



林思齊東西學術交流研究所
David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)

Working Paper Series 研究報告系列

Paper Number: 75
May 2008

**Cultural Influence on the Relationship
Cultivation Strategies in the Chinese Society**

Flora C. J. Hung
Hong Kong Baptist University

The author welcome comments from readers.
Contact details:

**Flora C. J. Hung, Department of communication Studies, Hong Kong Baptist
University, Hong Kong**
E-mail: cjhung@hkbu.edu.hk

**David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)
Hong Kong Baptist University (HKBU)**

LEWI Working Paper Series is an endeavour of David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), a consortium with 28 member universities, to foster dialogue among scholars in the field of East-West studies. Globalisation has multiplied and accelerated inter-cultural, inter-ethnic, and inter-religious encounters, intentionally or not. In a world where time and place are increasingly compressed and interaction between East and West grows in density, numbers, and spread, East-West studies has gained a renewed mandate. LEWI's Working Paper Series provides a forum for the speedy and informal exchange of ideas, as scholars and academic institutions attempt to grapple with issues of an inter-cultural and global nature.

Circulation of this series is free of charge. Comments should be addressed directly to authors. Abstracts of papers can be downloaded from the LEWI web page at <http://www.hkbu.edu.hk/~lewi/publications.html>.

Manuscript Submission: Scholars in East-West studies at member universities who are interested in submitting a paper for publication should send an article manuscript, preferably in a Word file via e-mail, as well as a submission form (available online) to the Series Secretary at the address below. The preferred type is Times New Roman, not less than 11 point. The Editorial Committee will review all submissions. The Institute reserves the right not to publish particular manuscripts submitted. Authors should hear from the Series Secretary about the review results normally within one month after submission.

Copyright: Unless otherwise stated, copyright remains with the author. Please do not cite and circulate the paper without the author's consent.

Editors: Ah Chung TSOI, Director of LEWI; Emilie Yueh-yu YEH, Cinema & TV and Associate Director of LEWI.

Editorial Advisory Board: From HKBU: CHEN Ling, Communication Studies; Martha CHEUNG, English Language and Literature; Vivienne LUK, Management; Eva MAN, Humanities; TING Wai, Government and International Studies; WONG Man Kong, History; Terry YIP, English Language and Literature. From outside HKBU: David HAYWARD, Social Economics and Housing, Swinburne University of Technology (Australia).

Disclaimer: David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI), and its officers, representatives, and staff, expressly disclaim any and all responsibility and liability for the opinions expressed, or for any error or omission present, in any of the papers within the Working Paper Series. All opinions, errors, omissions and such are solely the responsibility of the author. Authors must conform to international standards concerning the use of non-published and published materials, citations, and bibliography, and are solely responsible for any such errors.

Further Information about the working paper series can be obtained from the **Series Secretary:**

David C. Lam Institute for East-West Studies (LEWI)
Hong Kong Baptist University
Kowloon Tong
Hong Kong
Tel: (852) 3411-7273; Fax: (852) 3411-5128
E-mail: lewi@hkbu.edu.hk
Website: <http://www.hkbu.edu.hk/~lewi/>

Cultural Influence on the Relationship Cultivation Strategies in the Chinese Society

Flora C. J. Hung
Hong Kong Baptist University

Abstract

Public relations is commonly considered as a US phenomenon that came out as a result of industrialization and reaches to other parts of the world because of globalization (Hodges, 2006). Studies conducted in non-Western capitalist contexts are needed to better engage professionals in international public relations. In recent years, public relations scholars (mostly Asian scholars) have contributed to the extension and revision of public relations theories by conducting studies outside the United States to identify specific applications of public relations practices resulting from host countries' political systems (e.g., Braun, 2007; Chen, 2005; Kent & Taylor, 1993), economic systems (e.g., Hung, 2002; Hung & Chen, 2004; Chen, 2005), media (e.g., Hung & Chen, 2004; Wu, 2002), activism (Anderson, 1992; Ketchum, 2005), and culture (e.g., Huang, 2000, 2001a; Hung, 2004b; Rhee, 1999; Sha, 1999; Sriramesh, Y. Kim, & Takasaki, 1999; Y. Kim, 2002).

Studies on the influence of culture have been done in different disciplines, for example, interpersonal communication (e.g. Khan, 2005; Shenkar & Ronen, 1987; Yum, 1988) and organizational communication (Brown & McMillan, 1991; Carlon & Taylor, 1998; Koprowski, 1983; Morley, Shockley-Zalabak, & Cesaria, 1997). Consequently, public relations scholars should investigate how cultures affect the management of organization-public relationships (OPRs) to further improve the relationship management theory of public relations to a global context. However, there is only limited research in the public relations literature tackling this issue. Furthermore, current OPR studies mainly focus on the OPR evaluations that measure the outcomes of relationship management. Public relations scholars should build the blocks of relationship management theory by examining OPR types and cultivation strategies that affect the outcomes of relationship management.

The purpose of this study is to explore whether the theory of organization-public relationships developed in the Western capitalist societies can describe the dynamics of OPR management in the Chinese society. Specifically, this study examines the influence of Chinese cultural value orientations on the perception of relationship cultivation strategies an organization develops with its publics.

Conceptualization

The purpose of this study explores the cultural influences on organization-public relationship cultivation. To reach this end, this section includes the discussions of relationship cultivation strategies and cultural values.

Relationship Management and Relationship Cultivation Strategies

Ferguson first called for the attention on relationships with publics for public relations in 1984. However, it was not until 1997 that public relations scholars embarked on the development of theory building on this topic. The first few years of studies on the topic mainly focused on measuring relationship outcomes (Huang, 1997, 2001a; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999). However, if the contribution of public relations to organizational effectiveness is to build long-term quality relationships with its strategic publics (J. Grunig 1992; L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Dozier, 2002), scholarly inquiries of relationship management should shift their focus from measuring relationship outcomes to the strategies that can reach such goal (Hung, 2006). As a result, scholars moved to the next stage of the theory building on identifying and measuring relationship cultivation strategies in 2004 (e.g., Hung, 2004b, 2005, 2006; Ki, 2004, 2006).

Relationship Cultivation Strategies

Dindia and Canary (1993) provided the four most commonly used terms for interpersonal relationship maintenance (p. 163): 1) to keep a relationship in existence, 2) to keep a relationship in a specified state or condition, 3) to keep a relationship in satisfactory condition, and 4) to keep a relationship in repair. Hung (2004b) adopted the third and the fourth definitions to explain the term, “cultivation.” The third definition illustrates the efforts an organization puts to make the relationship pleasant and happy with the publics. In addition, Dindia and Canary (1993) and Baxter and Montgomery (1994) contended that relationships are not always stable and a damaged relationship is possible. As a result, organizations should

not just only maintain a relationship in its present state; rather, they also have to restore a failed or deteriorated relationship as the forth definition suggests.

Literature in interpersonal communication (e.g. Canary & Stafford, 1994) and public relations (e.g. J. Grunig & Huang, 2000; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Hung, 2000a; Ki, 2004) have identified the following cultivation strategies that are widely adopted in relationship management studies:

- *Access.* Members of publics or opinion leaders provide access to public relations people. Public relations representatives or senior managers provide representatives of publics similar access to organizational decision-making processes.
- *Positivity.* Organizations do whatever is necessary to make publics feel more content in the relationships.
- *Openness or Disclosure.* Canary and Stafford (1994) considered openness is about the willingness to engage in direct discussions about the nature of relationships.
- *Assurances of Legitimacy.* Hon and J. Grunig (1999) said that assurances of legitimacy involve efforts by the parties in the relationship to express that they are committed to maintaining the relationship.
- *Networking.* This strategy pertains to the effort organizations exert in order to build networks or coalitions with the same groups as their publics, such as environmentalists, unions, or community groups. Hung (2000a) showed that networking serves as a catalyst in relationship building, especially in China, because personal relationships have been considered important in Chinese society (Huang, 2000; Hung, 2000a, 2000b, 2002).
- *Sharing of Tasks.* Organizations and publics do their fair share to solve problems which concerns the other. For example, managing community issues, providing employment, making a profit, and staying in the business operation that are for the interests of the organization, the public, or both (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999).

Additional Relationship Cultivation Strategies

In addition to the strategies mentioned above, other cultivation strategies were identified: Hung's (2002) research on multinational and Taiwanese companies' relationship cultivation in China suggested the following strategies: keeping promises in order to win trust from the public; educating consumers for reaching better customer attitudes, and being attentive to public's concerns. Chen (2005) found that multinationals in China cultivated their relationships with the Chinese government by keeping organizational credibility and adhering to interpersonal and cultural rules of government officials. Rhee (2006) in studying Brookhaven Laboratory in New York State identified the Laboratory's cultivation strategies as *visible leadership, listening responsiveness and continued dialogue*.

