, Schwartz (1992) defined a continuum of 10 values that define the motivational basis of the

individual. He later refined his theory, expanding it to 19 values that form a motivational circle (Schwartz et al., 2012). Schwartz also believes that these 19 values belong to four higher-order values: Openness to Change, Conservation, Self-Enhancement, and Self-Transcendence.

As a predictor of the second level (situation level), we consider the intercultural communication apprehension and the ethnicity of the opponent in a conflict situation. Intercultural communication apprehension (ICA) is defined as the fear or anxiety associated with the expected or actual interaction with people from another ethnic or cultural group (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). Uncertainty in communication leads to anxiety, while uncertainty in communication with a person from another culture leads to anxiety in intercultural communication (Trawalter et al., 2012). As ICA gets stronger, people are less likely to engage in intercultural interaction (Neuliep & Ryan, 2008). This may lead to a decrease in tolerance and an increase in prejudice towards people from other cultures (Croucher, 2013). If ICA levels decline, then the desire to communicate with other cultures may increase (Turner, Crisp, & Lambert, 2007). The intercultural communication apprehension is, on the one hand, a communicative expression of the level of perceived threat (Croucher, 2013; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997), and, on the other hand, reflects the development of intercultural communicative competence (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003).

The aim of this research is to study personal and situational predictors of the choice of behavioral strategy behavior in intercultural conflict in Russia and Germany at different context levels.

Objectives of the research:

Theoretical objectives

To analyze the main theoretical approaches and empirical studies that study behavior in intercultural conflict and its predictors.

Methodological objectives

To develop a program and procedure for an empirical study of predictors of the choice of behavior strategy in intercultural conflict.

To prepare tools for the study of preferred strategies of behavior in intercultural conflict and their predictors - individual values and intercultural communication apprehension.

Empirical objectives

To conduct an empirical study of predictors of the choice of strategy for conflict behavior among the representatives of the national majority groups in situations of conflict with representatives of different ethnic groups in Russia and Germany.

To analyze the relationship of individual values and of intercultural communication apprehension with preferred behavioral strategies in intercultural conflict.

To identify the similarities and differences in the patterns of behavior of the national majority of Russia and Germany in intercultural conflict with representatives of different ethnic groups.

To conduct empirical research aimed at studying the role of situational and contextual features for choosing a strategy of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict.

To conduct a qualitative study of the choice of strategy of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict.

Object of the research: the behavioral strategy choice in intercultural conflict.

Subject of the research: the role of individual values and interaction context in the behavioral strategy choice in intercultural conflict.

General hypothesis: individual values and intercultural communication apprehension are predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict.

Private hypotheses:

Values of Self-Transcendence are positively associated with a preference for cooperative strategies of conflicting behavior (collaborating, accommodating) and negatively with a preference for noncooperative strategies of behavior (competing, avoiding).

Values of Self-Enhancement are positively associated with a preference for competing strategy and negatively with a preference for collaborating, avoiding, and accommodating.

Values of Openness to change are positively associated with a preference for assertive behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing) and negatively with a preference for passive behavioral strategies (avoiding, accommodating).

Values of Conservation are positively associated with the preference for passive behavioral strategies (avoiding, accommodating) and negatively with the preference for assertive behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing).

The intercultural communication apprehension is positively associated with a preference for passive noncooperative behavioral strategies (avoiding) and negatively with a preference for assertive and / or cooperative behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing, accommodating).

The following research questions were also raised:

Is the choice of behavior strategy in intercultural conflict contextual, that is, depends on which ethnic group is in conflict and what is the subject of this conflict?

Are the relationships between predictors and the choice of behavior strategy in intercultural conflict universal for both countries?

The theoretical and methodological base of the study was:

Theoretical approaches to the study of the phenomenon of conflict and the peculiarities of the behavior of its participants in domestic and foreign psychology (N. V. Grishina, L. A. Petrovskaya, B. I. Hasan, J. Rubin, D. Pruitt, M. Deutsch, K. Thomas, E. van de Vliert).

Theories of intercultural communication and intercultural conflict (C. Ting-Toumi, J. Oetzel, J. Kim, M. Hammer, E. Kramer, E. Halperin, D. Bar-Tal).

The theory of individual values of S. Schwartz.

Theoretical concepts and empirical studies of intergroup anxiety (W. Stefan, C. Stefan) and intercultural communication apprehension (J. Neuliep, D. MacCroskey, S. Croucher).

Domestic and foreign studies in the field of intergroup perception, stereotypes and intergroup relations (S. Fisk, T.F. Pettigrew, L. Tropp, F. van de Vijver, N.M. Lebedeva, G.U. Soldatova).

Socioecological perspective in psychology to the study of interpersonal and intercultural interaction (U. Brofenbrenner, J. Berry).

Approaches to the study of the relationship between cultural characteristics and behavior in a conflict (D. Tjusfold, S. Ting-Toomey, K. Leung, W. Stefan).

Methods of the research

To perform the tasks, a combination of qualitative and quantitative methods of socio-psychological research was applied.

The following methodological tools were used:

Methods and scales for the quantitative measurement of the studied socio-psychological constructs. The Rahim (ROCI-II) Organizational Conflict Inventory (1983) modified by J. Oetzel et al. (2003) for intercultural conflict to measure preferred conflict behavior strategies. The updated Schwartz PVQ-R value questionnaire (Schwartz et al., 2012) for measuring individual values. The scale of of intercultural communication apprehension by J. Neuliep and D. McCrosky (1997).

