Politeness in Conflict: Identity Management and Politeness Strategies Used During a Conflict

by

Carly Gabrielle Sheridan

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the

Requirements for the Degree of Bachelor of Arts

With Honors in Psychology from the

University of Michigan

2013

Advisor:

Dr. Fiona Lee

Abstract

People have different identities and roles, many of which have conflicting demands. Drawing on the emerging literature on how individuals manage multiple identities and roles, this study examines how individual differences in role integration (or perceived compatibility between conflicting roles) relate to how people handle conflict. I hypothesized that higher levels of identity integration will be related to behaviors that integrate multiple identities. A study was conducted where a sample of Israeli participants read a vignette about a commander in the Israeli army and an underperforming soldier in the unit, who is also a friend. Participants were asked to imagine that they are the commander, and provided a verbal response to the underperforming soldier. These verbal responses were coded for the frequency of strategies and different types of politeness used in each response. Participants also filled out an 8-item identity integration scale, which measured their perceived compatibility between commander and friend roles. Correlational and regression analyses showed that identity integration was negatively associated with politeness; that is, people who were more likely to integrate their commander and friend roles were more direct, and less polite, when dealing with the underperforming soldier. These results are consistent with previous research showing that, unlike Americans, Israelis value directness in their friendships, while Americans value indirectness and avoidance. These results show that cultural values and norms of communications may influence the relationship between role integration and behaviors.

Keywords: identity integration, identity management, politeness strategies, conflict, distance, directness, cultural values, norms of communication

Have you ever wondered why some people in a conflict respond honestly and directly, while others beat around the bush, making it seem like there is no conflict at all? In 1978, Brown and Levinson first presented their Politeness Theory, which discussed the nature of politeness as a mode of communication, and aimed to address the overall composition of ones responses and the universal patterns of human language. This sociolinguistic theory is important as it can measure directness and politeness strategies used in everyday speech. To some, politeness can avoid offending the other person's feelings and can be the easiest way to avoid tension (Kasper, 1990). For others, politeness may be seen as unfruitful for finding a solution because politeness rarely addresses the issue directly (Blum-Kulka & Kasper, 1989). In this thesis, I propose and test the idea that politeness is related to individual differences in how multiple roles are integrated. For example, an employee may be caught between appeasing their boss by working late or supporting his family by going home early for a familial obligation, which creates role-conflict situations (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005; Cheng & Lee, 2009). Because both employer and family identities are important in shaping one's identity, examining situations where two aspects of the identity are being pulled may shed light on how individuals manage these role conflicts through their speech or verbal behaviors. In developing my hypothesis, I review the literatures on identity integration, cultural values, politeness, and cultural norms of communication.

Identity Integration. Identity integration (II) refers to individual differences in how well one's multiple identities blend into each other (Benet-Martínez & Haritatos, 2005). People with high levels of identity integration perceive their many identities— such as being a member in a family, workplace, an ethnicity and a culture—as more compatible or integrated with each other. In contrast, people with low II perceive their multiple identities as conflicting when two or

more of their identities are simultaneously presented, and choose to keep their identities separate (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). Especially in regards to bicultural and multiracial identity integration, individuals experience differences in how they identify with their previous and current cultures. Results found that identity integration can be divided into two constructs: cultural conflict, which is an emotional reaction engendering a feeling of conflict and pressure to blend one's identities, and cultural distance, which cognitively identifies the degree of overlap (or separation) of one's identities, highlighting each identity in different contexts (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005; Cheng & Lee, 2009; Miramontez, Benet-Martínez, & Nguyen, 2008).

Taken together, higher levels of identity integration have predicted more creativity (Cheng, Sanchez-Burks & Lee, 2008; Mok & Morris, 2010), openness to new experiences, agreeableness, lower stress levels, and extraversion (Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). In this paper, I examine how identity integration is related to verbal communication strategies. Just as high IIs perceive their multiple identities as compatible, they will also perceive the communication norms of each identity to be compatible. As such, their verbal communication will reflect norms associated with *both* identities. To examine verbal communication, I draw on Politeness Theory, which is discussed in the next section.

Politeness and Norms of Communication. Politeness is a linguistic research theory that describes how social dynamics are reflected in our everyday speech or verbal discourse (Brown & Levinson, 1978). Unlike the colloquial presumption that politeness is in reference to manners and pleasantries, researchers agree that politeness is a strategic method used to avoid conflict by saving face for others and showing concern for them, while also maintaining clarity on the issue (Blum-Kulka, 1987). We need politeness when we criticize others, give negative feedback, or do

things that threaten people's ego and face, so as to allow social interactions to communicate face-threatening information while simultaneously showing concern for others. Indeed, using politeness strategies in resolving a conflict does not abate the message's overall meaning, even if our response is mostly using indirect language (Lee, 1993).

