CONFLICT IN COMMUNICATION: PERSONAL ATTITUDE AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT STYLE IN THAI AND NON-THAI SCHOOL WORKERS IN INTERNATIONAL SCHOOLS

KEDSANEE BROOME

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment of the Requirements for the Degree of

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Graduate School of Counseling Psychology

ASSUMPTION UNIVERSITY

2004
This study was undertaken to determine communication conflicts that occur because of the differences of personal attitude and conflict management styles among Thai and non-Thai school workers in cross-cultural settings. The samples were school workers in international schools around Bangkok.
The study seeks to determine the relationship between personal attitudes and conflict management styles between Thai and non-Thai school workers. According to the assumption that communication conflicts occur among Thai and non-Thai school workers because there are differences between their personal attitudes that consequently lead to the different styles used in managing conflicts.

The subjects for this study were categorized into two independent groups with culture and language differences that distinguished one from the other. The two groups were 157 Thai and 143 non-Thai school workers in Bangkok based international school system, in which English is the working language. The instrument used to measure personal attitude was Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) and the instrument used to measure conflict managing styles was Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI).

The findings indicated that:

1. Non-Thai respondents have higher self-esteem than Thai respondents and they tended use more solution-orientation style while Thai respondents are likely to use more of nonconfrontation style in dealing with conflict.

2. Male respondents obtained lower social-approval in Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) compared to females in both groups with statistical significances at the level of .05.
3. Respondents with higher education level tend to have high confidence in both
groups with F-test values that lower than a .05 set for level of significance.
4. Both groups were found to receive similar level of self-esteem when classified by
four different levels of age with no statistical significant difference.
5. Thai respondent with higher work experiences are likely to have high confidence
with a received F value that lower than a .05 set for level of significance.
6. Gender and Age have no significant relationship with styles used in dealing with
conflict.

Correlation between personal attitude and conflict managing strategies was
found that there was no significant relationship between popularity and conflict
managing styles in Thai respondents and there was no significant relationship between
self-esteem and solution-orientation and control styles among non-Thai respondents.
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CHAPTER I

THE PROBLEM AND ITS BACKGROUND

Introduction

Thailand, like many other East and Southeast Asian countries, has developed rapidly in recent years, attracting substantial foreign enterprises and investments. A number of expatriates move to Thailand because job markets are increasing.

To be able to communicate in a background of language differences is important as shown in daily English newspapers. The most popular job for a foreigner is teaching English. Also the Thai language business schools’ enrolment is fast growing. Is the language difference the only barrier in communication? Do the differences and conflicts still remain if Thai and non-Thai speak the same language? Living in a new environment, the foreigner becomes aware that his/her behavior, which for years he/she had thought of as correct, polite and friendly, can be interpreted or misinterpreted as odd, rude and even hostile. As Cooper & Cooper (1982) mentioned in their book Culture Shock Thailand, “throwing things, even if it is only a box of matches, is considered quite snobbish; if the object is of the ‘semi-sacred’ category, e.g. food, it is rude. If throwing involves a sacred object, e.g. a Buddha pendant, then you are asking for trouble.”

Acknowledging cultural differences, the question which occurs in mind is how deeply the cultural differences affect communication?

Johnson (1994) explained that the cross-ethnic prejudices that create conflicts are typically reflected in stereotypes. Stereotypes influence what we perceive and remember about the actions of out group members. The social categories we use to process
information about the world, control what we tend to perceive and not perceive. For instance, Thais perceive that using a loud voice in an argument is creating a conflict meanwhile foreigners might perceive the same behavior as one of communicating styles.

From the previous stated, it shows that language difference is not the only barrier in communication but cultural differences also influence the communication relationship between Thais and non-Thais. Conflicts have risen according to the gradually increasing need for inter-cultural communication. The following is an excerpt of conversation between Thai and non-Thai office workers, which can occur quite often.

In an International School, a physical education teacher, who is a native English speaker, and a secretary to the school director who is Thai, who speaks fluent English, were engaged in an ordinary communication.

The physical education teacher wanted the school to build aluminum goals for the soccer field. As the service manager had limited skills in speaking English, the secretary explained to her about the teacher's need. Instead of directly denying the request, the service manager shifted the PE teacher's goal by asking through the secretary if he wanted to look at galvanized steel goal posts to see if they could be substituted for the aluminum ones which could cost more money.

**PE teacher:** Can you tell her (the service manager) that I want the soccer goals made of aluminum instead of galvanized steel?

**Secretary:** She wants you to look at the galvanized steel pipes.

**PE teacher:** I know what they look like but I want to know if she can provide aluminum goals.

**Secretary:** Why don't you just go and have a look first?
PE teacher: Why don’t you just keep quiet and let me deal with her?

Secretary: I tried to help you but the only thing I got from you is rudeness.

The PE teacher was frustrated with the non-confrontational tactic used by the service manager (instead of telling him that the school can’t provide the aluminum goals because of their cost) and easily starts the conflict in communication. The secretary might think that she helped the teacher and the service manager in order to make an easier communication. However, without knowing herself, she engaged in conversation conflict when she said: “Why don’t you just go and have a look first?” At the same time, the teacher was angry because he didn’t get what he wanted and also he thought that the secretary crossed the line in trying to be more than an interpreter.

According to Hocker & Wilmot, (1991), who describe this pattern of conflict in their book, Interpersonal Conflict, as goal shifting: the content goal of the PE teacher to get aluminum pipes turns into a relationship contest between him and the secretary. In the same way the secretary’s goal of completing the task of being an interpreter turns into a personal involvement.

In Psychology of the Thai People (1991), Komin describes Thai people as being influenced by the hierarchy in their collectivist society. They value harmonious social relationships, avoid confrontation, and handle conflicts with harmony. Direct confrontation and loss of face must be avoided by all times, which again explains the indirect communication style used by the Thai people. When conflict arises, Thai people try to avoid the situation whereas people in Western countries, voice out their opinions and express their emotions and try to deal with the conflict in a constructive way (Courso, 1997).
Imagine the same situation happening among Thais. The conflict might not explode right away as this researcher observes, but since foreigners are likely to use confrontation tactics in a conflict situation rather than avoidance tactics which is normally used by Thais. A Thai PE teacher may not get too frustrated with the service manager’s tactic of avoidance and may patiently agree to check out the PVC pipes even if he knew they could not be an effective substitute.

Thais perceive conflict as destructive and such affairs must be avoided in order to maintain positive relationships. Dunford (1994) explains the similar perspective as the unitary perspective—harmony is the natural state; conflict represent aberration, an abnormal state of affairs. Unlike Thais, Westerners are concerned with directly reflecting their differing interests when conflict occurs. Westerners are likely to view conflict as constructive in its effects, Dunford (1994) gives an explanation of this conflict perspective as the pluralist—perfect phenomenon reflecting the differing interests and perspectives of organizational members.

Another example of a conversation between a Thai and a non-Thai presents a good example of the different perspective of both parties. A Thai secretary was criticized by a European manager about her work.

Manager: I want you to recheck this report again. It’s not the first time that you handed in a report with mistakes.

Secretary: I’m sorry.

Manager: I don’t need your apology but more effective working abilities.

The secretary walked out of the manager’s room with tears in her eyes thinking that the manager dislikes her and he broke the relationship between them. Instead of directly
discussing this conflict with her boss, she just considered looking for a new job. This situation reflects the secretary’s perception that conflict is abnormal and non-productive. Meanwhile, the manager thought that this is a natural affair which often happens in a working situation.

Through the examples of communication above, it is obvious that Thais and non-Thais with differing ethnic backgrounds, will unavoidably face conflicts if they do not understand their communication differences and attitudes, and develop an awareness of dealing with conflicts.

The study focuses on determining: (a) communication conflicts, which occur basically as a result of cultural differences, even with Thais who can speak fluent English or non-Thais who are able to speak Thai very well, (b) personal attitudes, focuses on how people take conflicts personally, and (c) conflict management styles in handling conflict.

**Objectives**

The objectives of the study are:

1. To identify personal attitudes as measured by the Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) of Thai and non-Thai school workers.

2. To identify the conflict managing styles of Thai and non-Thai school workers as measured by Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI).

3. To measure the difference between personal attitude and selected demographic variables in relation to age, gender, education level, and years of work experience among Thai and non-Thai school workers.
4. To measure the difference between conflict managing styles and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience among Thai and non-Thai school workers.

5. To determine the relationship between personal attitude and the three situational managing styles i.e. nonconfrontation, solution-orientation and control used by Thai and non-Thai school workers.

Statement of the problem

The study of the relationship between personal attitudes and conflict management styles of Thai and non-Thai school workers aims to answer and clarify the following questions:

1. What are the personal attitudes of Thai and non-Thai school workers?

2. What are the conflict managing styles used by Thai and non-Thai school workers?

3. What is the significant difference between personal attitude of Thai and non-Thai school workers and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience?

4. What is the significant difference between conflict management styles used by Thai and non-Thai office workers and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience?

5. What is the significant relationship between personal attitude and the three situational management styles i.e. nonconfrontation, solution-orientation and control?
Hypotheses

The following research hypotheses are tested in this study:

1. There is a significant difference between personal attitude and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level and years of work experience among Thai and non-Thai school workers.

2. There is a significant difference between conflict management styles and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience of Thai and non-Thai school workers.

3. There is a significant relationship between the two factors measuring personal attitudes: confidence and social-approval and the three conflict management styles: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control.

Significance of the study

This research is aimed at identifying personal attitude and conflict management styles used by Thai and non-Thai school workers in communication. The researcher believes that the difference in culture and language varies in age, gender, education, position and years of experience. These also influence the conflict management styles and lead to the escalation of the conflict.

This study will focus on both verbal and non-verbal communication, as it is impossible to completely exclude the one from the other. According to the belief of the researcher, the cultural differences and language barriers are the major causes of communication conflict. The findings of this research will provide useful information to...
help Thai and non-Thai school workers understand the nature of their differences and be able to manage their conflicts more productively. Communication styles can have positive aspects in some societies and also negative ones in another, Klausner (1986) stated that one of the most pervasive Thai culture imperatives is avoidance of social confrontation. This research is aimed at identifying the conflict management styles by Thai and non-Thai. Its findings can be useful sources for counselors, workers, students and anyone who is involved with the afore-mentioned environment and as a guide in counseling, therapies or work shops.

Scope and Limitations

Limitations of this study are explained into two sections: the limitation of the instruments and overall study’s limitations.

The limitation of the instruments

Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI)—this instrument describes personality by using self-esteem as a factor of measurement. Although there are numerous studies that documented the association between self-esteem and coping-behavior which represent the importance of determining self-esteem in explaining personal behavior. However, self-esteem is only a subcomponent of a person’s total self-concept. Smith, Wethington and Zhan (1996) postulate the importance of self-concept clarity underlying a network of associations between self-esteem, depression, anxiety, perceived social support, and perceived stress that also have been linked empirically to coping behavior. They further claim that self-esteem is not an adequate way to represent the influence of self-concept on coping. Since it
is impossible to use many instruments to measure all the subcomponents of personality, this researcher therefore focused on the major factor, self-esteem, to measure personality.

Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI)—the development of this instrument is based on three assumptions; a) conflict strategies involving strategic or planned interaction; that is, participants make choices about alternative behaviors by considering their own goals and the anticipated goals of the other person, b) conflict strategies representing the behavior choices that people make rather than a person's characteristic style c) the use of particular strategy is largely governed by situational rather than personality constraints. (Putnam & Wilson, 1982) According to the development of OCCI, the findings of each factor: nonconfrontation, control and solution-orientation cannot describe the subjects' overall strategies in conflict but situational strategies used in conflict. Putnam & Wilson (1982) state that majority of people do not have a characteristic mode of conflict management behavior.

Overall study limitations

This research focuses on cultural differences as a factor influencing personality in conflicts and managing styles of Thai and non-Thai school workers. As Rahim & Bonoma (1979) suggested, a conflict situation is defined by the amount of conflict, the organizational structure and the personal-cultural factors of individuals. Some variables such as gender of supervisor and organizational commitment will have less effect. However, the findings of many researchers on gender of supervisor and organizational commitment (Renwick, 1997; Kilmann & Thomas, 1975; and Zammuto, London, & Roland, 1979) concluded that the feeling-oriented cognitive systems of female supervisors were conducive to integration and cooperation and male supervisors forced resolutions in
order to maintain a semblance of harmony. Conflict management style follows models of situational leadership in that they characterize an individual’s choice of behavior across a variety of situations. The consequences of these findings increase the awareness of the researcher regarding limitations at some levels.

The other limitation of this study is the major use of English language with non-Thai school workers against the Westerners and Europeans (including Australians and New Zealanders) who use English as a first language. The findings from this research may throw a bias with either the non-native English speakers and the non-Thais.
Definition of Terms

**Attitude**—an enduring pattern of evaluative responses towards a person, objects, or issue. (Oxford Dictionary of Psychology, Colman, 2001) In this research, attitude represents correspondents' sub-component of personality that varies accordingly to cultural differences.

**Communication**—A process by which information is exchanged between individuals through verbal and non-verbal messages in the circumstance that the diversity of backgrounds, experiences, and assumptions resident in communicators to their culture has the potential to make communication difficult. (Larry A. Samovar, 2001)

**Communication Conflict**—an expressed struggle between at least two interdependent parties who perceive incompatible goals, scarce resources, and interference from the other party in achieving their goals. (Hocker and Wilmot, 1991)

**Confidence**—the fact of being or feeling certain; assurance. The act of confiding, trusting, or putting faith in. (Webster's New World Dictionary, 1994) In this research confidence is a factor measured self-esteem.

**Conflict Management Style**—the specific event that coping style can be defined as the usual and stable response to an event (s) or situation (s) which is a product of cognitive process involving the appraisal of situational demands, the adaptability and possibility of responses, and the reappraisal of the situation following the person's behavior. (Jackson & Bosma, 1990)
**Conflict Strategies**—are those communicative behaviors, both verbal and nonverbal, that provide a means for handling conflict. Conflict involves strategic or planned interaction; that is, participants make choices about alternative behaviors by considering their own goals and anticipated goals of the other person. (Putnum & Wilson, 1982)

**Control** — The characteristics of a person that can explain direct confrontation leading to persistent argument and nonverbal forcing. (OCCI, Putnum & Wilson, 1982)

**Nonconfrontation** — the characteristics of a person that explain avoidance and smoothing as indirect strategies for dealing with the conflict. (OCCI, Putnum & Wilson, 1982)

**Non-Thai school worker** — In this study, it is a foreigner or ‘farang’ (the generic Thai word for white foreigner that is American, Canadian, South African, British, Australian or New Zealander) who works in an international school participating in cross-cultural communication with Thais and uses English as a native language.

**Personal Attitude**—in this study means one’s feelings or beliefs towards objects, persons, and situations that make one distinct from the others.

**Popularity**—the state of being accepted among people in general; common; prevalent or being liked by many or most people. (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1994)
Self-esteem— one’s attitude towards oneself or one’s opinion or evaluation of oneself, which may be positive (favorable or high), neutral, or negative (unfavorable or low). (Oxford Dictionary of Psychology, Colman, 2001). In this study, self-esteem is one of the subcomponents of personality that is most important and is a major explanation of personality in individuals.

Social-approval— being accepted or favorable opinion by a group or society where their dealings affect one another. (Webster’s New World Dictionary, 1994)

Solution-Orientation – The characteristics of a person that can explain direct confrontation, open discussion of alternatives, and acceptance of compromises. (OCCI, Putnum & Wilson, 1982)

Thai school worker – Refers to a Thai citizen who uses the Thai language as a native language, grew up in Thailand, and is working in an international school embracing a cross-cultural communicative environment.
Conceptual Framework

Figure 1 The Conceptual Framework of the Independent and Dependent Variables
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- Years of Work Experience

Personal Attitude
- Confidence
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- Control
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

This research focuses on personal attitudes and conflict management styles that are used by Thai and non-Thai school workers. The review of related literature includes topics of communication and conflict in organizations, cultural differences, personal attitude, conflict management styles, related studies.

Communication and Conflict in Organizations

In this section, the four reviewed topics are; the study of organizational communication, metaphor of communication that determines the importance of the relationship between communication and organization, metaphor of conflict which broadens the view of conflict perspectives, and the conflict in organization.

The Study of Organizational Communication

History and development of organizational communication research (Putnam, Nelson, and Chapman 1996) shows that in early research from the 1920s to the 1950s, and in interests in business and industrial communication until the 1950s to the mid 1970s, the human relations movement increased. Through the 1960s and 1970s, the dominant perspective shifted to the study of messages that flowed through organizations and the way communication influenced the adequacy and effectiveness of message transmissions.
According to this research, individual and organizational effectiveness are influenced by communication.

Prior to the 1980s and at the beginning of the 1980s, Redding and Tompkins (1988) indicated two dominant interests that formed the foundation of the field are: the skills that made individuals more effective communicators on the job, and the factors that characterized system-wide communication effectiveness. This period, called modernist orientation, (Putnam and Cheyney 1985; Redding and Tompkins 1988) focuses on the psychological study in the field of communication climate, superior and subordinate interaction and information processing.

In the mid 1980s, Putnam (1996) claims that the new approach arose after the critiques, in the absence of theoretical frameworks and the nature of organizational reality became embedded in modernist work. New research focuses on the meanings of organizational events, strategies ambiguity, language symbols and organizational culture.

