

This article was downloaded by: [National Chengchi University]

On: 29 December 2014, At: 20:19

Publisher: Routledge

Informa Ltd Registered in England and Wales Registered Number: 1072954 Registered office: Mortimer House, 37-41 Mortimer Street, London W1T 3JH, UK



Chinese Journal of Communication

Publication details, including instructions for authors and subscription information:

<http://www.tandfonline.com/loi/rcjc20>

Collectivism, relations, and Chinese communication

Georgette Wang^a & Yi-Ning Katherine Chen^a

^a Department of Journalism , National Chengchi University , Taipei, Taiwan

Published online: 24 Feb 2010.

To cite this article: Georgette Wang & Yi-Ning Katherine Chen (2010) Collectivism, relations, and Chinese communication, Chinese Journal of Communication, 3:1, 1-9, DOI: [10.1080/17544750903528708](https://doi.org/10.1080/17544750903528708)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17544750903528708>

PLEASE SCROLL DOWN FOR ARTICLE

Taylor & Francis makes every effort to ensure the accuracy of all the information (the "Content") contained in the publications on our platform. However, Taylor & Francis, our agents, and our licensors make no representations or warranties whatsoever as to the accuracy, completeness, or suitability for any purpose of the Content. Any opinions and views expressed in this publication are the opinions and views of the authors, and are not the views of or endorsed by Taylor & Francis. The accuracy of the Content should not be relied upon and should be independently verified with primary sources of information. Taylor and Francis shall not be liable for any losses, actions, claims, proceedings, demands, costs, expenses, damages, and other liabilities whatsoever or howsoever caused arising directly or indirectly in connection with, in relation to or arising out of the use of the Content.

This article may be used for research, teaching, and private study purposes. Any substantial or systematic reproduction, redistribution, reselling, loan, sub-licensing, systematic supply, or distribution in any form to anyone is expressly forbidden. Terms & Conditions of access and use can be found at <http://www.tandfonline.com/page/terms-and-conditions>

INTRODUCTION

Collectivism, relations, and Chinese communication

Georgette Wang* and Yi-Ning Katherine Chen

Department of Journalism, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan

Hofstede (1980) did not claim to have based his conception of cultural dimensions on the features of any particular culture or ethnic groups. Yet since the publication of his cultural indicators in 1980, Chinese and East Asians have often been chosen to represent *the* typical collectivist cultural group to contrast with Americans as the typical individualist cultural group. Likewise, the communication style that has reportedly characterized collectivistic cultures is also found to represent the features of Chinese and East Asian people.

There is little doubt that the paired concept of individualism and collectivism has been useful in distinguishing cultural differences in studies of communication, yet some issues and questions have begun to emerge about Chinese collectivism after decades of empirical research. First, there is the matter of scope; most of the studies on collectivism among Chinese have focused on interpersonal communication but not as extensively on media uses. A second, and perhaps more fundamental, issue is about depth; to what extent is collectivism a factor when Chinese communicate? In the face of frequently mixed findings, a question that is begging for answer is: can Chinese truly represent a concept that dates back to the premodern era of human civilization (Triandis, 1994), including Plato's *Republic* and Jean-Jacques Rousseau's *Du Contrat Social* (cited in Brewer & Chen, 2007, p. 133)?

Increasingly, relations has emerged as an important dimension in the study of Chinese communication. While Chinese relations (*guanxi*) has become a popular topic of research by itself, in individualism/collectivism (I/C) studies, it seems to be difficult not to include this dimension when Chinese or East Asian respondents are used in a study. What is the implication of this development? How much effort has been made to look into the issues from a Chinese perspective? In other words, while Chinese have been an "object" of individualism/collectivism research, how much has been done to gain ownership of the study?

The papers in this special issue represent a collective effort in responding to some of the above critical questions. The purpose here is not to provide all the answers and draw conclusions, as neither is possible given the limitation of resources and labor. Yet it is hoped that by confronting the issues square in the face and putting important pieces together we will be able to have a more comprehensive view of the entire picture of Chinese communication.