What is considered polite, or socially normative, depends on the roles we take. Some roles require us to be more direct, using on-record and positive politeness strategies, such as a boss chastising a worker, whereas other roles require us to be less direct, using negative politeness and off-record strategies, such as a mother who wishes to express concern for her son. Yet, how does someone encompassing both roles, such as a female boss who's son is her employee, manage the conflicting politeness norms associated with each role? It is in this scenario that identity integration plays an integral role. If this mother possesses a higher II, then she can utilize both direct and indirect strategies in both roles. However, if she has a low II, she will be more direct when speaking to her son while at work, because her inability to fully integrate her maternal role will impede on her ability to use those indirect politeness strategies (Batson, Sager, Garst, Kang, Rubchinsky, & Dawson, 1997; Benet-Martinez & Haritatos, 2005). In a similar study conducted with an American sample, results showed that higher II led to more polite or indirect statements (Henderson & Lee, 2012). However, is this a universal occurrence or simply a cultural phenomenon? I argue that there are cultural differences in reflecting politeness.

Research has supported that this conceptualization of verbal politeness or indirectness as a way to show concern for others may not be universal. Blum-Kulka argues that there is, in fact, a distinction between these categories. In four experiments conducted in the Cross-Cultural Speech Act Realization Patterns project, Blum-Kulka (1987) found that Hebrew and English

speakers differ in their interpretation of how polite it is to communicate one's intentions through hints**.** An example, taken from the study, is alluding to one's displeasure that the driveway is crowded, instead of directly stating that the car needs to be moved (Blum-Kulka, 1987). Important results found that English-speaking participants rated hinting as more polite than Hebrew participants. It can be seen that Hebrew speakers view indirect statements as a less polite strategy to use, whereas English speakers hold converse opinions.

In another study, House, Blum-Kulka, and Kasper (1989) accounted for differences in directness by finding that Israelis are more direct than Germans when upholding the same social status or power role. Indeed, Israelis believe that using indirect forms of speech is insincere on behalf of the speaker and interferes with cultural values of openness and honesty (Katriel, 1986). This suggests that indirectness may be considered differentially effective in showing concern for others across cultures and language (Kasper, 1990). In particular, for Israelis, indirectness, or on-record polite forms of speech, is viewed as less polite and exhibiting less care and concern for others compared to typical indirect strategies (Blum-Kulka, 1987).

Thus, I propose that, unlike Americans, Israelis' socio-linguistic norms of verbal communication would lead them to use more direct verbal strategies with friends, or in relationships where they want to show concern for the other person. Thus, Israeli bosses who have integrated their boss and friend roles will show less indirectness. In short, the relationship between II and politeness will be opposite from that observed in Americans.

Cultural Values. Milton Rokeach first pioneered the concept a universal values, indicating that there are 36 values that can be applied to people across the globe (Schwartz, 1992). Schwartz' value theory, which has substantial empirical support across dozens of cultures,

amalgamated Milton Rokeach's 36 values into ten motivationally driven values (Schwartz, 1992).

Values have contributed to affecting an individual's perception and interpretation of information

about the world, as well as altering one's long term behavior (Sagiv, Schwartz, & Arieli, 2010).

However, Bardi and Schwartz (2003) found that even though values motivate behavior, this

relationship is moderated by the social norms to perform certain behaviors in a given context.

Indeed, cultural values that are emphasized by members of society have been found to influence

individuals' personal values (Sagiv & Schwartz, 1997). Thus, the more external pressure and

social norms there are, the weaker the relationship is between values and behavior, and the

stronger the relationship becomes between behavior and social norms (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003).

Roccas and Sagiv (2010) found similar results when taking a cross-cultural perspective.

They agreed that values and behavior are moderated not only by contextual social norms, but

also by cultural norms. These cultural differences can explain a disparity between the usage and

strength of values to guide behavior and the cultural difference in the meaning of specific

behaviors (Roccas & Sagiv, 2010). Another longitudinal study concluded that Israel and United

States samples were congruent for all seven value domains tested: prosocial, restrictive

conformity, enjoyment, achievement, maturity, self-direction, and security (Schwartz & Bilksy,

1990). However, even though national values may be similar, one's "politeness potential" is

influenced more by the context of the situation than by values, whereby specific situations play

more of a role in utilizing certain politeness strategies over the overarching value systems (Blum-

Kulka 1987; Kasper, 1990). Thus, politeness strategies and norms around directness in verbal

communication are to be considered more influential on the individual's sense of identity in this

role-conflict scenario.

Method

I analyzed a vignette study where participants are asked to visualize themselves as a commander in the Israeli Defense Force, who has to talk to his friend, who is also soldier in his unit, about underperforming on the job. Participants had to respond with what they would say to the friend/soldier, and I coded these responses for politeness/indirectness. Participants also filled out eight questions regarding the commander and friend identities, to determine their II score.

Participants

The Israeli data was collected at both Open and Hebrew Universities, located in Israel. Participants took part in this study as partial fulfillment for a course requirement. The mean age for participants is 23.5 years old. There are 45.6%, n = 26, men and 54.4%, n = 31 females. Of these 57 Israelis, 50 have participated in military service whereas 7 did not. Furthermore, 46 people spoke Hebrew as their mother tongue and 9 learned another language first. Lastly, the mean years living in Israel is 22.6, with a minimum of 5 years and a maximum of 29, which indicates that the vast majority of participants lived in Israel for their whole lives.

