Values and Communication Apprehension as Antecedents of Conflict Styles in Intercultural Conflicts: A Study in Germany and Russia

Anastasia Batkhina
National Research University Higher School of Economics

The purpose of this study was to examine and predict conflict styles in an intercultural conflict from personal values and intercultural communication apprehension (ICA). We used a comparative approach, employing data ($N = 455$) from Germany ($N = 221$) and Russia ($N = 234$) to establish some common patterns and provide a more detailed insight into this phenomenon. As predicted, both countries displayed common patterns of relationships. The self-transcendence values were positively associated with the preference for a collaborating style. Self-enhancement values were positively correlated with the preference for a dominating style, and conservation values with the preference for an avoiding style. A high level of ICA was an obstacle to the adoption of a collaborating style. These findings were discussed within the historical and sociocultural context of these 2 countries.

Public Significance Statement
This study shows that personal values and intercultural communication apprehension play a predictive role for conflict style preferences in an intercultural conflict in Russian and German samples.

Keywords: intercultural conflict, conflict styles, personal values, intercultural communication apprehension, intercultural communication

According to evolutionary biologists (e.g., Thayer, 2004), conflicts and wars between members of different social and ethnic groups has accompanied modern humanity for more than 10,000 years throughout its developmental history. Now, in the 21st century, the problems of interethnic and intercultural conflicts are particularly pressing (Hammer, 2015; McCarthy & Rodes, 2018; Ting-Toomey, 2010). Modern societies in many countries experience global sociocultural changes. Processes such as globalization, involuntary and voluntary migration, local wars (and a consequent

increase in the number of immigrants), refugees, and displaced people lead to an increase in cultural heterogeneity and the frequency of intercultural contacts (Matsumoto & Hwang, 2015). Unfortunately, such mass encounters of different cultures and ethnicities often give rise to the appearance of cultural misunderstandings, prejudices, and conflicts (Clark, 2012; Ting-Toomey, 2010).

Following Ting-Toomey (2010) and Kim (2005), we define intercultural conflict as an interpersonal conflict arising in the process of intercultural communication due to cultural differences. This study aims to fill some of the gaps in the literature by considering conflict styles in intercultural conflicts as an interpersonal phenomenon with three common dimensions. The first of these is personal characteristics (personal values), followed by situational factors associated with ethnic categorization of the other party (intercultural communication apprehension [ICA]), and, lastly, sociocultural factors associated with the broader situation in the region (German and Russian contexts). Furthermore, we justify the need to consider intercultural conflicts at various levels, describe approaches to conflict styles, and explain why we focused on personal values and ICA as antecedents. This article attempts to empirically test the role of values and ICA in the choice of conflict style in intercultural conflict in Russia and Germany by combining classical theories of intercultural communication, an ecological perspective, and Schwartz's values theory, which is the first use of this theory to explain intercultural conflict behavior.

Socioecological Perspective to Intercultural Conflicts

According to the socioecological framework put forward by Brofenbrenner (1979), any conflict can occur at four levels: micro

(interaction between two people in specific situations—interpersonal conflict), meso (the interconnection between different microsystems— organizational conflict), exo (forces inside the higher social system—community conflicts), and macro (cultural beliefs and values—international conflicts). Intercultural conflict is usually seen not only as a kind of intergroup conflict, but also as an interpersonal conflict between members of different cultures (micro level) that arises from the perceived incompatibility of cultural values, rules, and norms (Ting-Toomey & Oetzel, 2001). Thus, cultural differences lie at the root of intercultural conflict.

During any interpersonal communication, there are interactions between two individuals possessing not only a unique set of personality traits and attitudes, but who are also influenced by the social groups to which they belong, their past experiences, their genetics, and their environment (Ting-Toomey, 2009). Therefore, we can assume that, in addition to the sociocultural misunderstandings that arises between participants during an intercultural conflict, factors such as personal characteristics, prejudice, the nuanced history of the relationships between those ethnic groups, categorization, and unfair distribution of resources will also affect the conflict dynamic (Bar-Tal, Halperin, Sharvit, & Zafran, 2012). Considering the highest levels at which intercultural conflict unfolds (i.e., at the national and societal levels), it is worth mentioning the influence of elites on interethnic relations and stereotypes. Many studies indicate that violent conflicts and interethnic clashes are often provoked by individual political and religious leaders, who can utilize both ethnic mobilization and the characterization of another ethnic group as an "enemy" to achieve their own political goals (Durante & Fiske, 2017; Wedel, 2017).

In accordance with previous theories, the contextual theory of interethnic communication by Kim (2005) assumes the existence of some intercultural continuum of interpersonal interaction consisting of several contextual layers. The subject of intercultural communication can move along this continuum and relates to another person individually (e.g., as a friend) or as an undifferentiated member of the ethnic group (e.g., as a Mexican immigrant) accordingly. Thus, the two poles of this continuum represent individualization and categorization, respectively. Kim (2005) also identified the following layers of interethnic communication: behavior, which can be associative and dissociative; the communicator and its identity; the situation representing the immediate social environment in which interethnic communication takes place and which includes ethnic distance; shared or common goals and personal integration of the network; and, finally, the environment, which consists of institutional inequality, the relative strength of the group, and environmental stress. Therefore, intercultural conflict must be considered in its sociocultural context. The antecedents of behaviors in an intercultural conflict can presumably fall within three common dimensions: personal characteristics, situational factors, and broader sociocultural factors.

Antecedents of Conflict Styles in Intercultural Conflicts

Based on a number of modern studies (Hammer, 2015; Van de Vliert, 1997; Worchel, 2005), the choice of behavior in a conflict can be assumed to be a product of socialization, cultural and individual values, and norms; however, in each specific situation,

contextual factors may also influence the choice of strategies employed in conflict behavior.

Research on intercultural conflict, such as by Marsella (2005) and Hammer (2015), pay special attention to the predictors of participants' behavior in intercultural conflict. Marsella (2005) believes that culture itself can provoke violence and aggressive behavioral strategies, both within one's own group and in relation to members of other groups. A separate factor highlighted by Marsella (2005) is the history of the relationship between cultural groups whose representatives are now in conflict. This becomes particularly important when there is a long-standing, unresolved conflict between ethnic groups. The group's history is an important aspect of group identity; however, according to Worchel (2005), it is not the story itself that takes on special significance, but rather its interpretation by members of the group. For example, an attack on civilians may be viewed as an act of terrorism by one party and as an act of fighting for freedom and justice by the other party.

The hypothesis that culture is the most important factor that influences the choice of strategy in intercultural conflict has been confirmed in a number of empirical works (Ting-Toomey, 2009, 2010). According to the theory of social identity, interaction with a member of another culture enhances one's own group identity and thereby actualizes the norms, values, and behavioral patterns shared in a given culture (Ting-Toomey, 2010).

Despite the strong support of the theory of cultural influence on the choice of strategy in conflict behavior, results from other studies contradict this theory. For example, Drake (1995) found that when American and Taiwanese people conducted intercultural negotiations, they did not necessarily employ the strategies predicted by their culture. Instead, their choice was significantly influenced by individual and situational factors. As Worchel (2005) writes, despite the strong influence exerted, group values and attitudes do not always manifest themselves at the individual level of interaction. Thus, despite the existing well-founded theoretical model of intercultural conflict, empirical studies on predictors of the behavior of its participants remain too heterogeneous and often consider only a separate group of factors, which highlights the need for further systematic study of this topic.

Personal Values

In our study, we tried to examine the antecedents of conflict style choice in an intercultural conflict at various contextual levels. This was achieved by identifying personal determinants, as conflict styles are considered relatively stable patterns related to individual characteristics (Van de Vliert, 1997). Personal traits and values were developed as psychological constructs for explaining human behavior (e.g., Bardi & Schwartz, 2003). In our work, we decided to consider values as an individual-level predictor of conflict styles for the following reasons: First, evidence shows that values are good predictors of actualized behaviors (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014; Schwartz et al., 2017; Torres, Schwartz, & Nascimento, 2014). Due to the relationship between values and long-term goals, values can stimulate consistent behavior. Recent studies show that different types of behavior are affected primarily by their compatibility to one's values (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). Second, in the literature, values are also associated with ethnic and cultural attitudes, but, at the same time, values' effects on conflict styles in general—and on intercultural conflict styles in particu-

lar—are poorly studied (Davidov, Meuleman, Billiet, & Schmidt, 2008; Tartakovsky & Walsh, 2016).