Chinese Cultural Values

Kluckhohn (1951) contended that the concept of value as "... a conception, explicit or implicit, distinctive of an individual or a group, of the desirable which influences the selection from available modes, means, and ends of action" (p. 395). Kroeber and Kluckhohn (1952) considered cultures should include the explicit and systematic study of values and value systems (as cited in Bond, 1996). Hence, to explore how culture affects the relationship cultivation strategies, one has to take the Chinese cultural values into consideration as it is the values a person holds that shape his or her behaviors.

To understand cultural values, scholars started with uncovering general dimensions of variability across cultures that systematically explain and predict the similar and different essentials of the thinking and behaviors from people all over the world (Gudykunst & Kim, 2003). This approach searches for universality (L. Chen, 2006). Hofstede's (1980, 2001) cultural dimensions (individualism vs. collectivism, masculinity vs. femininity, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and Confucian dynamism) have been the most widely recognized and used of such. In addition to Hofstede, Schwartz (1994) also developed seven types of values across cultures:

1. *Conservatism* highlights being secured in-group relationship that one self is considered part of a collectivity embedded in a traditional order.
2. *Harmony* stresses a protective, appreciative relationship to the world of nature.
3. *Egalitarian commitment* is the emphasis that one goes beyond egocentric concern and holds on to interpersonal morality and social principledness.
4. *Intellectual autonomy* is the emphasis on cognitive freedom.
5. *Affective autonomy* is about “personal desires for stimulation and pleasure” (Bond, 1996, p. 216)
6. *Mastery* highlights active self-assertion to have power over the social and physical environments.
7. *Hierarchy* is about whether one has power and the rank in social affairs and allocation of resources.

In Schwartz’s (1994) study that included 38 samples and six of whom were Mainland Chinese, he found Chinese samples showed especially high on the hierarchy and mastery values but low on egalitarian commitment values. He then concluded that Chinese people were not typical collectivists “if collectivism refers to a conception of the person as deeply embedded in the collectivity without legitimate autonomous interests” (p. 111). This finding contradicted with Hofstede’s (1980, 2001) study that found Chinese were high in the collectivism index. We believe that the question on whether Chinese people are collectivistic can be further examined in this study, inasmuch as the society culture and values may have changed and moved more toward individualistic after China joined the WTO and allowed more multinationals to enter China in 2001.

Hofstede’s (1980, 2001) and Schwartz’s (1994) cultural value indices provided the scholars in different parts of the world the evaluation criteria for cross-border studies. Bond (Chinese Culture Connection, 1987) argued that Hofstede’s cultural dimensions allowed cross-cultural scholars to choose cultures for comparison on a priori basis. However, he contended that the major problem arising from such fundamental premise is whether such

instruments developed from a different culture and applied to another culture would yield the same findings from those of Hofstede's. Bond questioned whether Hofstede's dimensions are sufficient in discovering another culture's vantage ground? By the same token, over the years, Chinese scholars continuously challenge whether the Western categorization of concepts can explicitly describe the context in the Chinese society (Hung & Chen, 2004; C. Yang, 2001; K. Yang, 1992).

In efforts to examine variability within cultures and derive culture-specific theories, the Chinese Culture Connection (1987)¹ led by Bond, developed the Chinese Value Scale (CVS) that includes 40 indigenous cultural values deriving from the traditional Chinese ethos (see Table 1). The CVS is a four-factor structure, including moral discipline (i.e., keeping oneself under control with regard to others),² integration (i.e., one's tolerance with others and the importance of social stability),³ human-heartedness (i.e., one's compassion toward others and portrays the necessity to be kind to others),⁴ and Confucian work dynamics (i.e., values derived from the teachings of Confucius, thoughts of other schools, and folk wisdom).⁵ The CVS overcomes the bias of other Western-based value measures while being largely comparable to the Western measures (Hofstede & Bond, 1988).

Reliability and validity of the CVS has been tested by various studies. However, the construct validity of the scale factors remains inconclusive. Several studies (e.g., L. Chen, 1999; Guan & Dodder, 1998; Matthews, 2000; McIntyre & Zhang, 2003) proposed different component composition and factor numbers that challenge the dimensionality of the scale.

¹ The Chinese Culture Connection (CCC) was named by an international network of scholars put together by Michael H. Bond. In all, there were 23 scholars all around the world participating in the study on Chinese Culture Values.

² This factor consists of values of moderation, keeping oneself disinterested and pure, having few desires, adaptability, and prudence.

³ Including values of tolerance of others, harmony with others, solidarity with others, non-competitiveness, trustworthiness, contendedness, being conservative, a close, intimate friend, filial piety, patriotism, and chastity in women).

⁴ Consisting of values of kindness, patience, courtesy, sense of righteousness, and patriotism.

⁵ Including ordering relationships, thrift, persistence, having a sense of shame, reciprocation, personal steadiness, protecting "fact," and respect for tradition.

Furthermore, as L. Chen (2006) argued, the “integration” factor of the CVS did not have face validity and needed revision.

To tackle this problem, L. Chen (1999) employed an exploratory factor analysis that produced five factor of the scale with 28 original CVS value items. She (2001) conceptually associated the factors with Kluckhohn and Strobeck’s (1961) value orientations and referred them as “traditional value orientations.” She labeled the five factors as work ethics (that describes the traditional Chinese values about work and making a living),⁶ moral virtues (which judges that being a good persona and which has something to do with human nature),⁷ temperament (which exhibits an almost passive personality and one being not pushy for action),⁸ human relations (that pertains the orientation of human relationships with others),⁹ and social prestige (that does not echo with any of the universal problems identified by Kluckhohn and Strodtbeck).¹⁰ She and her colleague, then, employed the revised five-factor CVS scale to investigate how a Chinese person’s traditional value orientations influenced his or her argumentative tendencies (L. Chen & Yeh, 2004). Their research findings showed that three out of the five traditional Chinese value orientations; namely, temperament (negatively correlated), moral virtues (positively correlated), and social prestige (positively correlated), had significant effects on argumentative tendencies. With the preliminary evidence of the construct validity of the five factors, L. Chen (2006) conducted a confirmatory factor analysis for a larger survey of 1,528 college students in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland China and proposed the five Chinese value orientations (factors) as indigenous constructs of the CVS.

⁶ Including adaptability, thrift, trustworthiness, knowledge, a close, intimate friend, persistence, self-cultivation, patience, and steadiness and stability.

⁷ Including patriotism, resistance to corruption, sense of righteousness, sincerity, having sense of shame, filial piety, solidarity with others, kindness, hardworking, and chastity in women.

⁸ Consisting of being conservative, having few desires, being disinterested and pure, content with one’s position, non-competitiveness, respect for tradition, loyalty to superiors, and acceptance of social hierarchy.

⁹ Including humbleness, moderation, harmony with others, tolerance of others, observation of rituals, courtesy, reciprocation of good will, and prudence.

¹⁰ Pertaining wealth, face, sense of cultural superiority, accountability for good/evil, and benevolent authority.

Chinese Culture and Organization-Public Relationships

Even though there are numerous public relations studies focusing on cross-cultural comparisons of public relations practices up-to-date, the cross-cultural studies on organization-public relationships are still limited. Huang (2000, 2001a, 2001b) and Hung (2002, 2004b) were the two scholars examining the context of organization-public relationships from the cultural perspective.

Huang (2000, 2001a, 2001b) elicited some Chinese cultural characteristics, such as *gao guanxi* (facilitating personal relationships), face and favor, to illustrate the unique means of relationship building in the Chinese society. Her findings (Huang 2001a) provided not only the standards of reliability and validity in measuring relationships and the cultural variables, face and favor, proved to be valid indicators to study relationship management in the Greater China region. In addition, her other research findings (Huang, 2001b) suggested that face and favor had significant effects on conflict strategies.

Hung (2004b) interviewed 40 participants from 36 multinational companies in China. The findings revealed that the characteristics of Chinese culture, such as family orientation, *guanxi*, and relational orientation (role formalization, relational reciprocation, face, favor, relational harmony, relational fatalism, and relational determination), significantly influenced on multinational companies' relationship cultivation strategies. Multinational companies from the Western countries, however, were found to be more persistent in applying their own cultural values in relationship building with the Chinese publics than those companies from Asia.