Materials

The survey includes the following sections, presented in this order:

Vignette Scenario Survey. This vignette, created in Hebrew, describes a scenario about a commander of a unit in the Israeli Defense Force, who is excited that his friend has joined his unit. Initially the friend completes all the tasks, but after a while he does not carry his weight and even ruins some friendships in the unit (see Appendix A). Thus, the role of the commander requires the protagonist to maintain unity and success, but the role of a friend requires the

protagonist to show care and concern for his friend. After reading the vignette, participants were asked to take the role of the protagonist in the vignette, and write down all the actions he/she would take to solve the conflicting situation. Participants were also asked to indicate what they would verbally say to their friend. Because citizens of Israel have mandatory army service, this vignette is particularly relatable to survey participants.

Identity Integration Scale. Second, participants rated their levels of identity integration. There were eight different statements and a Likert Scale ranging from 1-7, completely agree to completely disagree (see Appendix B). This scale has been adapted from Benet-Martinez and Haritatos (2005) Bicultural Identity Integration (BII) scale. This version of the scale has been modified so instead of asking about perceived compatibility between two cultural identities, it asked about 2 other roles—commander/boss and friend. BII has been successful and shown good reliability and validity in previous studies, which confirmed its inclusion in this study. These statements addressed each specific scenario, asking if one is able to integrate one's identity as a commander and friend, or if one finds it difficult. Other statements rated what one considers a good friend or commander. The higher the participants' answers were on the scale, the higher their II score became. Overall these statements will be important when compared to their responses to the conflicting situation and measuring politeness.

Coding Procedure

The verbal responses participants provided were coded using the Politeness Coding Protocol (see Appendix C). The standard coding protocol for verbal politeness in speech, created in English, measures eight different items: how long the statement was, which politeness strategies were used (on-record/impolite, positive politeness, negative politeness, off-

record/polite), how many politeness strategies were used in the response, the overall politeness

category code which measures which strategy was used most frequently, and the coders' overall

opinion of the how polite the entire string was. Three coders, including myself, who are

proficient in both Hebrew and English, coded the verbal responses using this protocol.

Independent and Dependent Measures

The independent variable in this study is the identity integration score. The eight items

measuring identity integration is averaged (after reverse coding appropriate items) to form a

single identity integration score. The results between the eight statements were reliable, $\alpha = .850$.

Conflict and distance subscales were also created based on previous research showing these two

subscales, and these scores were also reliable, $\alpha = .797$ and $\alpha = .653$, respectively.

The dependent variables are overall measure of politeness used, the frequencies of each

strategy used, the number of politeness strategies used in each response, and the average word

count, or length, of each response. I ran descriptive statistics tests to make sure that there was no

peculiar data or any outliers, and that the means and medians were close together, confirming a

more even distribution, as shown in Table 1.

Data Analysis Procedures

I analyzed the data by performing the reliability analysis, and found the rating of the

three coders to be reliable, Chronbach's word count $\alpha = 1.0$, on-record, $\alpha = .905$, positive

politeness, $\alpha = .865$, negative politeness, $\alpha = .881$, off-record, $\alpha = .825$, politeness strategy, α

$= .851$, politeness category, $\alpha = .848$, and politeness overall, $\alpha = .878$. One dependent variable,

politeness categorization, which describes the overall politeness strategy used, was a categorical

variable, and thus I needed to create dummy codes for each of the four politeness categories, on-record, positive politeness, negative politeness, and off-record.

Thereafter, I ran two correlation tests. The first test was an intercorrelation between the averaged politeness variables and the new dummy codes, n = 11, which measured the relationship between the types and frequencies of politeness used, the length of the statement, and the overall type of politeness used for the entire response. I also ran a correlation test between the average score for all the politeness variables, n = 8, and the participant's average identity integration score, distance integration score, and conflict integration score, n = 3. The purpose of this test was to examine the relationship between identity integration and politeness strategies used in a conflict.

Results

Of the 101 participants who partook in the study, only 57 responses were direct verbal communication strategies said from the commander to the friend. The remaining 44 responses were recorded in the third person, which made coding for politeness impossible, and were consequently removed from the analysis.

Correlations Analyses. Table 2 shows the intercorrelation between the key variables. There were no significant correlations between the five control variables and average overall politeness. There were, however, significant correlations among the politeness strategies. Overall politeness was negatively correlated with whether participants used on-record strategies (the least polite and most indirect option), $r = -.561$, $p < .01$, but positively correlated with whether participants used more polite or indirect options such as using negative strategies, $r = .395$, $p < .01$, and using off-record strategies $r = .422$, $p < .01$.

Word count was significantly correlated with on-record/impolite , $r = .348$, p < .01, as well as word count and positive politeness, $r = .415$, p < .01, and number of politeness strategies used, r = .351, p < .01. These results indicate that the less polite one is, the longer one's responses became.

Overall politeness rating. As Table 2 shows, the correlations between II and each politeness variable were significant. As hypothesized, the overall identity integration score was negatively correlated with average overall politeness, $r = -.310$, $p < .05$, indicating that people who were higher on identity integration were less likely to polite or indirect. Similarly, the two identity integration subscales—distance and conflict, where higher levels indicate less distance and conflict or more politeness/indirectness—were also negatively correlated with average overall politeness, $r = -.291$, $p < .05$, and $r = -.354$, $p < .01$, respectively.