In Schwartz's theory, 19 values are singled out that relate to four higher-order values (Schwartz et al., 2017): openness to change, conservation, self-enhancement, and self-transcendence. Values of openness to change carry with them the motives of independence in making decisions and actions, as well as openness to new experience, the search for new sensations, the "taste for life." Values of self-enhancement are associated with the desire for status, resources, social success, and power. Conservation values include a focus on security, maintaining norms and rules, and conforming and nonconflicting interactions with other people. The values of self-transcendence include tolerance and acceptance of other people, striving for equality, and the good of other people and the world as a whole.

Intercultural Communication Apprehension (ICA)

As antecedents of the interethnic level of intercultural communication, we emphasized ICA. This is a communicative expression of perceived threat (Croucher, 2013; Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). Communication apprehension is the most studied obstacle to a constructive dialogue (Trawalter, Adam, Chase-Lansdale, & Richeson, 2012; Turner, Crisp, & Lambert, 2007). ICA is defined as fear or anxiety associated with an expected or actual interaction with people from another ethnic or cultural group (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997). Uncertainty in communication leads to anxiety, while uncertainty in communicating with a person from another culture leads to anxiety in intercultural communication (Trawalter et al., 2012). As ICA increases, people are less likely to participate in intercultural interaction (Neuliep & Ryan, 1998). This can lead to a decrease in tolerance and increased biases toward people from different cultures (Croucher, 2013). If the level of ICA is reduced, then the desire to communicate with members of other cultures may increase (Turner et al., 2007).

In our study, we consider ICA specifically as a predictor rather than an intercultural competence for a number of reasons. First, as previously mentioned, ICA is directly related to the level of perceived threat, meaning that ICA will be actualized in the conflict situation (Oommen, 2013). Second, ICA is directly related to negative attitudes toward another ethnic group (Croucher, 2013). Third, although intercultural competence is a widely used construct, most studies differ in their definitions of both the competence itself and its components, choosing to include or exclude language skills, knowledge of other cultures, as well as certain personality traits such as emotional stability and openness to experience (Hammer, Bennett, & Wiseman, 2003). It remains unclear whether competence is an acquired skill or a set of certain personality traits.

Thus, it can be concluded that investigating the antecedents of conflict styles in an intercultural conflict at various contextual levels will, on one hand, help broaden the comprehension of the nature of intercultural conflicts in general, and may, on the other hand, help clarify which parameters should be accounted for when preventing and resolving such conflicts. In addition, we provide a detailed description of the contexts of each country included in the study below.

Contexts of the Study

The German Context

According to the OECD (2019), Germany has the second-highest number of immigrants of any country in the world (after the United States); the number of migrants in Germany has grown by 25% since 2007 and now stands at 13 million. Since 2015, refugees and internally displaced people from the Near East countries—primarily from Syria—have joined the list of labor and voluntary immigrants (UNHCR, 2017). After 2015, European countries registered over 2 million petitions from asylum seekers (Grigonis, 2016). According to the United Nations Refugee Agency (UNHCR, 2017), there are currently more than 6 million Syrian refugees in the world. In Europe, there are a million asylum seekers. German society was affected by this migratory crisis and faced the significant and rapid growth of Syrian refugees in its territory (Bertoli, Brücker, & Moraga, 2016).

The rise in the number of immigrants and refugees, and a number of subsequent intercultural collisions (e.g., New Year attacks on women in Germany in 2015/2016) and terrorist attacks, the responsibility for which was taken by Muslim terrorist organizations (supermarket in Hamburg, 2017; Christmas fair in Berlin, 2016; music festival in Ansbach, 2016; train near Würzburg, 2016), led to the rise in negative attitudes and prejudices toward Syrian migrants (Bertoli et al., 2016).

Although there was no clear correlation between the number of refugees and the increase in the level of terrorism, and even though United Nations representatives were provided with evidence to the contrary of this correlation, the level of perceived threat by Muslim migrants and the level of perceived threat in Europe dramatically increased hostility toward these migrants (Stanek, 2017; Zobi, 2017). Additionally, refugees are perceived not only as a threat to security but also as a cultural and economic threat, posing problems for maintaining and preserving cultural norms and rules, as well as the economic well-being of the country (Bertoli et al., 2016). Refugees from the Near East are also perceived by the host population as carriers of pathogens or dangerous diseases such as typhoid, tuberculosis, and malaria, which instigates further prejudice (Zobi, 2017). Thus, attitudes toward refugees in Germany can arise from multiple complex, interconnected threats on several levels. Syrian refugees generate a strong perception of threat, which leads to their dehumanization among the various social strata and ages of the host population (Gómez-Martínez & de la Villa Moral-Jiménez, 2018).

Currently, there are very few studies on the Germans' perception of Syrian refugees. So far, the lack of knowledge does not allow us to say with certainty what the impact was on the perception of Syrian refugees by the presence in Germany of long-living other groups of Muslim migrants (e.g., Turks). However, as a recent study in the framework of the model of stereotyping in Germany shows, Syrian refugees are separated in the perception of Germans from other groups of migrants and are rather low, both in terms of warmth and competency (Kotzur, Friehs, Asbrock, & van Zalk, 2019).

The Russian Context

Modern Russia is one of the most culturally heterogeneous countries in the world; according to the most recent 2010 census,

over 220 ethnic groups live within its boundaries (Karachurina & Mkrtchyan, 2017). Moreover, Russia ranks third in the world for the highest number of immigrants. At the same time, one of the key challenges faced by modern Russian society is the mutual acceptance and respect of different ethnic groups sharing their land (Lebedeva, Tatarko, & Berry, 2016). Relations between the national majority and some minorities in Russia remain volatile as Soviet-era ethnic hierarchies still continue to exert influence in Russian society (Minescu & Poppe, 2011). One of these minority groups is the North Caucasus peoples. The significant cultural distance between Russians and Caucasians, and the fact that most of the peoples of the North Caucasus are Islamic, undoubtedly influences their intercultural relations (Grigoryev & van de Vijver, 2018; Lebedeva et al., 2016). New findings by Grigoryev, Fiske, and Batkhina (2019) showed that the representatives of the North Caucasians are perceived by Russians as rather low on both dimensions of the stereotype content model (warmth and competence). Thus, the representation by ethnic Russians of North Caucasians is marred by negative stereotypes.

It is also worth noting that despite the fact that, according to various sources, from 50 to 62 different ethnic groups live in the Caucasus, including Christians and Jews, studies show that the ethnic majority of Russia perceives the inhabitants of the national republics of the North Caucasus as a relatively homogeneous group of Caucasians-Muslims (Lebedeva et al., 2016). As mentioned above, this group is quite stereotyped. For example, nationalist Russians use the same offensive name for all representatives of the North Caucasus, which emphasizes the perceived narrow-mindedness and "savagery" of the inhabitants of the Caucasus. Therefore, in our study, we set out to study the attitude of Russians to Caucasians as a whole, taking into account the fact that, first of all, the image of a Caucasians will be associated with Islam.