*Corresponding author. Email: telgw@nccu.edu.tw

Chinese as the representation of collectivist culture

The I/C model has been used extensively in the past few decades in management, comparative psychology, and other areas of social scientific research (Bond, 1994; Fischer et al., 2009; Triandis, 1990). According to Markus and Kitayama (1991, p. 227) and Triandis (1994), members of collectivist and individualist cultures differ in several areas: the members' definition of the "self", the way they relate to "others", and the determinants of their goals and concerns that drive members' behavior. The former see themselves as part of a group, or a "collective", in contrast to the latter who consider themselves independent individuals with unique attributes. In an individualist culture, the goals and behavior of an individual are based on his or her own needs, attitudes, and perceived rights, but to those in a collectivist culture, group norms and the duties and obligations of members take priority. In other words, the "self" and "other" in a collectivist culture are interdependent, while those in an individualist culture are independent of one another.

With Confucianism regarded as the philosophical basis of collectivism (U. Kim, 1994), Chinese are noted to place the need, interest, and objective of in-groups at a higher priority than that of the individual. Yang (1981), for example, found that Chinese have a tendency to conform to social norms and expectations. A study on self-construals by Triandis, McCusker, and Hui (1990) showed Chinese respondents saw themselves more as belonging to a family or an ethnic group than American respondents. The linkage with in-groups was also found to be stronger among Chinese respondents than among their American counterparts.

Empirical findings also showed the I/C model is useful in differentiating the communication styles and strategies of various ethnic groups (Burlison & Mortenson, 2003; Li & Chi, 2004; Seo, Miller, Schmidt, & Sowa, 2008). For example, people in collectivist, East Asian cultures such as Korea and Japan tend to be indirect, nonexpressive, and high context, while those in individualist cultures such as the United States and Australia are direct, expressive, and low context (Gudykunst et al., 1996). Likewise, Chinese in general prefer to use "other-oriented" communication strategies, including encouragement, credit-giving, or example-setting, while attempting to exercise influences (Li & Chi, 2004; Ma & Chuang, 2001). In conflict situations, on the other hand, Chinese rely more on unofficial mediation to resolve the issue (Ma, 1992).

Not all empirical findings, however, indicate a clear-cut pattern across cultures. Contrary to the assumption that Chinese pay greater attention to relationship maintenance in the execution of a project, Bond, Leung, and Wan (1982) found that their study's respondents emphasized *both* responsibility and relationship, rather than harmony or simply humility and knowledge. Results of other studies investigating communication behaviors of Chinese and East Asians (M.S. Kim et al., 1996; Yeh & Chen, 2004) also indicated a mixture of individualist and collectivist cultural features.

While the literature seems to have provided ample evidence to show that Chinese culture is collectivist with a distinct communication style, relatively less attention has been paid to how the concept can predict media behavior among Chinese users, e.g., whether and how the media influence on audiences of collectivist cultures differs from that on audiences of individualist cultures, and if people present themselves

differently on the new media platform. These questions are especially significant in view of the conflicting findings mentioned above.

Failure to find consistent evidence supporting the Chinese/East Asian and collectivism connection is not necessarily problematic. As emphasized by Triandis (1994) and U. Kim (1994), people and society are typically both individualistic and collectivistic. Yet the representation of Chinese culture as *typically* collectivistic has made it difficult for us to ignore the implications of these conflicting results, and how this may relate to our understanding of communication behavior and media use. To what extent can Chinese be justifiably assumed to represent the “collectivistic culture”.

Relations as an important dimension of Chinese communication

In recent years, relations (*guanxi*) has emerged as an important dimension of studies in self-construal, Chinese business practices, and social networks (Law, Wong, Wang, & Wang, 2000; Tsui & Farh, 1997; Xin, 1997). Despite different theoretical perspectives, study approaches, and emphases, studies have all pointed to the significance of relations in the way Chinese relate to others. Relations has so often shown to be an important aspect of collectivism that little attention was paid to the original meaning of collectivism – a concept that did not prescribe close relations among members of a group, let alone differential relations with different members of a group. In this respect, empirical studies showed rather different results. The Triandis et al. (1990) study mentioned above, for example, found a strong linkage with in-groups among Chinese respondents, but at the same time the researchers found that Chinese people’s perceived social distance varied with their relationships with “others”, e.g., father, roommates, or acquaintances. The varied distance also indicated the extent to which respondents were willing to become the subordinate of these “others” – a clear indication of a “relation” factor.