Similar trends were observed with categorical ratings of whether participants used each strategy, which can be seen by analyzing the dummy codes. As hypothesized, overall II, was positively correlated with the on-record or most impolite strategy, $r = .365, p < .01$, meaning that people with higher identity integration are more likely to use this particular strategy. Results showed the opposite effect between overall II and off-record or the most polite strategy, with marginally significant results, $r = -.235, p > .05$. Positive politeness and negative politeness codes were not significant, although II is positively correlated with distance, $r = .930, p < .01$, as well as conflict, $r = .805, p < .01$.

Regression Analyses. Linear regression analyses were used to test the relationship between overall identity integration on overall politeness, with five control variables: participants' age, gender, military service (whether they served), whether Hebrew was their first language,

and how many years he/she lived in Israel. As hypothesized, identity integration was a significant predictor of overall politeness, with a significance level of $p < .05$ for each analysis. None of the other covariates were significant predictors of overall politeness, except for Hebrew as the first language, which was a significant predictor of overall politeness, $ß = -.696$, $t = -.2.776$, $p < .05$. This result implies a linguistic significance to the study, as language was the only variable that accounted for variance of the data. The main effect of II in this analysis, $ß = -.277$, $t = -.2.722$, $p < .01$, was still higher than the control variable, indicating that II was more influential in predicting politeness.

Discussion

The study aimed to assess the relationship between identity integration and politeness strategies used in a conflict that pulls at two aspects of a participants' identity. Results found that there is a negative correlation between identity integration and overall politeness. In other words, participants who integrated their boss and friend identities were less polite (or less indirect) when criticizing the soldier. As mentioned, this trend was opposite to what was found in past studies with American participants, suggesting that verbal strategies used for politeness can be interpreted in different ways across cultures. Results also found that there is a positive correlation between the frequencies of strategies used and the overall category of politeness for the response. Additionally, the more impolite strategies used, the longer the response was. Contrary to predictions based on the Politeness Theory, these surprising results may be attributed to the fact that impolite people speak directly and are choosing to get their point across, which uses more words than a more polite response that sidesteps the real issue and therefore may save face by speaking less (Brown & Levinson, 1978; Holtgaves, 1986). Additionally, the longer one speaks, the more opportunity one has to use multiple strategies. However, because these results

are different than other researchers' findings, future research should continue to explore the impact of types of language on response length.

Indeed, even though Israeli cultural values are generally very similar to the United States, previous research has shown that Israeli norms of communication may highlight honesty and directness among people who care about each other, whereas American norms of communication emphasize indirectness and couching in the same relationships. Because the study vignette was created to prime cultural rather than international or universal norms, cultural norms and values are embedded in the scenario, which makes the these values more prominent. Furthermore, since speaking Hebrew as one's mother tongue was the only significant control variable in the data, results provide linguistic implications.

Taking other people's perspectives and understanding their feelings and actions can contribute to an increase in helping and understanding others as well as taking moral actions (Batson et al., 2003; Batson, Sager, Garst, Kang, Rubchinsky, & Dawson, 1997; Davis, Conklin, Smith, & Luce, 1996). This form of "self-other identification" can be important understanding one's points of view which may enable people to assuage a conflict (Batson, Sager, Garst, Kang, Rubchinsky, & Dawson, 1997, p. 495). Even in teams, perspective taking can positively impact conflict management by perceiving conflict as task-oriented rather than people-oriented, which places the blame on the task and minimizes intolerance towards an individual (Sessa, 1996). Since identity integration is related to norms of communication and a high II allows for increased perspective taking, study results implied that participants with high II took others' perspectives and provided a response that they too would want to hear.

Evidently, both Israel and the United States have similar values, yet language is not considered when analyzing similarities in values. Consequently, norms of communication between these cultures may be different, as there may be a difference between the definition of politeness and what context it is most appropriately used. Regarding the study, an individual, being a commander and a friend, may care tremendously for his/her friend, but may feel like being direct, and therefore "impolite" according to the American definition, may be the best way to solve the problem and express their love and concern. In contrast, individuals from the United States may believe that being "polite" is the best way to express their concern, as they do not want to hurt their friends' feelings. Thus, participants in both cultures are still expressing themselves in a polite and caring way, even if the definitions of politeness vary across cultures.

Limitations and Future Research

There were, however, some limitations to this study. Most importantly, a direct comparison needs to be done between the Israeli and American samples to statistically compare these samples. Even though different studies show different results, there are no statistical comparisons to strengthen this argument. Second, given that the interpretation of our results hinges on the idea that Israeli norms of communication focuses on directness among friends, future research is needed to directly measure participants' endorsement of this belief. Relatedly, more detailed information about participants' identification with and knowledge of Israeli cultural norms should be collected.

Third, there was a very small sample size, n = 57, and the sample consisted primarily of college students, who might have unique communication patterns compared to non-college students. Future studies should replicate this finding with a larger and more diverse sample.

