Toward a Normative Theory of Relationship Management

Chun-ju Flora Hung

Ph.D. Candidate, University of Maryland

Completed under the supervision of

Dr. James E. Grunig

Department of Communication

University of Maryland

College Park, MD 20742

Acknowledgement

The author would like to thank the following people:

The 40 participants from 36 multinational companies, for their time and commitment in the lengthy interview processes.

The project advisor, **Dr. James E. Grunig**, for his advices, in the theory development and methodology consideration. Also, for his continuous moral support and dedication in the entire lengthy research process.

The colleagues in the Research and Measurement Department of Ketchum in New York, especially my mentor, **Mr. Graham Hueber,** and **Ms. Nancy Lazarus**, for their valuable support and sharing of resources in this research.

The Institute for Public Relations, **Dr. Jack Felton** and **Michelle Hinson**, for their confidence and patience in my research.

Dr. Larissa A. Grunig, for her moral support, encouragement, and inputs in the qualitative methods.

Yi-Ru Chen, for her assistance in the data collection process and pretests. **Jeff He**, for his assistance in pretests.

Dr. Jack Kleiman, for his wonderful kindness in editing this project.

The anonymous reviewers, for their participation in the study proposal.

INTRODUCTION

Purpose of Study

The study on relationship management has become one of the most important research topics in recent years (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 2000; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001; Hung, 2000a). In reviewing the development on this topic, Broom, Casey, and Ritchey (2000), frustrated by a lack of definition of "relationship," reviewed the literature and constructed a definition for organization-public relationships. In addition, they also developed a model of the antecedents and consequences of organization-public relationships. Ledingham and Bruning's (2000) edited book examining organization-public relationships (OPR) from the following perspectives: the general theories (J. Grunig & Huang, 2000; Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 2000), applications in different areas, such as crisis management (Coombs, 2000), issues management (Bridges & Nelson, 2000), and community relations (Wilson, 2000). Huang (1997) provided relationship indicators, which include trust, control mutuality, relational commitment, and relational satisfaction, which have become the major areas for later research (Brunner, 2000; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Len-Rios, 2001).

Hon and J. Grunig (1999) provided a guideline for measuring OPR. In this guideline, the following six relationship indicators are identified: control mutuality, trust, commitment, satisfaction, communal relationships, and exchange relationships. The instruments provided in the guideline were adopted in Brunner's (2000) research on the relationship between campus diversity and relationship outcomes and Len-Rios's (2001) research of on-line organization-public relationships. This guideline also provided insight on why relationship outcomes are different as a result of the different types of relationships, for example, communal and exchange relationships.

Yet, the framework of relationship management J. Grunig and Huang (2000) proposed has not yet been evaluated in empirical studies. In addition, as public relations practices became a global phenomenon, one should take the influence of culture into consideration when discussing about the global practices of relationship management.

In this study, therefore, I intend to find out how multinational companies manage relationships with their publics in China. I hope, by conducting this study, I can also extend the findings to develop a normative theory of relationship management for public relations research. This research is timely for several reasons.

By the end of 2001, China has become a member of the World Trade Organization (WTO). It has been a long march for China to become a member. It first officially expressed its interest in resuming its original status with the General Agreement on Tariffs, and Trade (GATT), the predecessor of the WTO, in July 1986 (J. Z. Yin, 1999). The vote for allowing China, still a developing country, to become a member of this influential trade organization indicates that China's economic development has been recognized and its economic influence on the world cannot be ignored. Upon becoming a member of the WTO, China will become one of the players in setting trading rules, instead of merely a follower of the rules.

Under this circumstance, what are the most effective ways to communicate with Chinese organizations effectively? Scholars in different disciplines have sought to answer this question (N. Chen, 1996; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998). Yet, China, as Gannon (1994) pointed out, is a country with thousands of years of history that has produced a complex culture. In addition, in the current stage of economic development (Suliman, 1998), communication seems to have become more complicated, because Chinese society, along with its systems and people, is always undergoing change.

consequences of their behavior, particularly in regard to public relations.

Public relations in China started when the door opened to the West in 1979 (N. Chen, 1996; Hung, 2000b). The complexity in the environment resulted from the market economy, which accelerated public relations development (Hung, 2000b). Chinese business society is relationship-based, which means relationships are a form of social capital (M. J. Chen, 2001). If public relations is "the management of communication between an organization and its publics" (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984, p. 6), it is inevitable that companies in China ought to pay more attention to relationships with their publics and should know how to manage those relationships.

