Weaving together three strands of research: Culture, communication, and conflict

Deborah A. Cai http://orcid.org/0000-0002-7759-2628

Edward L. Fink http://orcid.org/0000-0001-6387-5574

Abstract

This chapter uses the Biblical notion that a cord of three strands is not easily broken to represent the inseparability of culture, communication, and conflict. Focusing primarily on interpersonal contexts, this chapter first discusses how communication, culture, and conflict each started as fields of study, but then looks at research to show how these three areas are intertwined throughout the 20th century. The studies examined in this chapter address differences in how people from different cultural backgrounds express themselves, different reasons for why they express themselves the way they do, and different perceptions by others about what people's expression means. Further, this review shows that what people experience and what they say they experience, as well as what they do and what they say they will do, can differ quite significantly so that conflict that arises from these types of misunderstandings in perceived meaning of communication may be more disruptive rather than unifying, unless we seek to find ways to appreciate, rather than disparage, such different forms of communication.

Keywords

Conflict, culture, communication, argument, aggression

Words for the Index

Conflict, culture, communication, pain, argument, aggression, culture of honor, pain, prejudice

Weaving together three strands of research: Culture, communication, and conflict

Strife is the father of all things.

Heraclitus, ca. 500 B.C.E. (as quoted in Collins, 1994a, p. 47)

This chapter uses a metaphor from the book of Ecclesiastes (4:12, Christian Standard Bible), which says a cord of three strands is not easily broken. Although Solomon (the assumed author of Ecclesiastes) was referring to the protection that three people have over two if they are overpowered by another person, the metaphor is used here to represent the inseparability—the tying together—of culture, communication, and conflict.

Our focus is primarily on interpersonal contexts rather than mediated or organizational settings, and how research on communication, culture, and conflict have come together and changed over the 20th century. By providing these boundaries, we can address the specific ways these areas of study were shaped during the past century, when each of these areas grew as a specific field of study with many facets. Our goal in this chapter is to demonstrate how, over the 20th century, researchers already integrated the study of culture, communication, and conflict, treating these areas as inseparable. We begin by first looking at the origins typically cited for these three areas

of study. We then examine more closely some important works outside the canon of culture, communication, and conflict literature, but that, nonetheless, contribute important insights into how we understand their interdependence.

Communication

Jefferson Pooley and David Park (2012) have provided an insightful look at the various histories that have been written about communication as a field of study. These authors considered the different areas of study under the communication umbrella, including journalism, rhetoric, and media, and they reviewed the scholars who are reported to be the founding disciplinary parents, as well as the non-U.S. sources that have been left out. Thus, they noted that the field's history is largely presented from a Western, especially a North American and European, perspective, with little focus on the international histories that have also shaped the discipline at large.

Jesse Delia (1987) traced the social science roots of communication as a discipline to the early 20th century. Research on aspects of communication was being written by scholars in sociology, psychology, English, political science, and so on, without it being recognized yet as a field of study. At the same time, in response to the cultural changes in the United States toward mass production and consumption, businesses were changing, and there was a greater need for people—especially men—to sell products. It was within this context that Dale Carnegie wrote the book *How to Win Friends and Influence People* (1936), which focused on public communication and social interaction and remains one of America's best-selling books.

When researchers identified similar interests in areas of study related to communication, those interests began coming together. Wilbur Schramm is often considered the first professor of communication (1947), and Michigan State University had the first college of communication (1958). A turning point of the field was the development of the information flow model, described by Claude Shannon and Warren Weaver in their 1949 book, *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*, which provided the first model and the first book that focused on the communication process. Departments that focused on areas such as rhetoric and English began to include speech communication, or simply *communication*, in their names. This shift mid-20th century led to the creation of the discipline of communication, with its own journals, theories, departments, and academic associations.