Additionally, regarding demographic variables, participants did not disclose their position in the military, which could have been an interesting control variable to see how actual commanders responded to the scenario over participants with other military positions. Furthermore, future studies may want to explore the relationship between II and cultural norms for bicultural individuals, such as Israelis living in America and Americans who moved to Israel. Perhaps cultural norms prime individuals at different ages or life stages, which can impact these cultural differences in results.

The implications of this study are important, as communication is an essential component of everyday life. By delving deeper into understanding an individual's identity integration to measure the politeness strategies used, one can discern the differences of how people express their values, at least in terms of politeness. Along these lines, future research may want to examine cultures that are very different in values, such as Eastern cultures or perhaps less developed countries, where norms of social interaction and communication may set a different standard and definition for politeness (Kasper, 1990). Perhaps, for example, Asian cultures may strive to be more polite to maintain a high level of respect.

Ambaday, Koo, Lee, and Rosenthal (1996) discovered that there are cultural differences, not only in linguistic politeness but also nonlinguistic politeness. The study concluded that the Korean sample was more influenced by relational, nonverbal cues, whereas the Americans were more impacted by linguistic cues. I believe my results would have been different had I included nonlinguistic politeness, because not only is there an individual difference in the way people use their body while communicating, but different cultures emphasize hand gestures more than others, which could both improve and hinder the interpretation of the speaker's message.

Additional research may also want to explore the relationship between politeness and other aspects of social interaction. For example, Cohen, Vandello, Puente, and Ranitlla (1999) examined the association between politeness, interaction styles, and aggression in both Northern and Southern United States cities. Through a series of three studies, they found that norms of violence and politeness reinforce each other, such that southerners were less effective at conflict-resolution, and even though they were less sensitive to watching dangerous situations, they were more sudden in their outrage after being provoked (1999). Clearly the southern states possess a culture of honor that is missing in the north, which impacts politeness when faced with a conflicting situation, and could negate II's impact on one's response to a conflict.

To conclude, integration of boss versus friend identities entails incorporating friendship norms into a working relationship. However, what friendship norms mean may vary cross-culturally. In Israel, where friends are supposed to be open and direct with one another, especially when it comes to negative criticism or feedback, lower levels of politeness or indirectness are reflected when participations have higher levels of identity integration. This study shows that understanding these differing cultural perceptions and norms are critical for understanding how identity management strategies affect behaviors, and reveal the nuances of friendship across cultures.

References

Ambady, N., Koo, J., Lee, F., & Rosenthal, R. (1996). More than words: Linguistic and

nonliguistic politeness in two cultures. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

70(5), 996-1011.

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations.

Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29(10), 1207-1220.

Batson, C. D., Lishner, D. A., Carpenter, A., Dulin, L., Harjusola-Webb, S., Stocks, E. L., Gale,

S., Hassan, O., & Sampat, B. (2003). "...As you would have them do unto you": Does

imagining yourself in the other's place stimulate moral action? *Personality & Social*

Psychology Bulletin, 29, 1190-1201.

Batson, C. D., Sager, K., Garst, E., Kang, M., Rubchinsky, K. & Dawson, K. (1997). Is empathy

induced helping due to self-other merging? *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

73, 495-509.

Benet-Martínez, V., & Haritatos, J. (2005). Bicultural identity integration (BII): Components and

psychosocial antecedents. *Journal of Personality, 73*(4), 1015-1050.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1987). Indirectness and politeness in requests: Same or different? *Journal of*

Pragmatics, 11, 131-146.

Blum-Kulka, S., House, J., & Kasper, G. (Eds.) (1989). Cross-cultural pragmatics: Requests and

apologies. Norwood, NJ: Ablex.

Cohen, D., Vandello, J., Puente, S., & Rantilla, A. (1999). "When you call me that, smile!" How

  norms for politeness, interaction styles, and aggression work together in southern culture.

  Social Psychology Quarterly, 62(3), 237-275.

Cheng, C.-Y., & Lee, F. (2009). Multiracial identity integration: Perceptions of conflict and

  distance among multiracial individuals. *Journal of Social Issues, 65*(1), 51-68.

Cheng, C.-Y., Sanchez-Burks, J., & Lee, F. (2008). Connecting the dots within. *Psychological*

  Science, 19(11), 1178-1184.

Davis, M. H., Conklin, L., Smith, A., & Luce, C. (1996). Effect of perspective taking on the

  cognitive representation of persons: A merging of self and other. *Journal of Personality*

  and Social Psychology, 70, 713-726

Holtgraves, T. (1986). Language structure in social interaction: Perceptions of direct and indirect

  speech acts and interactants who use them. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology,*

  51 (2), 305-314.

Henderson, M. & Lee, F. (under review). Managing organizational role conflict: Identity

  integration facilitates integrative strategy use. Integrative power and communication

  strategies. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). University of Michigan, Ann Arbor.

Kasper, G. (1990). Linguistic politeness: Current research issues. *Journal of Pragmatics*, 14,

  193-218.

Katriel, T. (1986). Talking straight: Dugri speech in israeli sabra culture. Cambridge: Cambridge

  University Press.

Lee, F. (1993). Being polite and keeping MUM: How bad news is communicated in

organizational hierarchies. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 23, 1124-1149.