She also found that *guanxi* (personal relationships) was associated with the strategy of networking because "when people find the common networks, it will sometimes facilitate getting things done sooner" (Hung, 2004b, p. 275). In addition, the emphasis on family values and "bao" (reciprocity) in the Chinese society significantly affected multinationals' behaviors of corporate social responsibilities in China. Family values emphasize one's caring for the place that nurtures him or her. "Bao" means that one should always reciprocate by returning others' favors. As a result, multinationals in China considered it necessary to

participate in public welfare activities because the Chinese society had become the family they should take care of since they operated there and they should repay for the support from the society that kept their businesses running. Another interesting finding of her study was that the emphasis of relational hierarchy, a cultural Chinese characteristic, affected the perception of legitimacy in establishing business-government relationships. This was well illustrated as many Taiwanese companies in China had to apply joint efforts in electing a representative with a proper title (e.g. president of the Taiwanese Businessmen Association) in order to have the equivalent status to discuss or build organizational relationships with the central or regional party leaders.

To sum up, this study explores how culture plays a role in cultivating OPRs in Greater China. To investigate the question, the literature suggests the following two research questions:

RQ1: What are the traditional value orientations of the Chinese culture?

RQ2: To what extent traditional value orientations have influence on perceived OPR cultivation strategies among the Chinese in Hong Kong and Mainland?

Methodology

Participants

A nonrandom sample of 370 participants from Chinese cities in Mainland ($n = 128$) and Hong Kong ($n = 242$), who were adult residents or university students. 37.8 percent of the sample were male ($n = 140$) and 61.1 percent were female ($n = 226$).¹¹ Their ages ranged from 16 to 50 years old with the following distribution: 16-20 ($n = 85$), 20s ($n = 222$), 30s ($n = 50$), and 40-50 ($n = 8$).¹² For participants' education level, 63.5 percent of the participants ($n = 235$) had a bachelor's degree; 28.3 percent ($n = 104$) graduated lower than or equal to high school; and 7.6 percent ($n = 28$) had a master's degree or higher.¹³

¹¹ Four participants did not specify sex.

¹² Five participants did not report age.

¹³ Three participants did not identify their education level.

Procedure and Measurement

Participants were asked about their cultural values and the relationship cultivation strategies they perceived to be used by a multinational fast food restaurant toward them. Student participants filled out questionnaires in the class and other adult residents self-administered the questionnaires provided by their recruiters. The English questionnaire was translated to colloquial Chinese, back translated into English to maintain instrument validity, and then printed in simple Chinese characters for respondents in Mainland and traditional characters for Hong Kong respondents.

Cultivation Strategies Scale

When measuring relationship cultivation strategies, participants were asked for self-reported perception of OPR types with a fast food restaurant and use of seven cultivation strategies by the fast food restaurant toward them. Cultivation strategy measures were adapted from those employed in the previous studies, including Bruning & Calloway (2003), Canary and Stafford (1994), Harrison and St. John (1996), Hon and J. Grunig, Hung (2000, October), and Plowman (1995). 7 Likert-type scale was used to rate the perceived use of each of the seven cultivation strategies, 1 of being “strongly disagree” and 7 of being “strongly agree.” Reliabilities of the seven cultivation strategy measures were assurance of legitimacy (.870), networking (.813), openness (.812), sharing of tasks (.801), positivity (.795), being unconditionally constructive (.731), and access (.703).

Chinese Values Scale

Instead of adapting the common practice in cross-cultural investigations by employing cultural I-C scale or Rokeach’s Value survey, the CVS was used as the main instrument in this study. As L. Chen and Yeh (2004) argued, the CVS reflects “the Chinese cultural preferences, which contains aspects what Western values or Western-based scales may not have covered.” They further contended that the CVS measures traditional Chinese collective values of the Chinese common to three societies [in Taiwan, Hong Kong, and Mainland] and

indexes what may have survived the different cultural and ideological governing” (p. 8). Participants were surveyed for self-reported perceived importance of 34 Chinese values¹⁴ in the CVS in addition to two other Chinese values, favor giving (人情) and loyalty to friends (義氣). The participants were asked to rate each value in terms of its importance to them personally. The rating was on a Likert-type scale of 1 to 7, 1 being “not at all important” and 7 being “of supreme importance”.

Analysis

To examine cultural influences on the perception of cultivation strategies, an explanatory factor analysis was first performed on data of the 38 cultural values to identify latent factors. The researcher, then, conducted multiple regressions with the latent factors as the predicting variables and the perceived use of cultivation strategies as outcome variables.

This study aims to develop a relationship management theory in the Greater China area by factoring Chinese culture into the US-dominant OPR theories of public relations. As L. Chen (2006) argued, Chinese culture, embedded in more than one society, “provides a unique context for indigenous research to uncover culture-specific theories and constructs...” (p. 1). Thus, the researcher analyzed the data of the Mainland China and Hong Kong samples together in this study to identify indigenous tradition value orientations common to the Chinese societies and their influences on relationship cultivation.

Results

Research Question 1: Traditional Value Orientation of the Chinese Culture

An explanatory factor analysis produced an eight-factor model, with some intercorrelations (The KMO test = .836 and Bartlett’s test of Sphericity at .000 significant level). Percentage of variance and scree plot were employed to determine the number of

¹⁴ Four Chinese values in the CVS were dropped from the measurement of Chinese cultural values because these two items were not relevant to organization-public relationships. They are: having few desires, patience, chastity in women, and wealth.

factors to extract. The eight factors have eigenvalues exceeding 1.0 and can account for 62% of the variance. 11 cultural values were deleted one by one to tackle the cross-loading problem of the model. The resultant 27 value items produced a $>.5$ loading on one of the eight factors, labeled respectively as “self discipline,” “temperament,” “hierarchical responsibility,” “moral virtue,” “social stability,” “professional ethics,” “relational reciprocation,” and “affective neutrality” (see Table 2).

Self discipline, similar to the CCC’s (1987) “moral discipline,” comprised adaptability, prudence, moderation, and self-cultivation. This value orientation concerns keeping ones under control in relation to others (L. Chen, 2006). Temperament included items of contentedness with one’s position, being conservative, non-competitiveness, and acceptance of ordering relationships, which fit right into the orientation of human motives for action. This traditional orientation advocates the Klucnhohn and Strodbeck’s (1961) “being” or “being in becoming” activity orientation that accepts people, events, and ideas as flowing naturally or as the status quo with contentment (Adler & Jelinek, p. 130). Hierarchical responsibility contained patriotism, respect for tradition, (sense of) righteousness, and filial piety. It emphasizes social ordering and the privileges and obligations associated with one’s role in the hierarchy, such as leader-follow, elder-junior, and parent-child. Moral virtue comprised value items as trustworthiness, having a sense of shame, and courtesy. This traditional value orientation represents the quality of being a good person.

Social stability contains items as tolerance of others, harmony with others, and humbleness. This traditional value orientation leans towards the tendency of maintaining the status quo of human relations. Professional ethics contained knowledge, steadiness and stability, solidarity with others, and favor giving that points out the traditional Chinese values about work and organizations one serves. Relational reciprocation signifies the basic tenet in balancing give and take to maintain one’s relationships with others and social prestige in the Chinese society, including items of repayment of good/evil, reciprocation of good will and cultural superiority. The factor of affective neutrality, as proposed by Parsons (1951), with two components as persistence and thrift represents the tendency of the Chinese to delay the

gratification by performing self-restrain.

Reliability tests were conducted for the eight subscales and yielded mostly satisfactory results: Alpha = .716 (self discipline), .699 (temperament), .676 (hierarchical responsibility), .728 (moral virtue), .704 (social stability), .666 (professional ethics), .557 (relational reciprocation), and .669 (affective neutrality). As L. Chen and Yeh (2004) argued, a Cronbach's $\alpha > .50$ should be considered acceptable when using the CVS because the instrument was derived from indigenous values but not from research results.

Research Question 2: Chinese Cultural Influence on Cultivation Strategies OPR Cultivation Strategies

The mean scores of each cultivation strategies for the entire sample were as follows: access ($M = 4.16$, $SD = .83$), assurance of legitimacy ($M = 4.03$, $SD = .90$), being unconditionally constructive ($M = 4.24$, $SD = .90$), networking ($M = 4.05$, $SD = 1.06$), openness ($M = 4.07$, $SD = .84$), positivity ($M = 4.11$, $SD = .99$), and sharing of tasks ($M = 4.04$, $SD = .95$). Results suggested that the participants, as customers, reported the studied restaurant used all Hon & J. Grunig's seven strategies to cultivate its OPRs and did not have a strong awareness of any particular cultivation strategy used.