Furthermore, according to sociological research, the number of internal migrants in Russia has doubled in recent years and currently amounts to approximately 4 million people (87% of the total number of arrivals), while the peoples of the North Caucasus occupy a leading proportion of these (Karachurina & Mkrtchyan, 2017). According to the data for 2012, the number of representatives of the North Caucasus region in Moscow was 15.1% (~46,000 people) of the total number of Russians who came to the capital in the last 2 years (Karachurina & Mkrtchyan, 2017). Thus, the percentage of North Caucasians in regions with a predominantly Russian population is growing significantly. The growing number of contacts between Russians and representatives of the North Caucasus peoples, coupled with the presence of negative intergroup attitudes, can lead to conflicts. Over the past 15 years, Russia has seen a series of massive conflicts between Russians and representatives of the North Caucasians—for instance, the conflict in Kondopoga in 2006 and on the Manege Square in the center of Moscow in 2010. In addition, according to Kim (2005), during times of economic crisis, interethnic relations tend to deteriorate due to increased perceived competition for resources. In this regard, there is an acute practical need to study the intercultural Russian context and relations, which remain much less studied than, for example, those of the United States.

We chose these two countries as an analysis of cases for a number of reasons. In our study, we wanted to select a partially similar and partially different sociocultural context. Both countries are among the largest recipients of migrants and, if we compare Germany and the Central regions of Russia, then both of these geographical areas have long been relatively culturally homogeneous. Both Syrians and Caucasians are stereotypically perceived by the majority as a threat, which engenders growth of negative beliefs and prejudices. In addition, both groups are unduly associated with Islam and terrorism. The difference is the Syrians in Germany are refugees and immigrants who arrived in the country only a few years ago, whereas Caucasians in Russia and Russian citizens have lived side by side for a long time. At the same time, the situation in Germany is so recent that there is a scarcity of information on the host population's perceptions and actions toward this new influx of immigrants. Thus, the majority perception can make the selected groups similar, but the overall sociocultural and political context in both countries varies significantly.

Present Study

Based on the socioecological approach to intercultural communication, the aim of the present research was to examine the predictors of behavioral attitudes (conflict styles) in an intercultural conflict at the interpersonal dimension (values) and at the interethnic dimension (ICA) in order to form a comprehensive account of this phenomenon. In accordance with the terminology of Brofenbrenner, we explore intercultural conflict as a phenomenon unfolding simultaneously at the micro and macro levels. In addition, we conducted similar studies in two countries, Russia and Germany, to account for the macrolevel sociocultural context as well. However, we did not implement our study in the classic cross-cultural paradigm as we varied the research conditions across countries based on the actual social situation. Rather, we view our research as an emic analysis with elements of etic conceptualization for the systematic identification of behavioral patterns in an intercultural conflict.

Speaking of the notion of conflict behavioral styles, we use Rahim's taxonomy in both countries, as this approach proved itself to be useful in Western countries and in Russia (Rahim & Magner, 1995) and was also effectively used for the investigation of intercultural conflicts (Ting-Toomey, 2010). The conflict style is understood as a sample response of an individual to a conflict in different situations. The approach of Rahim is one of the modifications of the dual concern model. According to this model, all styles of behavior in conflicts are situated in a two-dimensional model, where one axis determines the degree of assertiveness and the other determines the degree of cooperation.

According to Rahim, five conflict styles are located in this coordinate system: "competing" (high assertiveness and low cooperation), "collaborating" (high assertiveness and high cooperation), "compromising" (an average level of assertiveness and cooperation), "accommodating" (low assertiveness and high cooperation), and "avoiding" (low assertiveness and low cooperation). However, following the logic of previous research that demonstrated that "compromising" does not constitute a separate style (Van de Vliert, 1997), our research operates on four styles.[1]

---

[1] The author's version of the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory-II (ROCI-II, 1983) identified five factors: collaborating, compromise, avoiding, obliging, and dominance. However, as we expected the results of our analysis showed that the four-factor model, where cooperation and compromise formed one factor, had better model fit (see Results section).

Table 1

The Expected Relationships for the Antecedents and Conflict Styles for Russia and Germany

Antecedent/conflict style	Dominance	Collaborating/compromise	Avoiding	Obliging
Openness to change	(+) Positive association, because this style implies an open and assertive interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies an open and assertive interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an indirect and unassertive interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an indirect and unassertive interaction
Self-transcendence	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an uncooperative interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies a cooperative interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an uncooperative interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies a cooperative interaction
Self-enhancement	(+) Positive association, because this style implies the use of pressure and violence towards the other side	(−) Negative association, because this style does not imply the use of pressure and violence towards the other side	(−) Negative association, because this style does not imply the use of pressure and violence towards the other side	(−) Negative association, because this style does not imply the use of pressure and violence towards the other side
Conservation	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an open and assertive interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an open and assertive interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies an indirect and unassertive interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies an indirect and unassertive interaction
Intercultural communication apprehension	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an open and assertive interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies an open, assertive and cooperative interaction	(+) Positive association, because this style implies an indirect and unassertive interaction	(−) Negative association, because this style implies cooperative interaction

Our study was more exploratory since we were extremely limited in the proposal of specific hypotheses due to the lack of extant empirical work investigating the associations between values, ICA, and behavioral styles in an intercultural conflict. However, we put forward a number of assumptions in Table 1 regarding the existence and nature of these associations based on theoretical concepts of the essence of values, conflicting styles, and ICA, respectively.

Considering the fact that this study examines an acutely social problem, prior to the empirical work, the survey was conducted and reviewed by the University Ethical Commission and received its approval. Prior to the survey, respondents received detailed information that the study was aimed at studying behaviors in intercultural conflict and was being performed for exclusively scientific purposes. Respondents were also informed that, in the course of the study, they would be asked to evaluate their behavior in a hypothetical conflict with a member of another culture; it was indicated that this situation was fictional and in no way speaks of the culture as a whole. After completing the study, respondents were reminded that they evaluated a hypothetical situation that does not exist in reality, and were also gently asked to remain respectful to members of all cultures. We also asked whether their opinion toward representatives of other cultures (Caucasian/Syrian) had changed and, if so, in what manner (improved/worsened). All responses (100%) in both samples stated that their opinion of the other culture had not changed. Respondents were also provided with the researchers' contact information should they require individual debriefing.

Method

Participants

The total sample comprised 455 participants including 221 Germans living in Germany (87 men and 134 women, M_{age} =

31.03, $SD = 11.23$, 10.7% was students) and 234 ethnic Russians living in Russia (93 men and 151 women, $M_{age} = 31.96$, $SD = 10.21$, 12.15% was students).

Procedure

A preliminary qualitative study was conducted to establish the most relevant conflict conditions for Germans and Russians before we produced a questionnaire and began data collection. In both countries, we conducted brief semistructured interviews with the author of this study, who speaks fluent Russian and German. Respondents were recruited through ads on social networks. In the interview, we asked which cultures they believed often have intercultural conflicts with the national majority and what they believed to be the underlying reasons for these conflicts. They were also asked to recall and describe such a conflict that occurred with, or was witnessed by, themselves or their acquaintances, and which they consider to be typical for daily Russian or German life, as appropriate (see interview guide in the Appendix). The interviews were 8–17 min long.

Respondents' answers were recorded on a voice recorder with their consent and then deciphered. All interview recordings underwent the coding procedure proposed by Strauss, where open, axial, and selective coding is performed alternately. During open coding, broad topics such as "place of conflict," "conflict participants," "cause of conflict," and so forth were identified and further specified in more precise codes. The coding procedure was performed by three experts in the field of social psychology from the Higher School of Economics, Moscow State University (for Russian interviews) and from Humboldt University (for German interviews). The codes were then mutually translated and the Cohen's kappa coefficient was calculated to be 0.82.

For Russians, we carried out structured interviews with 27 respondents (17 women, 10 men). The analysis of the responses showed the following: (a) the most typical perceived conflict

situations were from everyday life (e.g., in a public place, transport, a store); (b) the most typical intercultural conflict was a conflict with a member of the peoples from the North Caucasus; (c) the differentiation of the peoples of the North Caucasus into ethnicities was very weak, as respondents typically subsumed these ethnicities under the broader category of "Caucasians" (96.3% used the general term "Caucasians," whereas 3.6% specified the ethnic group "Chechens"). According to the respondents' opinions, the main reason for such conflicts was the "provoking" and "uncultured" behavior of members of these ethnic groups in public places. In the coding process, the code "the opponent of the conflict violated the norms of social behavior" was singled out; this code was contained in 81.5% of the conflict cases described in the interviews. Other reasons given for these conflicts included personal hostility, insults, and nationalistic proclamations.