Smith (1993) explains the relationship between communication and organization in three ways: containment, production, and equivalency. He claims that containment relationship sets communication within organization as a materialistic structure of organization. The production type of relationship states that communication produces organization, or organizations produce communication, or the two co-produce each other. The third type is equivalence, which treats communication and organization as a monastic unity or as the same phenomenon expressed in different ways that is, communicating is organizing and organizing is communicating. Smith (1993) and Taylor (1995) claim the two processes are isomorphic.
Conflict in Organization

In order to understand the conflict in organization, it is essential to study the structural model of the conflict. Dunford (1994) concludes the possibility that conflict is divided into two groups: causal factors, which identify the cause of conflicts in the first place, and shaping factors or how the conflicts will be handled.

According to Dunford (1994) causal factors which set up the possibility of conflict in the first place are;

Organization design—differentiation is a fundamental factor in organization design that grows in many divisions that share common goals, such as marketing departments, financial departments, sales departments etc. Dunford (1994) suggested that differentiation might develop members' special skills but as many groups develop differentiations, it can lead to more differences among groups. The other organization design that influences the increasing of the conflict such as hierarchy, interdependence, asymmetrical relations, dependence on common resources etc.

Employment relationship—Edwards (1986) states that conflict exists because there is a “structure antagonism; that is, ‘employers need workers’ creative capacities but cannot give them free reign because of the need to secure a surplus and to maintain a degree of general control”

Diverse agendas—is seen in a political model of organization where cooperation and conflict are dual natures of organization.

Cultural factors—conflict can arise between incompatible subcultures or in the case of mergers and takeovers; conflict may develop if the cultures of the pre-merger organizations were different.
Communication practice—communication achievement is important as information flows through an organization. It may be changed, blocked or misunderstood. Conflict may arise from the lack of success in disseminating information. (Dunford, 1994)

The pre-existing influences or shaping factors on how the conflict will be handled, Dunford (1994) are as follows;

Behavioral predisposition – the particular way that ‘conflict episode’ (Pondy, 1967) develops, not just the specific details of the conflict episode but also significant dominant style that the party has.

Social pressure—in a conflict, a group of members pressuring the representative, which limits the ability of the representative, as the expectations of the members judges the outcome of the representative’s actions.

Rules and procedures—the action of group members is shaped by decision rule; specific decisions that are made in a given circumstance and procedural rules that specify how a decision is to be determined. (Dunford, 1994)

Cultural Differences

Culture is the values, beliefs and thoughts that are rooted in a society where people behave differently from group to group because of living factor differences. Brown (1983) explained that cultures emerge from efforts to solve the problems of living in society, and cultural features may be based in factors like climatic conditions, availability of food, terrain, and availability of land. This section focuses on causal factors of cultural differences in communication between Thais and Westerners. These causal factors include language, place, thought processing and nonverbal communication.
Language

Language is a basic tool in communication. Therefore, it is a norm that conflict occurs even among people who speak the same language. According to Borisoff & Victor (1998), in the context of language differences, there are accent differences, linguistic differences and translation difficulties that all parties engaged in cross-cultural communication have to understand.

Accent differences explained by Borisoff & Victor (1998), as the way one pronounces, enunciates, and articulates words, fall under the general category of accent. In Thai society, students generally study English with Thai teachers who also have limitations in pronouncing English as it is not their native language. Such difficulties in pronunciation and articulation have an affect on communication, and can cause misinterpretation. Cooper & Cooper (1998), pointed out that one of the most frequent causes of misunderstanding is the Thai speech habit of never pronouncing two consonants without a vowel sound in between. Often the second consonant gets lost. This can be confusing; ‘I can’t go.’ And ‘I can go.’ Mean quite different things, but 90 percent of Thais will pronounce both as ‘I can go.’

Linguistic differences Borisoff & Victor (1998) stated that one can even approximate the meaning of a message through translation, and at best convey the ideas connected to the translator’s choice of words in that language. In this researcher’s own experience, the word ‘Mun-kiaw’ translated in English as ‘itchy fang’ means the feeling that someone or something is adorable. Thais have the feeling of desire to hug or kiss as much as to sink their fangs when seeing such a cute puppy or a cute baby. Westerners might not be able to grasp the meaning and may lose the understanding as the feeling of ‘itchy fang’ does not exist in Western culture.
Translation difficulties Borisoff & Victor (1998) claimed that the difficulties with the translation of language fall basically into three categories which are gross translation problems, the conveyance of subtle distinctions from language to language, and recognizing culturally based variations among speakers of the same language.

Place

Place is one of the causal factors that influences cultural differences. Borisoff & Victor (1998) defined place as (1) the physical environment in which one lives and (2) existing technology, or the way in which one manipulates that environment. They later explained that to some extent the environment and technology of a culture are interrelated, forming a culture system and culturally ingrained biases about natural and technological environment can create communication barriers.

To illustrate how such environment-based differences may cause a communication-based conflict, consider how the hot climate in Thailand makes Thais more laid back and they see no reason for rushing or moving fast – called jai-yen (cool heart). According to foreigners, ‘cool heart’ refers to a vain personality rather than a laid back personality. Therefore this translated meaning does not match with the behavior in their sense. Because climate differentiates people’s life styles, personality and culture, people in a cold climate country need to move fast to keep warm, which is opposite to Thais who are in a hot climate need to slow down to stay cool. The word ‘jai-yen’ therefore is common and becomes a Thais characteristic.

These two researchers give interesting meanings to ‘jai-yen’ according to their own culture base. Cooper & Cooper (1998) defined jai-yen as the philosophy of conflict avoidance that is most common and respected by Thais, but infuriates many Westerners.
Thais can stay “cool hearted” and smile their way out of almost any situation, carefully
avoiding any words or actions that might be regretted later. Komin (1991) defined jai-yen
as calm, easy-going, and not easily excited. This ‘smooth over’ characteristic trait is one of
the Thai values meaning to maintain or preserve one another’s feeling or ego. One shall be
careful not to hurt another person’s feelings even though it is contrary to one’s own feeling.

*Thought Processing*

Thought processing is the way people process the meaning of the environment
surrounding them. Victor (1992) defined thought processing in cultural differences in
perspectives as four variables: (1) social organization, (2) contexting, (3) authority, and (4)
temporal conception likely to shift across cultures affecting how a person understands what
is communicated.

Borisoff & Victor (1998) stated that social organization shapes the most
fundamental beliefs of member culture. Conflict is likely to occur when an individual
assumes as universal his or her views on issues reflecting the social organization of his or
her own culture. Klausner & Klausner (19886), gave an example of a new “farang”
manager who was invited to a wedding and dinner reception, but he felt somewhat
embarrassed as he did not know the bride or groom and only knew the father of the groom
very slightly.

Similar to social organization, contexting is the area of thought processing in which
people in a society share common things together but especially in the way in which they
communicate and the circumstances surrounding that communication. Borisoff & Victor
(1998) acknowledged that in a highly contexted situation much of what the communicator
chooses not to articulate is essential to understanding the transmitted message. They
explained later that there are levels of contexting within a culture. Thus there are high-context cultures whose members rely heavily on inferred meaning, and in low-context cultures whose members rely heavily on literal meaning. In Thai culture, it is bad to lose one’s temper and become angry. Therefore, Thais often smile and stay ‘jai-yen’ even if they face a difficult situation.

Nonverbal Communication

Nonverbal communication is a type of communication used from the sender to the receiver to convey information without using words or to augment the words used. Cooper & Cooper (1998) conclude Thais’ nonverbal communication or ‘body talk’ which includes ‘the wai’ (a gesture of putting hands together and placing them at the chest as in Buddha’s image), the smile, head and feet gestures, the hands, the voice, and the appearance. This body talk is essential in Thai communication. A foreigner, who is new to the environment, may unavoidably be considered rude when using his or her foot to point at things, or by touching someone’s head, or increasing his or her voice while talking. Meanwhile, the ‘smile’ when Thais make a mistake may frustrate the Westerner and may appear as if they do not show a real sympathetic apology. However, Cooper & Cooper (1998) explain that the embarrassed smile also functions to avoid conflict, but indicates the smiler’s guilt and his willingness to make amends. In this situation the Westerner may interpret the Thai’s smile after making mistake as inappropriate behavior but Thais’ tend to apologize with a smile.
Personal Attitudes

History of Personality Study in Relation to Culture

In cross-cultural research, Hofstede & McCrae (2004) summarized that the history of personality study in relation to culture has been done since the 18th Century, philosophers like Hume in England, Montesquieu in France, and Kant in Germany dealt with questions of 'National Character.' In the 20th Century, anthropologists embraced the concept of national character. In the 1920s and 1930s, ideas on personality and culture began to be discussed and during and after World War II the U.S. government called on anthropologists to help understand the psyche of its enemy nations, including Germany, Japan, and Soviet Union. Culture and personality and personality and culture became classic names for psychological anthropology.

In the 1990s, researchers around the world began to develop translations of the instrument, making cross-cultural research possible. The consequences of many studies brought the new concept of studying personality and culture that is no longer a matter of documenting how culture shapes personality but how personality traits and culture interact to shape individuals' behavior. The findings mean that personality traits are basically based dispositions that characterize members of the human species, Hofsted & McCare (2004).

Since the key factors in explaining the whole set of characteristic adaptations reflect contributions of both the individual and cultural context referred by Hofstede and McCrae (2004) are attitude, values, habits and skills. This study therefore focuses on two factors; attitude, that is a personality ingrained that describes how a person evaluates things around themselves, and values, which are the beliefs or thoughts that are the part of a distinctive culture.
Komin (1991) distinguished attitudes from values by describing that an attitude is an organization of several beliefs focused on a specific given object or situation, a value on the other hand is a single belief about a desirable mode of behavior or end-state of existence, that transcend across specific objects and situations, in guiding actions, attitude, judgments and comparisons.

**Attitude**

Myers (1993) claims that social psychology’s detectives suspect three possible sources on how action affects attitude. These are: *Self-presentation theory*, which assumes that for strategic reasons we express attitudes that make us appear consistent; *Cognitive dissonance theory*, which assumes that to reduce discomfort, we justify our actions to ourselves, and; *Self-perception theory*, which assumes that our actions are self-revealing (when our uncertain about our feelings or beliefs, we look to our behavior, much as anyone else would).

According to the statement of Thompson & Zanna (1995) that ‘we can all think of instances in which we have held different beliefs about the same issue, felt torn between two emotions or choices, or had our heart tell us one thing and our head another. The phenomenology of these attitudes is often quite distinct. With the positive and negative aspects being seemingly equally significant concerns, our attitudes pull us in different directions.’ It is in agreement with Myer (1993)’s reference from many social psychologists’ findings that attitudes-usually assessed as our feelings toward some object or person- often poorly predict actions.
Thompson & Zanna (1995) therefore postulate that the experience of ambivalence is not merely associated with a particular attitude, but may, in certain instances, characterize an attitude domain. Meanwhile, Myer (1993) assumes that attitude will predict behavior if (1) other influences such as social influences on expressed attitudes are minimized (2) if the attitude is specific to action (3) if attitude is potent. From these two postulations, it is certain that the relationship between attitude and behavior can range from no relationship to a strong one. As Myer (1993) infers, social psychologists agree that attitudes and actions have a reciprocal relationship, each feeding the other. In this study, therefore one cannot ignore the importance of attitude in determining the relationship between Thais’ and non-Thais’ attitude toward themselves and others, and how do they react according to their attitudes.

The Thai Attitude toward Conflict

Many resources and studies about Thai culture have explained that when Thais are engaged in conflict, they smile their way out of almost any situation using nonconfrontation or avoidance styles such as mai pen rai and jai yen. (Cooper & Cooper, 1998; Klausner & Klausner, 1986; Komin, 1991). Thais see conflict as a social destructive situation. They manage their anger and thus preserve social harmony. Klausner & Klausner (1986) described the way that Thais avoid social confrontation as a game, which they called ‘projected vilification’ meaning a vibration of the scapegoat syndrome. It is not only emotionally satisfying to play this game, but one is able to preserve an outward semblance of friendly social relationships. Hopefully, the one who has offended and caused displeasure will receive the message of social warning and mend his ways.
The *Farang* Attitude toward Conflict.

‘Farang’ means white foreigners or westerners, and this study aims to determine and compare their specific cultural characteristics with Thais characteristics. According to Klausner & Klausner (1986), confrontation and conflict are the norm to the *farang*. For a Westerner, the ‘cool heart or jai yen’ is not highly valued. It is not only acceptable but appropriate to speak bluntly and frankly. Criticism, argument and confrontation are overt behaviors and public context is the norm.

*Values*

According to Komin (1991), values are beliefs about the desirable, as against those that are undesirable or less desirable. They serve as “standards or criteria” to guide human thought and actions, judgment, choice, attitude, evaluation, argument, exhortation, rationalization, and one might add, attribution of causality. (p18) In her study, Komin (1991) concludes Thais’ 9 value clusters on a continuum of psychological importance from high to low as presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Value clusters according to their relative significant positions in the Thai cognitive system

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>Ego orientation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Grateful relationship orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Smooth interpersonal relationship orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Flexibility and adjustment orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Religio-psychical orientation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Education and competence orientation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(7) Interdependence orientation
(8) Fun-pleasure orientation
(9) Achievement-task orientation

Note: From Psychology of The Thai People, by Komin S., 1991, Bangkok: Magenta Co. Copyright

In relation to the study of communication conflict affected by culture differences that vary on individual attitude and values, this researcher focuses on high rated values of Thais compare to non-Thais. The four high rated values are; Ego orientation, Grateful relationship orientation, Smooth interpersonal relationship orientation and Flexibility and adjustment orientation.

Ego orientation – Komin (1991) explains the Thai ego orientation as a deep sense of independence, pride and dignity. Despite a cool and calm front, a Thai can be easily provoked to strong emotional reactions. Since the “ego” of a Thai is so important, it naturally follows that Thais use “avoidance mechanisms” to fend off unnecessary clashes. The sub-values under this cluster include a “face-saving” value clarified by Komin (1991) p 135 as the value of saving the “face”- the “ego” of the person involved. The Thai would usually find the indirect ways to soften the negative message. “Criticism-avoidance” value is a result of Thais being very “ego” oriented, to the extent that it is very difficult for the Thai to dissociate an idea or opinion from the “ego” self. This is why strong criticism to the expressed ideas, is often automatically taken as criticism to the person holding those ideas.

Grateful relationship orientation—Komin (1991) specifies Bunkhn, a psychological bond between someone who, out of sheer kindness and sincerity, renders another person needed help or favor, and the latter’s memory of the goodness done and his ever-readiness to reciprocate the kindness, is the presentation of most Thai interactions.
Reciprocity of kindness, particularly the value of being Grateful is a highly valued characteristic trait in Thai society. It therefore emerges on the Thai value list, but does not emerge on the American value list.

_Smooth interpersonal relationship_—unlike the Americans whose top values tend to focus on self-actualization, ambition, and achievement, down-playing such values as self-control and politeness, the Thai dual values of “ego orientation” and “grateful relationship”, place high value on a group of ‘other-directed’ social interaction values all added up to project a picture of smooth, kind, pleasant, no-conflict interpersonal interactions, in short, the “surface harmony” as observed by many, Komin (1991)

_Flexibility and adjustment orientation_—the study of Thai values by Komin (1991) found that Thais are flexible and situation-oriented. This flexibility value orientation is somehow correlated with the laxness in principal, and consequently reflected in certain behavioral patterns like, “decision-shifting” behavioral patterns and corruptions.

**Conflict Perspectives and Conflict Managing Strategies**

When conflict arises, people will be focused on the decision of whether to avoid or resolve it (Hocker & Wimot, 1993). To make such a decision, we need to understand the circumstances that brought about conflict.

According to Walton (1987), the circumstances that surround the conflict include both barriers to beginning negotiations and invite that trigger expression. Johnson (1994) stated that international barriers include negative attitude, values, fears, anxieties and habitual patterns of avoiding conflicts. External barriers may include task requirement,
group norms for avoiding conflict, pressure to maintain a congenial public image, and faulty perception of one’s vulnerability and others’ strength.

This study aims to identify personality and task situations when both parties engage in intercultural communication. This section views related literature that explains conflict perspectives and strategies used in task situations to explain when conflict occurs.

Conflict Perspectives

In the study of organizational behavior, Dunford (1992) exclaims that the main reason for understanding conflict in organizations is to understand the assumption about how ‘normal’ conflict is and how desirable conflict is. Fox (1973), Edward (1986), and Morgan (1986) as sighted in Dunford (1992) identify the three perspectives that related to Dunford’s assumption of studying how ‘normal’ conflict is.

The unitary perspective—regards it as an aberration, an abnormal state of affairs. The conflict arises from mistakes such as poor communication, poor leadership or inadequate rules and procedures. The unitary perspective views conflict as an abnormal destructive affair that contrasts with a normal state of harmony.

The pluralist perspective—views conflict as a normal phenomenon reflecting the different interests of organization members. This group regards conflict as potentially constructive in its effects

The radical perspective—views conflict as an inherent characteristic in which both employer and employee have different interests.

Cooper & Cooper (1982) explain conflict between Thais and foreigners in their book, Culture Shock. There is a sound reason for conflict. For Thais seek to avoid conflict at any cost, while Westerners expect a resolution if any conflict or misunderstanding
between two parties occurs. According to the pluralist perspective, Hocker & Wilmot (1991) insist that conflicting parties engage in an expressed struggle and interfere with one another but are interdependent. Each person’s choice affects the other because conflict is a mutual activity and because of this mutual activity it is one of the processes of human interaction even though they are from the same community and speaking the same language.