Meier, A.J. (1995). Defining politeness: Universality in appropriateness. *Language Sciences*,

17(4), 345–356

Miramontez, D. R., Benet-Martínez, V., & Nguyen, A.-M. D. (2008). Bicultural identity and

self/group personality perceptions. *Self & Identity, 7*(4), 430-445.

Mok, A., & Morris, M. W. (2010). Asian-americans' creative styles in asian and american

situations: Assimilative and contrastive responses as a function of bicultural identity

integration. *Management and Organization Review, 6*(3), 371-390.

Roccas, S., & Sagiv, L. (2010). Personal values and behavior: Taking the cultural context into

account. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass, 4*(1), 30-41.

Sagiv, L., & Schwartz, S. H. (2007). Cultural values in organizations: Insights for

europe. *European Journal of international Management*, (**1**), 176–190.

Sagiv, L., Schwartz, S. H., & Arieli, S. (2010). Personal values, national culture and

organizations: insights applying the schwartz value framework. In N. N. Ashkanasy, C.

Wilderom & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *Handbook of Organizational Culture and Climate* (pp.

515-537). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: theoretical advances

and empirical tests in 20 countries. In M. Zanna (Ed.), *Advances in Experimental Social

Psychology* (Vol. 25, pp. 1–65). New York: Academic Press.

Schwartz, S.H., & Bilsky, W. (1990). Toward a theory of the universal content and structure of

　　　values: extensions and cross-cultural replications. *Journal of Personality and Social*

　　　Psychology, 58(5), 878-891.

Sessa, V. I. (1996). Using perspective taking to manage conflict and affect in teams. *Journal of*

　　　Applied Behavioral Science, 32, 101-115

Author Note

Table 1

Descriptive Statistics for All Main Variables

Variable	Mean	Standard Deviation	Min	Max
Word Count	20.2281	8.71169	6.00	40.00
On-Record	1.2982	.97729	.00	4.33
Positive Politeness	1.0994	.81154	.00	2.67
Negative Politeness	.2515	.48909	.00	2.33
Off-Record	.1754	.38886	.00	2.00
Politeness Strategy	1.7836	.57560	1.00	3.33
Politeness Category	1.7076	.71289	1.00	4.00
Politeness Overall	2.0994	.92574	1.00	5.00
Identity Integration	4.7478	.70096	1.00	6.00