For Germans, the preliminary interview was performed with 25 respondents (16 women, nine men). Of these, 72% recalled a conflict situation related to a migrant or refugee from Syria, whereas another 20% cited a conflict with a Turk, and 8% with a native of Eastern Europe. Next, we analyzed the conflicts with the Syrian refugees since they constituted the majority. Respondents believed that such conflicts occurred because Syrians disrespect German women, do not understand the German language, and violate unspoken social rules. German respondents also predominantly spoke of perceived inappropriate behavior by immigrants in public places.

After composing the questionnaire, participants were recruited to complete the questionnaire using a paid platform: "clickworker.com" for Germans and "anketolog.ru" for Russians (where respondents receive a small reward). Respondents received exactly $1 dollar for completing the questionnaire and the average completion time was 18 min. To address potential drop-out rates, we first ensured proper attention was exercised (upon completion of the survey, participants were asked to recall who was the opponent in a hypothetical conflict), and second, the completion time was less than 10 min. Participants received instructions that included information about the main topic discussed in the study, the confidentiality policy, and how to contact the researchers. Participation in the survey was completely anonymous, which was intended to reduce the impact of social desirability on responses.

Measures

The Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory–II (ROI-II) was translated and adapted using back-translation and the cognitive interview by the think-aloud technique. We attracted four native speakers (two men and two women) from each of the German and Russian sides to conduct this protocol. Think-aloud protocols involve participants thinking aloud as they perform a set of specified tasks. In this case, they discussed how each of the measurement item sounds, whether they understand its meaning, and whether everything is grammatically sound in their native language. A separate conversation was conducted with each participant. The 6- or 7-point Likert-type scales with different points were used for all items (more details below). Cronbach's alpha was indicated in parentheses: The first value is for Germans and second one is for Russians.

Dependent Variables

We assessed the ROCI–II (Rahim & Magner, 1995) in the modification by Oetzel, Myers, Meares, and Estefana (2003) for intercultural conflicts. Because not all respondents from the paid platforms have experienced participation in intercultural conflicts, we asked them to imagine a hypothetical conflict situation when, in their opinion, a member of another culture violated the norms and rules established in the majority culture. We then asked them to "indicate how much you agree that in this conflict situation you will behave in each of the ways presented below." At the same time, respondents were asked to take into account their real-life experiences of participation in intercultural conflicts or in any other conflicts in general. The Russian respondents were asked to imagine a conflict with a member of the North Caucasus ethnic groups whereas the German respondents were asked to imagined a conflict with a Syrian migrant. We did not specify the religious affiliation of the opponent in the conflict, because we were more interested in the perception of the ethnic group as a whole. Participants then evaluated how much each item corresponds to their assumed behavior in this conflict situation (7-point Likert scale: 1 = *strongly disagree*, 7 = *strongly agree*). The higher the respondents evaluated each item, the more they were confident that they would act in this conflict situation as indicated.

Antecedent Variables

Values. We administered Schwartz's Personal Values Questionnaire—Revised (PVQ–R; Schwartz et al., 2012) for measuring personal values. In this study, we considered four higher-order values: conservation, openness to change, self-enhancement, and self-transcendence. The questionnaire included 57 items describing a certain person. Respondents rated each item on a 6-point Likert scale (1 = *completely different from me*, 6 = *completely similar me*).

Intercultural communication apprehension. For measuring the level of ICA, we assessed the 14 items of the intercultural communication apprehension scale by Neuliep and McCroskey (1997).

Sociodemographic characteristics. Respondents indicated their gender, age, level of education, occupation, religion, income level, their own ethnicity, and ethnicity of their parents.

Data Analysis

To process the data, we used the statistical package SPSS 24.0 with the AMOS 24.0 application. In the preliminary analysis, we checked the missing data and outliers, and conducted confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) for all scales and verified convergent and divergent validity for ROCI-II, because the instruction of the measure was modified to evaluate intercultural conflicts. We calculated the following coefficients: Cronbach's alpha (α), Raykov's composite reliability (ω), average variance extracted (AVE), maximal reliability (H), maximum shared variance (MSV), and the square root of AVE. We were guided by the following reliability indicators: a scale is reliable if $\alpha > .70$, $\omega > .70$, and $H > .80$; convergent validity is acceptable if $AVE > .50$; discriminant validity is acceptable if $MSV < AVE$ and if the square root of AVE is larger than interconstruct correlations. For the CFA we

used the recommended global fit measures: CFI > .90, SRMR < .08, and RMSEA < .08 (Kline, 2011).

In addition, for data processing with PVQ-R questionnaire we used a standard procedure for centering each person's responses (e.g., Schwartz et al., 2012). Also, we used the following statistical procedures: descriptive statistics, partial correlation analysis (with bootstrapping ($n = 1,000$) with the following sociodemographic covariates: gender, age, education, religious affiliation), and hierarchical regression analysis. For hierarchical regression analysis, we also conducted the multicollinearity test. The influence of multicollinearity was considered as absent if the VIF was <3 (Kline, 2011).

Results

Measurement Model

We compared the four- and five-factor model of ROCI-II with the help of confirmatory factor analysis. For Germans, the constructed model for the four factors had better model fit, $\chi^2(192, N = 221) = 388.3$, $p < .001$, CFI = .927, RMSEA = .066, 95% CI [.058, .074], AIC = 724.733, SRMR = .064 than for five factors, $\chi^2(208, N = 221) = 471.2$, $p < .001$, CFI = .910, RMSEA = .068, 95% CI [.066, .082], AIC = 851.234, SRMR = .067. For Russians, the constructed model for the four factors had better model fit, $\chi^2(196, N = 234) = 394.4$, $p < .001$, CFI = .930, RMSEA = .069, 95% CI [.059, .079], AIC = 508.498, SRMR = .061 than for five factors, $\chi^2(210, N = 234) = 488.21$, $p < .001$, CFI = .917, RMSEA = .071, 95% CI [.066, .082], AIC = 651.234, SRMR = .067 (see Table 1).

We also calculated reliability, convergence and divergence validity for the four-factor model, they corresponded to the following values: $\omega > .70$, AVE > .50, MSV < AVE, and the square root of AVE > correlation coefficients. As can be seen from Table 2, one can speak of good validity and reliability of the measures. We also used the common latent factor method to determine the response style that is caused by social desirability. This analysis showed that the introduction of a general factor worsens the model fit in both samples, which allows us to say that the response style was not met in our research (see Table 3).

Analysis

We conducted a partial correlation analysis and a hierarchical regression analysis in three steps for each style. The Holmes-Bonferroni method was used to determine the level of correlations significance (the adjusted p value). At the first step, sociodemographic characteristics: gender, age, and level of education were used as predictors. In the second stage, we added four higher order values to the analysis. In the third stage, we included ICA. For both samples, a hierarchical regression analysis was conducted using the same model. Further, we consider the significant relationships separately for each conflict style in both samples (p values for partial correlations are indicated after the Holmes-Bonferroni correction).

Competing

In German sample, the partial correlation analysis showed that the competing style is positively related to self-enhancement, $r = .33$, $p = .008$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for competing is 16%. In the second stage of analysis, the competing style was significantly associated only with self-enhancement ($\beta = .32$, $p = .009$). In the third stage, the dominance style was positively related to self-enhancement ($\beta = .33$, $p = .007$) and negatively to gender ($\beta = -.40$, $p = .046$).

In Russian sample, the partial correlation analysis also revealed that the competing style is positively related to self-enhancement, $r = .39$, $p = .006$, and besides it to openness to change, $r = .23$, $p = .034$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for competing is 28%. In the first stage of analysis, competing is positively related to education level ($\beta = .15$, $p = .047$) and negatively to gender ($\beta = -.23$, $p = .007$). In the second and third stage, the strongest relationships for the competing style were obtained with the following predictors: gender ($\beta = -.17$, $p = .001$), self-enhancement ($\beta = .38$, $p < .001$), and self-transcendence ($\beta = -.37$, $p < .001$).