A t test for between-sample comparison yielded significantly different perceptions of assurance of legitimacy, $t(368) = 2.89$, $p < .01$, and being unconditionally constructive, $t(368) = 2.69$, $p < .01$, held by the Mainland Chinese participants and the Hong Kong participants. The result showed that Mainland sample had slightly higher (about one third of the mean difference) perceptions on the two cultivation strategies than their Hong Kong counterparts (see Table 3).

Traditional Value Orientations and OPR Cultivation Strategies

Multiple regressions were employed with eight indices of cultural orientations as the predicting variables and OPR cultivation strategies as the outcome variables. Factor score of each of the eight indices were obtained as a result of the previous exploratory factor analysis.

Stepwise method was employed for the model building of such relationship with a significant level at .05 for entering the model and a significant level at .01 for staying in the model. The results showed that all predicting variables combined to account for 2.6% to 6.5% of variance in cultivation strategies (see Table 4). As Table 4 indicates, cultural values did not have a significant impact on the strategy of access. Hierarchical responsibility significantly contributed to assurance of legitimacy and positivity; while relational reciprocation significantly contributed to networking. The variables of hierarchical responsibility and relational reciprocation significantly contributed to openness and sharing of tasks. The variables with significant contribution to being unconditionally constructive were hierarchical responsibility and professional ethics. In conclusion, hierarchical responsibility significantly contributed to all cultivation strategies except for access and networking. Self discipline, temperament, moral virtue, social stability, and affective neutrality did not show significant influence on any of the cultivation strategies.

Discussion and Conclusion

Chinese Traditional Value Orientations

This study is to explore cultural influences on cultivation strategies by investigating value orientations commonly existed in the two Chinese societies and their relations to the use of cultivation strategies perceived by the Chinese. An exploratory factor analysis was performed for a survey of 370 participants from Mainland China and Hong Kong to identify the fundamental orientations of Chinese traditional values. Results suggested eight factors representing the dimensionality of 27 traditional Chinese values. The eight factors are the Chinese traditional value orientations of “self discipline,” “temperament,” “hierarchical responsibility,” “moral virtue,” “social stability,” “professional ethics,” “relational reciprocation,” and “affective neutrality.” These factors can be resonated to Kluckhohn and Strodetbock’s (1961) value orientations of cultures.

Kluckhohn and Strodetbock (1961) posed five value orientations that portray commonalities and variances among cultures in human societies: 1) human-nature orientation

(the innate character of human nature), 2) person-nature orientation (relations between humans and nature), 3) time orientation (temporal focus of human life), 4) activity orientation (focus of human activity), and 5) relational orientation (the relationship with one another). Among the newly identified factors, self discipline and moral virtue deal with human orientation by providing the Chinese answer to the Kluckhohn and Strodetbock's question of whether human beings are inherently good or evil. Social stability, hierarchical responsibility and relational reciprocation describe one's relationships with others (people or entities) and rules of behaviors derived from the relationships in the Chinese societies. It should be noted that hierarchical responsibility and relational reciprocation not only illustrate the one's relationships with others in the social ordering but also point out the relational dialects emphasized by the Confucius, such as obligations/privileges, repayment of good/evil, and reciprocation/independence. Temperament and affective neutrality represent the activity orientation of the Chinese of "being" or "being in becoming" and delaying the gratification by exercising self-restrain. The factor of professional ethics resonates to Kluckhohn and Strodetbock's human-nature value orientation by reflecting how humans should act in a professional context based on the Confucius' teaching.

The eight factors are somewhat consistent with L. Chen's (2006) confirmatory model with five-factor dimensions of the CVS as previously discussed. The difference might be a result of two newly added Chinese values (favor giving and loyalty to friends) commonly held by Chinese culture members. In conclusion, this exploratory factor analysis model contributes to the search for the dimensionality of the CVS and for the completion of the CVS, a valid set of Chinese indigenous values, as called by L. Chen (2006).

This factor model also contributes to the public relations research on culture. Since culture consists of a complex set of values, these eight value orientations represent the underpinnings of the Chinese culture that has been supported to greatly influence the practice of public relations by many empirical (Chen, 2007; Huang, 1990, 2000; Hung, 2002, 2004b). Thus, the identified value orientations allow the researcher to examine how culture influences public relations by looking into the effects of each dimensions of culture rather than treating

it as one abstract concept.

Difference of Perceived Cultivation Strategies

The *t* test revealed the statistical significance of perceptions of assurance of legitimacy and being unconditionally constructive. The quantitative findings also reflect the qualitative study Hung (2002) conducted for Taiwanese and multinational corporations' relationship management in mainland China. For the strategy of assurance of legitimacy, as China is a society that emphasizes greatly on relational hierarchy, many Taiwanese companies in China faced the problem of not being able to some top leaders in the local or central government because these Taiwanese companies did not have "equivalent status" with the leaders. Hence, the many hundreds of Taiwanese companies in each city in mainland China formed regional Taiwanese Businessmen Association and elected a president to represent hundreds of Taiwanese companies to negotiate with the government leaders. As for being unconditionally constructive, China is in transition from the social economy to market economy. Hence, consumers were confused of their roles in a capitalist society and thus, they often demanded than they should to the multinational companies in China. Facing this problem, multinational companies tried their best to accommodate the customers with the hope to educate the correct consumer attitude.

Influence of Chinese Value Orientation on Cultivation Strategies

Overall, the results indicated that traditional Chinese values indeed have significant effects of the perception of cultivation strategies (except for access) even though the magnitudes of such influence are not large, accounting for less than 10% of the variance. This result is not unexpected for two reasons. One, the dimensionality of the CVS remains inconclusive and two, a number of other factors may affect perception of cultivation strategies. For example, cultural tendency at the individual level (self-construal) or within the society (sub-culture derived from the groups individuals associate with), personal experiences with the organization that uses cultivation strategies (Ki & Hon, 2007), organizational

reputations (Yang & Grunig, 2005), relational history of individuals and the organization (Chen & Hung, 2002), and the specific context where the cultivation takes place (Coombs, 2000).

Statistical analysis did not show significant influence of the eight Chinese value orientations on access. This interesting finding highlights the different interpretations of “symmetry” between one another of people in the East and West. From a Western, individualistic point of view, symmetry emphasizes balanced individual rights in interactions, such as in communication episodes or relationship building and cultivation. Hence, providing access to one another becomes the necessity of fostering quality, long-term relationships by maintaining symmetry and individual rights in the Western world. In the Chinese societies, however, Chinese symmetry is constituted by not only individual rights but also obligations to others. The eight Chinese value orientations all highlight one’s relations with others and the expectation and obligations one should have for himself or herself. This might explain the insignificant contributions of the eight Chinese value orientations to access from the participants’ viewpoint.

Findings suggest that the value orientation of relational hierarchy contributed to four of the seven relationship cultivation strategies. In other words, this orientation is most likely to influence publics’ perceptions of cultivation strategies. Bond and Hwang (1986) mentioned that in the Confucian tradition, Five Cardinal Relations (*wu lun*), meaning those between sovereign and subject, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend, were considered dominantly important in the Chinese society. Social harmony comes from following the proper role behaviors. Thus, each individual is defined by the hierarchical relationships and the social order is ensured through each party’s realizing the requirements in the role relationship. Traditional emphasis on each individual’s role and obligation to others contributed to the salient perception on positivity, being unconditionally constructive, assurance of legitimacy, and sharing of tasks. Confucian teaching stresses the importance of *li* (rules of correct behavior); hence, each individual ought to show respect and politeness to others in order to maintain harmonious relationships. This emphasis results in

the surveyed publics' perception on positivity and being unconditionally constructive. Moreover, the hierarchical emphasis in relationships affects whether each individual's role is legitimate in human interactions. Thus, individuals strive for doing their best in their roles and obligations in order to acquire the recognized legitimacy from others. Furthermore, individuals in the collectivist Chinese society have been aware the obligation to help others. As a result, it is not surprising to see the orientation of hierarchical responsibility affect the perception of sharing of tasks. In short, public relations scholars and practitioners should examine the nature and outcomes of OPR cultivation strategies with the Chinese publics by weighting hierarchical responsibility into the culture-public relations formula.

Nevertheless, the concept of relational interdependence (reciprocation) proposed by Yang (1991) also plays the significant role on how Chinese publics perceived the cultivation strategies employed by organizations. This orientation showed affects on the perception of networking, openness, and sharing of tasks. Yang (1991) and Hung (2002, 2004b) contended that the social exchange norm in the Chinese society stresses the obligation of repaying favors from others and the reciprocation of helping each other. Subsequently, a relational debt comes when one receives a favor from others. When helping others in their problems, the expectation of receiving favors was produced. This kind of social norm has affected Chinese people being open about asking favor and providing assistance to each other.