*Conflict Managing Strategies*

An overview of conflict management strategies written by L. David Brown (1983), shows the interesting assessing levels of conflict;

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Level</th>
<th>Perceptions</th>
<th>Communication</th>
<th>Actions</th>
<th>Outcomes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Too much Escalation</td>
<td>Common interests unrecognized</td>
<td>Extreme restriction</td>
<td>Exaggerate differences</td>
<td>Decision on poor information, low commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Extreme distrust</td>
<td>Serious Distortion of information</td>
<td>Coercive influence</td>
<td>Harm to parties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Hostility</td>
<td></td>
<td>Violence and Sabotage</td>
<td>Future relations deteriorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Productive Bargaining</td>
<td>Conflicting interests dominate</td>
<td>Exchange guarded</td>
<td>Preserve differences</td>
<td>Decision distribute fixed resources</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Common interests known</td>
<td>Selective offer and acceptance of information</td>
<td>Rigid commitments</td>
<td>Accepted process</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opponent recognized</td>
<td></td>
<td>Threads and promises</td>
<td>Future relations in bargaining mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Trust</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Problem-solving</td>
<td>Common interests dominate</td>
<td>Open exchanges</td>
<td>Explore differences</td>
<td>Decisions provide mutual benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict interests known</td>
<td>Accurate information</td>
<td>Flexible generation of alternatives</td>
<td>Creative alternatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Friendliness and trust</td>
<td></td>
<td>Consensus decisions</td>
<td>Future relations in problem-solving mode</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too little Suppression</td>
<td>Conflicting interests unrecognized</td>
<td>Controversial information suppressed</td>
<td>Deny differences Suppress disagreement</td>
<td>Decisions based on little information, analysis, or challenge to myths? Future relations as parties without differences</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Withdrawal</td>
<td>Conflict interests recognized but avoided</td>
<td>Controversy avoided</td>
<td>Avoid differences Reduce investment</td>
<td>No decisions, or decision by default Low commitment and participation Future relations in doubt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fear of other party and conflict</td>
<td>Low exchange of information</td>
<td>Decide by default</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


According to the table, this researcher presumes that Thais show a level of conflict somewhere between suppression and withdrawal and they perceive conflict as either unrecognized or to be avoided. Alternatively, non-Thais’ conflict level is in between escalation and bargaining where the conflicts and differences are acknowledged. To reach a level of problem-solving, both parties must be aware of their level of perception, communications, actions and outcomes and work through the differences toward the outcome of a problem-solving mode.

There are numerous studies that were developed to classify conflict managing styles. Blake and Mouton (1964) were the first researchers to propose a five-category scheme: forcing, withdrawing, smoothing, compromising, and confrontation for the management of organizational conflict. Using a conceptualization similar to Blake and Mouton and Thomas, Rahim (2004) proposes that the styles of handling interpersonal
conflict were differentiated on two basic dimensions, concern for self and for others. The first dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person attempts to satisfy his or her own concern. The second dimension explains the degree (high or low) to which a person wants to satisfy the concern of others. Figure 1 shows Rahim’s Model of Conflict Managing Strategy

Figure 2 The Dual-Concern Model of the Styles of Handling Interpersonal Conflict


The five subscales of handling interpersonal conflict with supervisor, subordinates, and peers can be described as follows:

*Integrating* (Rahim, 2004), *Collaborating* (Hellriegel, Slocum and Woodman, 1998) or *Confronting* (Dunford, 1994)—this style involves high concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. It is concerned with collaboration between parties, i.e., openness, exchange of information, and examination of differences to reach a solution
acceptable to both parties. It is associated with solving problem and seeking solution that achieves both its own goals and the goals of the other person.

_Obliging_ (Rahim, 2004), _Accommodating_ (Hellreigel et. Al., 1998) or _Smoothing_ (Dunford, 1994)—this style involves low concern for self and high concern for the other party involved in conflict. This personal style is to give up his/her goals in order to keep the relationship. Hellreigel et. Al.(1998) state that an individual may act as though the conflict will go away in time and appeal for cooperation.

_Dominating_ (Rahim, 2004) or _Forcing_ (Hellreigel et. Al., 1998 and Dunford, 1994)—this style involves high concern for self or goals and low concern for the other party or relationship involved in conflict. Forcing-prone individuals assume that conflict involves win-lose situations. Dominating may mean standing up for one's rights and/or defending a position that the other party believes to be correct.

_Avoiding_ (Rahim, 2004 and Hellreigel et. Al., 1998) or _Withdrawing_ (Dunford, 1994)—refers to unassertiveness and uncooperate behaviors. This style involves low concern for self or personal goals and low concern for the other or relationship. Rahim (2004) suggests that has been associated with withdrawal, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or “see no evil, hear no evil, speak on evil” situations.

_Compromising_ (Rahim, 2004, Hellreigel et. Al., 1998 and Dunford, 1994)—this style involves moderate concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. This is based on give and take or sharing whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision.

These five styles have been subject to scrutiny to try to find which one is best for conflict resolution. Studies found that _confronting_, while bringing about a solution was not greatly suited to conflict management (Burke 1970) and that _smoothing_ was good for
interpersonal needs but often did not achieve the necessary goals as Hellreigel et al., 1998 postulate that this style may be desirable under some situations when 1) the issue is minor or only of passing importance and thus not worth the individual’s time or energy to confront the conflict; 2) there isn’t enough information available to individual to deal effectively with the conflict at that time; 3) the individual’s power is so low relative to the other person’s that there’s little chance of causing change; and 4) other individuals can more effectively resolve the conflict.

There were however a number of variables which affected the results of these studies, one of which being gender. With regards to female vs. male subordinates, females were found to view supervisors as more likely to avoid conflict or smooth (Renwick 1977). Also it was found that male supervisors were more likely to inhibit confrontation styles (Zammuto, London & Rowland 1975).

Another problem that emerged during conflict management research was due to individuals’ differences relating to the amount of conflict, the organizational structure, and personal cultural factors (Rahim & Bonoma 1979).

Related Studies

Foreign Studies

Smith, Wethington and Zhan (1996) examined the relation between self-concept, clarity, and (a) preferred general coping styles, (b) coping with a specific event, and (c) coping with a specific on going situation, in 175 undergraduate students. The results of the regression analyses for general coping styles indicated that self-concept clarity made a reliable but weak positive contribution to active coping styles (e.g. planning and taking
action) and a strong negative contribution to passive coping styles (e.g. denial). The unique negative contribution of self-concept clarity to passive coping was replicated with respect to coping, with a specific event, and to coping with a specific on-going situation. However, the weaker positive contribution of self-concept clarity to active coping was not replicated with respect to coping with specific events of specific on-going situations.

Their findings reinforced the hypotheses of this researcher that people with high self-esteem are more likely to bring forth and exchange information when conflicts occur, while people with low self-esteem prefer to avoid or withdraw from the possibility of conflicts.

The study of Culture and Status-Related Behavior: Japanese and American Perceptions of Interaction in Asymmetric Dyads by Kowner and Wiseman (2003) found the high correlation between the ratings of behavior of lower and higher status people in culturally dissimilar societies such as Japan and the United States. It confirmed that status-related behavior in asymmetric dyadic interaction follows a similar and probably fundamental pattern. Nonetheless, the differences in the magnitude of status-related behavior perceived in these two nations also suggests that culture, among other factors, affects the way status-related behavior is manifested. In Japan, a hierarchical, collective, tight, and high-context culture, they found greater differences in status-related behavior of lower and higher status people than in the United States, a more egalitarian, individualist, and low-context culture.

Kowner and Wiseman’s (2003) study supported this researcher’s assumption that a subject’s status as well as other variables such as level of education and year of work experiences determines behavior across cultures. However, culture presumably affects various aspects of behavior. Thais, similar to Japanese, with a hierarchical, collective, tight,
and high-context culture compare to the Westerners who have a more egalitarian, individualist, and low-context culture, tend to avoid any behavior that may lead to the destruction of the harmony which is very important in the high-context culture. Thais therefore are likely to use nonconfrontation in dealing with conflicts which is opposite to the Westerners.

Thompson and Zanna (1995) studied the Conflicted Individual: Personality-Based and Domain-Specific Antecedents of Ambivalent Social Attitudes. The two studies investigated the notion that attitudes are largely unconflicted and unidimensional summary statements of feelings and beliefs, examining antecedent variables assumed important in the genesis of attitudinal ambivalence. The first study focuses upon personality-based factors such as individual’s Need for Cognition (NFC) and Personal Fear of Invalidity (PFI) (a heightened concern with error). The pattern of results was consistence with their predictions: High NFC was associated with less ambivalence and high PFI was associated with greater ambivalence. The second study investigated a domain-specific antecedent. It was predicted that higher involvement would reduce the level of ambivalence experienced. Further, involvement was expected to moderate the effect of personality-based antecedents. The results confirmed the hypotheses that high NFC was associated with less ambivalence, especially under conditions of high involvement with issues. Conversely, high PFI individuals who were highly involved with these issues experienced more ambivalence.

The Thompson and Zanna (1995)’s findings supported this researcher’s assumption that attitudes affect behavior. Conflicts which are based on beliefs and values were a necessary condition in order to induce ambivalence across cultures.
Local Studies

What Expatriate Managers Know about the Work Values of Their Subordinates: Swedish Executives in Thailand, by Selmer (1996), explored the work values between Swedish executives and Thai subordinates to determine whether Swedish expatriate executives working in Thailand are familiar with the work values of Thai subordinates. The results showed that Swedish managers have a substantial degree of familiarity with their subordinates’ work values. Although the findings lead to the rejection of the general hypothesis, it showed that with cross-cultural training, executives and subordinates could avoid culturally based conflicts. (Selmer, 1996)

As this researcher early mentioned; values, beliefs, thoughts and particularly language are all possible causes of cross-cultural differences, so does (Cohen 1987) in his research, ‘Phut Thai Dai!: Acquisition of Hosts Language among Expatriates in Bangkok, stated that with the acquisition of some Thai language skills, the chance of conflict between workers is reduced accordingly.

Hofstede’s (1980) four cultural dimensions study Culture’s consequences—

International Differences in Work-Related Values stated that Thai’s accept and expect that power in an organization is not distributed equally and that Thai’s avoid un-chartered situations, and have a stronger sense of loyalty, all factors in developing an avoidance orientated solution.
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This study used a descriptive research design that described respondents’ personal attitudes and their conflict managing strategy in task situations and made comparisons and evaluations to each demographic variable. The research methodology included the subsection of participants, instruments used in this research and the procedure in conducting the research.

Population and Sampling

The participants of this study were both male and female Thai and non-Thai school workers who worked in an international school and engaged in intercultural communication. According to the definition of non-Thai school workers clarified in Chapter I, non-Thai participants for this study were American, Australian, British, Canadian, New Zealander, and South African teachers who used English as their native language.

The demographic distribution of the population is widely scattered as there were many international schools who hire non-Thais teachers under their own criteria of qualifications. For instance an international school associated with India may hire many Indian teachers who met its own criteria of qualification. Therefore, most of the teachers in an international school mentioned above were unacceptable for the population in this study because their native language is not English.
According to the information from the International School Association of Thailand (ISAT), there are 41 schools around Bangkok and greater Bangkok where the number of populations of Thai and non-Thai school workers range from 25-200 in each school. However, the accurate number of non-Thai participants characterized in this study was indefinite. Three hundred samples of Thais and non-Thais school workers were therefore drawn by using nonprobability sampling techniques.

**Instrument**

Closed-ended information and self-administered questionnaires were used in the Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) and the Organizational Communication conflict Instrument (OCCI) as well as some parts of demographic information in Part 1 while short open-ended responses were used in the Demographic Information. The set of questionnaires included:

**Part I: Demographic Information**

This part includes personal data considered to be the independent variables, such as gender, age, nationality, level of education and years of working experience.

1. **Gender**: The researcher used gender as an independent variable in this study since the study took place in international schools where both genders have an equal chance to interact in communication that base on culture differences.
2. **Age**: The researcher divided subjects’ age into four subscales. The four subscales were; 29 or less, 30-39, 40-49, and 50 or more.

3. **Nationality**: Only two categories were used, Thais and non-Thais. Thais were those who grew up in Thailand and hold Thai citizenship. Non-Thais were westerners who used English as a native language and work in international schools.

4. **Highest Level of Education Achieved**: This variable had been chosen to determine the degree of differences of management styles according to education level. Since the staff level of education in each school range from below Bachelor’s degree in certain positions such as security, custodians, services supplies to Masters Degree or higher such as head of department, head master, superintendent. Three categories were divided as follows; Below Bachelor’s Degree, Bachelor’s Degree, and Master Degree or higher.

5. **Year of Work Experience**: As Putnam & Wilson (1982) theorized that sex and length of service interacted to affect the use of communicative strategies. Year of work experience referred to respondents’ total work experience. Four categories of years of work experience were designed as one year or less, more than one year to three years, three to five years, and over five years.

**Part II: Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI)**

The instrument constructed by Linda L. Putnam and Charmaine E. Wilson (1982), is an instrument measure of conflict management strategies in task situations. There are 30
described behaviors and participants are asked to rate themselves in each item that would represent most likely to the participants’ behavior. The alternative responses are: 1=always, 2=very often, 3=often, 4=sometimes, 5=seldom, 6=very seldom, and 7=never.

Scale Factors

*Nonconfrontation*—indirect strategies for handling a conflict; choice to avoid or to withdraw from a disagreement: such communicative behaviors as silence, glossing over differences, and concealing ill feeling.

*Solution Orientation*—direct communication about the conflict; behaviors that aim to find a solution, to integrate the needs of both parties, and to give in or compromise on issues.

*Control*—direct communication about the disagreement; arguing persistently for one’s position, taking control of interaction, and advocating one’s position.

Scoring

The items for each scale are added to produce three separate scores for each individual:

Nonconfrontation are items number 2, 5, 7, 12, 14, 15, 23, 24, 25, 27, 28, 29

Solution Orientation are divided into two sub-scale factors;

- Confrontation are items number 1, 4, 8, 11, 19, 20
- Compromise are items number 6, 9, 13, 16, 21

Control are items number 3, 10, 17, 18, 22, 26, 30
Interpretation of Scores

High Scores = Infrequent Use of the Style

- Nonconfrontation: 73 to 84
- Solution Orientation: 45 to 49
- Control: 40 to 49

Low Scores = Frequent Use of the Style

- Nonconfrontation: 10 to 37
- Solution Orientation: 16 to 26
- Control: 10 to 23

Reliability

The OCCI consisted of thirty items, each item followed a seven-point Likert response format that ranged from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree,” and each item met the criteria of simplicity in wording, clarity, and use of only one statement. The internal reliability test verified that each factor met standards for high internal reliability and high discriminatory power. The result in twelve items for the nonconfrontation scale is .93 Cronbach alpha; eleven items for solution-orientation scale is .88 alpha reliability; and six items for control scale has alpha reliability at .82.

Validity

Construct Validity

The test for construct validity was conducted to determine if scales on the OCCI correlated positively with similar construct and negatively with dissimilar ones. Table 3 presents coefficients for the inter-correlations among scales of Lawrence and Lorsch.
(1967), as sighted in Putnum (1982), Aphorism Scale (L&L) and Kilmann and Thomas (1977), as sighted in Putnum (1982), MODE instrument with OCCI given to ninety-three graduate management students at a large university.

**Table 3 Correlations between the OCCI and Other Conflict Instruments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Styles</th>
<th>Nonconfrontation</th>
<th>Solution-Orient</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Forcing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; L</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>-.23*</td>
<td>.38**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>-.23</td>
<td>-.31**</td>
<td>.44**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Smoothing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L &amp; L</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>24*</td>
<td>-.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MODE</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confrontation—L&amp;L</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.48**</td>
<td>-.27*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding—MODE</td>
<td>.41**</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>-.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compromise—MODE</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>-.29*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconfront—OCCI</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Orientation—OCCI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. The five Blake and Mouton styles are also referred to as smoothing = accommodation, forcing = competition, and confrontation = collaboration.

b. L&L: Lawrence and Lorsch Aphorism Instrument.
c. MODE: The Thomas-Kilmann Management of difference Exercise.

*p < .01  ** p < .001

Note: From Communication Yearbook 6, Communicative Strategies in Organizational Conflicts: Reliability and Validity of Measurement Scale by Putnum L. & Wilson C., 1982, Sage Publication

From the table, even though the coefficients for inter-correlation among these scales were considered moderately high, they provided support for both the convergent and discriminant validity of the OCCI.

**Predictive Validity**

Two predictive validity studies were designed to test the bureaucratic model of organizational conflict. The first predictive validity was the study of 283 employees of a
large insurance firm to determine the effect of position level and type of conflict on choices of communicative strategies for handling disagreement showed predicted findings that subordinates selected nonconfrontation strategies more frequently than managers. The second predictive validity study examined the bureaucratic model of conflict management but employed three specific situations as examples of upward, downward, and horizontal communication.