Collaborating

In German sample, the partial correlation analysis showed that the collaborating style is positively related to openness to change, $r = .40$, $p = .006$; self-transcendence, $r = .56$, $p < .001$; and negatively to ICA, $r = -.47$, $p = .002$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for collaborating is 46%. In the first stage, the collaborating style is positively associated with gender ($\beta = .54$, $p = .037$). In the first stage, the collaborating style is positively associated with gender ($\beta = .4$, $p = .046$) and self-transcendence ($\beta = .58$, $p < .001$). In the third, significant relationships were found with conservation ($\beta = .22$, $p = .03$), self-transcendence ($\beta = .40$, $p < .001$), ICA ($\beta = -.38$, $p < .001$), and gender ($\beta = .38$, $p = .041$).

In Russian sample, the partial correlation analysis also revealed that the collaborating style is positively related to openness to

Table 2

Model Fit for Factor Structure of ROCI-II for the German (N = 221) and Russian (N = 234) Samples

Factor model	χ^2	CFI	RMSEA 95% CI	AIC	SRMR
1. German sample four-factor model	388.3	.927	.066 [.058, .074]	724.733	.064
2. German sample five-factor model	471.2	.910	.068 [.066, .082]	851.234	.067
3. Russian sample four-factor model	394.4	.930	.069 [.059, .079]	508.498	.061
4. Russian sample four-factor model	488.21	.917	.071 [.066, .082]	651.234	.067

Table 3

Convergent and Divergent Validity of ROCI-II for the German (N = 221) and Russian (N = 234) Samples

Conflict style	ω	AVE	MSV	H	Correlations			
					1	2	3	4
Collaborating	.942/.932	.603/.582	.062/.028	.954/.941	.776/.763	.001	.248	.132
Dominance	.870/.880	.631/.714	.017/.024	.915/.928	−.105	.794/.845	.132	−.038
Avoiding	.866/.799	.520/.509	.465/.132	.870/.852	.168	.029	.721/.713	.682
Obliging	.901/.878	.606/.596	.465/.132	.914/.913	.034	.156	.364	.779/.772

Note. ω = Raykov's composite reliability; AVE = average variance extracted; MSV = maximum shared variance; H = maximal reliability; square root of AVE (on diagonal and underlined). Above the diagonal are the values of correlations of latent variables for the Germans and under the diagonal for the Russians.

change, $r = .31$, $p = .009$; self-transcendence, $r = .35$, $p < .006$; and negatively to ICA, $r = −.28$, $p = .018$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for collaborating is 24%. In the second third stage, collaborating is positively associated with openness to change ($β = .22$, $p = .031$) and self-transcendence ($β = .47$, $p < .001$) In the third stage, collaborating is positively associated with openness to change ($β = .18$, $p = .024$) and self-transcendence ($β = .40$, $p < .001$), and negatively with ICA ($β = −.16$, $p = .016$).

Avoidance

In German sample, the partial correlation analysis showed that the avoiding style is positively related to self-transcendence, $r = .32$, $p = .008$; and conservation, $r = .46$, $p = .004$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for avoiding is 24%. In the second and third stage of analysis, the avoiding style was significantly positively associated only with conservation ($β = .52$, $p < .001$).

In Russian sample, the partial correlation analysis also revealed that the avoiding style is positively related to conservation, $r = .22$, $p = .038$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for avoiding is 13%. In the first stage of analysis, avoiding is negatively related to education level ($β = −.15$, $p = .047$). In the second stage, avoiding is negatively related to education level ($β = −.15$, $p = .047$) and positively to conservation ($β = .30$, $p = .005$). In the third stage,

avoiding had positive relationships with conservation ($β = .23$, $p = .003$) and ICA ($β = .21$, $p = .004$).

Obliging

In German sample, the partial correlation analysis showed that the obliging style is positively related to self-transcendence, $r = .48$, $p = .003$; and conservation, $r = .45$, $p = .004$. According to the regression analysis, the overall percentage of the explained variance for obliging is 34%. In the second stage and the third stage, the obliging style was also positively related to the conservation values ($β = .40$, $p = .003$) and also with self-transcendence ($β = .26$, $p = .006$).

In Russian sample, the regression analysis showed that obliging had one significant negative association with the education level ($β = −.21$, $p = .004$). The shared explained variance is 9%.

All results are represented in the Tables 4 and 5.

Discussion

Our research examined the prediction of conflict styles in an intercultural conflict by assessing self-reported personal values and ICA. We used a comparative perspective between Germany and Russia to establish generalizable patterns and provide a more holistic view of this phenomenon. We must once again emphasize that we did not investigate actual behavior but, rather, considered the attitudes toward certain behaviors in the context of an inter-

Table 4

Descriptive Statistics and Partial Correlations for the German (N = 221) and Russian (N = 234) Samples

Variable	M	SD	Correlations								
			1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
1. Dominance	3.58/3.67	1.11/1.60	—	.02	.10	.09	.19	.33**	.12	.19	−.04
2. Collaborating	5.05/5.00	1.25/1.30	.01	—	.21*	.24*	.40**	.12	.56***	.26*	−.47**
3. Avoiding	4.09/3.74	1.27/1.33	.04	.07	—	.33**	.02	.14	.32**	.46**	.03
4. Obliging	4.30/2.67	1.09/1.25	.12	.13	.40**	—	.21	.12	.48**	.45**	−.19
5. Openness to change	3.53/3.84	.72/.75	.23*	.31**	−.02	−.05	—	.27*	.42**	.14	−.30*
6. Self-enhancement	2.88/3.17	.78/.93	.39**	.06	.12	.09	.26*	—	.18	.36**	.17
7. Self-transcendence	3.80/3.31	.80/1.03	.01	.35**	.13	.03	.39**	.19	—	.37**	−.39**
8. Conservation	3.21/4.10	.66/.87	.16	.16	.22*	.06	.18	.31**	.24*	—	.16
9. ICA	3.07/3.36	1.42/1.54	.02	−.28*	.17	.13	−.16	.09	−.14	.04	—

Note. ICA = intercultural communication apprehension. Above the diagonal are the values of correlations of latent variables for the Germans and under the diagonal for the Russians. The covariates included following socio demographic variables: gender, age, level of education, religious affiliation (yes/no).
* $p < .05$.   ** $p < .01$.   *** $p < .001$ (after Holm-Bonferroni correction).

BATKHINA

Table 5
Hierarchical Regression Analysis to Examine the Prediction of Conflict Styles by Personal Values and ICA for the German (N = 221) and Russian (N = 234) Samples

Variable	Dominance			Collaborating			Avoiding			Obliging		
	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β	Step 1 β	Step 2 β	Step 3 β
Gender	−.36*/−.23**	−.39*/−.17**	−.40*/−.17**	.54*/.06	.40*/.05	.38*/.04	−.11/.01	−.16/−.02	−.16/.01	.15/−.16	.07/−.15	.06/−.15
Age	.03/−.03	.01/.11	.03/.09	.01/.10	.01/.10	.01/.08	−.01/.10	−.01/.01	−.01/.03	−.01/−.10	−.01/.09	−.01/.11
Education	.07/.15*	.04/.07	.03/.06	.09/−.04	.08/.02	.06/.01	−.04/−.15*	−.01/−.16*	−.01/−.14	.02/−.21**	.03/−.22**	−.01/−.21**
Openness to change		.14/.15	.12/.14		.13/.22*	.06/.18*		.04/−.18*	.05/−.13		.07/−.09	.05/−.07
Self-enhancement		.32*/.37***	.33**/.38***		−.03/−.14	.03/−.12		.04/.07	.02/.04		.01/.13	.03/.12
Conservation		.06/.14	.09/.17		.08/−.23	.22*/−.17		.55***/.30**	.52***/.23**		.36**/.06	.40*/.02
Self-transcendence		−.01/−.34**	−.06/−.37**		.58***/.47***	.40***/.40***		.20/−.06	.23/.02		.33**/−.04	.26**/.01
ICA			−.10/−.08			−.38***/−.16*			.06/.21**			−.13/.09
ΔR²	.01/.08	.13/.19	.02/.01	.04/.01	.34/.17	.12/.06	.01/.02	.23/.07	<.01/.04	.01/.06	.31/.02	.02/.01
Total R²		.14/.27	.16/.28		.38/.18	.46/.24		.24/.09	.24/.13		.32/.08	.34/.09