The above analyses showed the need to explore not only the discriminatory power of the collectivism concept in predicting and explaining media behavior but also the cultural values and worldviews embedded in it. Further studies are necessary to give us a more comprehensive look into the issues involved and a chance to re-examine the validity issue that has shrouded discussions of the paired concept (Brewer & Chen, 2007; Oyserman, Coon, & Kimmelmeier, 2002).

A “Chinese” perspective?

In the past few decades, comparative studies have mostly adopted an “etic approach”—a culture-general approach to distinguish cultural differences. It was believed that with cultures dichotomized into types one is able to learn about and understand them. While the approach has served some research purposes, it was criticized as having vastly simplified the complexities that issues concerning cultures necessarily entail. In addition, the value of a dualistic model in facilitating our understanding or explanation of the relationship between culture and behavior was also questioned (Gudykunst et al., 1996; U. Kim, 1994; Triandis, 1994).

Following the development of postmodernism, postcolonialism, and cultural studies discourse, criticism and awareness of Eurocentrism have been growing in social scientific and communication research (Chakrabarty, 2000; Chen, 2006;

Miike, 2002, 2007; Nisbett, 2003; Wallerstein, 2006). Increasingly, scholars are challenging the universality of existing concepts, models, and theories. Greater emphasis was placed on the particularity of each culture or group of cultures (Flick, 1998), while highlighting the way different epistemological, methodological paradigms, cultural values, and worldviews may influence our understanding of human communication. The effort has led researchers to move away from a generalist and universalist approach to a multiculturalist, or cultural-centric approach, and a “Chinese perspective” is now called for.

At this stage, it is not yet fully clear what a multicultural approach entails; a “Chinese perspective”, therefore, may mean very different things to researchers in their academic undertakings. As M.S. Kim (2007) indicated, to mainstream communication researchers this issue is irrelevant as models, theories, and paradigms are universally applicable across cultures, following the definition of scientific laws. To others, it may be relevant but has already been taken care of as the targets of their study – whether they are cultural industries, government policies, media content, and texts or audiences – are Chinese. But to the rest, a “Chinese perspective” can bring out a host of complicated issues, and they must be addressed before any attempt to make greater contributions to the field can be successful.

In December 2008, a small group of media and communication researchers from Taiwan, China, Singapore, and Hong Kong gathered in Taipei to map out a plan to study “Chinese communication research”.

Before a conclusion could be reached, they found themselves caught with a series of questions. They include first of all conceptual problems, for example, how do we define “Chinese”? What is meant by a “Chinese perspective”, or “Chinese communication research”? What does it cover; is it about phenomenon—media, behavior, language, and meaning—or concepts, values, and world views behind the phenomenon? Secondly there are methodological issues to consider: what may be the theoretical and methodological basis for studying Chinese communication? How does one begin with the process of developing a “Chinese perspective”? Is it necessary to start with classical texts, as social science is a product of European Enlightenment? What is the objective for such an endeavor—is generalizing Chinese communication concepts and findings the best way in making greater contribution to the field and achieving the ultimate goal?

No answer (or conclusion) was, and unfortunately still has not been, arrived at for any of the above questions.

The above highlighted the plight faced by most of those who are concerned with indigenizing media and communication research. In an anxious attempt to find a solution, some have gone back to the classical writings of Confucianism and Taoism for inspiration or focused on topics and problems that are *unique* to a particular Chinese society. The others who are not content with this culture-specific approach have turned to the so-called culture-general approach, only to find it loaded with as many, if not more, obstacles (Wang & Shen, 2000).

In recent years, there has been rapid growth of communication programs in tertiary education institutions in Chinese societies. The rise in the number of postgraduate students and increasing resources devoted to research have pointed to the urgency of the issue. Is studying media and communication to remain the way they have been for the future generation of Chinese researchers? Are there any

possibilities for them to make a greater contribution to the field – in comparison to their predecessors, and how?

To the above questions, there is obviously no quick answer in sight; however, the time has come for us to begin searching for one. To provide a more comprehensive picture of the issues involved, articles in this special issue have been chosen with the same general focus in studying media and communication behavior, and collectivism and relations, with the latter offered as a potential area for future research. Aside from wide usage in communication studies, collectivism was also chosen as the focus because the historical origin of the concept allows us the room to go back to Confucian teachings to determine the extent to which the two are similar or identical. It is hoped that by examining the various conceptual, epistemological, and methodological issues involved, a new perspective in analyzing the self-other relationship will emerge – a perspective that is based on Chinese experiences but with implications for the study of media and communication behavior in general.