These two predictive validity studies supported the power of the OCCII to predict the communicative strategies employees might use in bureaucratic and system conflicts. Table 4 shows data analyses yielded a significant difference on all three types of strategies of one of the two predictive validity studies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Strategies</th>
<th>Type of Conflict</th>
<th>Course Supervisor</th>
<th>Fellow TA</th>
<th>Student</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Non Confrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td>65.18**</td>
<td>66.18**</td>
<td>72.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td>36.22**</td>
<td>36.47**</td>
<td>45.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td>34.61</td>
<td>32.41</td>
<td>31.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The scales were scored with 1=always and 7=never. Low scores represent frequent use, while high scores indicate infrequent use. * p < .01 **p < .001
Note: From Communication Yearbook 6, Communicative Strategies in Organizational Conflicts: Reliability and Validity of Measurement Scale by Putnum L. & Wilson C., 1982, Sage Publication

Rubin, Palmgreen & Sypher (1994) mentioned OCCII’s strengths in several ways. First, its reliabilities are as good as those of other conflict instruments. Second, its emphasis
on communication behaviors in particular situations separates it from instrument that 
measure style. Third, the instrument has great potential as a training tool for getting people 
to think about strategies for measuring conflict. Lastly, Rubin et al. (1994) state that the 
important strength of OCCI serves as an important body of literature for researchers in 
contrasting use of strategies for instance in a vertical communication versus horizontal 
communication in organizations.

Part III: Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI)

The “Self-Attitude Inventory” (SAI) constructed by Maurice Lorr and Richard A. 
Wunderlich (1986). SAI is a 32-item instrument designed to measure self-esteem. The 
participants are asked to select one of the two statements that describe how people feel 
about themselves and how they relate to others

Description

The instrument is composed of two subscales - confidence and popularity or social 
approval.

Confidence described as the fact of being or feeling certain are items 1A, 3A, 5B, 

Popularity or social approval described as being an accepted or favorable opinion by a 
group or society where their dealings affected one another, are items 2A, 4B, 6B, 8B, 10B, 
The SAI is presented in a paired-choice format to minimize response bias. Because of the importance of self-esteem to a number of theoretical formulations of problematic behaviors, activities, and feelings, these two brief subscales that focus on specific components of self-esteem are viewed as particularly useful.

**Norm**

The SAI was studied with several samples of high school boys totaling 924, plus a sample of 45 psychiatric patients and 50 ‘normal’ adults.

**Scoring**

The SAI is easily scored by simply adding up the number of items circled that agree with items described (i.e., if 1A is circled, it is one point toward the total confidence score). The maximum score on each scale is 16, with higher scores showing greater self-esteem.

**Reliability**

From the manual constructed by Maurice Lorr and Richard A. Wunderlich (1986), the SAI has good internal consistency, with alphas that range from .80 to .86 for confidence and from .69 to .81 for popularity.

**Validity**

Maurice Lorr and Richard A. Wunderlich (1986) mentioned SAI’s validity in their instrument manual and stated that the SAI has good concurrent validity, correlating with Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale. The SAI also has good known-groups validity, significantly distinguishing between psychiatric patients and ‘normal’ adults.
Pilot Study

Since the pilot study provides firsthand information about the data collection instrument on how adequate a language translation is in order to avoid bias for using translated versions for Thai respondents, how easily and reliable the data collection forms work, and how best to identify, schedule, approach, and follow up on respondents. The pilot study therefore was conducted in two international schools.

Translation

Two instruments were translated in the Thai language, the pilot study was partly conducted to determine whether the instruments yielded the same results as when they were in Thai language format. The translation were done and proof-read back and forth by professional lecturers.

Participants

The 30 samples of the subject were selected from two international schools. Fifteen Thai participants were 7 males and 8 females and fifteen non-Thai participants were 10 males and 5 females. Table 5 showed the number of participants in each nationality in details.
Table 5 Number of Participants in the Pilot Study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Nationality</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Male</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>American</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Australian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>British</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Canadian</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Zealander</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South African</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thai</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reliability

To measure the internal consistency estimate of reliability of the Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) and the Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI), the researcher used the SPSS in computing the coefficient alpha in each item on these two instruments.

The Reliability of Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI)

The three subscales; Nonconfrontation, Solution-orientation, and Control were computed to find the coefficient alpha.

1. Nonconfrontation Scale

Twelve items measured the nonconfrontation scale were computed to find the mean, standard deviation, and the Cronbach’s alpha. The Cronbach’s alpha for nonconfrontation
scale met a standard of acceptability with a .86 alpha reliability. The mean of the
distribution was 51.67 and standard deviation was 12.39.

2. Solution-Orientaion Scale

This scale was divided into two subscales: confrontation which are items 1, 4, 8, 11,
19, 20 and compromise which are items 6, 9, 13, 16, 21. Eleven items in two subscales
were computed to find the coefficient of reliability using the Cronbach alpha. The result
showed a high standard of acceptability with a .90 alpha. The mean and standard deviation
of the pilot study of $\chi = 34.33$ and $\sigma = 10.65$ comparing to Putnum (1986)'s statistical
analysis of $\chi = 36$ and $\sigma = 10.1$ (N= 360), the two statistical data have similar measures of
central tendency.

3. Control Scale

There were seven items to measure the Control Scale. The internal consistency
estimate of reliability was measured using the Cronbach alpha. The outcome satisfied the
standard of acceptability with a .84 alpha; the mean of distribution at 29.83; and standard
deviation of 8.39. The result is similar to the descriptive statistics of dimension (Putnum,
986) that shows a mean of central tendency at .34 and standard deviation of data
distribution at .87.

The Reliability of Self Attitude Inventory (SAI)

The Confidence Scale and Popularity Scale in Self Attitude Inventory (SAI) were
computed to find the internal consistency estimates of reliability by using the Cronbach's
alpha measurement. Thirty respondents were asked to select one out of two statements in
each item that best described themselves. The findings were as follows;
1. Confidence Scale

There were sixteen items measured in the Confidence Scale which were items 1A, 3A, 5B, 7A, 9A, 11A, 13B, 15A, 17B, 19A, 21B, 23B, 25A, 27B, 29A, and 31B. However, all thirty respondents selected statement A (I tend to be optimistic when I take on a new job) on item 15. Therefore, this variable has zero variance and is removed from the scale. Cronbach’s alpha of fifteen items without item 15 is .69. The mean of distribution is 19.33 with the standard deviation of 2.77.

2. Popularity Scale

Sixteen items that scored one point toward Popularity Scale were 2A, 4B, 6D, 8B, 10, 12B, 14A, 16A, 18A, 20A, 22A, 24B, 26B, 28, 30A, and 32B. The variables met a standard of acceptability with a .78 Cronbach’s alpha. The average distribution of scores measured had a mean score of 28.8 and a standard deviation of 3.05.

**Procedure**

The questionnaires were administered according to the following procedure;

1. Instruments’ translation and pilot study

The pilot study was conducted among the respondents in two international schools where thirty samples were collected to test the estimated internal consistency of the instruments. Before the distribution of the questionnaires to the respondents, both instruments were translated and proofread three times by professional lecturers. After the
reliability test, five subscales from the two instruments were in significant level of reliability with the range of .676 to .910.

2. Data collection

International schools’ superintendents were contacted for their permission to distribute the questionnaires by E-mailing, mailing, fax, and personal meetings. Data collection was started between April 1st and June 30th, 2004. Five hundred questionnaires were distributed to 16 international schools with 300 valid questionnaires collected by E-mail, mail, and personal pickup. There were 63 invalid questionnaires from the collected responses under different reasons: 32 respondents were neither Thais nor non-Thais who used English in communication, 14 questionnaires with demographic data not completed, and there were 17 questionnaires that neither parts of OCCI instrument nor SAI instrument were completely answered. Table 6 illustrates questionnaires distribution in details.

Table 6 Questionnaires Distribution

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Mail</th>
<th>Fax</th>
<th>E-mail</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributed</td>
<td>428</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Returned</td>
<td>331</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>273</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Invalid</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Data Analysis

After receiving the actual number of samples, inferential statistical analysis measurements were used as follow;
3.1 Mean and Standard Deviation. As samples represent characteristics of population in the study, the mean was computed to determine average distribution of variables in OCCI and SAI. Standard Deviation was used to measure the spread or dispersion of scores in distribution of items in the OCCI and the SAI.

3.2 The $t$-test was used to determine the degree of significant difference between two group means of samples in this study for instance the significance between gender and conflict managing strategies used in task situations. To determine the statistical significance of the difference between means, two additional concepts were considered which were the hypotheses of the study and the level of significance. According to Best and Khan (1998), in psychological and education circles, the 5% (0.05) alpha ($\alpha$) level of significance is often used as a standard rejection.

3.3 The $f$-test was used to determine the degree of significant difference between dependent variables that have more than two groups which were age, level of education, and year of work experience.

3.4 Pearson’s Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation ($r$) was used to determine the significant relationship between the two factors of SAI-Confidence and Popularity- and the three factors of OCCI -Nonconfrontation, Solution-Orientation, and Control.
CHAPTER IV

PRESENTATION OF THE FINDINGS

This chapter presents result data of Thais and non-Thais respondents in international schools around Bangkok. The findings contain six sections in tables and graphs with explanation of statistics employed in the study by using standard error at significant level of .05. The six sections are:

1. Demographic data of Thai and non-Thai school workers. The selected demographic data were

   1.1 Gender: male, female

   1.2 Age: 29 or less, 30-39 years, 40-49 years, and 50 or more

   1.3 Highest level of education achieved: below Bachelor’s Degree, Bachelor’s Degree, and Masters Degree or higher

   1.4 Years of work experience: less than 1 year, 1 year – 3 years, 4 – 5 years, over 5 years

2. Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) as a measurement to determine respondents’ self-esteem.

   2.1 Confidence Scale

   2.2 Popularity or Social Approval Scale
3. Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) as a measurement to determine respondents’ managing strategies in task situations.

3.1 Nonconfrontation Scale
3.2 Social-Orientatation Scale
3.3 Control Scale

4. Evaluation of the findings between demographic data and two scales of Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) according to the hypothesis that there is a significant difference between selected demographic variables and the two scales of SAI

5. Evaluation of the findings between demographic data and three scales of Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) according to the hypothesis that there is significant difference between selected demographic variables and the three scales of OCCI

6. Correlation between Self-Attitude Inventory and Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) according to the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between SAI and OCCI

1. Demographic Data

The demographic data that were selected as independent variables in order to predict the degree of differences in this study were age, gender, and years of work experience. Three hundred respondents in this study were grouped into 157 Thais and 143
non-Thais. The two groups afterward were presented in four groups of demographic variables to determine the frequency and percentage. Table 7 showed the frequency and percentage according to each demographic variable.

Table 7 Frequency and Percentage of the demographic Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Demographics</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>85.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>25.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>46.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education Level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor's Degree</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters Degree</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year of Work Experience</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over five years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>44.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*non-Thai participants in this study were American, Australian, British, Canadian, New Zealander and South African.
From the table, there were 23 males or 14.6% of the total number of Thai respondents and there were 134 females or 85.4% of the total number of Thai respondents. In the non-Thai sample, the majority of respondents are males with the frequency of 99 or 69.2%; the number of non-Thai females for this study was only 44 or 30.8% of the total number of non-Thai respondents. The majority of both Thai and non-Thai groups were found in the age between 30-39 years with 46.5% or 73 were Thais and 46.9% or 67 were non-Thais. However, Thais’ equivalent number of 35.7% or 56 of respondents were found in the age between 39 or less.

According to level of education, both groups showed the majority of respondents fell in Bachelor’s Degree level with 99 or 63.2% in the Thai group and 96 or 67.1% in non-Thai group. Considering the least frequency, there were only 6 or 4.2% of below Bachelor’s Degree in the non-Thai group but 34 or 21.7% with below Bachelor’s degree in the Thai group.

The frequency and percentage of years of work experience showed that the Thai group were mostly found at the level of over 5 years with 70 or 44.6%, 43 or 27.4% at the level of 1-3 years, 24 or 15.3% at the level of 4-5 years, and 20 or 12.7% at the level of less than 1 year. Non-Thai respondents were mostly found at the level of over 5 years with 95 or 66.4% followed by 27 or 18.8%, 14 or 9.8%, and 7 or 4.9% at the level of 4-5 years, 1-3 years, and less than 1 year respectively.

2. Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI)

Self-Attitude Inventory was selected to determine respondents’ personality in the way they perceived themselves in society. The frequency and percentage of two sub-scales
verified the self-esteem between Thais and non-Thai participants, confidence and popularity or social approval, were shown in Table 8.

Table 8  Frequency and Percentage of Respondents According to the Two Factors of SAI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Thais</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Thais*</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>81.1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>125</td>
<td>87.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>72.6</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* non-Thais include American, Australian, British, Canadian, New Zealander, and South African

The two factors, confidence and popularity, were divided into three ranges; high, medium, and low to determine the frequency and percentage in each factor followed by the comparison between Thais and non-Thais. The finding for the Confidence factor among the two groups of respondents showed that the Thai group had the same number of high and medium levels of Confidence with 62 frequency or 42.7% which differed from non-Thais who had high level of Confidence at 116 frequency or 81.1% and low level of confidence with 7 frequency or 4.9%.
Comparing the popularity factor between the two groups, the Thai group scored mostly at the medium level with 114 frequency or 72.6%. The lowest frequency score of 19 or 12.1%, was found in high level of popularity among the Thai group. In contrast to the Thai group, 125 or 87.4% of non-Thai group showed high level of popularity and there was only 4 or 2.8% of non-Thai group at the low level of popularity.

3. Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument

The respondents of the study were categorized into three types of conflict managing strategies; non-confrontation, solution-orientation, and control. Table 9 shows percentage of each type.

Table 9 Frequency and Percentage of Respondents According to the Three Factors of OCCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconfrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>12.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>61.8</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>60.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>26.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution-Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>56.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>63.1</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>35.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>58.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Comparing the differences between the three factors measuring situational conflict managing strategies, the two groups of respondents exhibited some degree of difference between the frequency in the use of nonconfrontation style, solution-orientation style, and control style as high, medium, and low level.

Comparing the nonconfrontation style, both groups had similar frequency at the medium level of nonconfrontation with 97 or 61.8% for the Thai group and 87 or 60.8% for the non-Thai group while the Thai group frequency were at high level of nonconfrontation (49 or 31.2%) which was larger than the non-Thai group’s frequency at 18 or 12.6%.

The Thai group’s frequency in solution-orientation style is mostly in the medium level with 99 or 63.1% and least frequency was the low level of solution-orientation with 17 or 10.8%. Unlike the Thai group, 81 or 56.6% of the non-Thai group ranged in the high level of solution-orientation style and 50 or 35% ranged in the medium level of solution-orientation.

Both groups of Thai and non-Thai had similar frequency use of control style with 89 or 56.7% among the Thai group and 84 or 58.7% among the non-Thai group at the medium level. Twenty five in the Thai group or 15.9% were in high level use of control style related to the non-Thai group of whom 20 or 14% were in high level of using control style. There was also a slight difference at the low level of frequency in the control style with 43 or 27.4% among the Thai group and 39 or 27.3% among the non-Thai group.
4 Evaluation between Demographic Variables and Self-Attitude Inventory

This section presents the descriptive data analysis between demographic variables and the two factors measuring personal attitude, confidence and popularity, in comparing two groups of respondents: Thais and non-Thais. Data analysis was determined accordingly to the hypotheses as follows:

**Hypothesis 1.1** There is a significant difference between gender of the Thai group and non-Thai group and the two factors, confidence and popularity, as measured by SAI.

### Table 10 Data Analysis Between Gender and Self-Attitude Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Scales</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>13.35</td>
<td>2.29</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.27</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>12.71</td>
<td>2.01</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.008</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>13.19</td>
<td>2.87</td>
<td>1.18</td>
<td>.279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>9.43</td>
<td>1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.057*</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>10.29</td>
<td>1.50</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>13.93</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>3.68</td>
<td>.057*</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>13.40</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>.023*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Comparing the two groups in the confidence scale, the Thai males obtained a mean score of 13.35 which were higher than those obtained by Thai females had a mean score of 12.71. The non-Thai males had a mean score of 13.27 which were higher than the females who had a mean score of 13.00. Both groups of males and females received t-scores that were higher than alpha score of .05 (.908>.05, .908>.05), therefore the hypothesis was
rejected as it demonstrated that there was no statistical significance between gender and the confidence scale of the SAI.

For the popularity scale, Thai males received the mean score of 9.43 with a standard deviation of 1.75 whereas Thai female’s mean score was higher than the males mean score with a mean of 10.29 and a standard deviation of 1.50. Similarly, the non-Thai females’ mean score was higher than the males’ mean score with a mean of 13.93 and a standard deviation of 2.25 while males obtained a mean of 13.17 and a standard deviation of 3.26.

Testing the hypothesis to see the relationship between gender and popularity scale, the Thai group obtained $t = 3.68, p = .057$ which was higher than the accepted significant level at .05. It confirmed that there was no significant difference between Thai gender and the popularity scale. Unlike the Thai group, the non-Thais gender showed a significant difference in the popularity scale with a $t = 5.24, p = .023$ which was lower than the alpha score .05. Therefore the hypothesis was accepted that there was a significant difference between non-Thais gender and the popularity scale of SAI.

To evaluate the overall relationship between gender of both groups and the SAI’s two scales, it can be concluded that both Thai and non-Thai males were considered higher in the confidence factor but non-Thais means between males and females in the confidence scale had less difference than Thai males and females’ means. However, females of both groups had more popularity or social approval scores than the males.