Note. ICA = intercultural communication apprehension.
* p < .05.   ** p < .01.   *** p < .001.

cultural conflict. The associations of these conflict style preferences with personal values and ICA were analyzed. Our assumptions about the directions of these relationships were accurate but only partially confirmed. As can be seen from the findings of correlations and hierarchical regression analyses, for each style preference (with the exception of "obliging" in the Russian sample), one or two values held the greatest explanatory power, whereas the other values did not display any significant links with the style: "competing" is the value of self-enhancement for both countries and self-transcendence in the Russian sample; "collaborating" is the value of self-transcendence; "avoiding" is the value of conservation; and "accommodating," in the German sample, is also the value of conservation. This corroborates the finding in recent studies that values predict only those behaviors for the basis in which they lie (Bardi & Schwartz, 2003; Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). In addition, a strong opposite direction of values that form competing pairs was revealed in some—but not all—styles. Perhaps the value that is more significant for a specific conflict style suppresses the influence of its pair.

We can also assume that some strategies employed in conflict behaviors may have fundamental motives that relate to the value orientations opposite to Schwartz's taxonomy. For example, as the correlation analysis showed, cooperation can be simultaneously positively related to the values of conservation (the motive of security and conformism), because this is a socially acceptable manner of resolving conflicts, and with the values of openness to change (the motive of new knowledge and independence in decision making), as it implies an open and clear discussion of the problem.

Despite the differences in the initial conditions of two studies in these countries and the statistical differences of the model being tested, we can, in our opinion, draw a number of common qualitative conclusions. For both countries, a repetitive and sufficiently significant positive association between the following pairs of values and conflict styles was revealed: self-transcendence—collaborating, self-enhancement—dominance, and conservation—avoiding. These interrelations correspond to our assumptions made on the basis of a theoretical model. As was revealed in the motivational analysis of values and styles, these values may actually lie in the basis of the goals of each style. For example, one of the goals of dominance is to "win" over the other side, demonstrate one's power and strength, and place favorably in the social hierarchy (Rahim & Magner, 1995). All of these semantic constructs are also contained in the values of self-enhancement (Schwartz & Butenko, 2014). This allows us to assume that values are universal antecedents of behavior in not only intercultural conflicts, but in conflicts of various kinds.

As for the specific intercultural communication predictor ICA, we can here say that it does not manifest within all styles. In the Russian sample, ICA is negatively associated with "collaborating" and positively with "avoiding" styles. In the German sample, ICA is negatively associated with a "collaborating" style; no other significant links were identified. This may be due to the asymmetry of the antecedents of conflict styles—namely, the fact that some styles are more conditioned by personality traits, whereas others are more conditioned by situational factors (Pruitt, Rubin, & Kim, 2003). Apparently, for those who are accustomed to using a "dominating" style, the perceived threat is not an obstacle to the manifestation of one's own persever-

ance; however, it is also a serious obstacle to the adoption of a "collaborating" style. This once again confirms that intercultural contact is useless—or even harmful—if the parties perceive one another as threatening.

At the same time, of course, the different conditions of the conflicts for the two countries and the different histories of the relationship between the Russians and Caucasians (which have a long-standing negative connotation on both sides, even within experiences of armed conflicts) and the Germans and Syrians (whose relations are just beginning to take shape), influences conflict style preferences and the underlying motivations for these preferences.

These results confirm the notion that conflict style choice is a complex phenomenon that can be exposed to all three groups of factors: dispositional, situational, and cultural. Also, our data fit well into a socioecological context, which suggests that intercultural conflict takes place at several levels at once.

Of course, intercultural conflict is, in many respects, a reflection of the sociocultural and sociopolitical processes taking place in a given society. As has been shown in numerous studies, the dynamics of elites and power inequality have an effect on interethnic relations (Abbink & Salverda, 2013; Durante & Fiske, 2017). For example, competition for the power of the elite sometimes utilizes ethnic stereotypes to carry out mobilization along ethnic lines, which rarely contributes to harmonious interethnic relations (Wedel, 2017). For instance, in recent years, due to the deterioration of relations with Western countries and the deterioration of the country's socioeconomic condition, the Russian elite have been actively employing ethnic self-affirmation and Russian self-determination to increase levels of patriotism, emphasize Russia's special path, and exalt the merits of the past. Despite the fact that, as mentioned above, Russia is a multicultural country, the federal government in its discourse often appeals to the values and traditions of Russian culture and Orthodoxy directly, which often leads to a perception of any non-Russians, even as citizens of Russia, by the national majority as a foreign element of society. As for Germany, with the weakening of the ruling coalition's positions, various political forces are using anti-immigration sentiments to achieve their own goals. While the official policy of the ruling authorities is the adoption and integration of refugees, opposition and local politicians increasingly talk about the migrant threat. Such conflicting messages undoubtedly affect public opinion.

The German Sample

German respondents also showed the greatest preference for a "collaborating" style, while the second place in terms of mean scores went to the style of "obliging," which is considered flexible. Perhaps this "obliging" preference is due to the shared policy (at least at the public level) of tolerance toward migrants and refugees (Grigonis, 2016). It is probable that many Germans are reticent to come across as aggressive, intolerant, or nationalistic (Faulkner, 2017). Another possible explanation is the presence of a language barrier, such that the local population may be able to disengage from conflicts more quickly because they may not see an opportunity to build open dialogue.

As for the regression analysis, we see a picture emerge that is somewhat different from the Russian picture, but nevertheless similar in the sense that each style has one or two values that best explain its preference. For dominance, the most important value is, like in the Russian sample, self-enhancement (the desire for power and achievements). In the German sample, men are also more likely to use it, demonstrating masculine attitudes to conflict resolution.

The "collaborating" style is positively associated not only with self-transcendence but, in contrast to our assumptions, with the conservation values that are aimed at security and the adherence to traditions and social norms. Many Germans may see a constructive dialogue with migrants as the most effective method for their adaptation and integration into the host society. Thus, they may see that, through cooperation and integration, they can, on their own terms, safely include immigrants and refugees into a new life. Furthermore, negative associations with ICA are frequently expressed and the "collaborating" style is related to gender; it is more typical for women who may also express more conservation-related values (Van de Vliert, 1997).

It is interesting that the "avoiding" style is not associated with ICA. Thus, in the case of the Germans, ICA still prevents effective dialogue, but fails to provoke a complete termination of contact. It is possible that the German respondents did not experience a threat substantial enough (the average ICA score was modest) to abandon the interaction entirely. Nevertheless, as we assumed, the "avoiding" style displayed a pronounced positive association with conservation values. The obliging style is also, as we assumed, significantly positively related to both conservation (accommodating in the conflict ensuring the fulfillment of the interests of the other side, as it were, guarantees the safety to the other side) and with self-transcendence (this style is most strongly associated with the desire to help the other side) values (Pruitt et al., 2003).

The Russian Sample

We examined the antecedents of the preferred conflict styles of Russians in an imaginary conflict with members of North Caucasian groups. We associate a high mean score of the "collaborating" style with social desirability and the fact that the respondents could actually be confident that they would behave in such conflicts in the most constructive way. The next most preferred style was "avoiding." First, this conflict-resolution approach is quite typical in Russian society (Grishina, 2008). Second, the situation of conflict with the member of the North Caucasians may indeed be perceived as threatening, which may motivate avoidance of open interaction.