In addition, Yang (1991) mentioned the relational interdependence resulting in Chinese people emphasizing *guanxi*, meaning building personal relationships. This perception shows the significance on the perception of networking applied by the multinational corporation chosen in this study. Interestingly, Jo's (2006) study on manufacturer-retailer relationships in Korea reflected personal network as one of the relational dimensions in Asia. Personal network is defined as "uncontrollable external forces such as ties by blood, school, and hometown" (Jo, 2006, p. 230). The statistical result that the cultural orientation of relationship reciprocation influences the perception of networking echoes the similar finding that personal connection or building relationships with important people is a unique cultural characteristic in Eastern Asia.

In conclusion, by examining the effects of the eight traditional Chinese value orientations on the perception of cultivation strategies provides the preliminary evidence of the value orientations that affect cultivation strategy perceptions. Most importantly, the results suggest that even culture affects public relations in general, what is considered as the underpinning of the Chinese culture might not have an effect on certain practice of public relations. Thus, this research allows the public relations scholars and practitioners to uncover the complexity of the Chinese culture and those culture value orientations that affect relationship management.

Limitation and Future Research Directions

This study has taken a step further in relationship management to better understand cultivation strategies of OPRs and cultural influences on those. This study has the following contributions: First, the findings shed lights on the factors outside an organization that may affect an organization's relationships with the publics. Secondly, from the global public relations perspective, this study somehow confirmed the cultural influence on the perception of relationships between an organization and its publics by exploring the complexity of a culture and further pointing out the value orientations that lead to the perception of certain cultivation strategies. Thirdly, the identified value orientations provide a tool for public relations scholars and practitioners to better study "culture" in relations to public relations practice in the Chinese societies that might evolve differently given the dynamics of social, political, economic, media, and activism factors (J. Grunig, and L. Grunig, 1996; Sriramesh & Vercic, 2003). Last, but not least, the identified value orientations can be a useful tool for training for public relations practitioners who are going to work for a client with strategic publics from the Chinese culture or those going to work in a Chinese society. As L. Chen (2006) advocated, the value orientation items in the CVS scale could be used in designing training material to "increase trainees' awareness of their own values and how they differ from a host [Chinese] culture/society" (p. 15).

This study also encountered some limitations. Most of intercultural empirical studies

have sample sizes between less than 100 to a bit more than 300 participants. The sample size of this study (N = 370) is considered acceptable for analysis. However, the uneven number between the mainland China and Hong Kong samples may affect the findings. Furthermore, this study, employing the Chinese value orientations in investigating how culture plays a role in relationship cultivation, only limited the research locales to mainland China and Hong Kong. Future research may expand the locales to other Chinese societies, such as Taiwan and Singapore, to further validate measures on culture value orientations and relationship cultivation strategies can be provided.

In addition, this study did not investigate the impact of relational cultivation on organizational achievements or failure. The Excellence study (J. Grunig, 1992; L. Grunig, et.al., 2002) showed that public relations makes an organization more effective by building long-term, quality relationships. Future research may focus on how organizations in the Chinese or Asian societies develop relationships that result in both tangible and intangible success.

Bibliography

- Adler, N. J., & Jelinek, M.. 2000. "Is "Organization Culture" Culture Bound?" in *Culture, Communication and Conflict: Readings in Intercultural Relations* (2nd ed.), edited by G. R. Weaver. Boston: Pearson.
- Anderson, D. 1992. "Identifying and Responding to Activist Groups: A Case Study". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 4: 151-165.
- Bardhan, N. 2003. "Repturing Public Relations Metanarratives: The Example of India". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 15: 225-248.
- Bond, M. H. 1996. "Chinese Values" pp. 208-226 in *The Handbook of Chinese Psychology*, edited by M. H. Bond. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Bond, M. H., & Hwang, K. K. 1986. "The Social Psychology of Chinese People" pp. 213 – 266 in *The Psychology of the Chinese People*, edited by M. H. Bond. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.
- Braun, S. 2007. "The Effect of the Political Environment on Public Relations in Bulgaria". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 19: 199-228.
- Brown, M. H., & McMillan, J. J. 1991. "Culture as Text: The Development of an Organizational Narrative". *The Southern Communication Journal* 57: 49-61.
- Carlone, D., & Taylor, B. 1998. "Organizational Communication and Cultural Studies: A Review Essay". *Communication Theory* 8: 337-367.
- Chen, L. 1999. "Traditional Values in Three Chinese Societies". Paper presented at China's 3rd International Symposium on Intercultural Communication, Shenzhen, China, November 2005.
- Chen, L. 2001. "Traditional Values in Chinese Societies Today: Implications for Cross Cultural Studies". Paper presented at Southern States Communication Association's Annual Conference, Lexington, KY, USA, April 2001.
- Chen, L. 2006. "Traditional Chinese Value Orientations as Indigenous Constructs: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis". LEWI Working Paper Series, Hong Kong Baptist University, Hong Kong.

- Chen, L., & Yeh, B. 2004. "Traditional Value Orientations and Argumentative Tendencies: A Study of Chinese Societies of Hong Kong, Taiwan and Mainland China". Paper presented at International Communication Association Annual Conference, New Orleans, USA, May 2004.
- Chen, Y. R., & Hung, C. J. F. 2002. "Organizational Behavior, Stigma, and Organization-public Relationships". *Proceedings of the International Public Relations Research Symposium, Slovenia* 9: 194-205.
- Chen, Y. R. 2007. "The Strategic Management of Government Affairs in China: How Multinational Corporations in China Interact with the Chinese Government". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 19 (3): 283-306. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Coombs, W. T. 2000. "Crisis Management: Advantages of a Relational Perspective" pp. 73-94 in *Public Relations as Relationship Management: A Relational Approach to the Study and Practice of Public Relations*, edited by J. A. Ledingham & S. Bruning. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Ferguson 1984. "Building Theory in Public Relations: Interorganizational Relationships as a Public Relations Paradigm". Paper presented to the Association for Education in Journalism and Mass Communication, Gainesville, FL, August 1984.
- Grunig, J. 1992. *Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Grunig, J., Grunig, L., Sriramesh, K., Huang, Y., & Lyra, A. 1995. "Model of Public Relations in an International Setting. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 7: 163-186.
- Grunig, L., Grunig, J., & Dozier, D. 2002. *Excellent Public Relations and Effective Organizations*. Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum Associates.
- Guan, J., & Dodder, R. 1998. "Instrument Validity of Cross-cultural Studies: A Further Search for Culture-free Dimensions". Paper presented at the 93rd Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, San Francisco, USA, August 1998.

- Gudykunst, W. B., & Kim, Y. Y. 2003. *Communicating with Strangers* (4th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Hofstede, G. 1980. *Culture's Consequences: International Differences in Work-related Values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.
- Hofstede, G. 2001. *Culture's Consequences, Comparing Values, Behaviors, Institutions, and Organizations Across Nations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E. 1999. *Measuring Relationships in Public Relations*. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.
- Huang, Y. H. 2000. "The Personal Influence Model and Gao Guanxi in Taiwan Chinese Public Relations". *Public Relations Review* 26: 219-236.
- Huang, Y. H. 2001a. "OPRA: A Cross-cultural, Multiple-item Scale for Measuring Organization-public Relationships". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 13: 61-90.
- Huang, Y. H. 2001b. "Values of Public Relations: Effects on Organization-public Relationships Mediating Conflict Resolution. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 13: 265-302.
- Hung, C. J. F. 2004a. "Relationship Building, Activism, and Conflict Resolution – A case Study on the Termination of Licensed Prostitution in Taipei City". *Asian Journal of Communication*, 13 (2): 21-49.
- Hung, C. J. F. 2004b. "Cultural Influence on Relationship Cultivation Strategies: Multinational Companies in China". *Journal of Communication Management*, 8 (3): 264-281.
- Hung, C. J. F., & Chen, Y. R. 2004. "Public Relations in China in the Era of Change" pp. 29 - 62 in *Public Relations in Asia: an Anthology*, edited by K. Sriramesh. Singapore: Thomson Learning.
- Jo, S. 2006. "Measurement of Organization-public Relationships: Validation of Measurement Using a Manufacturer-retailer Relationship". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 18: 225 – 248.
- Ketchum, D. 2005. "HK Disneyland's PR will be Pressured by Big Promises Made". *Media*

Asia 16.