The method of vignettes to study the situational influence on the preference for strategies of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict. Vignettes were developed according to a specific procedure for both countries.

Method of semi-structured interview for the qualitative stage of the study.

The quasi-experiment method using simulation of a non-zero-sum game (“trust game”) as an auxiliary indirect method for studying conflict behavior.

Techniques that were not originally presented in Russian or German languages were translated and adapted to the Russian and German samples, respectively. The procedure was carried out using the techniques of direct and reverse translation and cognitive interview using the “think-aloud” method (reasoning out loud) (Jones & Kay, 1992). All the techniques presented in German, passed an additional expert assessment by native German speakers.

The reliability and reliability of the results obtained is ensured by the theoretical and methodological validity of the methods used and the representativeness of the sample.

Methods of statistical data processing: descriptive statistics, private correlation analysis, exploratory and confirmator factor analysis, hierarchical regression analysis,

network analysis, paired Student's t-test, analysis of variance ANOVA & MANOVA, linear analysis of mixed models. The software used was SPSS 24.0 statistical packages and the R statistical environment.

The empirical base of the study: representatives of the national majority of Russia and Germany in the amount of $n = 1654$. The total number of respondents in Russia is $n = 1051$ (392 men, 659 women, aged 18 to 56 years). The total number of respondents in Germany is $n = 624$ (283 men, 341 women, aged 18 to 64 years). All respondents completed an anonymous online questionnaire created on google, anketolog.ru and socisurvey.de platforms. A semi-structured interview was conducted during a full-time or online (with the help of Skype) conversations with respondents. Respondents were attracted using the snowball strategy, as well as on paid platforms (socisurvey.de, anketolog.ru), operating on the Amazon Mechanical Turk principle where respondents receive a certain cash reward for completing the questionnaire.

Scientific novelty

Theories of intercultural communication (S. Ting-Toomey, J. Kim) and the theory of individual values (S. Schwartz) are combined to study behavioral strategies in intercultural conflict.

The Rahim organizational conflict inventory (ROCI-II) in the modification of J. Oetzel et al. Was adapted to the Russian sample for intercultural conflict and the scale of fears of intercultural communication by J. Neuliep and D. McCrosky.

The interrelations of individual values, of intercultural communication apprehension with strategies of behavior in intercultural conflict were studied.

Preferred behavioral strategies in intercultural conflict with representatives of different ethnic groups among the national majority of Russia and were studied.

Comparative study of the preferred strategies of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict in Russia and Germany was conducted.

The statistical network analysis method was used to study predictors of strategies for conflict behavior in intercultural conflict.

The theoretical significance of the work lies in the fact that the theoretical ideas about the predictors of strategies of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict were expanded at different contextual levels - individual, situational, and cultural.

The practical implication of the study is that the results can be used:

- for the prevention and resolution of intercultural conflicts,
- for conducting trainings on ethnic tolerance and intercultural communication,
- for developing recommendations to state and non-profit organizations dealing with the problems of interethnic relations, adaptation of refugees and migrants.

Basic ideas of the dissertation to be defended:

1. Individual values are universal predictors of the choice of strategies for conflict behavior in intercultural conflict. The values of Self-Transcendence are positively related to the preference for collaborating in both samples and the preference for accommodating in the German sample. In the Russian sample, values Self-Transcendence are negatively associated with a preference for competing strategies. Values of Self-Enhancement are positively associated with a preference for competing strategies in both samples and in all situations. Values of Openness to change are positively associated with a preference for assertive behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing). Values of Conservation are positively related to the preference for avoiding in both samples and the preference for accommodating and cooperation in the German sample.

2. The intercultural communication apprehension is positively associated with a preference for avoiding and negatively with a preference for collaborating. At the same time, these relationships vary depending on the ethnic affiliation of the opponent of intercultural conflict. The choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict is contextually and culturally determined, that is, it depends on which ethnic group is represented and for what reason the conflict occurs.

Approbation and introduction of the results:

The content of the work was discussed at the scientific seminars of the International Research and Training Laboratory for Socio-Cultural Research at HSE “Culture Matters”, at the VII International Summer School “From Proposal to Submission: Design of Cross-Cultural Study” at HSE (2017), at the VIII International Summer School “Design of

Cross-Cultural Study” HSE (2018). The results of the work were also presented at the International Scientific Conference of Young Scientists “Psychology - Science of the Future” (Institute of Psychology, RAS, Moscow, 2017), at the V and VI international scientific conferences “Culture in Society, Between Groups and Across Generations” (Moscow, 2018, 2019), at the International Winter School BIGSSS-Live Winter School “Life Course” (Bremen, 2018).

Dissertation structure:

The thesis consists of two chapters, contains an introduction and conclusion, a list of references (275 sources, of which 24 are in Russian, 250 are in English, and 1 is in German) and 4 applications. The work includes 15 drawings and 10 tables. The total amount of the text of the thesis is 221 pages.

Publications: The dissertation materials are presented in 3 publications. Of these, 2 publications in Russian in journals recommended by HSE, and 1 publication in English in a journal from the WoS / Scopus list

MAIN CONTENT OF THE DISSERTATION

Conflicts are an integral part of any social interaction and communication. The emergence and progression of conflicts between representatives of different cultures is complicated by the presence of a large number of factors and conditions that influence this process. Systematization of antecedents of the dynamics of intercultural conflicts is necessary both for a deeper understanding of the features of intercultural interaction, and for leveling and reducing the risk of conflicts in the process of intercultural communication.