Theoretical Problems in Public Relations

Since Ferguson (1984) called for an emphasis on studying relationships in public relations and L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Ehling (1992) advocated a research agenda on relationships, extensive research on relationship management has been conducted (Brunner, 2000; J. Grunig & Huang, 2000; J. Grunig & Hung, 2000; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001a, 2001b; Hung, 2000a; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000; Len-Rios, 2001). Further emphasizing the importance of relationships in public relations research and practices, Hung (2000b) provided another generic principle of public relations: "The ultimate goal for public relations practice is building and maintaining substantive relationships with internal and external publics" (p. 23).

In terms of talking about types of relationships between an organization and its publics, are there any other existing relationships except for communal and exchange relationships? In discussing communal and exchange relationships, Mills and Clark (1994) and Mills (1999, personal communication) briefly mentioned exploitive relationships. I believe it is worth exploring whether there are any additional categories of relationships.

Furthermore, no research has shown how the macro environment influences an organization's relationships with different publics. The literature includes cultural factors, e.g. Huang's (2001a, 2001b) face and favor, Cai & Hung's (2000, in press) application of Hofstede's (1984, 2002) individualism/collectivism dimensions in studying relationships. Yet, as Verèiè, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig's (1996) global theory of public relations suggests, culture, political systems, economic systems, media, level of activism, and level of development must also be taken into consideration in practicing multinational public relations. In my research (Hung, 2000a) on a Taiwanese company's relationships with different publics, I found that the influence of relationship maintenance on relationship outcomes was not always predictable. For example, an interviewee from this company said that even though he applied the strategies of openness and sharing of task strategies, he could not trust his Chinese partners because of the history between Taiwan and China. Also, the relationships among his publics also made relationship building and maintenance more complicated. To explain his answer, I found it necessary to look into the dynamics of a relationship: for example, how and what types of relationships organizations develop and what kind of impact a nation's culture will have on the communication process.

As a result, the theoretical purpose of this study is to describe the strategies that multinational companies use to develop and maintain different types of relationships. To accomplish that purpose, I will study cultural factors that affect these strategies and explain why they use them. I will also develop a normative theory of relationship management, which encompasses types of organization-public relationships, relationship maintenance strategies, the effect of multiple publics in an organization-public relationship, relationship outcomes, and the external forces influencing relationship maintenance and outcomes.

Significance of the Study

From an academic standpoint, I believe the results of this study should be useful to the following: 1) public relations scholars who attempt to evaluate organization-public relationships; 2) public relations scholars who are interested in global public relations; 3) public relations practitioners who attempt to develop, maintain, and evaluate relationships with publics of their organizations; and 4) multinational companies that intend to build long-term relationships in another country.

As mentioned, studies on evaluating organization-public relationships are flourishing (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001a, 2001b; Ledingham & Bruning, 2000). A holistic study in this dissertation, which includes relationship antecedents, relationship maintenance, and relationship outcomes, as J. Grunig and Huang (2000) suggested, will enable scholars to better understand more about why some organizations have better relationships than others (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999) and what kind of maintenance strategies they applied to achieve better relationship outcomes (Huang, 2001b; Hung, 2000a).

Wakefield (2001) contended that many practitioners lacked the knowledge and skills necessary in practicing public relations effectively in the global setting. He further argued that many similarities in practices may make the globalization of public relations possible; the many cultural differences of practitioners from different parts of the globe may hinder an organization's strategic executions. Hence, the generic principles and specific application of global public relations Verèiè, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig's (1996) developed are a waste, if multinational companies impose the cultural values of their respective countries on one another.

Hence, this study will contribute to the body of knowledge in public relations as follows. First, it will provide a research direction for evaluating "relationships" from the multiple-publics perspective - that is, the dynamics of the relationships of parties involved in organization-public relationships. Second, this study will benefit organizational communication scholars by defining "organizational effectiveness" based on the types of organizational relationships. Third, this study will provide a look at public relations in the international arena for scholars who intend to evaluate organization-public relationships from a qualitative research perspective. Finally, as public relations practices become global, I hope this study will provide evidence of the benefits of excellent global public relations practices.