Intercultural communication

Textbooks of intercultural communication typically point to Edward T. Hall's work as the start of this scholarly field. Beginning in the 1950s, Hall worked for the U.S. State Department, teaching intercultural communication to foreign service officers to prepare them for overseas assignments. From this work, he developed new concepts to explain cross-cultural differences in communication. His first book on this subject was *The Silent Language* (1959), which laid out the unspoken aspects of nonverbal behavior that varied across cultures and across contexts within those cultures and that could create complications in communication. Although Hall's work was instrumental in establishing the field of study that we now know as intercultural communication, some of the researchers that we will be discussing studied communication, culture, and conflict prior to the publication of Hall's first book.

Hall's books set the stage for the growing attention to what it means to communicate with people from cultures different from one's own and to identify what those differences might be. Throughout the 20th century, anthropology and psychology contributed significantly to the study of intercultural communication by offering dichotomies and typologies, such as the value orientations theory laid out in Florence Kluckhohn and Fred Strodtbeck's (1961) book *Variations in Value Orientations.* This work was followed by Milton Rokeach's (1979) study of individual and societal values, Geert Hofstede's (1980, 2001) comparison of cultural values among IBM employees around the world, Shalom Schwartz's (1992) examination of universal values, and Harry Triandis's (1995) investigation of individualism and collectivism.

The shift in the study of culture and communication over the 20th century reflects the shift in Western societies from a societal to an individual focus. Conceptualizations of culture in the late 19th century were influenced by sociologists such as Ferdinand Tönnies (German; citation 1887), David Émile Durkheim (French; citation 1893/1933), and Max Weber (German; citation 1922), who all considered how societies moved from communal and organic structures such as farms and villages to created larger structures, such as businesses and organizations developed by individuals to serve special interests. Over the 20th century, however, conceptualizations shifted to focusing less on societies and more on the individuals who were actors influenced by the society in which they were enculturated.

Conflict

Similar to the study of communication and intercultural communication, the study of conflict in interpersonal relationships also takes off during the middle of the 20th century. Morton Deutsch defined conflict as occurring whenever one person's action is "incompatible with another action" so that it "prevents, obstructs, interferes with, injures, or in some way makes the latter [action] less likely or less effective" (1973, p. 10).

Interpersonal conflict is pervasive in history, literature, and scholarship. The Biblical Book of Genesis described conflicts between Cain and Abel, and early conceptualizations of interpersonal conflict provide directives such as "an eye for an eye" as well as the New Testament's Golden Rule: Whatever you want others to do for you, do also the same for them (Matthew 7:12, Christian Standard Bible). Confucian teaching provides a slightly different version of this rule: Do not treat others in ways that you would not like to be treated. In contrast to the Golden Rule, Sigmund Freud (1922) addressed the aggressive drives within people that affect interpersonal relationships.

Although the precise origins of the study of interpersonal conflict as a scholarly endeavor are difficult to trace, one of the earliest 20th century considerations of social conflict was written by Georg Simmel (1904), who wrote that conflict is inevitable and important to societal development, noting that complete unity in relationships and society is neither realistic nor desirable. Early research on interpersonal conflict can be traced to Lewis Coser (1956), who argued that social conflicts serve a number of relational functions such as binding groups together as they seek to manage differences with out-groups. Coser laid the groundwork for later efforts by scholars in psychology and communication to understand how conflict affects many different types of relationships (William Donohue and Deborah Cai, 2022; for sociological approaches to the study of conflict, see Randall Collins, 1994a, 1994b).

Conflict scholars have argued that conflict is pervasive in human interaction and that, at times, conflict can be beneficial. Conflict has the potential to challenge old ways of thinking, generate new ideas, identify problem areas that need improvement, and even improve relationships when they are managed effectively. Rather than destroying relationships, interpersonal conflict can create more meaningful relationships when it opens up the communication between individuals.

By the mid-20th century, the study of culture, communication, and conflict each developed into separate fields of study. Yet earlier in the century, these three areas were already being investigated as inseparable threads for understanding people's attitudes and behaviors toward others.