The study of this problem dictates the use of an integrated and systematic approach, involving the integration of various theoretical backgrounds and research tools, to form a holistic view of behavior in intercultural conflict, which is the foundation of the present study.

The **Introduction** reflects the relevance of the research topic, as well as the degree of its development in domestic and foreign psychological literature. There are identified the object, subject and objectives of the study; the research tasks and methodology are described. Provisions are given for protection, the characteristic of scientific novelty of dissertational research is given, and its theoretical and practical significance is indicated

The aim of this study is to investigate the universal and specific for intercultural interaction predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict in Russia and Germany.

The theoretical part of the study is presented in the chapter “**Theoretical Approaches to the Study of Predictors of Behavior in Intercultural Conflict**”, which systematizes the existing approaches to the study of intercultural conflicts in modern domestic and foreign literature. The content of this chapter also analyzes models and patterns of behavior in the context of conflict behavior in general and intercultural conflict in particular. In addition, the first chapter summarizes the approaches to the study of predictors of conflict behavior, separately considered such predictors as individual values and the fear of intercultural communication in the context of the research subject.

The first paragraph “**The main approaches to the research of intercultural conflict in modern psychology**” systematizes the existing ideas about intercultural

conflict and gives a definition of this socio-psychological category from the point of view of various theories.

The definition of intercultural conflict as an interpersonal conflict arising in the process of intercultural communication due to cultural differences is given.

The socio-ecological perspective to the research of intercultural conflicts is considered in most detail. It justifies the need to study this phenomenon at all four levels of social interaction - interpersonal, organizational, social, international, taking into account the predictors of these levels.

As a key model, revealing the nature of intercultural conflict, the paragraph considers the conceptual model of the theory of interethnic communication by J. Kim and the theory of “the face negotiation” S. Ting-Toomey. The contextual theory of interethnic communication by Kim (Kim, 2005) assumes the existence of a certain continuum of intercultural interaction, consisting of several contextual layers: behavior, personality traits of interaction participants, situational context, and sociocultural environment.

Within the framework of the “face negotiation” theory by S. Ting-Toomey (Ting-Toomey, 1988; 2004) intercultural conflict is understood as a situation requiring active management of the “face”, that is, social image, of two interdependent participants. The author of this theory also says that the participant’s desire to take care of his own “face” or “face” of a partner is influenced by factors of different contextual levels: cultural variability, individual characteristics and situational factors.

The conflict crisis model S.A.F.E. is also considered as an applied model of intercultural conflict. Hammer and Rogan (Rogan & Hammer, 2002), showed the effectiveness of its practical application and, at the same time, its limitations as a theoretical explanatory model.

In the second paragraph **“Socio-psychological approaches to investigation of behavior in intercultural conflict”**, a full analysis of the existing patterns of personality behavior in interpersonal conflict was conducted, the advantages and disadvantages of these approaches were critically evaluated, their empirical validity was indicated.

As the most frequently used model in socio-psychological research, a two-dimensional model of double interest was considered (Rubin, Pruitt, & Kim, 2003), as

well as five basic styles of personality behavior, which it includes: collaborating, competing, compromise, avoiding, accommodating. The motives for choosing each of these strategies were identified that is an important theoretical basis for our study.

Separately, alternative theories describing conflict behavior are considered: an estimated productivity assessment (Pruitt & Rubin, 1986) and Deutsch's motivational model (Deutsch, 2014), developed in the framework of game theory and social dilemmas.

Also strategies of conflict behavior developed specifically for intercultural conflict were considered - the model of intercultural conflict M. Hammer (Hammer, 2005) and the model of "face negotiation" by S. Ting-Toomey (Ting-Toomey et al., 2000). M. Hammer proposes to allocate two orientations of behavior in intercultural conflict: 1) behavior, which reflects direct or indirect approaches to the discussion of existing differences; 2) behavior that reflects more emotional and more restrained ways of expressing the feelings of the parties to each other. In turn, the theory of S. Ting-Toomey suggests that strategies of behavior in intercultural conflict may have two loci - be directed to their own image and carry individualistic values in their basis, and may be aimed at maintaining the image of the other and based on collectivist installations.

The catalyst for the use of various strategies described in models of conflicting behavior is a whole range of different predictors, which was the subject of the next section.

In the third paragraph **"Research of predictors of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict"**, the main determinants and regulators were studied, determining the choice of a specific strategy of behavior in conflict interaction.

It was concluded that all the studied predictors of strategy choice in a conflict can be divided into three large groups: personal factors (personality traits and characteristics, motivation, attitudes, gender, age, type of activity of the participant), situational factors (context of the situation, social roles, the image of the conflict and the other side) and socio-cultural factors (normative, value, cultural components), which corresponds to different levels of interaction within the framework of socio-ecological theories. Studies examining predictors from each of these groups were analyzed.

According to the results of a theoretical study, it was assumed that the choice of

strategy of behavior in a conflict is a product of socialization, which is influenced by cultural and individual values and norms but in each specific situation contextual factors may also influence the choice of strategy of conflict behavior.