Operational Definition

As J. Grunig and his colleagues (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984; J. Grunig, 1992) indicated that public relations is a management function that involves planning and problem solving, it is critical for this management function to manage relationships with stakeholders (Coombs, 2001; J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1992). Scholars have tried to define what a relationship is (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, 2000; Brunner, 2000; Ledingham & Bruning, 1998). Broom et al., after reviewing extensive literature in interpersonal communication, psychotherapy, interorganizational relationships, and systems theory, defined organization-public relationships as:

> Organization-public relationships are represented by the patterns of interaction, transaction, exchange, and linkage between an organization and its publics. These relationships have properties that are distinct from the identities, attributes, and perceptions of the individuals and social collectivities in the relationships. Though dynamic in nature, organization-public relationships can be described at a single point in time and tracked over time. (Broom, Casey, & Ritchey, p. 18)

Ledingham and Bruning (1998) described organization public relationships as

> The state that exists between an organization and its key publics that provides economic, social, political, and/or cultural benefits to all parties involved, and is characterized by mutual positive regard. (Ledingham & Bruning, 1998, p. 62)

As Hon and J. Grunig (1999) pointed out, an organization-public relationship begins when there are consequences created by an organization that affect publics or the behaviors of publics have consequences on an organization. Therefore, in discussing the formation of organization-public relationships, I will develop the operational definition of a relationship from the following perspectives: 1) systems theory and 2) resource dependence theory and exchange theory.

Systems Theory

J. Grunig (1976) and J. Grunig and Hunt (1984) developed a systems theory of public relations. A system, according to Infante, Rancor, and Womack (1993), is "a set of interdependent units which work together to adapt to a changing environment" (p. 81). Theorists usually identify systems as closed and open. In open systems, resources are exchanged with other subsystems in the environment through a permeable or semi-permeable boundary. In closed systems, the boundary between other subsystems in the environment is sealed and exchange of resources is impossible (J. Grunig & Hunt, 1984; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Spicer, 1997). In order to survive, organizations acquire resources, which means the organization must interact with others who control those resources. Through the activities of environmental scanning and issues management, public relations can collect and filter information for its organization (Aldrich, 1979) while acting as communication facilitators between organizations and publics (Aldrich & Herker, 1977; Chase, 1984; Chase & Crane, 1996; Crable & Vibbert, 1985; Dozier & Broom, 1993). As a result, the value of public relations is that it can help an organization build a sound relationship with its external stakeholders and minimize the possibility of conflicts or crises.

The study of systems theory helps researchers to recognize the interdependent relationship of an organization and its environment (L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Ehling, 1992; Spicer, 1997). In order to help their organizations reach effectiveness, public relations practitioners need to understand the importance of building relationships with constituencies and incorporate their values into strategic management.

Resource Dependency Theory and Exchange Theory

Broom et al. (1997) defined antecedents to relationships as "sources of change, pressure, or tension on the system derived from the environment" (p. 94). They also pointed out that the study of antecedents to relationships mostly has been derived from resource dependency theory and exchange theory. In resource dependency theory, a relationship forms because of the organization's need for resources. Therefore, this relationship involves the exchange of resources between organizations. Broom et al. recognized the mutual benefit brought by the "voluntary transaction and the mutuality of interests and rewards" (p. 91).

J. Grunig and Huang (2000) argued that these theories could not support the reality that other pressures will exist and may have nothing to do with resources. They pointed out that some pressures organizations face are actually from publics, activist groups, government agencies, and others. Obviously, human factors are involved in relationship building. From the point of view of the exchange theory, interpersonal interactions can be seen as ways of exchanging resources, which will lead to different relationships (U. G. Foa & E. B. Foa, 1971, 1974; U. G. Foa, Converse, Jr., K. Törnblom, & E. B. Foa, 1993)