- Khan, M. A. 2005. "Interpersonal Communication and Acculturation: A Path Analysis". *Journal of Development Communication* 16: 10-19.
- Ki, E. J., & Hon, L. C. 2007. "Testing the Linkages among the Organization–public Relationship and Attitude and Behavioral Intentions". *Journal of Public Relations Research* 19 (1): 1-23.
- Kim, Y., & Hon, L. C. 2002. "Public Relations in Korea: Applying Theories and Exploring Opportunities". *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication* 11: 263 – 286.
- Kluckhohn, F. R., & Strodtbeck, F. L. 1961. *Variations in value orientations*. Evanston, IL: Row, Peterson.
- Koprowski, E. J. 1983. "Cultural Myths: Clues to Effective Management". *Organizational Dynamics*, Autumn, 39-51.
- Kroeber, A., & Kluckhohn, C. 1952. *Culture*. New York: Meridian Books.
- Matthews, B. M. 2000. "The Chinese Value Survey: An Interpretation of Value Scales and Consideration of Some preliminary Results". *International Education Journal* 1 (2): 117-126.
- McIntyre, B. T., & Zhang, W. 2003. "Western Mass Media Exposure and Chinese Cultural Values: The Case of Hong Kong". Paper presented at the 2nd Hawaii International Conference on Social Sciences, Honolulu, USA, June 2003.
- Morley, D. D., Shockley-Zalabak, P., & Cesaria, R. 1997. "Organizational Communication and Culture: A Study of 10 Italian High-technology Companies". *The Journal of Business Communication* 34: 253-268.
- Parsons. 1951. *The Social System*. Glencoe, IL: Free Press.
- Rhee, Y. 2006. "Interpersonal Communication as an Element of Symmetrical Public Relations: A Case Study" pp.103-117 in *The Future of Excellence in Public Relations and Communication Management: Challenges for the Next generation*, edited by E.L. Toth. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Schwartz, S. H. 1994. "Cultural dimensions of values: Toward an understanding of

- National Differences” pp. 85-119 in *Individualism and Collectivism: Theory, Method, and Application*, edited by U. Kim, H. C. Triandis, C. Kagitcibasi, S. C. Choi, and G. Yoon. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Sha, B. L. 1999. *Cultural Public Relations: Identity, Activism, Globalization, and Gender in the Democratic Progressive Party on Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.
- Shenkar, O., & Ronen, S. 1987. “The Cultural Context of Negotiations: The Implications of Chinese Interpersonal Norms”. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science* 23: 263-275.
- Sriramesh, K., Kim, Y., & Takasaki, M. 1999. “Public Relations in Three Asian Cultures: an Analysis”. *Journal of Public Relations Research* 18: 201-211.
- Sriramesh, K., & Vercic, D. 2003. *Global Public Relations Handbook: Theory, Research, and Practice*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Vercic, D., Grunig, L. A., & Grunig, J. E. 1996. “Global and Specific Principles of Public Relations: Evidence from Slovenia” pp. 31-65 in *International Public Relations: a Comparative Analysis*, edited by H. M. Culbertson & N. Chen, Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Wu, X. 2002. “Doing PR in China: a 2001 Version-Concepts, Practices and Some Misperceptions”. *Public Relations Quarterly*, 47 (2): 10-18.
- Yang, C. F. 1991. *Chinese Interpersonal Relationships, Feelings, and Trust*. Taipei: Yuen Liou Publishing.
- Yang, K. S. 1992. “Chinese Social Orientation: from the Social Interaction Perspective” pp. 87-142 in *Chinese Psychology and Behavior*, edited by K. S. Yang & A. B. Yu, Taipei: Laurel.
- Yang, S. U., & Grunig, J. E. 2005. “Decomposing Organizational Reputation: The Effects of Organization-public Relationship Outcomes on Cognitive Representations of Organizations and Evaluations of Organizational Performance”. *Journal of Communication Management* 9: 305-325.
- Yum, J. O. 1988. “The Impact of Confucianism on Interpersonal Relationships and

Communication Patterns in East Asia". *Communication Monographs* 55: 374-388.

Table 1*The Chinese Value Survey and English Equivalents*

孝（服從父母，孝敬父母，尊崇祖先，贍養父母）	Filial Piety (Obedience to parents, respect for parents, honoring of ancestors, financial support of parents)	廉潔	Resistance to corruption
勤勞	Industry (Working hard)	耐力（毅力）	Persistence
容忍	Tolerance of others	耐心	Patience
隨和	Harmony with others	報恩與報仇	Repayment of both the good or the evil that another person has caused you
謙虛	Humbleness	文化優越感	A sense of cultural superiority
忠於上司	Loyalty to superiors	適應環境	Adaptability
禮儀	Observation of rites and social rituals	小心（慎）	Prudence (Carefulness)
禮尚往來	Reciprocation of greetings, favors, and gifts	信用	Trustworthiness
仁愛（恕，人情）	Kindness (Forgiveness, compassion)	知恥	Having a sense of shame
學識（教育）	Knowledge (Education)	有禮貌	Courtesy
團結	Solidarity with others	安分守己	Contentedness with one's position in life
中庸之道	Moderation, following the middle way	保守	Being conservative
修養	Self-cultivation	要面子	Protecting your "face"
尊卑有序	Ordering relationships by status and observing this order	知己之交	A close, intimate friend
正義感	Sense of righteousness	貞潔	Chastity in women
恩威並施	Benevolent authority	寡欲	Having few desires
不重競爭	Non-competitiveness	尊敬傳統	Respect for tradition
穩重	Personal steadiness and stability	財富	Wealth

Table 2*Items Loading on Eight Factors*

Items	Communality	1 Self Discipline	2 Temperament	3 Hierarchical Responsibility	4 Moral Virtue	5 Social Stability	6 Professional Ethics	7 Relational Reciprocation	8 Affective Neutrality
Adaptability	.645	.702							
Prudence	.613	.724							
Moderation	.536	.697							
Self Cultivation	.700	.674							
Contendedness with one's position	.618		.655						
Being conservative	.685		.769						
Non-competitiveness	.581		.743						
Ordering relationships	.585		.583						
Patriotism	.672			.773					
Respect for tradition	.554			.525					
A sense of righteousness	.552			.619					
Filial piety	.586			.785					
Trustworthiness	.608				.517				
Having a sense of shame	.684				.795				
Courtesy	.698				.826				
Tolerance of others	.607					.796			
Harmony with others	.701					.835			
Humbleness	.559					.623			
Favor giving	.501						.576		
Knowledge	.603						.800		
Steadiness and stability	.616						.645		
Solidarity with others	.637						.735		
Repayment of good/evil	.627							.779	
Reciprocation for good will	.574							.552	
Cultural superiority	.567							.548	
Persistence	.681								.687
Thrift	.725								.761

Table 3*Means and Standard Deviations of Relationship Cultivation Strategies*

<i>Cultivation Strategy</i>	<i>t</i>	<i>df</i>	Mainland China		Hong Kong	
			<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>
Access	1.69	368	4.25 (128) ^a	.85	4.12 (242) ^a	.82
Assurance of Legitimacy*	2.89	368	4.21 (128) ^a	.97	3.93 (242) ^a	.85
Being Unconditionally Constructive*	2.68	365	4.41 (127) ^a	.98	4.15 (240) ^a	.85
Networking	.960	362	4.11 (126) ^a	1.15	4.01 (238) ^a	1.01
Openness	1.83	368	4.18 (128) ^a	.95	4.02 (242) ^a	.78
Positivity	1.43	366	4.21 (128) ^a	.99	4.06 (240) ^a	.98
Sharing of Tasks	1.63	365	4.18 (128) ^a	1.02	3.98 (239) ^a	.92

Note: All items were measured on a 7-point likert type scale ranging from 1 (strongly disagree), 2 (disagree), 3 (slightly disagree), 4 (neutral), 5 (slightly agree), 6 (agree), and 7 (strongly agree).

* $p < .01$

^a These numbers represent the number of participants in the sample for the test.

Table 4*Multiple Regression Models for Traditional Value Orientations and Cultivation Strategies*

	R	R ²	R ² _(Full Model)	F	B	Beta	p-value	VIF
<i>Access</i> ^a								
<i>Assurance of Legitimacy</i>								
Model	.163	.026	.037	10.851			.001	
Factor 3					.147	.163	.001	1
<i>Being Unconditionally Constructive</i>								
Model	.225	.051	.065	10.577			.000	
Factor 3					.131	.147	.007	1.245
Factor 6					.104	.111	.032	1.245
<i>Networking</i>								
Model	.135	.018	.026	7.339			.007	
Factor 7					.141	.135	.007	1
<i>Openness</i>								
Model	.199	.040	.051	8.195			.000	
Factor 3					.115	.139	.006	1.064
Factor 7					.138	.167	.028	1.064
<i>Positivity</i>								
Model	0.164	.027	.048	10.922			.001	
Factor 3					.164	.164	.001	1
<i>Sharing of Task</i>								
Model	.190	.036	.044	7.425			.001	
Factor 7					.120	.125	.015	1.060
Factor 3					.115	.117	.022	1.060

Note. ^a The regression model was not established by the stepwise method which implies the cultural values do not have a significant impact on access.