In the subparagraph **“Personal predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict”**, the influence of personality traits, gender, age, emotional intelligence and the choice of strategy of behavior in a conflict was considered in detail. Special attention was paid to individual values, in connection with this, the personal values theory by Schwartz (Schwartz, 1992; 2012) was analyzed, and the rationale for the need to consider values as behavioral motives and, consequently, as predictors of strategy choice in conflict was given.

In the subparagraph **“Situational predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict”** the following situational predictors were analyzed: the goals of the parties, the parties' perception of each other, the emotional component of the conflict, the subject of the conflict. Special attention was paid to a specific predictor for intercultural conflict – the intercultural communication apprehension. A rationale was also given why this indicator should be considered as a predictor of the situational level.

In subsection **“Socio-cultural predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict”**, the relationship between different cultural dimensions and predictors of choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict was considered.

In the paragraph **“The author's approach to the study of predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict. Hypotheses of the study”**, presents a theoretical justification for the hypotheses of the study. It was assumed that the values and fear of intercultural communication will be predictors of the choice of strategy of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict. It was also assumed that the choice of strategy of behavior in an intercultural conflict is contextual, that is, it depends on the representative of which ethnic group and on what occasion the conflict occurs.

In the second chapter **“Empirical study of predictors of behavior choice in intercultural conflict”** examines the stages of the study, describes the methods used, provides characteristics of the sample and descriptive statistics of variables, analyzes the main results, discusses their discussion and conclusions of the study.

At the beginning of the paragraph, a description is given of the Russian and German sociocultural context, as well as the characteristics of interethnic relations in the territory of these countries. The rationale for the selection of these countries for the study is presented. Modern Russia is one of the most multicultural countries in the world: according to the 2010 census, more than 220 ethnic groups live on its territory (Karachurina & Mkrtchyan, 2017). In addition, according to the UN (OECD, 2014), Russia ranks third in the number of immigrants. According to the same data (OECD, 2014), Germany ranks second in the world after the United States in terms of the number of immigrants. The total number of immigrants to Germany from 2006 to 2014 was about 4.4 million people. Since 2015, refugees and forced migrants from the Middle East, primarily from Syria, have been added to the usual flow of labor and voluntary immigrants (UNRA, 2016).

The subparagraph “**Design of empirical research**” provides a brief description of the three studies carried out as part of this work, and also describes a general methodological concept that combines the research performed. The assumption is described that in this paper we study attitudes toward conflict behavior, and not the conflict behavior itself.

The paragraph “**Method and procedure of research**” contains a methodological description of all three empirical research. The research procedure is outlined and substantiated, key methods and methods are described, and the general characteristics of the sample for each of the proposed research stages are presented.

The main study was conducted in two countries - Russia and Germany; three samples were collected in each country. Each sample was offered an identical questionnaire, which included the Schwarz PVQ-R value questionnaire (Schwartz et al., 2012), the scale for intercultural communication apprehension (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997), and Rahim's ROI-II organizational conflict inventory modified by J. Oetzel (Oetzel, 2003). The samples differed in what culture they represented the conflict with and representative of their intended behavior, respectively. The Russians were asked to evaluate their behavior in a conflict with a representative of the North Caucasian ethnic groups / Russian / Chinese, respectively, and the German participants represented a

conflict with a Syrian migrant / German / Chinese.

As a research method of the second study was chosen the method of vignettes. The study was conducted only in Russia, 420 Russians took part in it. The participants were asked to evaluate their behavior in four conflict situations: 1) a conflict with a neighbor in the stairwell due to loud noise; 2) the conflict with the girl in the bus because of her tactless behavior; 3) a conflict with a roommate due to confusion; 4) conflict with a man in the parking lot. The respondents were randomly divided into two groups: the first group evaluated their intended behavior and the behavior of a typical representative of Russian culture in conflict with a representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus, and the second group evaluated behavior in similar situations in conflict with a Russian.

Also procedure for conducting a qualitative study of behavior in intercultural conflict using the method of semi-structured interview was described. This study was conducted in both countries - in Russia and Germany. The qualitative research has expanded our understanding of possible behavioral strategies in intercultural conflict. The interview was conducted according to the following scheme: the interviewee was asked to imagine that he / she had fallen into a cross-cultural conflict. A brief explanation was also given that an intercultural conflict is a conflict with a representative of another ethnic group due to certain cultural differences or misunderstandings. The respondent was also told that in this conflict he is in his country and represents the majority culture, respectively. The interviewee was asked how he / she behaves in this situation and why he / she decided to behave in this situation that way. The study involved 15 Russian and 21 German.

Hierarchical regression analysis, comparative and network analysis, t-test, and Manova were used as the main statistical methods. The total sample of the study was 1654 subjects. At the initial stage, the validation questionnaire of the organizational conflict of M. Rahim ROI-II was modified by J. Oetzel for the Russian and German samples.

The paragraph **“Qualitative research of preferred strategies of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict”** includes information about the strategies described by the respondents partly corresponded to the double-interest model, for example, the subjects quite clearly described the categories of avoiding, collaborating and competing. At the

same time, features were found that are characteristic in our opinion, primarily for intercultural conflict, for example, the strategy of “teaching cultural norms”. Summarizing, we can say that in the answers of the subjects one can see a different motivation for choosing one or another strategy of conflict behavior. Conventionally, we have divided this motivation into three categories: 1) the motivation of conformism is to follow conventional norms and rules, “not causing” inconvenience and discomfort to another person; 2) protection motivation against threats (threats to security, culture, and values); 3) emancipative motivation - maintaining equality, respect and mutual assistance. This description echoes the results of the quantitative research presented in this paper.