**Hypothesis 1.2** There is a significant difference between age of the Thai and non-Thai groups and the two scales, confidence and popularity, measured by the SAI.
Table 11  Data Analysis Between Age and Self-Attitude Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>12.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>12.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>13.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12.89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>9.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>10.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The respondents were divided into four groups, according to their age, 29 and under, 30-39, 40-49 and 50 and over. At the confidence scale, both groups received very similar average scores at all levels of age with a highest mean of 13.00 at age of “40-49” among the Thai group and the highest mean of 13.39 at the age of “50-39” and “50 or more” among the non-Thai group.

The hypothesis testing showed that there was no significant difference between the age of both groups and the confidence scale had the value of .799 and .628 which are greater than the level of significance set at .05. The result showed that there was no significant difference between age of the two groups of Thai and non-Thai so the confidence scale was rejected.

The mean score of the Thai group in the popularity scale according to the four age levels were slightly different from the mean of the non-Thai group. The Thai group had the lowest mean at 9.33 and the highest mean at 10.42 while the non-Thai group had the lowest


at 13.22 and the highest mean at 13.76. The value of significance of both groups were higher than the level of accepted significance set at .05 (.128>.05, .929>.05). It demonstrated that there was no significant difference between age of the Thai and non-Thai groups and the popularity scale. The Hypotheses therefore were rejected.

**Hypothesis 1.3** There is a significant difference between education of the Thai and non-Thai groups and the two scales, confidence and popularity, measured by SAI.

**Table 12** Data Analysis Between Education and Self-Attitude Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>12.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>12.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or Higher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>9.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>10.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or Higher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 12 showed that the Thai and non-Thai groups total means in the confidence scale categorized by education level had a mean of 12.81 and a standard deviation of 2.05 among Thai respondents and a mean of 13.19 and standard deviation of 2.87 among non-Thai respondents. When considering the scores within the three levels of education, the mean scores were significantly varied with a value of .041 in the Thai group and .040 in the non-Thai group after the scores were tested by using the One-Way ANOVA with the level
of significance at .05. It confirmed that both Thai and non-Thai scores, on confidence scale, varied according to the level of education. The Hypothesis was accepted under the assumption that there was a significant difference between level of education of the Thai and non-Thai samples and the confidence scale.

The popularity scale from the table showed that there were slight differences among the means for both groups with the lowest mean of 9.97 on “Below Bachelor’s Degree” and the highest mean of 10.58 on “Masters Degree or Higher” among the Thai group and the lowest mean of 12.17 on “Below Bachelor’s Degree” and the highest mean of 13.46 on “Bachelor’s Degree” and “Masters Degree or Higher” with the non-Thai group. The result of significant values for both groups indicated the higher level set for a significant acceptance with a value of .321 in the Thai group and .590 in the non-Thai group. It can be concluded that there was no significant difference between the level of education of the Thai and the non-Thai groups and popularity. Hence, the hypothesis was rejected.

**Hypothesis 1.4** There is a significant difference between years of work experience of the Thai and non-Thai groups and the two scales, confidence and popularity, measured by SAI.
Table 13  Data Analysis Between Year of Work Experience and Self-Attitude Inventory

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th></th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>F</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Confidence</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.85</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>12.16</td>
<td>1.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13.08</td>
<td>2.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>13.10</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>12.81</td>
<td>2.05</td>
<td>2.074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Popularity</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>10.25</td>
<td>1.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.09</td>
<td>1.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>10.33</td>
<td>1.93</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>10.13</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>10.16</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.153</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Year of work experience were categorized into four levels as shown in Table 13. It is noticeable that the lowest mean score of confidence and popularity scales for both Thai and non-Thai group was at the level of “1 – 3 years” of work experience. Nonetheless, the mean at each year level of work experience for the Thai group, in confidence, showed less compared to the mean of the non-Thai group which obtained the lowest mean of 10.57 with a standard deviation of 4.99 and the highest mean of 13.85 with a standard deviation of 2.05. The Thai group’s mean scores were clustered from 12.16 to 13.10 with a slight difference.

The significance value tested by using the One-Way ANOVA showed that the years of work experience among the Thais had no difference in the confidence scale the value of .106 was higher than the level of significant at .05. The significance level in the non-Thai group indicated a relationship between years of work experience and confidence scale with a value of .002 which was lower than the significance level at .05. The hypothesis testing
found a significant difference between the years of work experience among the non-Thai respondents and confidence scale but there no significant difference between the year of work experience among the Thai sample and confidence scale.

The mean of the popularity scale categorized by years of work experience among the Thai group were densely grouped from 10.09 to 10.33. A little scattered compared to the non-Thai group, the means of confidence scale among non-Thais ranged between 12.07 and 14.00. However, both groups received significant values at .928 for the Thai group and .274 for non-Thai group which were higher than the accepted level of .05. Hence, there was no significant difference between years of work experience of both the Thai sample and the non-Thai sample and popularity scale. The hypothesis was rejected.

5. Evaluation between Demographic Variables and OCCI

This section presents statistical descriptive data of mean, standard deviation and One-Way ANOVA to determine the relationship between selected demographic variables of Thai and non-Thai respondents and the three scales measuring situational conflict managing styles: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control. Each score was categorized according to a specific characteristic of demographic variables and were tested to find the level of significance whether to accept or reject the hypotheses.

Hypothesis 2.1 There is a significant difference between gender of the Thai and non-Thai respondents and the three OCCI scales: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control.
Table 14 Data Analysis Between Gender and OCCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconfrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>45.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>44.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution-Orienta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>39.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>35.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>31.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 14 demonstrated the mean and distribution of scores in three scales of OCCI under male and female cluster of two groups. The Thai group received a total mean score of 44.29 with a standard deviation of 9.84 which was different from the non-Thai group who received a total mean score of 55.44 and standard deviation of 9.57. According to the research conducted among 360 subjects by Putnum & Wilson (1982), the mean result for nonconfrontation scale was 55 which was similar to the mean of the non-Thai group in this study. This verified that the Thai group are more nonconfrontational than the non-Thai group since the mean score of 44.29 is closer to “10 to 37 = nonconfrontation” than the non-Thai group’s mean score of 55.44.

The mean scores of nonconfrontation scale within group though showed a similarity for both the Thai and the non-Thai group’s with a mean score of 45.56 among Thai males and 46.06 among Thai females and a mean score of 55.24 for the non-Thai sample which were similar to the non-Thai females who scored 55.89. Both groups were
tested to find a significant level of acceptance, the results of both groups showed that there was no significant difference between gender and nonconfrontation scale with the $p$ values of .263 in the Thai group and .068 in the non-Thai group at the .05 level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis that there was a significant difference between gender and nonconfrontation scale was rejected.

At the solution-orientation scale, the Thais group obtained a greater range between male and female mean scores than the non-Thai group with a mean score of 39.60 among males and 35.93 among females while the non-Thai males’ mean score was 33.43 and females’ mean score was 33.54. However, the standard deviation of Thai males and females showed similarity with a standard deviation of 8.43 in males and a standard deviation of 8.45 in females. The non-Thai group also received similar distribution of scores with a standard deviation of 6.36 in males and 6.20 in females. The results of $p$ values for both groups indicated that there was no significant difference between gender and solution-orientation scale. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected since a significant value of .923 in Thais and .615 were higher than a .05 level of significance.

Considering the control scale, males and females of both groups received similar mean scores with a mean of 31.43 in Thai males and a mean score of 31.98 in Thai females, a mean score of 31.17 in the non-Thai males, and 31.54 in the non-Thai females. However, the differences in scores among Thai males and females were greater, with a standard deviation of 6.40 in males and 7.35 in females compared to the non-Thai males who obtained a standard deviation of 5.57 and 5.54 in females. Hypothesis testing by using the $t$-test found that the gender of both groups bore no relation to control scale with a significant value of .444 in the Thai group and .975 in the non-Thai group which were
higher than the significant level of .05. The hypothesis which stated that there was a significant difference between gender and control scale in OCCI therefore was rejected.

**Hypothesis 2.2** There is a significant difference between age of the Thai and non-Thai group and the three scales: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control measured by OCCI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconfrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>45.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>43.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>43.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>39.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution-Orienta</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>38.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>36.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>33.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29 or less</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>33.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30 – 39 years</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>30.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 – 49 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>32.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 or more</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>35.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 15 showed the respondents’ scores on three OCCI scales classified by four ranges of age. Nonconfrontation scale of the Thai and non-Thai groups demonstrated mean scores that related to the range of age as follow: 39.11 at the level “50 or more”, 43.84 at
the level of "40-49 years", 43.93 at the level of "30-39 years", 45.73 at the level of "29 or less". From this finding, it indicated that older Thai respondents are more nonconfrontational since the mean score for nonconfrontation ranged between 10 to 37. Nevertheless, the value of significance after testing, using the One-Way ANOVA (.282), was higher than the level of significance at .05. The nonconfrontation scores verified by age of the Thai respondents showed no significant difference. The non Thai mean scores on nonconfrontation scales were clustered from 53.66 to 55.16 with a .695 significant value. The non-Thai group also showed no relationship between age and nonconfrontation scale. The hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between age of both groups and nonconfrontation scale, was rejected.

The distribution of mean scores on solution-orientation scale of both groups showed no difference since the Thai mean scores which ranged from 33.55 to 38.25 while the non-Thai mean scores ranged from 31.76 to 34.64 with the dispersion of scores ranging from 7.91 to 9.00 in the Thai group and from 4.95 to 8.52 in the non-Thai group. In testing the relationship between age and solution-orientation scale by using the One-Way ONOVA at a .05 level of significance, the result of .215 in the Thai group and .135 in the non-Thai group indicated no significant difference. The hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between age of Thai and non-Thai groups and solution-orientation scale was rejected.

The mean scores and standard deviations of control scales were less clustered for Thai respondents compared to the non-Thai respondents, with a mean range from 30.49 to 35.11 and a standard deviation from 6.33 to 9.06 in the Thai group while the non-Thai group obtained a mean range from 30.88 to 32.78 and a standard deviation from 5.11 to 6.74.
Hypothesis 2.3 There is a significant difference between education level of the Thai and non-Thai groups and the three scale: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control measuring by OCCI

Table 16 Data Analysis Between Education and OCCI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nonconfrontation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>46.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>43.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or Higher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>43.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solution-Orientation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>35.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or Higher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>34.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Below Bachelor’s</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>32.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor’s</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>32.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters or Higher</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 16 showed the mean scores of nonconfrontation scale classified by three levels of education. The mean scores of both the Thai and non-Thai groups ranged from the lowest mean to the highest level of education (a mean of 43.42 at the level of “Masters degree or Higher”, a mean of 43.88 at the level of “Bachelor’s Degree”, and a mean of 46.09 at the level of “Below Bachelors’ Degree” among the Thai respondents and a mean of 54.44 at the level of “Masters degree or Higher”, a mean of 55.68 at the level of “Bachelor’s Degree”, and a mean of 58.50 at the level of “Below Bachelors’ Degree”
among the non-Thai respondents). This finding may indicate that, at a certain point, the level of education is likely related to the nonconfrontation scale. When scores were tested to find a significant relationship between level of education and nonconfrontation scale, the result however showed no significant difference between the two groups of variables since the significant value of .475 in the Thai group and .573 in the non-Thai group were higher than a .05 level of significance.

The Thai mean scores on solution-orientation had a greater divergence, with a mean score of 34.04 and a standard deviation of 9.52 at the education level of “Masters Degree or Higher”, a mean score of 35.73 and a standard deviation of 8.00 at the education level of “Bachelor’s Degree”, and a mean score of 40.35 and a standard deviation of 8.31 at the education level of “Below Bachelor’s Degree” compared to the non-Thai sample who received a mean score of 32.32 and a standard deviation of 6.04 at the education level of “Masters Degree or Higher”, a mean score of 33.84 and a standard deviation of 6.37 at the education level of “Bachelor’s Degree”, and a mean score of 35.33 and a standard deviation of 5.35 at the education level of “Below Bachelor’s Degree”. The result from the Thai group clearly indicated that there was a significant difference between education level of Thai respondents and the solution-orientation scale with a .007 significant value that is lower than an alpha value of .05 for level of significance. Hence, the hypothesis, that there was a significant different between level of education of Thai respondents and solution-orientation scale, was accepted. In contrast, the education level of the non-Thai sample was not related to solution-orientation scale since .323 p value was higher than .05 alpha level of significance. The hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between education level of non-Thai sample and solution-orientation scale, was rejected.
The mean scores of control scale on each level of education among the two groups indicated no difference with a total mean score of 31.90 and a standard deviation of 7.20 in Thais and a total mean of 31.29 and a standard deviation of 5.54 in non-Thai respondents. The hypothesis was rejected under the condition that there was no significant difference between education level of Thai and non-Thai groups and control scale since .784 p value and .309 p value were higher than the level of significance at .05.

**Hypothesis 2.4** There is a significant difference between years of work experience of Thai and non-Thai respondents and the three scales: nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control as measured by OCCI.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Thai</th>
<th>Non-Thai</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Mean</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Nonconfrontation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>46.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>43.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>46.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>44.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solution-Orientation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 1 year</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>37.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>35.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>36.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Control</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 year or less</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>30.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 – 5 years</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>30.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 5 years</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>32.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>31.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17 showed the distribution and dispersion of scores in each scale of OCCI when classified by four ranges of years of work experience between the Thai and non-Thai school workers. The mean scores on nonconfrontation scale of both groups, showed no relation to the level of years of work experience with the cluster of mean scores ranging from 43.02 to 46.83 among the Thai group and a cluster of mean scores ranging from 53.41 to 59.57 in the non-Thai group. Considering the years of experience, the Thai group’s lowest mean on nonconfrontation scale (interpreted as nonconfrontation oriented) was 43.02 at the level of work experience of “1-3 years”. The level of “4-5 years” of work experience among the non-Thai respondents obtained the lowest mean of 53.41. Hypothesis testing for both groups showed no significant difference between years of work experience and nonconfrontation scale with the value of .325 for the Thai group and .457 for the non-Thai group. Thus, the hypothesis was rejected since the $p$ values of both groups were higher than the level of significance at .05.

The distribution of scores on solution-orientation scale for both groups demonstrated randomly mean scores according to year of work experience. The Thai group had mean scores that ranged from 35.54 to 37.15 with standard deviations ranging from 8.40 to 9.05. The non-Thai sample had a minimum mean score of 30.00 with a standard deviation of 6.53 and a maximum mean score of 35.00 with a standard deviation of 5.57. The scores from both groups were tested to find the $p$ value of significance. The finding indicated that there was no significant difference between years of work experience and solution-orientation scale since a value of .686 in the Thai sample and a value .288 in the non-Thai sample were greater than .05 value of level of significance. The hypothesis, that there was a significant difference between the years of work experience of the Thai and non-Thai respondents and the solution-orientation scale, was rejected.
Table 17 also showed the mean, standard deviation, f scores and p value of control scale of both the Thai and non-Thai groups. The range of mean scores among Thai respondents was from 30.42 to 33.05 with a range of standard deviation from 6.25 to 8.18. When non-Thai distribution and dispersion of scores was considered, the range of means was 26.28 to 32.55 and the range of standard deviation was 5.22 to 6.90. It is noticeable that the Thai respondents received the highest mean of 33.05 at the first year or less of work experience while the non-Thai respondents received the lowest mean score of 26.28 at the same level of work experience. This was interpreted that conflict managing style among the non-Thai group were likely control orientated compared to the Thai group (control score = 10 to 23). Hypothesis testing showed that there was no significant difference between years of work experience and the control scale among the Thai group (.364 p value > .05). In contrast, in the non-Thai group there was a significance difference between years of work experience and the control scale, with a value of .049 which was smaller than the value of .05 for level of significance. Hypothesis stated that there is a significant difference between years of work experience and control scale among non-Thai group therefore the hypothesis was accepted.
6. Correlation between Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) and Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI)

This section presents paired sets of data between the two variables from SAI which are confidence and popularity and the three variables from OCCI which are nonconfrontation, solution-orientation, and control, to determine the relationship between these two sets of variables. The degree of relationship was measured by the Pearson's Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation (r).

**Hypothesis 3.1** There is a significant relationship between SAI and OCCI in the Thai respondents.

Table 18 Correlation Between SAI and OCCI in Thai Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SAI Scales</th>
<th>Nonconfrontation</th>
<th>Solution-Orientation</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.090</td>
<td>.205**</td>
<td>.157*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2tailed)</td>
<td>.262</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.084</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2tailed)</td>
<td>.298</td>
<td>.294</td>
<td>.608</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>157</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).**
*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 18 showed a significant relationship between solution-orientation and confidence and between control and confidence in the Thai group. The value of .205,
between solution-orientation scale and confidence scale, indicates that the Thai respondents who scored high in the confidence scale also scored high in the solution-orientation scale. 

Less strong, but still clearly showing a significant relationship, between the control scale and the confidence scale the value .157 indicates that the Thai respondents who scored high on the confidence scale of SAI were likely to score high on the control scale of OCCI.

It is noticeable that both scales of SAI had a negative relationship with nonconfrontation scale although the r values did not reach the level of significance with the r value between nonconfrontation and confidence at -.090 and the r value of -.084 between nonconfrontation and popularity.

The table showed no significant relationship between solution-orientation and popularity and between control and popularity as the .084 value and the .041 value were not in the level of significant relationship.