Attitudes and actions

In 1924, Emory Bogardus, a sociologist, developed what came to be known as the Bogardus Social Distance Scale, one of the earliest measures of attitudes. The scale was designed to measure prejudice of one group (A) toward another group (B) by asking a series of questions, such as would a person be willing to marry a member of another group, such as an immigrant from a particular country, or would a person be willing to have a person from that other group as a close friend or neighbor or colleague. The cumulative values reported by participants represented the social distance between Group A and Group B. Bogardus wanted to understand the attitudes of racial and ethnic prejudice held by Americans toward immigrant groups during a time of rising racist immigration restrictions. Colin Wark and John F. Galliher (2007, p. 390) described the scale as follows:

> In 1924 Bogardus created the first edition of the Social Distance Scale, a pioneering statistical measure in the field of race and ethnic relations. . . . Bogardus was clearly concerned with racial issues before he invented the Social Distance Scale. In his 1922 book . . . Bogardus expressed concern with what he referred to as "the race problem" which he acknowledged to be one of the major social dilemmas confronting America. . . .

One of the restrictive immigration laws passed that would have concerned Bogardus was the U.S. Immigration Act of 1924. In addition to the Chinese Exclusion Act of 1882, these immigration policies barred or restricted many non-Northern European immigrants from entering the U.S. and prevented most Asian immigrants already in the U.S. from becoming citizens or owning land. It was during this time that Richard T. LaPiere (1899-1986), a sociologist, set out to better understand the relationship between people's attitudes and their actions regarding racial and ethnic relations.

Beginning in 1930, LaPiere took a Chinese couple on a road trip across the United States. They visited 67 hotels, auto camps, and tourist homes, and 184 restaurants and cafes. On this trip, LaPiere asked the proprietors if they (LaPiere plus the couple) would be allowed to visit as hotel or restaurant guests; only one place out of the 251 they visited refused to do so. Six months later, LaPiere issued a questionnaire to these same establishments, along with others, asking "Will you accept members of the Chinese race as guests in your establishment?" (LaPiere, 1934, p. 233). Of the 128 places that they had previously visited, all but one said "no," meaning that they would not serve Chinese people in their establishment.

Thus, when LaPiere and his fellow travelers communicated initially with the establishments, it was face-to-face, and he and his Chinese companions were welcomed in all but one place. But when asked, via a questionnaire six months later, if they would be welcome, they were refused. The mode of communication changed the results: As LaPiere stated, "those establishments who had provided for our needs so graciously were, some months later, verbally antagonistic towards hypothetical Chinese" (p. 234). Gordon W. Allport (1979, p. 390) summarized this finding this way:

> The "verbal" situation aroused more hostility than the actual situation.

LaPiere's work (1934) followed a few years after the development of the Bogardus Social Distance Scale. This scale confirmed that the attitudes represented prejudice, but the attitudes were not consistent with how the Chinese couple was initially treated face to face. That said, when LaPiere sought to examine the question of attitudes versus actions, he was well aware that rejecting a Chinese couple was consistent with the then-existing American cultural bias.

Cultural experience and expression of pain

In 1952, Mark Zborowski (1908-1990), an anthropologist, examined different responses to pain exhibited by American men from different cultural backgrounds (i.e., Italian, Irish, Jewish, and what he termed "Old American," which were people described as "White, native-born individuals, usually Protestant, whose grandparents, at least, were born in the United States and who do not identify themselves with any foreign group. . . . ," p. 19). The study focused on patients at a veterans hospital in the Bronx, a borough of New York City. Findings were based on the observations and interviews with the hospital's medical staff and interviews with the patients that lasted up to two hours each, as well as with interviews with patients' family members.

Differentiating cultural responses to pain provides several useful insights that can be used to understand how the study of culture, communication, and conflict come together and how they are inseparable. First, the doctors' and nurses' observations provided a glimpse of the external assumptions that the medical staff made about these different culture groups based on differences in communication. For example, the medical staff described Italians and Jews as having very emotional and exaggerated responses, and they concluded that these responses reflect high sensitivity and a low threshold for pain. In comparison, people from Nordic groups were described as having a higher threshold for pain because they were less expressive. In other words, the expression of pain was assumed (falsely it turns out) to reflect the physical state of pain.