The paragraph **“Investigation of the relationship of individual values, fears of intercultural communication and the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict”** consistently outlines all aspects of the main empirical research.

A comparative analysis showed that for the Russian sample significant differences were found ($F = 6.89, p = .001$) in the preference for the competing strategy. She received the greatest preference in conflict with a representative of their ethnic group, then in a conflict in the Chinese, and finally with a representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus. We see exactly the same picture regarding the dominance strategy for the German sample ($F = 14.46, p < .001$).

For the Russian sample, there are also significant differences in the preference for the strategy of accommodating ($F = 16.49, p < .001$). This strategy received the greatest preference in conflict with the Chinese, the least one with the representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus.

In the German sample, significant differences are observed for the avoiding strategy ($F = 47.6, p < .001$). This strategy is most preferred in the conflict with the Syrian refugee and least of all - with the Chinese.

Hierarchical regression analysis showed that for the preference of each strategy, as a rule, one or two values have the greatest explanatory power, while the others do not have any significant links with this strategy at all. This result was repeated regardless of the ethnicity of the opponent in the conflict.

The values of Self-Transcendence are positively related to the preference for collaborating in both samples and the preference for accommodating in the German sample. In the Russian sample, values Self-Transcendence are negatively associated with a preference for competing strategies. Values of Self-Enhancement are positively associated with a preference for competing strategies in both samples and in all situations. Values of Openness to change are positively associated with a preference for assertive behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing). Values of Conservation are positively related to the preference for avoiding in both samples and the preference for accommodating and cooperation in the German sample.

The situational and cultural features of the interrelationships between the studied variables were also discovered. The results are discussed in terms of theoretical justification and context features.

The paragraph **“Study of situational factors of strategies of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict”** is aimed at studying the situational influence on the choice of strategy of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict.

In both Russian samples, respondents, on average, assessed their own behavior as more cooperative, and the behavior of a representative of Russian culture as more aggressive. A linear analysis of the mixed model for each strategy of behavior on 2 interindividual factors (ethnicity of the opponent and gender of the respondent) and on one intraindividual factor (context of the situation) showed that for all strategies (both when evaluating one’s own behavior and when assessing the behavior of typical representative of Russian culture) there are significant intra-individual differences at the level of $p < .001$. Thus, the behavior of the respondents has a steady dependence on the situation.

It was found that, in general, regardless of the situation, there is a joint influence of the factors of the opponent’s gender and ethnicity on the preference for avoiding and accommodating. Women more often prefer an avoiding strategy in a situation of conflict with a Russian, rather than with a representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus. At the same time, they use the strategy of accommodating with the Russians less often than

with Caucasians. For men, we see a "mirror image." The influence of the situational factor on the preference of all strategies was also discovered.

In the paragraph **“General discussion of the study of predictors of the choice of behavior strategy in intercultural conflict”**, the rationale of the results is given in stages. It is noted that in this study an attempt was made to study the predictors of conflict behavior in intercultural conflict at different levels of intercultural interaction - interpersonal, situational, sociocultural. We used a comparative perspective, analyzing Germany and Russia, to establish some universal models and to provide a more holistic view of the phenomenon under study. It should be noted once again that we did not study real behavior, but rather considered behavioral attitudes in intercultural conflict. The associations of these preferences of strategies of conflict behavior with individual values and the fear of intercultural communication in two different countries in situations of conflict with representatives of different ethnic groups were analyzed.

For both countries, a recurring and sufficiently significant positive relationship was revealed between the following value pairs and strategies of conflict behavior: values Self-Transcendence - collaborating, values of Self-Enhancement - competing and values of Conservation - avoiding. Values are functional motives of behavior, the choice of strategy of behavior is also largely due to the motivation of interaction, which is manifested in the dichotomy of cooperative - competitive motives and motivations of assertiveness - flexibility. For example, the key goal of competing is “victory” over the other side, a demonstration of one’s own strength and strength, the struggle for a place in the social hierarchy — a competitive motive (Rahim & Magner, 1995). All these motivational orientations are also contained in the values of Self-Enhancement (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014).

Collaborating in terms of motivational conditionality is a more complex poly-motivated strategy. It is based on the cooperative motive of maintaining good relations and respecting the other side, which corresponds to universalistic motives in the terminology of S. Schwartz. In addition, cooperation involves the motivation of assertive behavior - the desire to defend their point of view, to be heard by the other party. Such motivational orientations correspond to the values of openness to change. But, as our

research has shown, the choice of cooperation may also be based on other motives, unforeseen by the double interest model, that are the motives of conformity and modesty (not harming the other side) that correspond to the values of Conservation in the theory of S. Schwartz.

As can be seen when analyzing the motivational content of strategies, these values may indeed underlie the goals of these strategies. Moreover, a similar structure manifested itself in both countries and in an interpersonal conflict with a representative of his own ethnic group. This allows us to assume that values are universal predictors of behavior in different, and not only in intercultural conflicts.

As for the specific predictor of intercultural communication - ICA, here we can say that it does not manifest itself for all strategies. Perhaps this is due to the asymmetry of the predictors of strategies for conflict behavior, namely, the fact that the choice of some strategies is largely determined by personality traits, and some - situational. However, for all situations studied, the intercultural communication apprehension is a serious obstacle to the use of cooperation.