In reference to hypothesis 3.1, there was no significant relationship between confidence and popularity (SAI) and nonconfrontation (OCCI). The hypothesis was rejected. There was also no significant relationship between popularity and the two scales of OCCI; solution-orientation and control. The hypothesis was therefore rejected. However, the hypothesis was accepted in confidence (SAI) and solution-orientation and control (OCCI).
Hypothesis 3.2 There is a significant relationship between SAI and OCCI in the non-Thai respondents.

Table 19 Correlation Between SAI and OCCI in Non-Thai Respondents

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>OCCI Scales</th>
<th>Nonconfrontation</th>
<th>Solution-Orientaiton</th>
<th>Control</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Confidence</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.275**</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.058</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2tailed)</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.237</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popularity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-.274**</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2tailed)</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.596</td>
<td>.522</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>143</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Two pairs of variables showed a significant relationship among non-Thai respondents. With the alpha level of .01, the correlation for the population of 143 non-Thais between nonconfrontation and confidence scores was -.275 which indicated that the two variables were negatively correlated. As one increased, the other tended to decrease.

Thee non-Thai respondents who scored high on nonconfrontation scale are likely to score low on confidence scale. The correlation between nonconfrontation and popularity was also significant, with a value of -247 at the alpha value of .01. This finding verified that non-Thai respondents who scored high on nonconfrontation scale tended to score low on popularity scale as the two variables were negatively correlated.
The hypothesis therefore was accepted as there was a significant relationship between SAI and nonconfrontation scale among non-Thai respondents. However, the correlation between SAI and the two scales of OCCI (solution-orientation and control) was not statistically significant. The hypothesis, that there was a significant relationship between confidence and popularity (SAI) and solution-orientation and control (OCCI), for the population of 143 non-Thai sample, was rejected.
CHAPTER V

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS, DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter presents a summary of the overall study of conflict in communication among Thai and non-Thai school workers in international schools around Bangkok. The master concept that applied in this study was personal attitude of the respondents related to the managing styles used in situational communication conflicts at work between two groups, the Thai and non-Thai school workers. To determine the relationship between personal attitude and conflict managing styles, two instruments, SAI and OCII, were used in this study following the procedures of statistical research in social studies. The summary of the research is divided into seven sections as follows:

1. The purpose of the study
2. The research design
3. The subjects and instruments
4. Summary of the findings
5. Discussion
6. Conclusion
7. Recommendations
The Purpose of the Study

According to the statement of the problems that communication conflicts occur among Thai and non-Thai school workers because there are differences between their personal attitudes that consequently lead to the different styles used in managing conflicts. The study seeks to determine the relationship between personal attitudes and managing styles in task situations between Thai and non-Thai school workers. In order to conclusively prove significant relationships, statistical methods of testing were used to verify the relationship between personal attitudes and conflict managing styles and demographic data of two groups were taken into account in testing for statistical significance.

The findings, of these statistical methods of investigation provide useful information for Thai and non-Thai school workers to help them appreciate their differences, and serve as a guide to practice their personal skills in resolving conflicts in a multi cultural work environment.

The Research Design

The research designed for this study is a descriptive research that aims to describe the personal attitudes and conflict managing styles in a comparative way between two independent groups: Thai and non-Thai school workers. Descriptive research seeks to find answers to questions through analysis of variable relationships in which gender, age, level of education, and years of work experience were set as independent variables while
personal attitudes using SAI and conflict managing styles using OCCI were set as dependent variables.

A non-probability sampling technique was used for collecting the data since there are no available statistics regarding Thai and non-Thai school workers employed in the Bangkok International School system, in which Thai and non Thai school workers engage in cross-cultural communication using English as the working language.

There were two types of data analyses applied in this study, descriptive data analysis and inferential data analysis. Statistical measurements used in descriptive data analysis were: Mean to investigate the distribution of the scores of dependent variables, Standard Deviation to measure the spread of scores in a distribution, and Pearson’s Product-Moment Coefficient of Correlation to determine the degree of relationship between paired variables of the Self Attitude Inventory (SAI) and the Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI). Inferential data analysis was used under the principle that there was an inevitability of sampling error whether through the sampling process or sample characteristics. The methods used for testing statistical significance were the t-test (specifically used for the mean scores of two samples) and f-test (specifically used for the mean scores of more than two samples). The rejection or acceptance of a null hypothesis is based on a level of significance (alpha level) as a criterion. In this study a .05 alpha level was set as a standard for rejection or acceptance.
Subjects and Instruments

The subjects for this study were categorized into two independent groups with culture and language differences that distinguished one from the other. The language differences specified in this study were Thai and English. The two groups were, Thai and non-Thai employees in the Bangkok based international school system, in which English is the working language.

Through the data analysis, the two groups of subjects were separately presented in statistical processes of generalizing data then the two groups were compared by describing the different outcomes.

A set of instruments included the demographic data, Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI), and Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI). After the instruments were selected, the researcher then contacted the author for the permission of use the instrument (see Appendix A for the permission letter). The instruments were translated and proof read by professional lecturers in Psychology before conducting the pilot study. The findings of a pilot study indicated the reliabilities of the two instruments with the range of Cronbach’s alphas from .84 to .90 in OCCI and a Cronbach’s alpha of .69 in confidence scale of SAI and a .78 alpha of popularity scale in SAI (see details of SAI and OCCI instruments in Chapter III).

The set of questionnaires was compiled with seven pages and three sections of demographic data, SAI, and OCCI in English language and eight pages in Thai language. Both sets of questionnaires were enclosed with the letter explaining the study synopsis, the ethics of data collecting, and the researcher’s contact information.
Summary of the Findings

This section presents evaluations and interpretations of the research findings according to the hypotheses including theoretical consequences of the results and validity of the conclusions.

Demographic Data of Thai and non-Thai School Workers in Relation to SAI and OCCI

Selected demographic factors were included in this study, to investigate whether they manipulate the outcome of the relationship between personal attitudes and conflict managing styles as in the following discussions;

1. Considering the results of statistical significance of a coefficient correlation (r-value) between gender and SAI, popularity scale tended to depend on type of gender for both Thai and non-Thai respondents since the r-value of .057 in Thai respondents was very close to a .05 level of significance. When the groups of 23 males and 134 females were taken into account, the great diversity of the sample size between genders prejudiced the outcome. Compared to the r-value of .023 in the non-Thai sample of 99 males and 44 females, the variation of sample size was smaller than the Thai respondents.

2. Both Thai and non-Thai groups showed no significant difference in styles used in situational conflict when classified by gender. All of the r-values from the three OCCI scales exceeded the .05 level of significance. The Thai and non-Thai group nonconfrontation scale r values were .263 and .068 respectively, the r values for solution-
orientation were .923 and .615 scale, and the t-values for control scale were .444 and .975. However, the nonconfrontation scale for both groups came closest to the .05 alpha value.

3. The relation between respondent's age and SAI indicated that there was no significant different between confidence and popularity of Thai and non-Thai sample when classified by age. However, the sample size of Thai respondents between the age over 50 was considered inadequate to generalize (N = 9).

4. When considering the relation between conflict managing styles and age, the research found that older Thai respondents tended to use the nonconfrontation style more than the younger age group e.g., 29 years and under m = 45.73, 30-39 years = 43.93, 40-49 years = 43.84 and 50 years plus = 39.11. The scale of solution orientation and control among the Thai and non-Thai group showed no significant relationships with age, with significant values of .215 and .135 in solution-orientation scale for Thai and non-Thai respondents and significant values of .102 and .679 in the control scale for Thai and non-Thai groups which were greater than the alpha value set for level of significance at .05.

5. In the education categories for both Thai and non-Thai groups, the majority were in the "Bachelor's degree" level, with 63.1% for Thai respondents and 67.1% for non-Thai respondents. The "Below Bachelor's Degree" group was the smallest for non-Thai respondents, with the frequency number of 6 or only 4.2% of the population. Hence, the sample size was insufficient to generalize.

In terms of the relationship between level of education and confidence scale, the values of significance of .041 in Thai group and .040 in non-Thai group verified that level
of education differences were related to the attitude differences in the confidence factor. Similar to the study of The Self-Presentation and Coping Styles of Mixed Marriages in Metro Bangkok by Sethi (2002), a significant relationship between level of education and self-presentation with a significant value of .045 indicated that level of education differences affect individual’s attitude.

The popularity scale in contrast demonstrated no significant difference with the level of education for both the Thai and non-Thai respondents with a .321 value of significance in the Thai group and a .590 value of significance in the non-Thai group which were greater than the .05 alpha value.

6. Most of the OCCI factors showed no significant relationship between education levels, for both the Thai and non-Thai respondents, with significance values that were greater than an alpha value of .05 ($p = .476 \text{ and } p = .573 \text{ in nonconfrontation scale } p = .323 \text{ in solution-orientation scale for the non-Thai group, and } p = .784 \text{ and } p = .309 \text{ in control scale for the Thai and non-Thai groups}$). However, the level of education showed a strong relationship with solution-orientation scale among the Thai respondents with a significant value of .007 ($p < .05$). This can be interpreted as a variation in level of education produced a different degree of solution-orientation in conflict among the Thai respondents.

7. The distribution of the two groups, in terms of years of work experience, revealed that the largest segment of both samples was in the “over five years work experience” category, with 44.6% in Thai respondents and 66.4% in non-Thai respondents. The “less than 1 year work experience” segment had the smallest population frequency for both Thai and non-Thai samples. However, in the non-Thai respondents’ population distribution the four
levels (years of work experience) revealed only 7 subjects had less than 1 year of work experience, 14 subjects in 1-3 years of work experience, 27 subjects in 4-5 years of work experience, and 95 subjects with over five years of work experience.

In contrast, the Thai group had the opposite distribution characteristics at all levels of years of work experience (20 subjects had less than 1 year of work experience, 43 subjects had 1-3 years of work experience, 24 subjects had 4-5 years of work experience, and 70 subjects had over five years of work experience). This indicates that the non-Thai group generally had teaching and administrative positions, whereas Thai group occupied positions in catering, operations, house keeping etc. The frequency of the two groups in years of work experience therefore was exceptionally different.

When considering the relationship between year of work experience and confidence among two groups, the confidence is strongly related to years of work experience among the non-Thai group ($p=.002 < .05$) but showed no significant relationship in the Thai group ($p=.106>.05$). Note that both groups characterized the lowest means at 1-3 years of work experience and surprisingly, the non-Thai group obtained a lower mean on the confidence scale ($\chi = 12.16$ for the Thai group and $\chi = 10.57$ for the non-Thai group).

Predictably, the Thai group received a significantly lower mean on the popularity scale which meant that the Thai group had a lower self-esteem toward social approval and it led to a dependence characteristic, always seeking peer approval ($\chi = 10.16 < \chi = 13.40$). When testing the degree of difference between the popularity scale and years of work experience scale the results showed no significant relationship between the popularity in both Thai and non-Thai respondents ($p=.928$ in the Thai group and $p=.274$ in non-Thai group). In the Thai group, clustered means from 10.09 to 10.33 in four categories of years of work experience indicated that self-esteem toward social approval or popularity does not
change whether there were less or more of years of work experience. This implication also applied to the non-Thai group since the mean values were clustered between 12.07 and 14.00.

8. It is clear that the total mean score on nonconfrontation compared between the two groups were greatly different with a total mean of 44.29 in the Thai group and a total mean score of 55.24 in the non-Thai group when the lower score was interpreted for the nonconfrontation type. It meant that the Thai group’s used nonconfrontation style in managing conflict than the non-Thai group.

On the solution-orientation scale, both groups received a slightly different mean scores with a total mean of 36.47 in the Thai group and 33.47 in the non-Thai group. The interpretation of the score from the OCCI manual authored by Putnum and Wilson (1987) indicated the range of solution-orientation frequent use of style from 16 to 26, the results from the two groups showed that the non-Thai group tended to use solution-orientation style more often than the Thai group.

Both groups had a similar frequency use of confidence style in managing conflict with a total mean of 31.90 in the Thai group and 31.29 in the non-Thai group. With the interpretation of the scores for the frequent use of control style was from 10 to 23 (Putnum & Wilson, 1987), the Thai group’s highest mean ($\chi = 33.05$) was in the less than 1 year of work experience, which was opposite to the non-Thai group who obtained the lowest mean ($\chi = 26.28$) at the same category of years of work experience.

When investigating the relationship between the three styles used in conflict and years of work experience, for both groups, the findings showed that there was no significant relationship between nonconfrontation and solution-orientation styles and years
of work experience \( p = .325 \) in Thai and \( p = .457 \) in the non-Thai nonconfrontation scale, \( p = .686 \) in Thai and \( p = .288 \) in the non-Thai solution-orientation scale). Moreover, there was no significant difference between the use of the control style and years of work experience among the Thai respondents \( (p = .364 > .05 \text{ alpha value}) \). There was a significant difference between control style use and years of work experience, with a \( p \) value of \( .049 \) at a .05 level of significance.

*The Relationship between SAI and OCCL*

1. The two groups were separated when testing the degree of relationship between personal attitudes and conflict managing styles. The results, among Thai respondents, showed that a strong relationship existed between confidence and the frequent use of a solution-orientation style in conflict management (\( r = .205, p < .010 \) at .01 level of significance). The use of control has a significant but slight relationship with confidence scale (\( r = .157, p < .049 \) at a .05 level of significance). This can be interpreted that the Thai group with high confidence is likely to use control style in managing conflict.

The Thai group with low confidence and popularity tended to use the nonconfrontation strategy frequently according to the negative relationship between the nonconfrontation scale and the confidence and popularity scales (\( r = -.090 \ p > .262 \) for confidence and \( r = -.084 \ p > .298 \) for popularity). Even though the correlation coefficient results indicated a negative relationship, the results for the two scales did not indicate a significant relationship, at either the .01 or .05 alpha level of significance.
2. Unlike the Thai group, non-Thai respondents tended to have a strong negative relationship between nonconfrontation scale and confidence scale and also had a strong negative relationship between the nonconfrontation scale and the popularity scale ($r = -0.275$ $p < .001$ at a .01 level of significance in control scale and $r = -0.274$ $p < .003$ at a .01 level of significance). This means that the more confident and popular non-Thai respondents are the less likely they will use a nonconfrontation style in a conflict.

The non-Thai group, however, showed no significant relationship between solution-orientation and either confidence or popularity scale ($r = 0.009$, $p > .237$). There was also no significance relationship between control scale and either confidence or popularity scale ($r = 0.045$, $p > .596$).

**Discussion**

This section focuses on the discussion of the findings according to the statements of the problem as follows;

1. Personal attitudes of the Thai and non-Thai school workers

This study used two scales-confidence and popularity from SAI in measuring subjects’ personal attitude. The postulation from the researcher was that the Thai group had lower self-esteem because of low confidence and popularity, and therefore tended to seek the approval of peers and family. According to Komin (1991), ‘Ego orientation’ was rated as a top value among Thai people. She explained that Thais had very big egos and a deep sense of independence, pride and dignity. They cannot tolerate any violation of the ‘ego'
self. Despite their cool and calm front, they can be easily provoked to strong emotional reactions, if the 'self' or anybody close to the 'self' like one's father or mother, is insulted. The other top values, rated by Thais from her study, were 'Grateful relationship orientation' and 'Smooth interpersonal relationship orientation'. It is clear that Thais see themselves as important people in their society and among family and friends. The Thai 'self', with close family relationships led to the importance of the value 'Grateful relationship orientation' and 'Smooth interpersonal relationship orientation'.

The observed lower confidence and popularity scales of the Thai respondents, as compared to the non-Thai group, explains why Thais with insecure feelings and low self-esteem seek social approval and show greater dependence on others. Thais regard the relationship between themselves and 'others' more important than do the non-Thais.

Even though there was no significant relationship between the popularity scale for the Thai group and solution-orientation and control, Komin (1991) produced similar findings in the study of Thai social relations and the entourage system with a similar concept to the SAI popularity factor. The findings of a relationship between a percentage of agreement on "favor one's entourage" and gender in the Komin study showed a noteworthy difference with a mean of 20.1 in males and a mean of 15.3 in females. Gender, therefore, related to popularity or social approval is characteristic among Thais in a certain level.
2. Conflict managing styles used by Thai and non-Thai school workers

From the findings, the Thai group used a nonconfrontation style in conflict situations more often than the non-Thai group did. Non-Thais used the solution-orientation style in conflict situations more than the Thai do. Both groups make relatively equal use of a control style in conflict situations. The assumption that Thais likely avoid confrontation when conflict occurs is supported by this research finding. In accordance with this assumption, Klausner & Klausner (1986) stated that one of the most effective methods of dealing with conflict among Thai people is to assure they do not occur at all. They later mentioned that 'farang' confrontation and conflict are the norm which supported the finding that the non-Thai respondents used solution-orientation style in conflict more than the Thai group.

Ramirez (1990) studied similarities in attitudes toward interpersonal aggression in Finland, Poland, and Spain, and suggests that European societies sharing similar degrees of acceptance of interpersonal aggression with a high acceptance of 'rage' and especially 'shouting'. This finding supports the position that 'acting out' when conflict occurs is common in 'farang' society.
3. *The significant difference between the personal attitude of Thai and non-Thai school workers and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience*

The only significant relationship between gender and SAI was the effect of gender and popularity scale in 99 non-Thai males and 44 non-Thai females with a statistically significant, $t = 5.24$, $p = .023$. Considering the mean scores between both sexes of non-Thai respondents, females seem to value popularity more than males. Thai males and females showed no difference in self-value toward confidence and popularity. However, the big difference of the sample size between Thai males and females must be taken into account since there were only 23 males but 134 females on this study. A further study with a more evenly balanced population of Thai males and females was necessary to confirm these results.