Papers in this special issue can be roughly categorized into two groups: those that adopt a more traditional top-down approach to test the individualism/collectivism concept in the media behavior of Chinese audiences and those that opt for a bottom-up approach to determine if Chinese culture and communication are best described as collectivistic. The first group of papers, using the standard measurement scales, offers a look into a formerly less explored area of communication in terms of the collectivism concept.

Ven-hwei Lo, Clement So, and Guoliang Zhang open this issue with an empirical analysis of the associations between individualism/collectivism and exposure to Internet pornography, sexual attitudes, and behaviors. Rather than comparing differences between Asian and American respondents, the authors made comparisons among college students in three Chinese cities: Shanghai, Hong Kong, and Taipei. Overall, the authors found collectivist tendencies correlated more strongly but negatively with exposure to Internet pornography. Yet respondents also exhibited both collectivist and individualist characteristics, although overall the students were more collectivism-oriented. More interestingly, a significant difference was also found in regard to horizontal individualism and horizontal collectivism among groups of respondents.

In the following article, Yi-Ning Chen makes the case that cultural differences also exist in the virtual environment. Taking blogs as a new platform for studying cross-culture communication, the author aims to compare impression management tactics and self-presentation on popular blogs in Taiwan and the US. The study results showed that American bloggers tended to dwell less on their relations but were more open about themselves, while Taiwanese bloggers were found to have paid closer attention to their social relations but tended to keep a distance from visitors to their blogs by offering few personal details for further contact. In comparison to their American counterparts, Taiwanese bloggers also used more self-promotion strategies by presenting their intellectuality to attract visitors and obtain further online interactions.

The second group, by going to the literature on Chinese communication or back to the root of Chinese history and culture, offers a culture-centric perspective on the problem. Relations, rather than collectivism, was found to be the core variable.

By looking into the historical background of the collectivism concept, Georgette Wang and Zhong-Bo Liu sought to re-examine the validity of the concept in a Chinese setting. They found the concept of a “collective” largely missing in Confucian

Chinese culture. In contrast, the emphasis of Confucianism on “differentiated hierarchies” and the reciprocity principle guiding interpersonal interactions underscore the importance of personal relations in the way the Chinese Self relates to its Other. Furthermore, the authors argued that the literature on self-construals, social behavior, and *guanxi* shows a tripartite model of individualism, relationalism, and collectivism can provide a more comprehensive analytical framework in a cross-cultural context. An appeal was made to formulate culture-general theses based on culture-specific considerations in future Chinese communication studies.

Jung-hui Yeh made a similar attempt to explore the most important dimensions of Chinese communication competence by reviewing the literature on interpersonal and intercultural communication studies with ethnic Chinese in China, Hong Kong, or Taiwan as the target of investigation. In contrast to effectiveness and persuasiveness, the two abilities generally considered to be the key to communication competence, the author found that Chinese societies have more subtle yet intricate rules in communication. The ability to negotiate relationships, interpret messages in a high-context situation, and merge the above two stood out from the literature as the most important aspects of communication competence. This method of defining competence points to a specific function of communication for Chinese: to maintain relationships but not necessarily to achieve group cohesion as a collectivist culture would require.

Given the importance of relationships in Chinese social lives and behavior, Kuang-Hui Yeh observed that several scholars have used relationalism to describe different modes of association but have failed to explain the evolving process within a dyadic relationship. The author therefore proposed a new framework to analyze the evolving process of Chinese interpersonal interaction. It is suggested that the evolving core of a specific relationship depends on the combinations of three components: obligatory, authentic, and selfish, which are the criteria for judging an interacting relationship. In particular, the dialectical changes caused by these components are also the focus of attention for this framework of analysis. This new framework elucidates how relationalism operates in modern Chinese interpersonal interactions.

The last paper, by Yi-Hui Huang, presents a holistic theoretical framework in which relations/*guanxi*, the I/C model, and self-construal constitute one of the three dimensions – the cultural dimension – for observation, measurement, and comparison in media, interpersonal, and organization communication. The theoretical framework consists of three sets of variables: outcome variables, including communication-related constructs, and two sets of independent and/or mediating/moderator variables, including cultural factors and contextual factors. It is believed that the framework will facilitate cross-cultural and cross-contextual theorizing with greater culture- and context-sensitivity.