In both countries, we also see that the preference for using strategies of conflict behavior varies depending on which ethnic group is an opponent in the conflict. So, in both countries, dominance is most actively intended to be used in conflict with a representative of their own ethnic group. We attribute this to the fact that in this interaction there is no intergroup anxiety, respectively, the parties can afford more aggressive behavior. Moreover, in both countries, in conflict with the Chinese, collaborating is more preferred than in conflict with Caucasians or Syrians. As the game of confidence showed, Russians trust the Chinese significantly higher than the representatives of the peoples of the North Caucasus. A higher level of trust may encourage more cooperative strategies of conflict behavior.

At the same time, of course, the different conflict conditions for the two countries and the different history of inter-ethnic relations in these countries postpone their imprint on the preference for strategies of conflict behavior and the deep motivation of these preferences. The study of the vignettes also confirmed the importance of the situational factor for the choice of strategies of conflict behavior.

The results confirm the idea of the choice of strategies of conflict behavior as a complex phenomenon, which can be affected by all three groups of factors - dispositional, situational and cultural. In addition, our data fit well into the socio-ecological context, which suggests that intercultural conflict unfolds on several levels at the same time.

The main value of this work we see is that the study made it possible to take a different look at the nature of the motives for choosing a strategy of behavior in interpersonal conflict in general and in intercultural conflict in particular. It was found that in order to explain the preference of a particular strategy, it is not enough to operate with only two motives from the double-interest model - the desire for cooperation and assertiveness. Our study showed that the choice of behavior strategies is associated with different social motives — status, autonomy, group affiliation, concern for others, security, learning new things, justice (Aunger & Kurtis, 2013). There is a combination of several motives in the choice of each strategy, however, we assume that they have a different “specific weight”. We also see that intercultural conflict is not just another type of interpersonal conflict, it has its own specifics. Depending on who the conflict is with, the motivation for choosing strategies may vary. For example, as was shown, if a group with a representative of which a conflict occurs is perceived as threatening or unpredictable, the fear of intercultural communication begins to play an important role in the strategy selection system. In our opinion, this is because this concern actualizes the security motive. If the opponent in the conflict seems less threatening, other motives may begin to emerge. Thus, our study confirmed the importance of the interaction context as a whole set of conditions that can act as prerequisites for choosing a particular strategy. This emphasizes the need for further systematic study of the problem, a holistic view of human behavior as a phenomenon, due to the antecedents of completely different levels - personal characteristics, a complex of conditions of the situation, a global socio-cultural context.

In the **Conclusion** the main results of the research are summarized, its limitations are listed, and prospects for further study of this topic are described.

MAIN CONCLUSIONS ON THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY

The main hypothesis that individual values and the fear of intercultural communication are predictors of the choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict has been confirmed. However, we can assume that values are universal predictors of behavior in conflicts of different types.

The values of Self-Transcendence are positively related to the preference for collaborating in both samples and the preference for accommodating in the German sample. In the Russian sample, values Self-Transcend are negatively associated with a preference for competing strategies.

Values of Self-Enhancement are positively associated with a preference for competing strategies in both samples and in all situations.

Values of Openness to change are positively associated with a preference for assertive behavioral strategies (collaborating, competing).

Conservation values are positively related to the preference for avoiding in both samples and the preference for accommodating and cooperation in the German sample.

The intercultural communication apprehension is positively associated with a preference for avoiding and negatively with a preference for collaborating. At the same time, these relationships vary depending on the ethnic affiliation of the opponent of intercultural conflict.

The choice of strategy of behavior in intercultural conflict is contextually and culturally determined, that is, it depends on which ethnic group is represented and for what reason the conflict occurs. For the Russian sample, significant differences were found in the preference for the competing strategy. She received the greatest preference in conflict with a representative of her ethnic group, then in a conflict in the Chinese, and finally with a representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus. For the Russian sample, there are also significant differences in the preference for the accommodating strategy. The strategy of accommodating received the greatest preference in conflict with the Chinese, the smallest with the representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus. In the German sample, significant differences are observed for the avoiding strategy. This strategy is most preferred in the conflict with the Syrian refugee and least of all with the

Chinese. German respondents most clearly prefer the strategy of competing in conflict with compatriots, and the least in conflict with Syrian refugees.

It was found that, in general, regardless of the situation, there is a joint influence of the factors of the opponent's gender and ethnicity on the preference for avoiding and accommodating. Women more often prefer an avoiding strategy in a situation of conflict with a Russian, rather than with a representative of the peoples of the North Caucasus. At the same time, they use the strategy of accommodating with the Russians less often than with Caucasians. In men, we see a "mirror image." The influence of the situational factor on the preference of all strategies was also discovered.

The qualitative study showed that the strategies described by the respondents partly correspond to the double-interest model, for example, the subjects quite clearly described the categories of avoiding, collaborating and competing. At the same time, features were found that are characteristic in our opinion, primarily for intercultural conflict, for example, the strategy of "teaching cultural norms". Summarizing, we can say that in the answers of the subjects one can see a different motivation for choosing one or another strategy of conflict behavior. Conventionally, we have divided this motivation into three categories: 1) the motivation of conformism is to follow conventional norms and rules, "not causing" inconvenience and discomfort to another person; 2) protection motivation against threats (threats to security, culture, and values); 3) emancipative motivation - maintaining equality, respect and mutual assistance. This description echoes the results of the quantitative research presented in this paper.