Most respondents in the study, in both the Thai and non-Thai groups, were in the 29 or younger, 30-39 and 40-49. The smallest number of respondents were in the 50 years of age and older groups, only 9 in the Thai group and only 18 in the non-Thai group. The statistical significant findings demonstrated no significant relationship between age and personal attitude in both groups. According to Kacmar & Ferris as sighted in Berry (1998), believed that personal needs, expectations, and values are likely to change as an individual moves through the three career stages:

- an establishment stage in which career is being developed,
- a middle stage in which the career is being advanced, and
- a final stage in which a career is maintained.
The researchers believed that aging should effect changes in values, whether in general or specific perspectives. Surprisingly, age differences do not affect the attitude toward either confidence or popularity, in either of the study groups.

It is assumed that people with higher education are more competitive and occupy higher positions at work. A person in a high position is expected to make important decisions thus boosting their self-esteem. The education level therefore influences personal attitudes. This assumption was supported by the study findings. There was a significant relationship between education level and confidence in both the Thai and non-Thai respondents with $F = 3.256, p = .041$ in Thai group and $F = 3.293, p = .040$ in non-Thai group. However, education level showed no relationship to the popularity scale. Individuals value social approval regardless of education levels.

Does length of service influence individual attitude? The findings showed a significant relationship between years of work experience and confidence in the non-Thai group, with $f = 5.403, p = .002$. Noticeably, the confidence mean, for respondents with one year of work experience or less, was higher in both groups than for those with 1-3 years of work experience. A possible explanation is that most new graduates in their first work experience tended to be a success at work. They were likely to put out a lot of effort, and do so with confidence.
4. The significant difference between situational managing styles used by Thai and non-Thai office workers and selected demographic variables such as age, gender, education level, and years of work experience.

The investigation of the relationship between gender and OCCI found no significant difference in all three styles of conflict management in males and females for both group. In contrast, the Putnum & Wilson (1982) study of 120 employees found a significant difference between gender and the three OCCI's scales. During the first year of an employee's work, females used more nonconfrontation strategies than did males ($F = 3.45$, $df = 3,117$, $p < .02$, $f = .55.11$, $m = 64.68$; low means = high frequency). This difference between the outcomes of the two studies may come from the great differences between sample sizes of gender since there were only 23 males and 134 females in Thai population and 99 males and 44 females in the non-Thai group while the study by Putnum & Wilson (1982) was conducted on 60 males and 60 females from two departments.

There was no significant difference between age and styles used in conflict strategies among Thai and non-Thai respondents. There was no study supporting this assumption, however, the results of mean score in nonconfrontation style for both Thai and non-Thai group, in this study, displayed a similar pattern as respondents tended to use a more nonconfrontation style as they grew older.

The Thai respondents having higher levels of education were more likely to use a more solution-orientation style, with a significant relationship ($F=5.129$, $p < .007$). Even though there was no statistical significant relationship between education levels and other scales of OCCI, the pattern of decreasing means is clearly associated with education levels and increased use in solution-orientation scale, for both groups. Respondents with higher
education are more likely to use solution-orientation styles. However, there were random means through levels of education with very close means between the two groups (minimum=29.00, maximum=32.14). Both groups made equal use of a control style in managing conflict.

With regards to the relationship between years of work experience and the three styles used in managing conflict, the only statistically significant relationship was found in the non-Thai group, between the years of work experience and the control style. There was a less frequent use of control style when years of work experience increased. This finding showed that the non-Thai group tends to use control style in a conflict more than the Thai group at the 1 year or less of work experience. The non-Thai group tended to use a control style less when their work experience increases which is opposite to the Thai group who tended to use more of control style in conflict when their work experience increased.

An interesting finding of Putnum & Wilson’s (1982) OCCI research into the three styles of conflict management and the length of service reinforced the assumption that years of work experience interacted differently in the use of conflict managing styles. The study compared the length of work and three scales on OCCI among male and female employees, the findings showed that females used more nonconfrontation strategies than did males during the first year of employee’s work. However, this pattern reversed itself for employees who had been working for more than five years.

However, Putnum & Wilson (1982) found a significant relationship between length of work and nonconfrontation. Their respondents tended to use more of the nonconfrontation style in the first year of work. In conclusion, years of work experience influence the use of the conflict management style among non-Thai respondents but does not affect conflict managing style use among the Thai respondents.
5. The significant relationship between personal attitude and the three situational managing styles i.e. nonconfrontation, solution-orientation and control

The Thai respondents with high confidence made significantly greater use of both the solution-orientation style ($r=.205, p=.01$ at .01 level of significance) and the control style ($r=.157, p=.049$ at .05 level of significance) in managing conflict. In contrast, respondents in the non-Thai group who had high self-esteem made less use of the nonconfrontation style in managing conflict ($r=-.275, p=.001$ at .01 level of significance in confidence scale and $r=-.274, p=.003$ at .01 level of significance in popularity scale).

The Komin (1991)'s explanation of differences between American values and Thai values draws from the following statement:

“...American whose top values tend to focus on self-actualization, ambition and achievement, down-playing such values of self-control and politeness. The Thais, after pricing ‘ego’ and ‘grateful relationship’, place high value on a group of ‘other-directed’ social interaction values all added up to project a picture of smooth, kind, pleasant, no-conflict interpersonal interactions, in short, the ‘surface harmony’ as observed by many...” (p. 143)

Thais value the importance of relationships with others. This dependency on others may lead them to avoid conflict in order to save their relationship, thus lowering their confidence and popularity. Consequently, they keep their relationship intact while acknowledging their differences of opinion during a conflict. In contrast, Americans value self-actualization, ambition and have a higher self-esteem. They acknowledge the inevitability of conflict and the need to seek solutions.
Conclusions

This section summarizes the findings according to the topics presented in Chapter IV as follows:

1. Distribution of Demographic Data in Thai and non-Thai School Workers

Three hundred samples were divided into two clusters (Thai and non-Thai) then grouped into each demographic category. Some of the group distribution were inadequate to accomplish statistical data analysis for instance 23 male samples and 134 females sample when categorized by gender in the Thai group.

2. Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI) as a measurement to determine respondents’ self-esteem.

Mean score distributions in SAI identified non-Thai respondents with higher scores in both scales measuring self-esteem compared to the Thai respondents. The finding supports the assumption that Thais have lower self-esteem compared to non-Thais.

3. Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) as a measurement to determine respondents’ managing strategies in task situations.

The Thai group used nonconfrontation style in conflicts more than the non-Thai group according to the OCCI score distribution where the majority of Thai respondents were in high and medium nonconfrontation orientation but the non-Thai majority were in medium and low nonconfrontation. Inversely, the non-Thai group used solution-orientation in task situations more than the Thai group did. The findings support the position that Thais
recognize conflict but avoid consequences resulting in no alternative solutions when conflict occurs. Non-Thais however, acknowledge conflicts and open the opportunities to exchange information to seek solutions.

Both groups surprisingly had similar frequency use of control style in conflicts. Klausner & Klausner (1986)’s explanation may help to understand as they mentioned that Thais had indirect techniques of social expression if one is annoyed or angered, one does not express such feelings directly but turn them toward other objects, either animate or inanimate. This projective defense mechanism were also illustrated through their responses in the OCCI.

4. The findings between demographic data and two scales of Self-Attitude Inventory (SAI), according to the hypothesis, that there is a significant difference between selected demographic variables and the two scales of SAI. The males statistically scored significantly lower in the popularity scale than the females in both groups. There was no difference of self-esteem level among different ages in both groups. However, higher education level signified higher confidence in all respondents. Work experience indicated a statistical difference of confidence level in non-Thai respondents since they were likely to have more confidence when their work experience increases.
5. The findings between demographic data and three scales of the Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) according to the hypothesis that there was significant difference between selected demographic variables and the three scales of OCCI.

The males and females demonstrated no difference in using three styles of conflict managing strategies. Respondents also showed no different use of conflict managing strategies at all age levels. Education level among the Thai respondents was the only variable that showed statistical relationship with solution-orientation scale in the way that educated Thais tended to use more solution-orientation style when conflict occurs. The non-Thai respondents with greater work experiences tended to use control style dealing with conflict less than the respondents with less work experiences.

6. Correlation between Self-Attitude Inventory and Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument (OCCI) according to the hypothesis that there is a significant relationship between SAI and OCCI.

The researcher found that people with high self-esteem tended to use solution-orientation style and people with low self-esteem tended to use more nonconfrontation style in dealing with conflicts.

The findings support this assumption as Thai respondents with high confidence were likely to use more of a solution-orientation and control style managing conflict than the nonconfrontation style. However, the popularity scale did not show any relations with conflict managing strategies. In the non-Thai group, respondents with low self-esteem used nonconfrontation style in dealing with conflict rather than the other two styles.
Recommendations

Recommendations Based on the Present Study

1. The results from this study should be used to assist Thais to see conflict from a different perspective. Conflicts are not necessarily destructive issues that need to be avoided but they can benefit an organization, if they were treated in a productive way by the group members and if both sides of a conflict understands the conflict-management style of their colleagues.

2. These findings should be used as the tools in workshops, seminars, and orientations in international schools in order to reduce the conflicts in workplaces across cultures.

3. The differences between personal attitudes and conflict managing styles found in this study can be utilized by Thais and foreigners who work in a multi-cultural setting in order to explore their differences and create alternative conflict managing styles.

4. This study should be provided as essential resources for cross-cultural therapists who are interested in organizing workshops in conflicts across cultural differences.

Recommendation for further study

1. This study draws conclusions from two cross cultural groups that are very small and specific to certain environments. However, it provides important sources for the researchers
who are interested in studying Thai characteristics and their conflict tactics, personality traits, and alter-personal prospective in multicultural settings.

2. Based on the assumption that conflicts are unusual events among Thai people, it is interesting to investigate conflict predispositions in Thais and how this affects conflict managing strategies.

3. This study disregards the effect of supervisors’ gender on their conflict managing strategies since Thai and non-Thai respondents independently interact with each other in international schools. However, it is beneficial to further study the effectiveness of conflict managing styles among supervisors as it may help reduce conflicts between supervisors and subordinates.

4. When personality measures are applied cross-culturally—particularly when scores for different cultural groups will be compared—issues of measurement bias and equivalence become important. Strict observations of general measurement issues are highly recommended in order to reduce cross-cultural bias.

5. The limitation of this study was the unequal sample size when classified by gender. Therefore, it failed to simplify the differences across gender factor. Further study with an equal sample size may provide adequate information to draw conclusions on this perspective.
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APPENDIX A
SURVEY QUESTIONNAIRE IN ENGLISH AND THAI
AND
ENCLOSED LETTER
Dear Participants,

As a graduate student at Assumption University, I am participating in a Master of Science in Counseling Psychology. My Master’s Thesis in Communication Conflict: Personality used by Thai and non-Thai School workers in TASK SITUATIONS require myself to accumulate data from Thai and non-Thai school workers.

My study is focused to describe the relationship between personalities measured by “Self-Attitude Inventory” and conflict managing styles in task situations measured by Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument.

I am inviting you to assist me in my research by completing the following questionnaire, which I hope will not take up much of your time. There are three parts to each questionnaire. It is important that you complete all three sections and that you do not leave any questions unanswered. All data collected will be strictly confidential.

I am very grateful for your co-operation and I will be happy to forward the results of my research to you upon request.

Sincerely yours,

Kedsanee Broome
(aoybroome@hotmail.com)

Part I: Personal Information

Please put an (X) inside the bracket which corresponds to your answer. This information will be used for this study and will be kept strictly confidential.

1. Gender ( ) Male ( ) Female

2. Age ( ) 29 or less ( ) 30-39 years ( ) 40-49 years ( ) 50 or more

3. Nationality ( ) Thai ( ) Other (please specify)__________

4. Highest Level of Education Achieved
   ( ) Below Bachelor’s Degree
   ( ) Bachelor’s Degree
   ( ) Masters Degree or higher

5. Years of work experience
   ( ) Less than 1 year ( ) 1 year - 3 years
   ( ) 4 - 5 years ( ) Over five years
Part II: Organizational Communication Conflict Instrument

Directions

Think of disagreements you have encountered in task situations with your immediate work group. Then indicate below how frequently you engage in each of the described behaviours. Please do not respond to the items with a particular disagreement in mind. Instead, keep in mind your experience with work group disagreements, in general. For each item select the number that represents the behavior you are most likely to exhibit. There are no correct or incorrect answers. Please respond to all items on the scale. The alternative responses (1-7) are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Always</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7 Never</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I blend my ideas with my work group to create new alternatives for resolving a disagreement.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>I shy away from topics which are sources of disputes with my work group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>I make my opinion known in a disagreement with my work group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>I suggest solutions which combine a variety of viewpoints.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>I steer clear of disagreeable situations.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>I give in a little on my ideas when my work group also gives in.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>I avoid my work group when I suspect that he or she wants to discuss a disagreement.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>I integrate arguments into a new solution from the issues raised in a dispute with my work group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>I will go 50-50 to reach a settlement with my work group.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>I raise my voice when I am trying to get my work group to accept my position.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1 Always</td>
<td>2 Very Often</td>
<td>3 Often</td>
<td>4 Sometimes</td>
<td>5 Seldom</td>
<td>6 Very Seldom</td>
<td>7 Never</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I offer creative solutions in discussions of disagreement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I keep quiet about my views in order to avoid disagreements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I give in if my work group will meet me half way.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>I downplay the importance of a disagreement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>I reduce disagreements by making them seem insignificant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I meet my work group at a mid-point in our differences.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I assert my opinion forcefully.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I dominate arguments until my work group understands my position.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I suggest we work together to create solutions to disagreements.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I try to use my work groups ideas to generate solutions to problems.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I offer trade-offs to reach solutions in a disagreement.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I argue insistently for my stance.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I withdraw when my work group confronts me about a controversial issue.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I side-step disagreements when they arise.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I try to smooth over disagreements by making them appear unimportant.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I insist my position be accepted during a disagreement with my work group.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I make our differences seem less serious.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Always</td>
<td>Very Often</td>
<td>Often</td>
<td>Sometimes</td>
<td>Seldom</td>
<td>Very Seldom</td>
<td>Never</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

28. I hold my tongue rather than argue with my work group. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

29. I ease conflict by claiming our differences are trivial. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7

30. I stand firm in expressing my viewpoints during a disagreement with my work group. 1 2 3 4 5 6 7
Part III: Self-Attitude Inventory

Directions

Below are a number of statements that describe how people feel about themselves and how they relate to others. You will notice that each numbered item has two possible answers labeled A and B. Read each statement and select the one (either A or B) you agree with the most. Then draw a circle around A or the B, whichever describes you best. Be sure to circle one answer for each item.

1. A. I usually feel confident in my abilities.
   B. I often lack confidence in my abilities.

2. A. I have few doubts that I am popular.
   B. I have real doubts about my popularity.

3. A. I usually expect to succeed in things I try.
   B. Only occasionally do I expect to succeed in things I try.

4. A. Not many people think well of me.
   B. Most people think well of me.

5. A. There are only a few things I can do that I am proud of.
   B. There are a fair number of things I can do that I am proud of.

6. A. I seldom feel approved or noticed by people I like.
   B. I usually get both approval and attention from people I like.

7. A. I feel sure of myself in most circumstances.
   B. I feel sure of myself only in a few situations.

8. A. Few people say they like being with me.
   B. Most people say they like being with me.

9. A. I can usually accomplish everything I set out to do.
   B. Often I am able to accomplish what I set out to do.

10. A. People seldom go out of their way to include me in their affairs.
     B. People often go out of their way to include me in their affairs.

11. A. I feel as capable as most people I know.
     B. I feel less capable than a fair number of people I know.

12. A. Few people consider me to be an interesting person.
     B. I feel that a lot of people consider me to be an interesting person.
13. A. I feel unsure whether I can handle what the future brings.
    B. I feel sure I can handle whatever the future is likely to bring.

14. A. A fair number of people seem to look up to me.
    B. Very few people seem to look up to me.

15. A. I tend to be optimistic when I take on a new job.
    B. I tend to expect failure when I take on a new job.

16. A. A fair number of persons say positive things about me.
    B. Relatively few people say nice things about me.

17. A. I seldom feel satisfied with myself.
    B. I usually feel pleased with myself.

18. A. I feel accepted by most people important to me.
    B. I feel accepted only by some people important to me.

19. A. Most people I know would rate me as a self-assured person.
    B. Few people I know would rate me as a self-assured person.

20. A. I seem to get more social invitations than my friends do.
    B. I seem to get fewer social invitations than my friends do.

21. A. I often feel I can’t do anything right.
    B. Usually I can do whatever I set my mind to.

22. A. Often people confide in me.
    B. It is seldom that people confide in me.

23. A. I have a record of fewer successes than failures.
    B. I have a record of more successes than failures.

24. A. Only a few people enjoy associating with me.
    B. Many people like to associate with me.

25. A. I usually expect to win when competing with others.
    B. I seldom expect to win when competing with others.

26. A. Few people tell me they enjoy my company.
    B. Most people say they enjoy my company.

27. A. I probably think less favorably of myself than an ordinary person does.
    B. I think more favorably of myself than an ordinary person does.
28. A. Not many people seem to value my friendship.
   B. Quite a few people appear to value my friendship.