Similarly, when people from different cultures use verbal or nonverbal expressions that may be perceived as communicating frustration, such as by using loud or raised voices, which are not mitigated to save face (see Penelope Brown and Stephen C. Levinson, 1987), they may be perceived as complaining or rude or annoying by people who do not expect this type of communication behavior. Zborowski differentiated a culture's experience of pain into *pain expectancy* and *pain acceptance*. For example, labor pain may be *expected* across cultures, but in Poland, for example, labor pain (at that time) was also *accepted*, so little was done to alleviate it. In contrast, in the United States, labor pain was *expected* but not *accepted* because interventions

were employed to alleviate the pain as much as possible. Similarly, in the cultures that accept war as an inevitable part of national life, battle wounds tend to be viewed as both expected and accepted by people in the society. But in pacifistic cultures, battle wounds may be expected but they are not accepted, which affects how others respond to those who suffer from such wounds.

By interviewing the patients, Zborowski identified differences in the cultural orientations based on how people from different backgrounds respond to pain given their expectations and acceptance of pain, how pain is treated, and how the pain may be treated in the future. He described Italians as being present-oriented toward pain and pain relief: They were concerned with the immediate pain sensation and expressed their discomfort, but once relieved and no longer suffering, they would no longer express concerns. In contrast, he described the Jewish response to pain as future-oriented pessimism, because Jews were more likely to be concerned with the symptomatic meaning of the pain and the potential meaning of the pain for the long-term welfare of the patient and the patient's family. Jewish patients also expressed greater concern about drugs that could alleviate their present suffering because of the risks of long-term addiction. They were also more likely to remain concerned even once the pain was alleviated because of the possibility that the pain might return.

What was described as "exaggerated and over-emotional" responses to pain was viewed by the medical staff as sowing seeds of mistrust with both Italian and Jewish patients (Zborowski, 1952, p. 23). Yet the responses for both groups were rooted in different concerns and goals. For one group (Italians), the expression of pain was to seek the immediate alleviation of the pain, and for the other (Jews), it was to seek to understand the causes of the pain and to prevent it in the future.

In contrast to both the Jewish and Italian patients, those who were identified as Old American were characterized as approaching pain with a future-oriented optimism. Rather than expressing discomfort to seek the alleviation of pain or to understand and prevent it in the future, Old Americans were described as being detached and unemotional observers, less likely to complain because "it won't do any good" (Zborowski, 1952, p. 25). The Old American patient was more likely to "avoid being a 'nuisance'" (p. 25) and was more concerned with seeking approval within the hospital environment. Not only was emotional expression viewed as a hindrance to healing by the Old Americans, but the medical staff was also expected to approach pain and the treatment of pain with this type of detached response.

There are several valuable lessons to be drawn from Zborowski's description and explanation of how people from different cultural backgrounds respond to pain. First, we can apply Zborowski's framework to consider that cultures differ in their expectation and acceptance of conflict and argument. How people express themselves about issues that impede their goals are guided by and interpreted by others based on a culture's acceptance and expectation of their goals and views that are being challenged. If expression of conflict, including argument and challenging others' ideas, is expected and accepted, then communication styles that are direct, less mitigated, and argumentative are not likely to be perceived as aggressive or offensive. However, if conflict behaviors are either not expected or accepted, direct styles of communication may be perceived as rude and off-putting, because behaviors that convey being nice and that avoid the appearance of conflict are generally preferred by others. But these are external perceptions of other people's behaviors, not what the people themselves believe they convey.

Second, Zborowski differentiated cultures by their level of pain apprehension and pain anxiety. Pain apprehension results in people avoiding any and all pain as much as they are able. Pain anxiety is the response people have to the experience of pain, which is based on their understanding of the meaning of pain and its significance for the welfare of the person and the person's family. Pain anxiety is affected by the intensity, quality, and duration of the pain that is experienced.

These differences can be used to understand cultures and their approaches to conflict. Conflict apprehension can result in avoidance of conflict at all costs, whereas conflict anxiety is how members of this culture differ in their experience of conflict and its potential outcomes for personal and group relationships, based on the anxiety's intensity, quality, and duration.