The work was done in the Department of Psychology of the Federal State Autonomous Educational Institution of Higher Education “National Research University Higher School of Economics”.

The main provisions of the study are reflected in the publications of the author:

Batkina A. A. Strategies of behavior in intercultural conflict: a review of foreign studies // *Social Psychology and Society*. 2017. V. 8. No. 3. P. 45-62. [In Russian]

Batkina A. A., Lebedeva N. M. Values and intergroup anxiety as predictors of the choice of strategy for the behavior of Russians in intercultural conflict // *Social Psychology and Society*. 2019. V. 10. No. 1. P. 70-91. [In Russian]

Grigoryev D., van de Vijver F., Batkhina A. Discordance of acculturation attitudes of immigrants // *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research*. 2018. Vol. 47. No. 6. P. 491-509.

REFERENCES

1. Antonioni D. Relationship between the big five personality factors and conflict management styles // *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 1998. T. 9 № 4. C. 336–355.
2. Anwar M., Shahzad K., Ijaz-ul-Rehman Q. Managing conflicts through personality management // *African Journal of Business Management*. 2012. T. 6. № 10. C. 3725–3732.
3. Barbuto J.E., Phipps K.A., Xu Y. Testing relationships between personality, conflict styles and effectiveness // *International Journal of Conflict Management*. 2010. T. 21. № 4. C. 434–447.
4. Bardi A., Schwartz S.H. Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations // *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*. 2003. № 29. P. 1207–1220.
5. Bar-Tal D., Halperin E., Sharvit K., Zafran A. Ethos of conflict: The concept and its measurement // *Peace and Conflict: Journal of Peace Psychology*. 2012. № 18. C. 40–61.
6. Bekerman Z., Zembylas M., McGlynn C. Working toward the de-essentialization of identity categories in conflict and postconflict societies: Israel, Cyprus, and Northern Ireland // *Comparative Education Review*. 2009. № 53. C. 213–234.
7. Bilsky W., Schwartz S.H. Values and personality // *European Journal of Personality*. 1994. T. 8. № 3. C. 163–181.
8. Canetti D., Elad-Strenger J., Lavi I., Guy D., Bar-Tal D. Exposure to violence, ethos of conflict, and support for compromise // *Journal of Conflict Resolution*. 2017. T. 61. № 1. C. 84–113.
9. Clark J.N. The ‘crime of crimes’: Genocide, criminal trials and reconciliation // *Journal of Genocide Research*. 2012. № 14. P. 55–77.
10. Croucher S.M. Communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate: A French analysis // *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication*. 2013. № 6. P. 298–316.

11. Davidov E., Meuleman B., Billiet J., Schmidt P. Values and support for immigration: A cross-country comparison // *European Sociological Review*. 2008. T. 24. P. 583–599.
12. Deutsch M. Cooperation and competition // *The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice* / Под ред. Coleman P.T., Deutsch M., Marcus E.C. Jossey-Bass, 2014. С. 23–43.
13. Erickson R.J. The importance of authenticity for self and society // *Symbolic Interaction*. 1995. T. 18. № 2. С. 121–144.
14. Grigor'ev D.S. Cennosti, social'naya distanciya i ustanovki po otnosheniyu k migracii: kross-kul'turnoe issledovanie v Bel'gii, Germanii, Francii i Niderlandah [Values, social distance and attitudes towards migration: a cross-cultural study in Belgium, Germany, France and the Netherlands] // *Psihologiya. ZHurnal Vyshej shkoly ekonomiki*. 2016. T. 13. № 2. С. 273–298.
15. Grigoryan L.K., Gorinova E.V. Faktornyj opros: preimushchestva, oblast' primeneniya, prakticheskie rekomendacii [Factor survey: advantages, scope, practical recommendations] // *Social'naya psihologiya i obshchestvo*. 2016. T. 7. № 2. С. 142–157.
16. Gudykunst W.B. *Theorizing About Intercultural Communication*. SAGE Publications. 2004. 480 с.
17. Hammer M.R. The Developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research // *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2015. T. 48. С. 12–13.
18. Hammer M.R., Bennett M.J. Wiseman R. Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory // *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2003. T. 27. P. 421–443.
19. Hitlin S., Piliavin J.A. Values: reviving a dormant concept // *Annual Review of Sociology*. 2004. T. 30. № 1. С. 359–393.
20. Inglehart R. *The Silent Revolution. Changing Values and Political Styles among Western Publics*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press. 1977. 496 с.