Table 2

Intercorrelations of Key Variables

		Gender	Age	Hebrew	Military	Yrs in Israel	Word Count	On-Record	Pos Pol	Neg Pol	Off-Record	Pol Strat	Pol Cat	Pol Overall	II score	II distance	II conflict
Gender	Pearson Correlation	1	-.343**	0.205	-0.021	-0.041	.289*	-0.045	0.04	0.16	0.082	0.064	0.153	0.15	-.392**	-.326*	-.274*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		0.009	0.132	0.878	0.76	0.029	0.738	0.767	0.234	0.545	0.635	0.257	0.264	0.003	0.013	0.039
Age	Pearson Correlation	-.343**	1	0.105	.455**	.484**	0.079	0.185	-0.046	-0.012	-0.069	0.167	-0.22	-0.093	0.117	0.149	-0.01
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.009		0.445	0	0	0.557	0.168	0.732	0.927	0.612	0.213	0.1	0.492	0.384	0.27	0.939
Hebrew	Pearson Correlation	0.205	0.105	1	0.161	.558**	.334*	0.252	0.094	-0.099	0.025	0.07	-0.255	-0.232	-0.126	-0.114	-0.207
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.132	0.445		0.242	0	0.013	0.063	0.495	0.473	0.858	0.612	0.06	0.088	0.358	0.409	0.129
Military	Pearson Correlation	-0.021	.455**	0.161	1	.285*	0.097	0.134	0.113	0.157	-0.061	.327*	-0.104	-0.037	0.132	0.137	0.087
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.878	0	0.242		0.032	0.475	0.322	0.404	0.242	0.653	0.013	0.44	0.784	0.329	0.309	0.52
Yrs in Israel	Pearson Correlation	-0.041	.484**	.558**	.285*	1	0.237	.294*	-0.086	0.069	0.02	0.205	-0.191	-0.112	0.08	0.175	-0.143
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.76	0	0	0.032		0.076	0.026	0.527	0.611	0.881	0.126	0.155	0.407	0.555	0.192	0.287
Word Count	Pearson Correlation	.289*	0.079	.334*	0.097	0.237	1	.348**	.415**	0.027	-0.089	.351**	-0.126	-0.114	-0.111	-0.103	-0.162
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.029	0.557	0.013	0.475	0.076		0.008	0.001	0.843	0.509	0.007	0.35	0.4	0.412	0.445	0.229
On-Record	Pearson Correlation	-0.045	0.185	0.252	0.134	.294*	.348**	1	-0.201	-.330*	-0.171	0.194	-.701**	-.650**	0.231	0.218	0.221
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.738	0.168	0.063	0.322	0.026	0.008		0.134	0.012	0.202	0.147	0	0	0.084	0.103	0.098
Pos Pol	Pearson Correlation	0.04	-0.046	0.094	0.113	-0.086	.415**	-0.201	1	0.006	-0.05	.484**	0.109	0.079	-0.03	-0.065	-0.061
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.767	0.732	0.495	0.404	0.527	0.001	0.134		0.965	0.712	0	0.418	0.559	0.824	0.633	0.655
Neg Pol	Pearson Correlation	0.16	-0.012	-0.099	0.157	0.069	0.027	-.330*	0.006	1	-0.08	0.253	.448**	.535**	-0.156	-0.134	-0.193
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.234	0.927	0.473	0.242	0.611	0.843	0.012	0.965		0.556	0.057	0	0	0.246	0.321	0.149
Off-Record	Pearson Correlation	0.082	-0.069	0.025	-0.061	0.02	-0.089	-0.171	-0.05	-0.08	1	0.199	.439**	.458**	-0.106	-0.101	-0.101
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.545	0.612	0.858	0.653	0.881	0.509	0.202	0.712	0.556		0.137	0.001	0	0.433	0.456	0.454
Pol Strat	Pearson Correlation	0.064	0.167	0.07	.327*	0.205	.351**	0.194	.484**	0.253	0.199	1	-0.041	0.149	0.171	0.165	0.039
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.635	0.213	0.612	0.013	0.126	0.007	0.147	0	0.057	0.137		0.763	0.268	0.203	0.219	0.773
Pol Cat	Pearson Correlation	0.153	-0.22	-0.255	-0.104	-0.191	-0.126	-.701**	0.109	.448**	.439**	-0.041	1	.893**	-.298*	-.297*	-.281*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.257	0.1	0.06	0.44	0.155	0.35	0	0.418	0	0.001	0.763		0	0.024	0.025	0.034
Pol Overall	Pearson Correlation	0.15	-0.093	-0.232	-0.037	-0.112	-0.114	-.650**	0.079	.535**	.458**	0.149	.893**	1	-.310*	-.291*	-.354**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.264	0.492	0.088	0.784	0.407	0.4	0	0.559	0	0	0.268	0		0.019	0.028	0.007
II score	Pearson Correlation	-.392**	0.117	-0.126	0.132	0.08	-0.111	0.231	-0.03	-0.156	-0.106	0.171	-.298*	-.310*	1	.930**	.805**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.003	0.384	0.358	0.329	0.555	0.412	0.084	0.824	0.246	0.433	0.203	0.024	0.019		0	0
II distance	Pearson Correlation	-.326*	0.149	-0.114	0.137	0.175	-0.103	0.218	-0.065	-0.134	-0.101	0.165	-.297*	-.291*	.930**	1	.725**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.013	0.27	0.409	0.309	0.192	0.445	0.103	0.633	0.321	0.456	0.219	0.025	0.028	0		0
II conflict	Pearson Correlation	-.274*	-0.01	-0.207	0.087	-0.143	-0.162	0.221	-0.061	-0.193	-0.101	0.039	-.281*	-.354**	.805**	.725**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	0.039	0.939	0.129	0.52	0.287	0.229	0.098	0.655	0.149	0.454	0.773	0.034	0.007	0	0	

Note: ** p < 0.01 level, 2-tailed * p < 0.05 level, 2-tailed

Appendix A
Conflict Scenario
(Originally in Hebrew, translated in English for inclusion in the thesis)

שריון. נבחרת לתפקיד מתוך מועמדים רבים. זהו דמיין שהתגייסת לפני שנה וחצי ואתה משרת בתפקיד מדריך הקורס השני שאתה מעביר וחשוב לך להוכיח את עצמך. בסוף הקורס יתקיים תרגיל חטיבתי בו ישתתפו החיילים שהדרכת והאופן שבו יבצעו את תפקידם יעיד על איכות ההדרכה שלך וישפיע על המשך התקדמותך בצבא.

יך היה חבר טוב שלך בתיכון. הוא התגייס חצי שנה אחריך לשריון, לאחר אחד החיילים בצוות שאתה מדר שסיפרת לו על הרבה חוויות טובות שלך בחיל. שמחת מאוד לגלות שאתה צפוי להדריך אותו כי אתה מכיר אותו כמשקיען ויודע שהוא "מורעל" על התפקיד.

בצורה הטובה ביותר, היה ברור שחשוב לו בתחילת הקורס הוא התחבר עם כל הצוות והשלים את כל המשימות להצליח. בזמן האחרון, ללא סיבה נראית לעין, הוא הדרדר מבחינת ביצועים ונתפס מספר פעמים מתבטל בזמן ששאר הצוות עובד. בעקבות זאת הוא גם הסתכסך עם מספר חברים בצוות.

ח שלהם בהמשך וחייל שלא מסתדר עם יכולת שיתוף הפעולה של כל חברי הצוות היא קריטית לתפקוד מוצל חבריו עלול לפגוע בכך. לתפישתך, כמדריך הקורס מוטלת עליך האחריות לשמור על אחדות הצוות והצלחתו, תוך דאגה לכל אחד מהחברים בו. מצד שני, מדובר בחבר טוב, ואתה מקווה שתישארו חברים גם אחרי השירות בצבא.