A third useful observation to be drawn from Zborowski's work for understanding culture, conflict, and communication is the vast difference between the perceptions of the medical staff based on the patients' expression of pain and the meaning those expressions have for the patients themselves. The expression of pain was assumed by the medical staff to reflect the reality of the physical state. But that was not the case: Similar expressions across the culture groups did not reflect similar attitudes about the pain that was experienced. Instead, similar reactions served very different functions and purposes for people from different cultural backgrounds.

This observation is very important for understanding how people from different cultures communicate and how they may be mistaken about what others perceive they are expressing. Applying Zborowski's differentiation between present, future-pessimistic, and future-optimistic orientations to conflict, the vehemence of an idea for people using a present orientation may be perceived as complaining and trying to get one's own way; however, it may be used by people from a future-pessimistic orientation as needing to understand an issue, challenging the ideas until they are understood, and arguing from multiple points of view. From a future-optimistic orientation, vehemence may be avoided generally because it is not conducive to good relationships and therefore perceived as not constructive to the conversation when used by others.

Understanding how people from different cultures express themselves, and how differences in expression can be misinterpreted and create conflict, affects the role of argument across culture groups: How argument is used, what it expresses, and how it can lead to misinterpretation.

Argument as conversation or conflict

The documentary film, *Arguing the World* (Joseph Dorman, 1997, and the book by the same name, Joseph Dorman, 2000), looks at the role of argument among four New York intellectuals in the mid-20th century and the role that argument played in shaping these men's abilities to critique and criticize the ideas of others. The four men were Daniel Bell (1919-2011), Nathan Glazer (1923-2019), Irving Howe (1920-1993), and Irving Kristol (1920-2009). All four men grew up in a borough of New York City, and all were sons of working-class Jewish immigrants from Russia or Eastern Europe. All attended City College of New York (CCNY), where they argued the world, including ideas about Trotsky and Stalin; socialism, fascism, and liberalism; literature and history; and much more. They knew each other for a good deal of their lives, and each of them four became an elite scholar in top American universities.

Significant to their development as scholars is the role of argument in the ethnic culture in which they were raised. As the sons of Jewish immigrants, they learned argument as part of every day life. Irving Howe, for example, explained, "The immigrant Jews brought with them memories of the old country, legends and stories of things that had happened there. So you absorbed this kind of historical consciousness at the kitchen table, literally at the kitchen table" (Dorman, 1997). In talking about the role of argument in Philadelphia, Schiffrin (1984) described "Jewish argument" as follows:

> In sociable argument, speakers repeatedly disagree, remain nonaligned with each other, and compete for interactional goods. Yet they do so in a nonserious way . . . . The analysis [in Schiffrin's article] also demonstrates the cultural relativity of norms of evaluation about dispute. (p. 311)

These four scholars were eventually responsible, individually and collectively, for a remarkable amount of communication, as lecturers and through the written word. Their cultural inheritance as Jews greatly influenced both their historical and religious knowledge as well as providing a foundation for arguing, frequently, vehemently, and discerningly. And that cultural foundation for argument makes the conflict in which they engaged a special type of conflict.

Similar to Zborowski's depiction of future-oriented pessimism, argument for this group of first-generation New York Jews was used to do "intellectual battle": "They had thought that argument would help to confirm the correct path toward political salvation . . ." (Dorman, 2000, p. 3).

Contrast this style of conversation with that of the "Minnesota nice" stereotype, which expects people to behave in ways that abide by norms that are considered polite, friendly, courteous, and restrained. One of the peers of the New York intellectuals contrasted Southern conversation with the communication within their group: "They're always praising one another and we're always attacking each other" (Dorman, 2000, p. 7).

When conflict becomes aggression, and aggression becomes violence

The implications of this contrast of cultures in how they communicate can also be found in Richard Nisbett and Dov Cohen's book, *Culture of Honor* (1996), which describes how cultural norms "require" Southern white men to insist on being seen as strong and tough. Nisbett and Cohen argued that this does not apply to all White men or to all Southerners; instead, these norms are associated with a culture that was historically tied to the life of being a herdsman. The herding culture created expectations to protect one's land and one's family and evolved into an unwillingness for men to tolerate insult, so insult came to require retaliation and revenge.