The two groups of papers as described above have obviously not answered all of the questions that were raised on Chinese communication research. Yet these papers have made a rather clear indication about possible future directions that this research may take, using the study of collectivism as a way to illustrate the point. As the first group of papers show, the results of using collectivism and interdependent construal as independent variables have failed to produce coherent results confirming its significance in predicting media use and impact.

While the mixed results from Chinese samples on collectivism may be a function of social change, Wang and Liu sought to find answers in the concept itself and its

relevance to Confucian Chinese culture. The emergence of relations as the key determining variable in communication among Chinese might not be a surprise, as *guanxi*, Chinese relations, has already become an increasingly popular topic of research for business communication in China. Yet as the articles by J. Yeh and K. Yeh show, the way relations shapes culture and communication behavior, positions the function, and defines the importance of communication also sheds light on how collectivism, as conceptualized, may fail to explain the characteristics of Chinese culture and communication.

At this stage, the validity of relationalism, as a concept either seen in its own right or as part of a tripartite model with individualism and collectivism, has not yet been fully established in empirical research. But the attempts by Wang and Liu and, earlier, Hwang (2005) to turn relationalism into a general concept beyond the Chinese cultural framework are examples that show the possibility of developing a cultural-general thesis based on cultural-specific analyses. Likewise, Huang's theoretical framework for comparative studies also showed the way culture-specific considerations may enrich models for comparative studies. The issue is not one of possibility or impossibility but one of success or failure.

What can be learned from the exercise is perhaps not the "right way" to define "Chineseness" or where and how to draw a line between the "Chinese" and "non-Chinese", but to open oneself to all the resources and possibilities that have been made available, including those from existing mainstream theories and methods, and most importantly, ideas, propositions, and worldviews from one's own cultural heritage. It is with this openness that Chinese researchers, and for that matter, all those in the academic periphery, will be able to come out of the embarrassing state of being the "Other" in the study about its "Self".

Acknowledgements

The publication of work in this special issue is partially funded by the Excellence in Communication project, College of Communication, National Chengchi University, Taiwan. The editors would also like to thank J.H. Yeh for her valuable input in the write-up of this article.

Note

1. These issues were raised by Tsang Kuo-jen, professor of journalism, National Chengchi University, Taipei, Taiwan, in a discussion session of the workshop.

References

- Bond, M.H. (1994). Into the heart of collectivism: A personal and scientific journey. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, Ç. Kagitçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method, and applications* (pp. 66–76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Bond, M.H., Leung, K., & Wan, K.C. (1982). How does cultural collectivism operate? The impact of task and maintenance contributions on reward distribution. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 13(2), 186–200.
- Brewer, M.B., & Chen, Y.R. (2007). Where (who) are collectives in collectivism? Toward conceptual clarification of individualism and collectivism. *Psychological Review*, 114(1), 133–151.
- Burleson, B.R., & Mortenson, S.R. (2003). Explaining cultural differences in evaluations of emotional support behaviors: Exploring the mediating influences of value systems and interaction goals. *Communication Research*, 30(2), 113–146.