Imagine you joined a year and a half ago and you serve as a commander in the army. This is a selection position chosen from many candidates. This is the second course you are moving and important for you to prove yourself. At the end of the course all of the soldiers in the unit will participate in an exercise to show how they carry out their duties and to testify the quality of your training which will affect the continued progress in the military.

One of the solider in the team is your good friend from high school. He enlisted in the six months after your service, after you told him about a lot of your good experiences in the corps. You are excited to discover that you are likely to be his commander, as you know him and you know he will add a positive "morale" on the job.

At the beginning of the course he connected with the whole team and completed all the tasks in the best way, it was clearly important to him to succeed. Lately, for no apparent reason, he deteriorated in terms of performance and was caught a few times idling/not doing anything while the rest of the team worked. Following this he fell out with some friends in the unit.

Cooperation and participation in all of the activities for all the team is critical to their successful functioning, and a soldier who does not get along with his friends might damage it. From your perspective, as an instructor of the course it is your responsibility to keep the unity of the team and its success, while caring for all of the members in it. On the other hand, he is a good friend, and you hope you stay friends after the service in the army.

Appendix B

Identity Integration Scale

התפקיד מפקד והתפקיד חבר של פקוד. –המשפטים בהמשך עוסקים בדעותייך לגבי שני תפקידים אחרים
שבה אתה חשוב על מצב בו היית משמש כמפקד, ואחד מפקודיך היה חברך. סמן בבקשה את המידה
מסכים או לא מסכים עם כל אחד מהמשפטים הבאים:

These sentences deal with opinions on two different roles- the role of a commander and the role
of a friend in the unit. Consider the situation where there was a commander, and also a friend.
Please put down your opinion that you agree with or don't agree with for every statement.

	מאוד לא מסכים do not agree						מסכים בהחלט agree completely
המחויבויות שלי כמפקד שונות מהמחויבויות שלי כחבר. **My role as a commander is different than my role as a friend.**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
אני מרגיש קונפליקט בין התפקיד שלי כמפקד לבין התפקיד שלי כחבר. **I feel conflicted between my job as a commander and my job as a friend**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
אני מעדיף להפריד בין היותי מפקד לבין היותי חבר. **I prefer to distinguish between my role as a commander and my role as a friend.**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
ההתנהגות שלי כמפקד לעיתים קרובות שונה מהתנהגותי כחבר. **My behavior as a commander often differs from my role as a friend**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
מה שהופך אותי למפקד טוב הופך אותי גם לחבר טוב. **What makes me a good commander also makes me a good friend.**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
אני מרגיש שאני נקרע בין הציפיות ממני כמפקד לבין הציפיות ממני כחבר. **I feel torn between the expectations of a commander and the expectations of a friend.**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
בצורה מלאה בין התפקיד שלי כמפקד לבין אני משלב התפקיד שלי כחבר. **I fully integrate my role of a commander and my role as a friend.**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
אני לא חש ניגוד בין המטרות שלי כמפקד לבין המטרות שלי כחבר. **I do not feel conflicted between my role as a commander and my role as a friend**	1	2	3	4	5	6	7

Appendix C

Politeness Coding Protocol

Context of the Study:

Subjects read 3 vignettes that presented different types of role conflict (student-family role conflict, student-worker role conflict, and boss-friend role conflict). Subjects always took the perspective of the character facing the role conflict, and they had to decide how to deal with the situation at hand. After reading each vignette, subjects generated a list of possible options for dealing with the situation and then chose the "best" option they would be most likely to use. Subjects were then asked to verbally implement their chosen strategy by writing down exactly what they would say when communicating their chosen option. You will be coding these open-ended responses in terms *of the number of various politeness strategies used, how you would categorize the overall response, and how polite YOU perceive the response to be overall.*

Complete a coding sheet for each response according to the vignette

Subject ID # _____

1) Word Count: _____

Indicate the total word count for the response.

2) Politeness Strategies (Counts):

After coding a response for politeness (using the coding manual), total up the number of phrases present in the response for each of the 4 politeness categories (This can range greatly, from 0, to 1, to several phrases).

On-record/Impolite: _____

Positive Politeness: _____

Negative Politeness: _____

Off-record/Polite: _____

3) Number of Politeness Strategies Used (1-4): _____

Indicate the number of politeness categories above that were used in the response: 1, 2, 3, or all 4 ("1" indicating that one of the politeness categories was used, "4" indicating that all four politeness categories were used).

4) Politeness Categorization (Overall Category Code):_____

Indicate which category best describes the overall response. This should typically correspond to the category that received the highest number in the previous counts of the politeness strategies (if multiple categories received the same counts, please use your best judgment to determine which category best reflects the response overall). Enter the number below corresponding to the category which best describes the response (1 for on-record, 2 for positive politeness, etc.)

On-record/Impolite = 1; Positive Politeness = 2; Negative Politeness = 3; Off-record/Polite = 4

5) Overall, how polite do you think this subject's email string was?

Please just use your own intuition when responding to this question, and enter the number below that best reflects your judgment of how polite (or impolite) the overall response was.

1	2	3	4	5
Very Impolite	Somewhat Impolite	Neither Polite/Nor Impolite	Somewhat Polite	Very Polite