29. A. There are very few things I would change about myself.
   B. There are many things about myself I wish I could change.

30. A. I am often asked to voice my opinion in a group discussion.
    B. I am seldom asked to express an opinion in a group discussion.

31. A. I seldom reach the goals I set for myself.
    B. I usually reach the goals I set for myself.

32. A. My acquaintances don’t seem to follow my suggestions.
    B. My acquaintances usually follow my suggestions.
เรียน คุณครู / เจ้าหน้าที่โรงเรียน

ด้วยจักรกลด้านวิชาการสื่อสาร: บุคลิกภาพของคนไทยและลักษณะดีการ
แก้ไขปัญหาในสถานการณ์ที่ทำงาน เพื่อยืนยันความหมายของผลการศึกษาตามหลักสูตรระดับวิทยาศาสตร์ มหาวิทยาลัยจุฬาลงกรณ์

ใจใจร่วมขยันพยายามจัดทำนิ้งให้ใครๆก็รู้ความรู้ที่แท้จริงของท่าน ผลการศึกษานี้ จะเริ่มในประโยคและสำเนาได้ที่ดีขึ้น ให้รับคำตอบจากท่านอย่าง

ครั้งถาวรที่จริง

ขออยู่ใจให้รับจากท่านจะเป็นประโยชน์อย่างสิ้นเปลืองการจัด ที่ผู้รู้จักจะเจริญข้อมูลนี้ไว้เป็นความลับ ใดจะ

นำมาใช้เพื่อการจัดจงต่อไปนี้เพื่ออย่างแท้จริงว่า

ขอขอบคุณราคุณมากขอบคุณท่านที่ให้ความร่วมมือ ณ โอกาสใน

ขอแสดงความนับถือ

นายยศนิธิ บรม

(aoybroome@hotmail.com)

ตอนที่ 1: ข้อมูลทั่วไป

โปรดตอบคำถามพวกขอต่อไปนี้ โดยท้าทายวิ่งมาที่ (X) ที่นั่นคำตอบที่เป็นจริงเกี่ยวกับตัวท่านมากที่สุด

โดยผู้ได้ใช้ข้อมูลเหล่านี้เพื่อการศึกษาและจะเก็บข้อมูลเหล่านี้ไว้เป็นความลับ

1. เพศ ( ) ชาย ( ) หญิง

2. อายุ ( ) 29 ปี หรือ ต่ำกว่า ( ) 30-39 ปี ( ) 40-49 ปี ( ) 50 ปี หรือ มากกว่า

3. สัญชาติ ( ) ไทย ( ) อื่น ๆ (โปรดระบุ)

4. ระดับการศึกษาสูงสุด

( ) ต่ำกว่าปริญญาตรี

( ) ปริญญาตรี

( ) ปริญญาโทหรือสูงกว่า

5. ระยะเวลาการทำงาน

( ) น้อยกว่า 1 ปี ( ) 1 - 3 ปี

( ) 4 - 5 ปี ( ) มากกว่า 5 ปี
ตอนที่ 2: แบบทดสอบความคลาดเคลื่อนทางการสื่อสารในองค์กร

กำหนด
ครูมานาจากความคลาดเคลื่อนที่ทำให้เรียนรู้ไปร่วมงานของท่านจากเอกสารการที่ได้รับมอบหมายและถูกต้องระบุว่าเป็นเครื่องมือไร้การที่ระบุนับรวมในแต่ละบทบาทที่กระทำไว้ที่ช่างที่ไม่ใครยอมรับความรู้สึกไม่เห็นด้วยกับพฤติกรรมมัน ๆ แต่ควรคำนึงถึงประสบการณ์ในความขัดแย้งที่ทำให้ต้องร่วมงานโดยทั่วไป แต่ละข้อที่แสดงถึงพฤติกรรมที่บ้านพื้นที่สุขภาพดีท่านไม่มีที่ทำด้วยที่มีที่ทำดีที่ดี

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>เป็นประจำ</td>
<td>ต่อนั้นกระจาเป็น</td>
<td>ประมวล</td>
<td>บารมีทรัพยากร</td>
<td>นานครบัง</td>
<td>ขณะไม่เคย</td>
<td>ไม่เคย</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. ข้าพเจ้าร่วมทดสอบความคลาดเคลื่อนเพื่อร่วมงานเพื่อล่าระหว่างการแนวต่อไปในการแล้วถูกทุ่มความขัดแย้ง

2. ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับความคลาดเคลื่อนที่เป็นเครื่องมือในการเอกลักษณ์เพื่อร่วมงานของข้าพเจ้า

3. ข้าพเจ้าที่ทำความคลาดเคลื่อนข้าพเจ้าเป็นที่รับรู้โดยเห็นความต่อไปเมื่อข้าพเจ้าไม่เห็นด้วย

4. ข้าพเจ้าสนับสนุนแนวทางให้ปัญหาความพิจารณาที่หลากหลาย

5. ข้าพเจ้าหลังจากทางการที่ทำให้คลาดเคลื่อนได้แก่

6. ข้าพเจ้ายอมรับความคลาดเคลื่อนเพื่อร่วมงานบางท่านเฉพาะในการนับกลับ

7. ข้าพเจ้าหลังจากเป็นช่วงที่เพื่อนร่วมงานของข้าพเจ้าหลังจากกลับในข้อที่มีความขัดแย้ง

8. ข้าพเจ้ามุ่งหวังประเด็นที่มีกลับเห็นปัญหาเพื่อความร่วมงานเข้าทุ่มแนวทางให้ปัญหาอื่น ๆ
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>เป็นประจำ</td>
<td>ค่อนข้างประจำ</td>
<td>น้อยครั้ง</td>
<td>กลางถึง</td>
<td>น้อยครั้ง</td>
<td>แทบจะไม่มีเลย</td>
<td>ไม่เกียะ</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. เมื่อต้องจัดเตรียมกับเพื่อนร่วมงาน ช้าเพราะความพยุงพักที่จะต้องออก

10. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะเนื่องจากช้าเพราะที่ทำให้เพื่อนร่วมงาน
     ยอมรับความมีค่อนข้างของช้าเพราะ

11. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะออกที่สร้างสรรค์เมื่อถึงอย่าง
    ประเด็นที่ไม่เห็นต้องต้องกัน

12. ช้าเพราะไม่ chang แต่ต้องการความชัดเจน

13. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะที่เพื่อนร่วมงานจะพบกัน
     ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะ

14. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะไม่ทำให้ช้าเพราะใช้เนื่องเรื่องใหญ่

15. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะไม่ทำให้ช้าเพราะใช้เนื่องเรื่องใหญ่
     ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะ

16. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะเห็นว่ามีความมีค่อนข้าง
    แตกต่างกัน

17. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะเห็นว่ามีค่อนข้างของช้าเพราะอย่างที่สุด

18. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะเห็นว่ามีค่อนข้างของช้าเพราะอย่างที่สุด

19. ช้าเพราะช้าเพราะเห็นว่ามีค่อนข้างของช้าเพราะอย่างสร้างสรรค์
20. ข้อพิจารณาหมายความคิดเห็นของเพื่อนร่วมงาน
ในการแสดงความรู้สึกใจปัญหา

21. ข้อพิจารณาสมานชื่อต้องมองเพื่อนร่วมงานให้ความชัดเจน

22. ข้อพิจารณาข้อคารังสีเพื่อรักษาจิตใจของข้าพเจ้า

23. ข้อพิจารณาข้อคำแนะนำเพื่อร่วมงานผู้ช่วยนักข้าพเจ้าใน
    ประเด็นที่ยังไม่มีข้อตกลง

24. ข้อพิจารณาข้อตกลงเพื่อรักษาจิตใจปัญหา

25. ข้อพิจารณาข้อคำแนะนำเพื่อรักษาจิตใจปัญหา
    โดยคำให้
    เทียนไม่สิ้นทุก

26. ข้อข้อจำจิตดีของข้าพเจ้าเพื่อให้เป็นที่ยอมรับ ระหว่าง
    การได้ยินถึงที่ร่วมงานของข้าพเจ้า

27. ข้อข้อทำให้ความแตกต่างระหว่างตัวข้าพเจ้าเอกภักษ์
    ร่วมงานเป็นเรื่องไม่สำคัญ

28. ข้อข้อจึงไม่สมบูรณ์กว่าที่จะได้ยินกับเพื่อนร่วมงาน
    ของข้าพเจ้า

29. ข้อข้อทำให้ความขัดแย้งหมดไป โดยขี้หักให้เห็นความ
    แตกต่างเป็นเรื่องเล็ก

30. ข้อข้อถับดับในการแสดงความคิดเห็นของข้าพเจ้า
    เมื่อได้ยินจากเพื่อนร่วมงานของข้าพเจ้า
คําอธิบาย

ข้อความต่อไปนี้ บรรยายว่าความมั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้า และมีปฏิบัติในทุกๆกิจการอย่างจริง ท่านจะสังเกตได้ว่าแต่ละข้อมีคำตอบที่เป็นไปได้ 2 คำตอบ คือ A และ B จงอ่านแต่ละข้อความและเลือกข้อ A หรือ B วงกลมลงอย่าง

1. A. โดยปกติข้าพเจ้าจะมั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้า B. บ่อยครั้งที่ข้าพเจ้ามั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้า

2. A. ข้าพเจ้ามั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้าให้ได้ B. ข้าพเจ้ามั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้าให้ได้

3. A. ข้าพเจ้ามั่นใจว่าจะประสบความสำเร็จเสมอ ไม่เปลี่ยนแปลง B. เป็นบางส่วนอาจมากกว่าข้าพเจ้าที่จะประสบความสำเร็จเสมอ

4. A. ไม่เคยมีมุมที่ข้าพเจ้าไม่พอใจ B. ข้าพเจ้ามีมุมที่ข้าพเจ้าไม่พอใจ

5. A. มีที่ทำงานที่มั่นใจได้ว่าข้าพเจ้าสามารถทำและมีความโปร่งใส B. ข้าพเจ้ามีที่ทำงานที่มั่นใจได้ว่าข้าพเจ้าสามารถทำ

6. A. มีคนที่สามารถช่วยให้ข้าพเจ้าทำได้ B. ไม่มีคนที่สามารถช่วยให้ข้าพเจ้าทำได้

7. A. ข้าพเจ้ามีความมั่นใจในงานที่ทำ B. ข้าพเจ้ามีความมั่นใจในงานที่ทำ

8. A. มีความมั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้า B. ไม่มีความมั่นใจในความสามารถของข้าพเจ้า
9. A. ปัจจัยที่สำคัญในการบรรลุผลสำเร็จในทุกสิ่งที่ทำเจ้าตัวต่างจะทำ
B. ปัจจัยที่สำคัญในการบรรลุผลสำเร็จในสิ่งที่ทำเจ้าตัวต่างจะทำ

10. A. ไม่ยอมยอมที่จะตั้งใจไปสอบยากที่จะทำเจ้าตัวมีความร่วม
B. ปัจจัยที่ทำโดยไม่คิดถึงการก้าวหน้าของเจ้าตัว

11. A. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญที่ผู้มีความสามารถก้าวหน้าอย่างมากที่สุดเจ้าตัว
B. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญที่ผู้มีความสามารถก้าวหน้าไม่ยอมให้เจ้าตัว

12. A. คุณสมบัติที่สำคัญในเจ้าตัวเป็นบุคคลที่น่าสนใจ
B. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญในเจ้าตัวเป็นบุคคลที่น่าสนใจ

13. A. ข้อผิดพลาดในมันว่าจะสามารถเพิ่มที่ทดสอบมากหรือไม่ได้ใจผู้ที่ไม่รู้
B. ข้อผิดพลาดในมันว่าจะสามารถเพิ่มที่ทดสอบมากหรือไม่ได้ใจผู้ที่ไม่รู้

14. A. คุณสมบัติที่สำคัญในการมีส่วนร่วมอย่างมากในอุปกรณ์
B. คุณสมบัติที่สำคัญในการมีส่วนร่วมอย่างมากในอุปกรณ์

15. A. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญในการมีส่วนร่วมอย่างมากในอุปกรณ์
B. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญในการมีส่วนร่วมอย่างมากในอุปกรณ์

16. A. มิคส์เจ้าตัวไม่ยอมรับข้อผิดพลาดในด้านบร
B. มิคส์เจ้าตัวไม่ยอมรับข้อผิดพลาดในด้านบร

17. A. ไม่ยอมรับข้อผิดพลาดในจุดไหนในด้านอื่น
B. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญไม่ยอมรับ

18. A. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญที่ยอมรับจากเจ้าตัวที่มีความสำคัญต่อเจ้าตัวเป็นส่วนใหญ่
B. ข้อผิดพลาดที่สำคัญที่ยอมรับจากเจ้าตัวที่มีความสำคัญต่อเจ้าตัวพิจารณา

19. A. คุณสมบัติที่สำคัญในเจ้าตัวที่สำคัญอย่างมากเจ้าตัวเป็นคนที่มีความสามารถ
B. คุณสมบัติที่สำคัญในเจ้าตัวที่สำคัญอย่างมากเจ้าตัวเป็นคนที่มีความสามารถ
20. A. ดูเหมือนว่าเจ้าหน้าที่ได้รับข้อมูลให้มีความรับผิดชอบกับกรณีของข้าพเจ้า
   B. ดูเหมือนว่าเจ้าหน้าที่ได้รับข้อมูลให้มีความรับผิดชอบกับกรณีของข้าพเจ้า

21. A. บ่อยครั้งที่เจ้าหน้าที่ยุติไปไม่สามารถทำอะไรได้อย่างถูกต้อง
   B. โดยปกติเจ้าหน้าที่สามารถทำอะไรได้ดีตามที่ข้าพเจ้าตั้งใจจะทำ

22. A. โดยปกติผู้คุ้มครองไว้วางใจข้าพเจ้า
   B. ไม่บอกให้คุณอื่นไว้วางใจข้าพเจ้า

23. A. ข้าพเจ้ามีความสำเร็จได้โดยตรงมาด้วย
   B. ข้าพเจ้ามีความสำเร็จได้ตามที่คุณอื่นที่จะทำ

24. A. มีข้อมูลที่ถูกต้องถูกต้องในการส่งข้อความกับข้าพเจ้า
   B. ข้อความของข้าพเจ้าไม่ถูกต้องถูกต้อง

25. A. โดยปกติเจ้าหน้าที่จะทำความช่วยเหลือข้าพเจ้า
   B. ข้าพเจ้าทำสิ่งที่จะทำให้เจ้าหน้าที่นั้น

26. A. ข้าพเจ้ายินดีที่จะร่วมงานในสิ่งที่จะทำให้เจ้าหน้าที่
   B. คนทำงานที่จะทำงานในสิ่งที่จะทำให้เจ้าหน้าที่

27. A. ข้าพเจ้าต้องการให้ข้าพเจ้าติดต่อข้าพเจ้าตามความต้องการ
   B. ข้าพเจ้าต้องการให้ข้าพเจ้าติดต่อข้าพเจ้าตามความต้องการ

28. A. ข้าพเจ้าไม่ต้องการที่จะติดต่อไปตามความต้องการ
   B. ข้าพเจ้าไม่ต้องการที่จะติดต่อไปตามความต้องการ

29. A. สิ่งที่ข้าพเจ้าอาจไม่ได้เป็นไปตามความต้องการ
   B. มีหลายสิ่งที่อาจไม่ได้เป็นไปตามความต้องการ

30. A. ข้าพเจ้าต้องการให้ข้าพเจ้าทำตามความต้องการระหว่างการปรึกษา
   B. ข้าพเจ้าต้องการให้ข้าพเจ้าทำตามความต้องการระหว่างการปรึกษา
31. A. นานๆครั้งแล้วจะบรรลุเป้าหมายที่ได้วางไว้ให้กับตัวเอง
B. โดยปกติแล้วสามารถบรรลุเป้าหมายที่ได้วางไว้ให้กับตัวเอง

32. A. ฉุกเฉินนวัตไปจนนักให้ทบทวนค้นหารำนำของข้าพเจ้า
B. โดยปกติแล้วจะทบทวนค้นหารำนำของข้าพเจ้า
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Department of Communication
Texas A&M University
108 Roton Hall
MS 4234
College Station, Texas 77843-4234
(979) 845-5500
Main Office
(979) 845-6594
Fax

Date: 1/10/204
Time: 8:05 AM
Pages (including cover letter): 5

PLEASE DELIVER THIS FAX TO:
NAME: A. D. R. E. D. C. E. M.
FAX #: (123) 456-7890

LOCATION:

THIS FAX WAS SENT BY:
NAME: L. J. H. N. I. N. A.
FAX #: (456) 789-0123

LOCATION: Texas A&M Univ. Dept. of Communication

Message:
SINCE 1969
I have enclosed a copy of the OCCI and the scoring information. Feel free to duplicate and use it for your work. If you are conducting a research project with the OCCI, I would appreciate receiving any papers, reports, or summaries of your study. I keep a record of this work for future literature reviews. Two publications detail information on the reliability and the validity of the OCCI. You may already be familiar with them, but if not, I have listed the articles below.


(Both issues of MCQ are devoted to conflict scales—see also Knapp, Putnam, & Davis in this issue.)


I hope that this information is useful to you. I appreciate your interest in the OCCI and will be looking forward to receiving information on your study.

Cordially,

Linda L. Putnam
Professor

since 1969

St. Gabriel's Library, Au