The lowest mean score relates to the "obliging" style. Regression analysis revealed that this style is only associated with level of education and this association is a negative one. We propose the following explanation for this finding: The highly stratified hierarchy of Russian society, including attitudes of the national majority toward ethnic minority groups (Minescu & Poppe, 2011), can lead to the fact that an "obliging" style (i.e., satisfying the needs of the other party at the expense of one's own needs) employed during conflicts with North Caucasians may be perceived as weak and, therefore, humiliating. This may be more important for those who are more educated and, therefore, are more likely held in higher esteem in this society (Pruitt et al., 2003). This is certainly only an assumption and requires further statistical verification. We also believe that such questions regard-

ing the motives and reasons for choosing an intercultural conflict style can be answered by additional qualitative or mixed research.

Preference for a "dominating" style, as predicted, was significantly positively associated with values of self-enhancement and negatively associated with values of self-transcendence. This result is in accordance with the notion of a "dominating" style being based on the desire to achieve its goal in any manner, to "defeat" the opponent and thereby "win" the argument (Rahim & Magner, 1995). In addition, quite as expected, men were more prone to aggressive conflict interaction than women were (Gbadamosi, Baghestan, & Al-Mabrouk, 2014). However, a "dominating" style was completely unrelated to ICA. As some researchers suggest, this style is more likely than others to constitute a stable personality trait and is less affected by the impact of situational or cultural factors (Guerrero, 2013).

As we assumed, openness to change and self-transcendence are positively associated with a "collaborating" style. This fully aligns with theoretical concepts of the nature of collaboration that imply not only a high concern for one's own interests and those of the other party (which, in this sense, corresponds to the values of self-transcendence), but also an ability to engage in dialogue, find effective joint solutions, and conceive an alternative point of view (which corresponds to the values of openness to change). In addition, a "collaborating" style was negatively correlated with ICA. This is consistent with the position of intercultural communication theories that states that a sense of threat and high anxiety when interacting with an outgroup member comprises one of the key obstacles to normalizing relations and makes it difficult to establish a constructive intercultural dialogue (Neuliep & McCroskey, 1997; Neuliep & Ryan, 1998).

The "avoiding" style is positively associated with the values of conservation and ICA. As a rule, the motivation for choosing this style during a conflict is associated with unwillingness to engage in open interaction that is in good agreement with values such as conformity, security, and modesty, which are part of the values of conservation (Guerrero, 2013). The link between an "avoiding" style and ICA is consistent with the findings of studies demonstrating that anxiety interferes with positive intergroup contact (Turner et al., 2007). Interestingly, the correlation between ICA and preferences of the "avoiding" style can also be considered as one of the few positive consequences of ICA. Thus, a high level of apprehension can restrain more negative aspects of intergroup relations such as conflicts. This is in line with Coser's (1998) idea that the very threat of social conflicts in a given society is the force that prevents their occurrence.

Limitations and Further Research

This study has a number of limitations. First, respondents' answers of their self-reported prospective behavior in a conflict were likely influenced by social desirability. In addition, respondents rated hypothetical—rather than actual—behavior. Thus, they displayed their attitudes more than their real behavior. Moreover, quantitative research fails to provide unequivocal predictors of conflict behavior. In this regard, we see great potential in conducting further mixed research where a quantitative survey will complement an interview or case analysis. This will enable researchers to further delineate the perceived motives for choosing certain conflict styles, as well as expand the comprehension of the vari-

ability of conflict styles, going beyond the usual pattern of dual concern model.

Our model dealt with personal values and did not describe the effects of traits that may also matter as they can separate the variance with values. Moreover, we did not consider situational predictors. The research of situational antecedents could explain why some contexts cause relatively homogeneous changes in conflict behavior. Future experimental studies involving situational influence would be useful for a deeper understanding of the topic. It is also certainly necessary for future research to consider the behavior in an intercultural conflict at all levels proposed in models of intercultural communication.

Implications and Conclusions

The present work offers both theoretical and practical implications. In our study in two countries, we received significant associations between the following pairs of values and conflict styles: self-transcendence and collaborating, self-enhancement and dominance, and conservation and avoiding. As for intercultural communication apprehension, this predictor was negatively associated with collaborating. In our work, we also found cultural features for these associations. Thus, in general, we can conclude that both values and ICA can be considered as predictors of behavior in an intercultural conflict. We believe that the obtained results can be used for practical recommendations in the field of intercultural mediation and conflict resolution.

The main applied value of this work is that we see that the study allowed us to take a fresh look at the nature of the motives for choosing a style in an intercultural conflict (because we consider values as motivational goals of behavior). We assume that the agenda dictated by politicians can actualize certain motives among the population, which in turn will incline them to choose certain styles of conflict with respect to migrants and ethnic minorities.

We can formulate the thesis that, in order to effectively resolve intercultural conflicts, it is necessary first of all to reduce the level of fear and anxiety regarding external and internal migrants that exists in society. It is necessary to change the image of a Muslim migrant, which is associated with terrorism and other threats among many residents of Europe and Russia. We also assume that for effective intercultural dialogue it is necessary to actualize the motives of universalism and self-transcendence among people, so that they can see in each other primarily a person with the same desires, problems, and difficulties, to understand the universal human that unites them.

In turn, we should reject the growing right-wing rhetoric and the ethnic mobilization policy used in some European countries, Russia, and the United States, and, on the contrary, actualize the values of self-enhancement and security (conservation), which, according to our study, can only lead to an increase in destructive intercultural conflicts.

References

Abbink, J., & Salverda, T. (2013). *The anthropology of elites: Power, culture, and the complexities of distinction*. New York, NY: Palgrave Macmillan. http://dx.doi.org/10.1057/9781137290557

Bardi, A., & Schwartz, S. H. (2003). Values and behavior: Strength and structure of relations. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 29,* 1207–1220. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0146167203254602

Bar-Tal, D., Halperin, E., Sharvit, K., & Zafran, A. (2012). Ethos of conflict: The concept and its measurement. *Peace and Conflict, 18,* 40–61. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0026860

Bertoli, S., Brücker, H., & Moraga, J. F.-H. (2016). The European crisis and migration to Germany. *Regional Science and Urban Economics, 60,* 61–72. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.regsciurbeco.2016.06.012

Brofenbrenner, U. (1979). *The ecology of human development.* Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Clark, J. N. (2012). The 'crime of crimes': Genocide, criminal trials and reconciliation. *Journal of Genocide Research, 14,* 55–77. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/14623528.2012.649895

Coser, L. A. (1998). *The functions of social conflict.* London, UK: Routledge.

Croucher, S. M. (2013). Communication apprehension, self-perceived communication competence, and willingness to communicate: A French analysis. *Journal of International and Intercultural Communication, 6,* 298–316. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17513057.2013.769615

Davidov, E., Meuleman, B., Billiet, J., & Schmidt, P. (2008). Values and support for immigration: A cross-country comparison. *European Sociological Review, 24,* 583–599. http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/esr/jcn020

Drake, L. E. (1995). Negotiation styles in intercultural communication. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 6,* 72–90. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/eb022756

Durante, F., & Fiske, S. T. (2017). How social-class stereotypes maintain inequality. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 18,* 43–48. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2017.07.033

Faulkner, N. (2017). Motivating cosmopolitan helping: Thick cosmopolitanism, responsibility for harm, and collective guilt. *International Political Science Review, 38,* 316–331. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0192512116630750

Gbadamosi, O., Baghestan, A. G., & Al-Mabrouk, K. (2014). Gender, age and nationality: Assessing their impact on conflict resolution styles. *Journal of Management Development, 33,* 245–257. http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/JMD-02-2011-0024

Gómez-Martínez, C., & de la Villa Moral-Jiménez, M. (2018). Dehumanization and Islamopohobia: Attitudes towards the Syrian refugee crisis. *Revista de Psicología Social.* Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/02134748.2018.1435218

Grigonis, S. (2016). EU in the face of migrant crisis: Reasons of ineffective human rights protection. *International Comparative Jurisprudence, 2,* 93–98.