LEWI Working Paper Series

The LEWI Working Paper Series is an endeavour of LEWI to foster dialogues among institutions and scholars in the field of East-West studies.

Circulation of this series is free of charge. Feedback should be addressed directly to authors. Abstracts of papers can be downloaded from the LEWI web page (<http://www.hkbu.edu.hk/~lewi/publications.html>); full text is available upon request.

1. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Both Sides, Now: A Sociologist Meditates on Culture Contact, Hybridization, and Cosmopolitanism*, English/38 pages, April 2002.
2. Mary Ann GILLIES (Simon Fraser University), *East Meets West in the Poetry of T. S. Eliot*, English/30 pages, April 2002.
3. 湯一介 (北京大學), 文化的互動及其雙向選擇: 以印度佛教和西方哲學傳入中國為例, 共 14 頁, 2002 年 7 月。
TANG Yijie (Peking University), *Cultural Interaction and the Bidirectional Option: The Introduction of Indian Buddhism and Western Philosophy into China as Examples*, Chinese/14 pages, July 2002.
4. Werner MEISSNER (Hong Kong Baptist University), *China's Response to September 11 and its Changing Position in International Relations*, English/15 pages, September 2002.
5. Janet Lee SCOTT (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Eastern Variations of Western Apprenticeship: The Paper Offerings Industry of Hong Kong*, English/30 pages, October 2002.
6. Alexius A. PEREIRA (National University of Singapore), *Sino-Singaporean Joint Ventures: The Case of the Suzhou Industrial Park Project*, English/32 pages, November 2002.
7. HO Wai Chung (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Between Globalization and Localization: A Study of Hong Kong Popular Music*, English/27 pages, January 2003.
8. 樂黛雲 (北京大學), 多元文化與比較文學的發展, 共 11 頁, 2003 年 2 月。
YUE Daiyun (Peking University), *Plurality of Cultures in the Context of Globalization: Toward a New Perspective on Comparative Literature*, Chinese/11 pages, February 2003.
9. XIAO Xiaosui (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The New-Old Cycle Paradigm and Twentieth Century Chinese Radicalism*, English/37 pages, February 2003.
10. George Xun WANG (University of Wisconsin Parkside), CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), and Vivienne LUK (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Conflict and its Management in Sino-Foreign Joint Ventures: A Review*, English/34 pages, March 2003.
11. Charles MORRISON (East-West Center, University of Hawaii), *Globalization, Terrorism and the Future of East-West Studies*, English/20 pages, April 2003.
12. Ien ANG (University of Western Sydney), *Representing Social Life in a Conflictive Global World: From Diaspora to Hybridity*, English/13 pages, June 2003.

13. Renate KRIEG (University of Applied Sciences, Werderstr), *The Aspect of Gender in Cross-Cultural Management – Women’s Careers in Sino-German Joint Ventures*, English/23 Pages, June 2003.
14. Martha P. Y. CHEUNG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Representation, Mediation and Intervention: A Translation Anthologist’s Preliminary Reflections on Three Key Issues in Cross-cultural Understanding*, English/29 pages, October 2003.
15. Yingjin ZHANG (University of California, San Diego), *Transregional Imagination in Hong Kong Cinema: Questions of Culture, Identity, and Industry*, English/14 pages, November 2003.
16. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Elvis, Allow Me to Introduce Myself: American Music and Neocolonialism in Taiwan Cinema*, English/29 pages, November 2003.
17. Tiziana LIOI (La Sapienza University, Rome), *T.S. Eliot in China: A Cultural and Linguistic Study on the Translation of The Waste Land in Chinese*, English/29 pages, November 2003.
18. Jayne RODGERS (University of Leeds), *New Politics? Activism and Communication in Post-Colonial Hong Kong*, English/17 pages, December 2003.
19. 鄭宏泰 (香港大學亞洲研究中心), 黃紹倫 (香港大學亞洲研究中心), *移民與本土：回歸前後香港華人身份認同問題的探討*, 共 35 頁, 2003 年 12 月。
Victor ZHENG (Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong) and WONG Siu-lun (Centre of Asian Studies, The University of Hong Kong), *Immigrant or Local: A Study on Hong Kong Chinese Identity after Handover*, Chinese/35 pages, December 2003.
20. ZHANG Longxi (City University of Hong Kong), *Marco Polo, Chinese Cultural Identity, and an Alternative Model of East-West Encounter*, English/23 pages, March 2004.
21. CHUNG Ling (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Pacific Rim Consciousness of American Writers in the West Coast*, English/18 pages, March 2004.
22. Dorothy Wai-sim LAU (Chu Hai College), *Between Personal Signature and Industrial Standards: John Woo as a Hong Kong Auteur in Hollywood*, English/27 pages, March 2004.
23. LO Kwai Cheung (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Myth of “Chinese” Literature: Ha Jin and the Globalization of “National” Literary Writing*, English/21 pages, April 2004.
24. Bradley R. BARNES (University of Leeds) and Qionglei YU (Zhejiang University of Technology and Business), *Investigating the Impact of International Cosmetic Advertising in China*, English/11 pages, May 2004.
25. Timothy Man-kong WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Local Voluntarism: The Medical Mission of the London Missionary Society in Hong Kong, 1842–1923*, English/36 pages, June 2004.
26. Ramona CURRY (University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign), *Bridging the Pacific with Love Eterne: Issues in Early Crossover Marketing of Hong Kong Cinema*, English/36 pages, June 2004.

27. Leo DOUW (University of Amsterdam), *Embedding Transnational Enterprises in China during the Twentieth Century: Who's in Control?* English/32 pages, July 2004.
28. WANG Wen (Lanzhou University) and TING Wai (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Beyond Identity? Theoretical Dilemma and Historical Reflection of Constructivism in International Relations*, English/32 pages, August 2004.
29. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Stranger's Plight, and Gift*, English/17 pages, September 2004.
30. Darrell William DAVIS (University of New South Wales), *Saving Face: Spectator and Spectacle in Japanese Theatre and Film*, English/26 pages, October 2004.
31. CHAN Kwok Bun (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Vivienne LUK (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Conflict Management Strategies and Change in Sino-Japanese, Sino-Korean, and Sino-Taiwanese Joint Ventures in China*, English/38 pages, November 2004.
32. Yingjin ZHANG (University of California, San Diego), *Styles, Subjects, and Special Points of View: A Study of Contemporary Chinese Independent Documentary*, English/31 pages, December 2004.
33. Ashley TELLIS (Eastern Illinois University), *Cyberpatriarchy: Chat Rooms and the Construction of 'Man-to-Man' Relations in Urban India*, English/14 pages, January 2005.
34. Koon-kwai WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Greening of the Chinese Mind: Environmental Awareness and China's Environmental Movement*, English/21 pages, February 2005.
35. Jonathan E. ADLER (City University of New York), *Cross-Cultural Education, Open-mindedness, and Time*, English/17 pages, March 2005.
36. Georgette WANG (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Globalization and Hybridization in Cultural Production: A Tale of Two Films*, English/25 pages, April 2005.
37. Timothy Man-kong WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Printing, Evangelism, and Sinology: A Historical Appraisal of the Sinological Publications by Protestant Missionaries in South China*, English/28 pages, May 2005.
38. Hanneke TEEKENS (Netherlands Organization for International Cooperation in Higher Education, NUFFIC), *East West: at Home the Best?* English/19 pages, June 2005.
39. Yinbing LEUNG (Hong Kong Baptist University) *The "Action Plan to Raise Language Standards": A Response to the Economic Restructuring in Post-colonial Hong Kong*, English/28 pages, July 2005.
40. 陳國貴(香港浸會大學)、黎熙元(廣州中山大學)、陸何慧薇(香港浸會大學), *中國“三資”企業中的文化衝突與文化創新*, 共 19 頁, 2005 年 7 月。
 CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), LI Xiyuan (Sun Yat-sen University), and Vivienne LUK (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Cultural Conflicts and Cultural Innovation of Sino-foreign Joint Ventures in China*, Chinese/19 pages, July 2005.

41. CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Odalia M.H. WONG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Private and Public: Gender, Generation and Family Life in Flux*, English/21 pages, August 2005.
42. LEUNG Hon Chu (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Globalization, Modernity, and Careers at Work: Life Politics of Woman Workers in Hongkong-Shenzhen*, English/14 pages, August 2005.
43. CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Cosmopolitan, Translated Man, or Stranger? Experimenting with Sociological Autobiography*, English/33 pages, September 2005.
44. CHUNG Po Yin (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Moguls of the Chinese Cinema – the Story of the Shaw Brothers in Shanghai, Hong Kong and Singapore, 1924-2002*, English/18 pages, October 2005.
45. Vivian C. SHEER (Hong Kong Baptist University) and CHEN Ling (Hong Kong Baptist University), *The Construction of Fear Appeals in Chinese Print OTC Ads: Extending the Four-Component Message Structure*, English/29 pages, November 2005.
46. 何平 (四川大學)、陳國貴 (香港浸會大學), 中外思想中的文化“雜交”觀念, 共 25 頁, 2005 年 12 月。
HE Ping (Sichuan University) and CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Hybridity: Concepts and Realities in China and the World*, Chinese/25 pages, December 2005.
47. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Innovation or Recycling? Mandarin Classics and the Return of the Wenyi Tradition*, English/22 pages, January 2006.
48. CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Leo DOUW (University of Amsterdam), *Differences, Conflicts and Innovations: An Emergent Transnational Management Culture in China*, English/25 pages, February 2006.
49. Eugene EOYANG (Lingnan University), *Of “Invincible Spears and Impenetrable Shield”: The Possibility of Impossible Translations*, English/10 pages, March 2006.
50. Thomas Y. T. LUK (The Chinese University of Hong Kong), *Adaptations and Translations of Western Drama: A Socio-cultural Study of Hong Kong Repertory Company’s Past Practices*, English/14 pages, April 2006.
51. CHEN Ling (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Traditional Chinese Value Orientations as Indigenous Constructs: A Confirmatory Factor Analysis*, English/21 pages, May 2006.
52. Paul HOCKINGS (United International College), Beijing Normal University/Hong Kong Baptist University, *Gaoqiao, a Second Look at a Well-Studied Yunnan Village*, English/13pages, June 2006.
53. Janet SALAFF (University of Toronto) and Arent GREVE (Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration), *Chinese Immigrant Women: From Professional to Family Careers*, English/38 pages, July 2006.

54. 張美蘭 (清華大學), 美國傳教士狄考文對十九世紀末漢語官話研究的貢獻:《官話類編》
專題研究, 共 47 頁, 2006 年 8 月。
ZHANG Meilan (Tsinghua University), *A Study on Calvin Wilson Mateer's A Course of
Mandarin Lessons: Contributions of American Missionaries to the Study of Mandarin
Chinese in the Late 19th Century*, Chinese/47 pages, August 2006.
55. CHAN Kwok-bun (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Globalization, Localization, and
Hybridization: Their Impact on Our Lives*, English/22 pages, September 2006.
56. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Incriminating Spaces: Border
Politics of Mukokuseki Asia*, English/19 pages, October 2006.
57. Brenda ALMOND (University of Hull), *Conflicting Ideologies of the Family: Is the Family
Just a Social Construct?* English/20 pages, November 2006.
58. Brenda ALMOND (University of Hull), *Social Policy, Law and the Contemporary Family*,
English/32 pages, December 2006.
59. Brenda ALMOND (University of Hull), *Analysing and Resolving Values Conflict*,
English/18 pages, January 2007.
60. Peter NEWELL (Global Initiative to End All Corporal Punishment of Children), *The
Immediate Human Rights Imperative to Prohibit All Corporal Punishment of Children*,
English/16 pages, February 2007.
61. Pablo Sze-pang TSOI (The University of Hong Kong), *Joyce and China: A Mode of
Intertextuality – The Legitimacy of Reading and Translating Joyce*, English/24 pages,
March 2007.
62. Janet SALAFF (University of Toronto), Angela SHIK (University of Toronto) and Arent
GREVE (Norwegian School of Economics and Business Administration), *Like Sons and
Daughters of Hong Kong: The Return of the Young Generation*, English/34 pages, April
2007.
63. Stephen Yiu-wai CHU (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Before and After the Fall: Mapping
Hong Kong Cantopop in the Global Era*, English/21 pages, May 2007.
64. 許維賢 (北京大學), 黑騎士的戀物/(歷史)唯物癖: 董啟章論, 共 43 頁, 2007 年 6
月。
HEE Wai Siam (Peking University), *Fetishism or (Historical) Materialism of Black Rider:
Critical Perspective on the Works of Dung Kai-cheung*, Chinese/43 pages, June 2007.
65. 葉智仁 (西門菲沙大學), 全球消費主義與倫理營銷: 耶、儒思想的初步回應, 共 20 頁,
2007 年 7 月。
Toby YIP (Simon Fraser University), *Global Consumerism and Ethical Marketing: Initial
Responses from Christianity & Confucianism*, Chinese/20 pages, July 2007.
66. Yiu Fai CHOW (University of Amsterdam), *Fear or Fearless: Martial Arts Films and
Dutch-Chinese Masculinities*, English/34 pages, August 2007.
67. CHEN Xiangyang (New York University), *Technologizing the Vernacular: Cantonese Opera
Films through the Legend of Purple Hairpin*, English/32 pages, September 2007.

68. YAN Feng (Fudan University), *Metamorphosis and Mediality: An Interart Approach to the Reception of Stephen Chow's A Chinese Odyssey in Mainland China*, English/14 pages, October 2007.
69. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University) and WANG Hu (Phoenix Television), *Transcultural Sounds: Music, Identity and the Cinema of Wong Kar-wai*, English/16 pages, November 2007.
70. 龍明慧 (中山大學), 原型理論下的中西翻譯認知, 共 15 頁, 2007 年 12 月。
LONG Minghui (Sun Yat-sen University), *Prototype-Based Analysis of Chinese and Western Conception of Translation*, Chinese/15 pages, December 2007.
71. 梁婷婷 (四川大學), 「被全球化」的城市 —— 1990 年代末以來成都市城市形象廣告片的社會背景與自我表徵, 共 18 頁, 2008 年 1 月。
LIANG Tingting (Sichuan University), *The Globalized City: Social Background and Self-Representation of City Promotional Videos of Chengdu – 1999 to 2006*, Chinese/18 pages, January 2008.
72. 沈本秋 (復旦大學), 香港的國際政治經濟「二元特徵」與美國的香港政策, 共 36 頁, 2008 年 2 月。
SHEN Benqiu (Fudan University), *The Dualistic Structure of Hong Kong's Political Economy and U.S. – Hong Kong Policy*, Chinese/36 pages, February 2008.
73. 汪暉 (清華大學), 去政治化的政治與中國的短二十世紀的終結, 共 51 頁, 2008 年 3 月。
WANG Hui (Tsinghua University), *The Politics of Depoliticizing Politics and the End of China's 20th Century*, Chinese/36 pages, March 2008.
74. Emilie Yueh-yu YEH (Hong Kong Baptist University) and Neda Hei-tung NG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Magic, Medicine, Cannibalism: the China Demon in Hong Kong Horror*, English/22 pages, April 2008.
75. Flora C. J. HUNG (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Cultural Influence on the Relationship Cultivation Strategies in the Chinese Society*, English/30 pages, May 2008.
76. Cynthia F. K. LEE (Hong Kong Baptist University), *Some Insights on Essential Elements and Barriers of Interdisciplinary Collaboration in Research in Higher Education*, English/15 pages, June 2008.
77. HO Wai Chung (Hong Kong Baptist University), *A Review of Moral Education in China's Music Education*, English/23 pages, July 2008.
78. LAU Patrick W. C. (Hong Kong Baptist University), Michael H. S. LAM (Hong Kong Baptist University), and Beeto W. C. LEUNG (University of Hong Kong), *National Identity and the Beijing Olympics: School Children's Responses in Mainland China, Taiwan and Hong Kong*, English/25 pages, August 2008.
79. 陳秀鶯 (華南理工大學), 高新技術中小企業關係質量的因因關係研究, 共 32 頁, 2008 年 9 月。
CHEN Xiuying (South China University of Technology), *A Study on High-tech SMEs Relationship Marketing Research in China*, Chinese/32 pages, September 2008.

Submission of Papers

Scholars in East-West studies who are interested in submitting a paper for publication should send article manuscript, preferably in a WORD file via e-mail, to the Series Secretary's email address at lewi@hkbu.edu.hk or by post to 9/F., David C. Lam Building, Hong Kong Baptist University, Kowloon Tong, Hong Kong. Preferred type is Times New Romans, not less than 11 point. The Editorial Committee will review all submissions and the Institute reserves the right not to publish particular manuscripts submitted. Authors should hear from the Series Secretary about the review normally within one month after submission.