Nisbett and Cohen provide a remarkable amount of evidence to support their thesis about the culture of honor, comparing people from different regions with varying population densities, homicide rates, attitudes toward violence, responses to insults, physiological ties to aggression, social policies, support for war, behaviors such as spanking children, and so on. Nisbett and Cohen examined the strong impact of culture and communication on conflict, and this example is the most impactful of the examples that we have discussed: Conflict was not merely displayed in rudeness; it often meant torture or death. We can use the NAACP's (2022) discussion of lynching to provide as a powerful example:

> A lynching is the public killing of an individual who has not received any due process. These executions were often carried out by lawless mobs, though police officers did participate, under the pretext of justice.
>
> ***
>
> Many victims of lynching were murdered without being accused of any crime. They were killed for violating social customs or racial expectations, such as speaking to white people with less respect than what white people believed they were owed. (NAACP, 2022)

In their comparison of Dutch and Turkish people, where Turkish immigrants in the Netherlands also came from an honor culture, Fieke Harinck and colleagues (2013) found that the culture of honor also yielded more constructive responses—rather than aggressive or violent ones—to conflict, as long as the people involved were not insulted by the other side, because their communication norms were shaped by an effort to avoid offending others. Contrast this view of conflict and its consequences, based on cultural norms surrounding appropriate communication, with that of argument in *Arguing the World:*

> City College alumnus Philip Selznick recalled, "in those days having a discussion meant arguing about something and doing it at the top of your lungs!" (Dorman, 2000, p. 2)

In one context, argument yielded engagement, new ways of thinking about age-old problems, and relational connection. In the other context, it could be perceived as threatening and offensive, and could result in violence.

Conclusions

The *Oxford English Dictionary* provides examples of the use of the term *communication* dating to 1382, of *culture*, to 1450, and of *conflict*, to 1440. Our task in this chapter is to consider how these terms came together in research over the 20th century. Above we discussed LaPiere's study (1934) and Zborowski's research (1952), which give us very different notions of the focal terms we use to guide our discussion. First, for LaPiere, communication had two distinct types: one was face-to-face, and the other was via a questionnaire, responding to it in writing. In addition, LaPiere spoke not only with the proprietors of the establishments he sought to visit, but also with the Chinese couple that was with him and who were presumably his friends (for a revisit of LaPiere's study, see Joanne R. Smith and Deborah J. Terry, 2013).

With whom did Zborowski speak? With the patients, all male, who were hospitalized, with the medical staffs of those hospitals—presumably doctors, nurses, and medical technicians—and with family members of the patients. The communication network was far more extended in Zborowski's research than in LaPiere's.

What about *conflict* in these studies? In LaPiere's study, the conflict was between him and the proprietors; he was a surrogate for the Chinese couple. As reported above, when asked via a questionnaire about the possibility of serving the Chinese couple, they responded with "verbally antagonistic [responses]." The response was clearly conflictual. Zborowski reported conflict regarding some patients not accepting medical treatment and the associated pain that they

suffered, the possibility of responses from family members who were not supportive, and the perceived standoffishness of the medical staff who could look down upon their patients. Again, the complexity of the conflict in the Zborowski study exceeds that of LaPiere's work.

As for culture, both studies examine cultural differences and cultural biases: This is obvious in the rejection of the Chinese couple in LaPiere. In Zborowski, it is multidimensional: The patients came from distinctly different cultures (Italian American, Jewish, Irish, and Old American), which influenced their responses.

Finally, it seems clear that, in these two studies, the communication was influenced by the cultural differences and conflict was a product of the intertwining of communication and culture. The resulting conflict ranged from the communication being clear, loud, and aggressive to the interactants (e.g., the doctors or the patients as separate groups) perhaps speaking in *sotto voce* to each other, yet being uncomfortable or embarrassed with each other.

When we consider the culture of honor, the antagonism impelled by the culture of the adversaries can range from verbal attacks to serious physical attacks. The culture is at the foreground of the behavior, and that culture + communication can easily make "conflict" an understatement.