Interdependence

From interpersonal communication perspective, relationship means the interdependence between two or more people (Coombs, 2001; O'Hair, Friedrich, J. Wiemann, & M. Wiemann, 1995). They view that relationships start when people are linked in some ways, for example, moral, economic, social, emotional, geographic, or cultural. Theorists in organizational communications (Katz & Kahn, 1978; L. Grunig, J. Grunig, & Ehling, 1992; Pfeffer & Salancik, 1978; Spicer, 1997) have asserted that, in an open system, organizations have interdependent relationships with other bodies or groups in their environments. The concept of interdependence has been widely discussed in organizational literature. Pfeffer and Salancik (1978) contended that, in social systems and social interactions, "interdependence exists whenever one actor does not entirely control all of the conditions necessary for the achievement of an action or for obtaining the outcome desired from the action" (p. 40). Relating it to public relations, Gollner (1983, 1984) contended that public relations and public affairs are the management of interdependence. Pfeffer and Salancik argued that all organizational outcomes are based on interdependent causes or agents. They also clearly explained that interdependence portrays the relationship between agents creating an outcome, not the outcome itself.

As a result, I define "a relationship" for this study as:

Organization-public relationships arise when organizations and their strategic publics are interdependent and this interdependence results in consequences to each other that organizations need to manage.

With the operational definition on organization-public relationships, I will develop the conceptualization as follows:

CONCEPTUALIZATION

The purpose of this study is to determine how multinational companies manage relationships with publics in China and to construct a normative theory of organization-public relationship management for such companies at a global setting. To reach that end, I constructed my theoretical framework by consulting literature from relationship maintenance strategies and outcomes, and interpersonal communication theories.

Nevertheless, I also believe that, when studying the dynamics of a relationship, one should look at external forces that influence relationship maintenance and outcomes. To answer this question, I employed the global theory of public relations, which takes into considerations of the influence of culture, political systems, economic systems, media systems, level of involvement, and level of activism (Verèiè, L. Grunig, & J. Grunig, 1996). In this study, I concentrate on culture.

Relationship Antecedents

Multiple Publics

J. Grunig (1997) said publics are groups of people facing the same or similar problems. Organizations usually surround with publics from government, media, consumers, investors, community, and so on. Different publics also raise different issues that organizations need to face and communicate (L. Grunig, et al., 2002). Heath (1999) and Lerbinger (1997) discussed the need to study multiple publics in public relations research. In echoing this concept, Verèiè (1997) stated, "the problem of managing multiple stakeholder relationships become particularly difficult when an organization is squeezed between two (or more) groups of stakeholders/publics with opposing needs and/or wants" (p. 265). To elaborate this point, he argued the difficulty of maintaining balanced symmetrical relationships with publics with opposing interests because organizations face the dilemma of choosing side and be symmetrical to one group.

In addition, the connections among publics also influence how an organization maintains its relationships with publics and influences relationship outcomes. I believe that the relationships among multiple publics are especially important in China. Chen and Culbertson's (1996) study showed that, in terms of public relations practices in China, the accomplishments of professional, personal, and social goals lie on "establishing connections, creating obligations and favors among interactants, and enjoying privileges through relationships" (p. 280), that is, the so-called "*gao guan-xi*."[1] In my study (Hung, 2000a) of a Taiwanese company's relationship with its publics in China, I found that the complicated personal relationship networks in China influence the company's relationship with publics as a whole. For example, the company's two Chinese partners, one in Nan-Chang, Jiang-xi Province, and one in Hu-Pei Province, were actually contract partners. Therefore, when this company had conflicts with the partner from Jiang-xi Province, it also had to think about the possible relationship outcomes with the partner from Hu-Pei Province.

Since multiple-public relationships are important in China (Hung, 2000a, 2000b), one cannot really ignore the multiple publics around an organization, inasmuch as a relationship with a public will lead to a different relationship with another public, like a domino theory. This leads to the first research question.

Research Question 1: How do the different publics of a multinational company influence the company's relationship management?

Types of Organization-Public Relationships

<u>Communal and Exchange Relationships</u>

Most of the research on communal and exchange relationships has been developed by psychologists Clark of Carnegie Mellon University and Mills of the University of Maryland. The two scholars adopted sociologist Goffman's (1961) concepts of social exchange and economic exchange. Social exchange states that something is returned because the relationship requires it and the intention of social exchange is to "stabilize the relationship" (p. 276). In economic exchanges, however, favors must be returned of the same values or in equivalent goods. Borrowing from the concept of social exchanges, Clark and Mills coined the term "communal relationship" to express the concerns that one person has about the welfare of the other party, whereas exchange relationships are derived from economic exchanges. The two scholars believed that many benefits exchanged between individuals do not involve calculated monetary values.