Grigoryev, D., Fiske, S., & Batkhina, A. (2019). Stereotype content model in Russia: An integration of approaches to ethnic stereotypes. *Cultural Diversity & Ethnic Minority Psychology.* Manuscript submitted for publication.

Grigoryev, D., & van de Vijver, F. (2018). Acculturation expectation profiles of Russian majority group members and their intergroup attitudes. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 64,* 90–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2018.03.001

Grishina, N. V. (2008). *Psihologiya konflikta* [Psychology of conflict]. Saint-Petersburg, Russia: Piter.

Guerrero, L. K. (2013). Emotion and communication in conflict interaction. In J. G. Oetzel & S. Ting-Toomey (Eds.), *The Sage handbook of conflict communication* (2nd ed., pp. 105–131). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications. http://dx.doi.org/10.4135/9781452281988.n5

Hammer, M. R. (2015). The Developmental paradigm for intercultural competence research. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 48,* 12–13. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2015.03.004

Hammer, M. R., Bennett, M. J., & Wiseman, R. (2003). Measuring intercultural sensitivity: The intercultural development inventory. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 27,* 421–443. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S0147-1767(03)00032-4

Karachurina, L. B., & Mkrtchyan, N. V. (2017). Vnutrennyaya dolgovremennaya migraciya naseleniya v Rossii i drugih stranah [Internal longitudinal migration of the population in Russia and other countries]. *MSU Vestnik, 2,* 74–80.

Kim, Y. Y. (2005). Association and dissociation: A contextual theory of interethnic communication. In W. B. Gudykunst (Ed.), *Theorizing about intercultural communication* (pp. 323–349). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Kline, R. B. (2011). *Principles and practice of structural equation modeling* (3rd ed.). New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Kotzur, P. F., Friehs, M., Asbrock, F., & van Zalk, M. H. W. (2019). Stereotype content of refugee subgroups in Germany. *European Journal of Social Psychology.* Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2585

Lebedeva, N., Tatarko, A., & Berry, J. W. (2016). Intercultural relations among migrants from Caucasus and Russians in Moscow. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 52,* 27–38. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2016.03.001

Marsella, A. J. (2005). Culture and conflict: Understanding, negotiating, and reconciling conflicting constructions of reality. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29,* 651–673. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.07.012

Matsumoto, D., & Hwang, H. C. (2015). The role of contempt in intercultural communication. *Cross-Cultural Research: The Journal of Comparative Social Science, 40,* 439–460. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1069397115599542

McCarthy, K., & Rodes, E. (2018). A resource dependence perspective on intergroup conflict: The synthesis of two theories. *Journal of Theoretical Social Psychology.* Advance online publication. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/jts5.22

Minescu, A., & Poppe, E. (2011). Intergroup conflict in Russia: Testing the group position model. *Social Psychology Quarterly, 74,* 166–191. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0190272511408057

Neuliep, J. W., & McCroskey, D. (1997). The development of intercultural and interethnic communication apprehension scales. *Communication Research Reports, 14,* 145–156. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824099709388656

Neuliep, J. W., & Ryan, D. J. (1998). The influence of intercultural communication apprehension and socio-communicative orientation on uncertainty reduction during initial cross-cultural interaction. *Communication Quarterly, 46,* 88–99. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/01463379809370086

OECD. (2019). *International migration outlook 2019.* Paris, France: Author.

Oetzel, J., Myers, K., Meares, M., & Estefana, L. (2003). Interpersonal conflict in organizations: Exploring conflict styles via face-negotiation theory. *Communication Research Reports, 20,* 106–115. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/08824090309388806

Oommen, D. (2013). The relationship between mental distress, assessed in terms of anxiety and depression, and conflict management in the context of cultural adaptation. *Journal of Intercultural Communication Research, 42,* 91–111. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/17475759.2012.744341

Pruitt, D., Rubin, J., & Kim, S. H. (2003). *Social conflict: Escalation, stalemate, and settlement.* New York, NY: McGraw-Hill Education.

Rahim, M. A., & Magner, N. R. (1995). Confirmatory factor analysis of the styles of handling interpersonal conflict: First-order factor model and its invariance across groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 80,* 122–132. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.80.1.122

Schwartz, S. H., & Butenko, T. (2014). Values and behavior: Validating the refined value theory in Russia. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 44,* 799–813. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2053

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Davidov, E., Fischer, R., Beierlein, C., . . . Konty, M. (2012). Refining the theory of basic individual values. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 103,* 663–688. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/a0029393

Schwartz, S. H., Cieciuch, J., Vecchione, M., Torres, C., Dirilen-Gumus, O., & Butenko, T. (2017). Value tradeoffs propel and inhibit behavior: Validating the 19 refined values in four countries. *European Journal of Social Psychology, 47,* 241–258. http://dx.doi.org/10.1002/ejsp.2228

Stanek, M. (2017). The humanitarian crisis and civil war in Syria: Its impact and influence on the migration crisis in Europe. *Kontakt, 19,* 270–275. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.kontakt.2017.09.013

Tartakovsky, E., & Walsh, S. D. (2016). Testing a new theoretical model for attitudes toward immigrants: The case of social workers attitudes toward asylum seekers in Israel. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology, 47,* 72–96. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022115613860

Thayer, B. A. (2004). *Darwin and international relations: On the evolutionary origins of war and ethnic conflict.* Lexington: University Press of Kentucky.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2009). Intercultural conflict competence as a facet of intercultural competence development. In D. K. Deardorff (Ed.), *The Sage handbook of intercultural competence* (pp. 100–120). Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Ting-Toomey, S. (2010). Applying dimensional values in understanding intercultural communication. *Communication Monographs, 77,* 169–180. http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/03637751003790428

Ting-Toomey, S., & Oetzel, J. G. (2001). *Managing intercultural conflict effectively.* Thousand Oaks, CA: SAGE Publications.

Torres, C. V., Schwartz, S. H., & Nascimento, T. G. (2014). The refined theory of values: Associations with behavior and evidences of discrim-

inative and predictive validity. *Psicologia USP, 27,* 341–356. http://dx.doi.org/10.1590/0103-656420150045

Trawalter, S., Adam, E. K., Chase-Lansdale, P. L., & Richeson, J. A. (2012). Concern about appearing prejudiced get under the skin: Stress responses to interracial contact in the moment and across time. *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology, 48,* 682–693. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jesp.2011.12.003

Turner, R. N., Crisp, R. J., & Lambert, E. (2007). Imagining intergroup contact can improve intergroup attitudes. *Group Processes & Intergroup Relations, 10,* 427–441. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/1368430207081533

UNHCR. (2017). *Global report 2017.* Turin, Italy: International Training Centre of the ILO.

Van de Vliert, E. (1997). *Complex interpersonal conflict behavior.* London, UK: Psychology Press.

Wedel, J. R. (2017). From power elites to influence elites: Resseting elite studies for the 21st century. *Theory, Culture & Society, 34,* 153–178. http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0263276417715311

Worchel, S. (2005). Culture's role in conflict and conflict management: Some suggestions, many questions. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 29,* 739–757. http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijintrel.2005.08.011

Zobi, F. (2017). Syrian refugees in Europe: Responses of the EU and the Member States. *Journal of European Studies, 33,* 77–90.

Appendix

The Guide of Interview

- How can I call you?
- How old are you?
- What is your occupation?
- What is your nationality?
- What do you think, in which sphere of life there one can face the most typical and widespread intercultural conflicts in your country?
- Could you recall and describe in detail a similar intercultural conflict, which you consider to be quite typical for your country and which happened to you or your friends?

- If the conflict occurred with your friend, how well do you know what exactly happened?
- Please describe the participants of the conflict, their nationality.
- What is the reason for the conflict?
- In what situation/context did the conflict occur?
- How did the conflict start?
- How did the parties to the conflict manifest themselves? What actions have you taken?
- How did the conflict end?