The inhabitants of the world filled with argument—and wit and wisdom and history and experience from this world—has a ready scale of responses to this world's politics and cultural frames. Conflict may be schizophrenic, revealing unity and enmity, and it also may reveal authority and humility. Here conflict can be more like a formal tournament than a rout. In our example, the culture here is Jewish culture, with a background of centuries of *pilpul* (Hebrew: פלפול, loosely meaning "sharp analysis"; from פִּלְפֵּל *[pilpel])* "pepper". It is a method of studying the Talmud through intense textual analysis in attempts to either explain conceptual differences between various halakhic rulings or to reconcile any apparent contradictions presented from various readings of different texts; from *Wikipedia.)*

Simmel (1904) argued that society cannot have complete harmony and that conflict serves to strengthen societies. Yet when cultural differences affect communication, the conflict that ensues can be more disruptive than unifying because of misunderstandings about how people from other cultures communicate. The studies we have examined, some of which were conducted before there were separate fields of study in intercultural communication and in conflict, show there are differences in how people from different cultural backgrounds express themselves, different reasons for why they express themselves the way they do, and different perceptions by others about what a group of people's expression means. Further, our review has shown that what people experience and what they say they experience, as well as what they do and what they say they will do, can differ quite significantly. Therefore, conflict that arises from these types of misunderstandings about the perceived meaning of communication may be more disruptive rather than unifying, unless we seek to find ways to appreciate, rather than disparage, such different forms of communication.

We have shown different forms of communication, different styles of culture, and different decibel levels of conflict. Of course, there are more, but our goal is for the reader to (a) appreciate these differences, and (b) employ this knowledge for interpersonal, intergroup, and international understanding and application.

Reference list

Allport, Gordon W. *The Nature of Prejudice*. New York: Addison-Wesley Publishing, 1979.

Brown, Penelope, and Stephen C. Levinson. *Politeness: Some Universals in Language Usage.* Cambridge, MA: Cambridge University Press, 1987.

Carnegie, Dale. *How to Win Friends and Influence People.* New York: Pocket Books, 1936.

Collins, Randall. *Four Sociological Traditions*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994a.

Collins, Randall. *Four Sociological Traditions: Selected Readings*. New York: Oxford University Press, 1994b.

Coser, Lewis. *The Functions of Social Conflict*. New York: Free Press, 1956.

Delia, Jesse. "Communication Research: A History." In *Handbook of Communication Science*, 20-98. Edited by Charles R. Berger and Steven H. Chaffee. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage, 1987.

Deutsch, Morton. *The Resolution of Conflict: Constructive and Destructive Processes*. New Have, CT: Yale University Press, 1973.

Donohue, William. A., and Deborah A. Cai. "History of Interpersonal Conflict." In *Encyclopedia of Violence, Peace, and Conflict* (3rd ed.). Edited by L. Kurtz. Oxford, UK: Elsevier, 2022.

Dorman, Joseph, dir. *Arguing the World*. 1997; Place: Riverside Productions. 2005. DVD.

Dorman, Joseph. *Arguing the World: The New York Intellectuals in Their Own Words*. New York: Free Press, 2000.

Durkheim, David Émile. *The Division of Labor in Society*. Translated by G. Simpson. New York: Macmillan, 1933.

Freud, Sigmund. *Beyond the Pleasure Principle.* Translated by C. J. M. Hubback. Vienna: The International Psychoanalytic Press, 1922.

Hall, Edward T. *The Silent Language*. New York: Double Day, 1959.

Harinck, Fieke, Saïd Shafa, Naomi Elemers, and Bianca Beersma. "The Good News About Honor Culture: The Preference for Cooperative Conflict Management in the Absence of Insults." *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research* 6, no. 2 (2013): 67-78. https://doi.org/10.1111/ncmr.12007

Hartwig, Daniel. (2010). *Guide to the Richard T. LaPiere Papers*. Stanford University. Libraries. Department of Special Collections and University Archives. Stanford. https://oac.cdlib.org/findaid/ark:/13030/kt1199r6zd/

Hofstede, Geert. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values.* Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 1980.