- Chakrabarty, D. (2000). *Provincializing Europe: Postcolonial thought and historical difference*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
- Chen, G.-M. (2006). Asian communication studies: What and where to now. *Review of Communication*, 6(4), 295–311.
- Flick, U. (1998). *An introduction to qualitative research* (3rd ed.). London: Sage.
- Fischer, R., Ferreira, M.C., Assmar, E., Redford, P., Harb, C., Glazer, S., Cheng, B.-S., Jiang, D.-Y., Wong, C.C., Kumar, N., Kartner, J., Hofer, J., & Achoui, M. (2009). Individualism-collectivism as descriptive norms: Development of a subjective norm approach to culture measurement. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, 40(2), 187–213.
- Gudykunst, W.B., Matsumoto, Y., Ting-Toomey, S., Nishida, T., Kim, K., & Heyman, S. (1996). The influence of cultural individualism-collectivism, self-construals, and individual values on communication styles across cultures. *Human Communication Research*, 22(4), 510–543.
- Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequence: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hwang, K.K. (2005). Chinese relationalism: Theoretical construction and methodological considerations. In K.K. Hwang, *Confucian relationalism: Reflections on culture and the reconstruction of paradigm* (pp. 133–173). Taipei: National Taiwan University (in Chinese).
- Kim, M.S. (2007). The four culture of cultural research. *Communication Monographs*, 74(2), 279–285.
- Kim, M.S., Hunter, J.E., Miyahara, A., Horvath, A.-M., Bresnahan, M., & Yoon, H.-J. (1996). Individual- vs. culture-level dimensions of individualism and collectivism: Effects on preferred conversational styles. *Communication Monographs*, 63(1), 29–49.
- Kim, U. (1994). Individualism and collectivism: Conceptual clarification and elaboration. In U. Kim, H.C. Triandis, Ç. Kâğıtçibasi, S.-C. Choi, & G. Yoon (Eds.), *Individualism and collectivism: Theory, method and applications* (pp. 19–40). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Law, K.S., Wong, C.S., Wang, D., & Wang, L. (2000). Effect of supervisor-subordinate guanxi on supervisory decisions in China: An empirical investigation. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 11(4), 751–765.
- Li, S.C., & Chi, X.R. (2004). Upward influence strategies in organizations: Examining the differences between Western and Chinese upward influence models. *Mass Communication Research*, 80, 89–126. (In Chinese)
- Ma, R. (1992). The role of unofficial intermediaries in interpersonal conflicts in the Chinese culture. *Communication Quarterly*, 40(3), 269–276.
- Ma, R., & Chuang, R. (2001). Persuasion strategies of Chinese college students in interpersonal contexts. *Southern Communication Journal*, 66(4), 267–278.
- Markus, H., & Kitayama, S. (1991). Culture and self: Implications for cognition, emotion and motivation. *Psychological Review*, 98(2), 224–253.
- Miike, Y. (2002). Theorizing culture and communication in the Asian context: An assumptive foundation. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, XI(1), 1–21.
- Miike, Y. (2007). An Asiacentric reflection on Eurocentric bias in communication theory. *Communication Monographs*, 74(2), 272–278.
- Nisbett, R.E. (2003). *The geography of thought: How Asians and Westerners think differently . . . and why*. New York: Free Press.
- Oyserman, D., Coon, H.M., & Kemmelmeier, M. (2002). Rethinking individualism and collectivism: Evaluation of theoretical assumptions and meta-analyses. *Psychological Bulletin*, 128(1), 3–72.
- Seo, K.K., Miller, P.C., Schmidt, C., & Sowa, P. (2008). Creating synergy between collectivism and individualism in cyberspace: A comparison of online communication patterns between Hong Kong and U.S. students. *Journal of Intercultural Communication*, 18. Retrieved from <http://immi.se/intercultural/nr18/kay.htm>

- Triandis, H.C. (1990). Cross-cultural studies of individualism and collectivism. In J. Berman (Ed.), *Nebraska symposium on motivation, 1989* (pp. 41–133). Lincoln, NE: University of Nebraska Press.
- Triandis, H.C. (1994). *Individualism & collectivism*. Boulder, CO: Westview Press.
- Triandis, H.C., McCusker, C., & Hui, C.H. (1990). Multimethod probes of individualism and collectivism. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 59*(5), 1006–1020.
- Tsui, A.S., & Farh, J.L. (1997). Where guanxi matters: Relational demography and guanxi in the Chinese context. *Work & Occupations, 24*(1), 56–79.
- Wallerstein, I. (2006). *European universalism: The rhetoric of power*. New York: New Press.
- Wang, G., & Shen, V. (2000). Searching for the meaning of searching for Asian communication theories. *Asian Journal of Communication, 10*(2), 14–32.
- Xin, K.R. (1997). Asian American managers: An impression gap? An investigation of impression management and supervisor-subordinate relationship. *Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 33*(3), 335–355.
- Yang, K.-S. (1981). Social orientation and individual modernity among Chinese students in Taiwan: Further empirical evidence. *Journal of Social Psychology, 113*, 159–170.
- Yeh, J.H., & Chen, L. (2004). Value orientations of self-construals and argumentative behaviors in China, Hong Kong, and Taiwan. *Mass Communication Research, 80*, 51–87. (In Chinese)