21. Karachurina L. B., Mkrtchyan N. V. (2017). Vnutrennyaya dolgovremennaya migraciya naseleniya v Rossii i drugih stranah [Internal longitudinal migration of the population in Russia and other countries] // MSU Vestnik. 2017. № 2. С. 74–80.
22. Kim Y.Y. Association and dissociation: A contextual theory of interethnic communication // Theorizing about Intercultural Communication / W.B. Gudykunst. Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. 2005. P. 323–349.
23. Kimmel P. Culture and conflict // The Handbook of Conflict Resolution: Theory and Practice / Под ред. Coleman P.T., Deutsch M., Marcus E.C. Jossey-Bass, 2014. С. 625–649.
24. Maio G.R. Pakizeh A., Cheung W.Y., Rees K.J. Changing, priming, and acting on values: Effects via motivational relations in a circular model // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 2009. Т. 97. № 4. С. 699–715.
25. Maslow A.H. The instinctoid Nature of basic needs // Journal of Personality. 1954. Т. 22. № 3. С. 326–347.
26. Matsumoto D., Hwang H.C. The role of contempt in intercultural communication // Cross-Cultural Research. 2015. Т. 40. № 5. С. 439–460.
27. Moberg P.J. Linking conflict strategy to the five-factor model: Theoretical and empirical foundations // International Journal of Conflict Management. 2001. Т. 12. № 1. С. 47–68.
28. Neuliep J.W., McCroskey D. The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales // Communication Research Reports. 1997. № 14. С. 145–156.
29. Neuliep J.W., Ryan D.J. The influence of intercultural communication apprehension and socio-communicative orientation on uncertainty reduction during initial cross-cultural interaction // Communication Quarterly. 1998. № 46. С. 88–99.
30. Oetzel J., Myers K., Meares M., Estefana L. Interpersonal conflict in organizations: Exploring conflict styles via face-negotiation theory // Communication Research Reports. 2003. Т. 20. № 2. С. 106–115.

31. Oetzel J.G., Ting-Toomey S., Rinderle S. Conflict communication in contexts: A social ecological perspective' // Handbook of Conflict Communication / Под ред. J.G. Oetzel, S. Ting-Toomey. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage. 2006. C. 727–739.
32. Park H., Antonioni D. Personality, reciprocity, and strength of conflict resolution strategy // Journal of Research in Personality. 2007. T. 41. № 1. C. 110–125.
33. Pruitt D.G., Rubin J.Z. Social Conflict: Escalation, Stalemate, and Settlement. New York, NY: Random House. 1986. 213 c.
34. Rogan R.G., Hammer M.R. Crisis/Hostage negotiations: Conceptualization of a communication-based approach // Law enforcement communication, and community / Giles H. Amsterdam, The Netherlands: John Benjamins Publishing. 2002. C. 229–254.
35. Rokeach M. The nature of human values. New York, NY: Free Press. 1973. 438 c.
36. Rubin Dzh., Prujt D., Kim H.S. Social'nyj konflikt: eskalaciya, tupik, razreshenie [Social conflict: escalation, deadlock, resolution]. SPb.: Prajm-Evroznak. 2003. 352 c.
37. Sagiv L., Schwartz S.H. Value priorities and readiness for out-group social contact // Journal of Personality and Social Psychology. 1995. T. 69. № 3. C. 437–448.
38. Sagiv L., Sverdlik N., Schwarz N. To compete or to cooperate? Values' impact on perception and action in social dilemma games // European Journal of Social Psychology. 2011. T. 41. № 1. C. 64–77.
39. Schwartz S.H. Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? // Journal of Social Issues. 1994. T. 50. № 4. C. 19–45.
40. Schwartz S.H. Robustness and fruitfulness of a theory of universals in individual human values // Values and behavior in organizations / Под ред. A. Tamayo, J.B. Porto. Petrópolis, Brazil: Vozes. 2005. C. 56–95.
41. Schwartz S.H., Butenko T.P., Sedova D.S., Lipatova A.S. Utochnennaya teoriya bazovyh individual'nyh cennostej: primenenie v Rossii [Refined theory of basic individual values: application in Russia] // Psihologiya. ZHurnal Vysshej shkoly ekonomiki. 2012. T. 9. № 2. S. 43–70.
42. Schwartz S.H., Butenko T. Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia // European Journal of Social Psychology. 2014. № 14. C. 799–813.

43. Schwartz S.H., Cieciuch J., Vecchione M., Torres C., Dirilem-Gumusll O., Butenko T. Value tradeoffs propel and inhibit behavior: Validating the 19 refined values in four countries // *European Journal of Social Psychology*. 2017. № 47. C. 241–258.
44. Stephan W.G., Stephan C.W. Intergroup anxiety // *Social Issues*. 1985. T. 41. № 3. C. 151–175.
45. Tartakovsky E., Walsh S. D. Testing a new theoretical model for attitudes toward immigrants: The case of social workers attitudes toward asylum seekers in Israel // *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*. 2016. T. 47. № 1. C. 72–96.
46. Ting-Toomey S. Intercultural conflicts: A face-negotiation theory. In Y. Y. Kim & W. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Theories in intercultural communication*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage Publications, 1988. P. 213–235.
47. Ting-Toomey S., Yee-Jung K.K., Shapiro R.B., Garcia W., Wright T.J., Oetzel J.G. Ethnic/cultural identity salience and conflict styles in four US ethnic groups // *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*. 2000. T. 24. C. 47–81.
48. Ting-Toomey S. Applying dimensional values in understanding intercultural communication // *Communication Monographs*. 2010. T. 77. № 2. C. 169–180.
49. Torres C.V., Schwartz S.H., Nascimento T.G. The refined theory of values: Associations with behavior and evidences of discriminative and predictive validity // *Psicologia USP*. 2014. T. 27. № 2. C. 341–356.
50. Turner R.N., Crisp R.J. Lambert E. Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup attitudes // *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations*. 2007. № 10. C. 427–441.
51. Verplanken B., Holland R.W. Motivated decision making: Effects of activation and self-centrality of values on choices and behavior // *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 2002. T. 82. № 3. C. 434–447.
52. Willis G.B. *Cognitive Interviewing: A Tool for Improving Questionnaire Design*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications. 2004. 352 c.