Hofstede, Geert. *Culture's Consequences: Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions and Organizations Across Nations*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage, 2001.

Kluckhohn, Florence R., and Fred L. Strodtbeck. *Variations in Value Orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson, 1961.

LaPiere, Richard T. "Attitudes vs. Actions." *Social Forces 13*(2), 230-237. (1934). https://doi.org/10.2307/2570339

NAACP. (2022). *History of Lynching in America.* https://naacp.org/find-resources/history-explained/history-lynching-america

Nisbett, Richard E., and Cohen, Dov. *Culture of Honor: The Psychology of Violence in the South.* Boulder, CO: Westview, 1996.

Pooley, Jefferson D., and David W. Park. "Communication Research." In *The Handbook of Communication History*, 76-90. Edited by Peter Simonson, Janice Peck, Robert T. Craig, and John P. Jackson, Jr. New York: Routledge, 2012. https://www.routledgehandbooks.com/doi/10.4324/9780203149119.ch3

Rokeach, Milton. *Understanding Human Values: Individual and Societal*. New York: The Free Press, 1979.

Schiffrin, Deborah. "Jewish Argument as Sociability." *Language in Society* 13, no. 3, (1984): 311-335. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0047404500010526

Schwartz, Shalom H. "Universals in the Content and Structure of Values: Theoretical Advances and Empirical Tests in 20 Cultures." In *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology,* Volume 25, 1-65. Edited by M.P. Zanna. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, 1992.

Shannon, Claude E., and Warren Weaver. *The Mathematical Theory of Communication*. Urbana, IL: The University of Illinois Press, 1949.

Simmel, Georg. "The Sociology of Conflict: I." *American Journal of Sociology* 9, no. 4, (1904): 490-525. https://doi.org/10.1086/211234

Smith, Joanne R., and Deborah J. Terry. "Attitudes and Behavior: Revisiting LaPiere's Hospitality Study." In *Social Psychology: Revisiting the Classic Studies*, 27-41. Edited by Joanne R. Smith and S. Alexander Haslam. Los Angeles, CA: Sage, 2013.

Tönnies, Ferdinand. *Gemeinschaft und Gesellschaft.* Leipzig: Fues's Verlag, 1887.

Triandis, Harry C. *Individualism and Collectivism*. New York: Routledge, 1995.

Wark, Colin, and John F. Galliher. “Emory Bogardus and the Origins of the Social Distance Scale.” *The American Sociologist* 38, no. 4 (2007): 383-95. https://doi.org/ 10.1007/s12108-007-9023-9

Weber, Maximilian Karl Emil. *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft*. Tübingen: Mohr, 1922.

Zborowski, Mark. (1952). Cultural Components in Response to Pain. *Journal of Social Issues* 8(4),16-30. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1540-4560.1952.tb01860.x

Author Biographies

Deborah A. Cai (Ph.D., Michigan State University) is professor and senior associate dean in the Klein College of Media and Communication at Temple University, and she is a faculty member in the Media and Communication doctoral program. Deborah is an international researcher with expertise in intercultural communication, persuasion, and negotiation and conflict management. Deborah is a Fellow in the International Academy of Intercultural Researchers and Past-President of the International Association for Conflict Management. She served as editor of the journal, *Negotiation and Conflict Management Research*, and is editor of the four-volume collection of research, *Intercultural Communication* (Sage, Benchmark in Communication).

Edward L. Fink (A.B., Columbia University; M.S., Ph.D., University of Wisconsin-Madison) is Laura H. Carnell Professor of Media and Communication at Temple University. He studies attitude change and research methods. He has received the 2020 Randall Harrison Outstanding Article Award from ICA's Information Systems Division and the 2018 Outstanding Contribution to Communication Science Award from ICA's Communication Science and Biology Interest Group. He is an ICA Fellow and a Fellow of Sigma Xi, The Scientific Research Honor Society. He has received ICA's B. Aubrey Fisher Mentorship Award and has been editor of *Human Communication Research*. He is from the Bronx.