In communal relationships, benefits are given in order to please the other. Even though this may sound like an exchange relationship, members who give benefits do not expect the other's return or obligation to pay back (Mills & Clark, 1994, p. 29). An exchange relationship suggests that members benefit one another in response to specific benefits received in the past or expected in the future. Mills and Clark (1994) contended that friendships, romantic relationships, and family relationships are more communal in nature, whereas participants in business settings or strangers meeting for the first time are more involved in exchange relationships (p. 30).

The similarity in these two relationships is that members provide benefits voluntarily, even though their intentions are different. However, even though a communal relationship may be considered a "symmetrical" approach, it sometimes can be one-sided. When one party gives benefits to another, he or she does not anticipate payback from the other. Communal

[1] The concept of "*gao guan-xi*" will be elaborated in the culture section of this chapter.

relationships can also be mutual. Clark and Mills (1993) concluded that, when following communal norms, members in the relationships would be more secure and fulfilled in their relationships. Mills and Clark (1994) also mentioned that exchange relationships could be mutual because the party receiving the benefit would have to be expected to reciprocate.

For the application of communal and exchange relationships in public relations research, J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1999) pointed out the necessity for public relations practitioners to foster communal relationships with strategic publics. In addition, with scholars' call for ethical public relations (Bowen, 2000; Seib & Fitzpatrick, 1995), the idea of communal relationships enables organizations to pay greater attention to their social responsibilities for the communities they are in.

Searching for Other Types of Organization-Public Relationships

I agree with a point raised by L. Grunig (1999) in an informal discussion that there exist other types of organization-public relationships. Even though Mills and Clark did not identify more types of relationships, they did bring up a good point for further exploration by researchers. In their research, Mills and Clark (1988) and Clark and Mills (1993) argued that, in both communal and exchange relationships, parties are willing to fulfill one's obligation for the other person. For example, in communal relationships, one will provide benefits to the other side without expecting anything in return. In this situation, one's obligation is to help the other one. In exchange relationships, one feels that the debt must be returned in the future. Therefore, in both situations an obligation exists. Clark and Mills asserted that selfish behaviors occur when one exploits the other by failing to fulfill the obligation.

Mills (personal communication, October, 1999) agreed that, other than communal and exchange relationships, there exists an "exploitive" relationship. Exploitive relationships arise when one takes advantage of the other when the other follows the communal norms or one does not fulfill his/her obligation in an exchange relationship (Clark & Mills, 1993).

In addition to exploitive relationships, Benette (2001) said educators should foster "covenantal relationships" with students, not "contractual relationships".[2] A covenantal relationship means both sides commit to a common good by their open exchanges and the norm of reciprocity. Individuals in the relationship always provide the others an opportunity to "ask for insight, to provide criticism, and to place a claim upon some of the individual's time" (pp. 9). The obligation of the other side is always to listen and provide responses. Contractual relationships start when parties agree on what each should do in the relationships. It is like writing a contract at the beginning of a relationship. Contractual relationships cannot promise equal relationships. As Benette indicated, power imbalance always has one side taking advantage in relationships; thus, power itself becomes control rather than collaboration.

I believe types of relationships need further exploration. Also, for future study, researchers need to identify additional positive organization-public relationships, such as communal and covenantal relationships. The concept of types of relationships suggests an additional research question as follows:

Research Question 2: What type(s) of relationship does a multinational company develop with its publics?

Relationship Maintenance Strategies

Based on the work of Canary and Stafford (1994), Plowman (1996), and Huang (1997), Hon and J. Grunig (1999) and J. Grunig and Huang (2000) conceptualized symmetrical and asymmetrical relationship maintenance strategies.

Symmetrical strategies encompass the following:

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.

From Canary and Stafford's (1994) proactive and constructive strategies, Hon and J. Grunig also provided the following symmetrical strategies:

Positivity

Organizations do whatever is necessary to make publics feel more content in the relationships. The behavior of being positive includes acting joyfully, being polite in conversation, and avoiding criticism of the other side (Canary & Stafford, 1994).

Openness or Disclosure

Disclosure is considered important in public relations ethics (Bivins, 1987; J. Grunig & L. Grunig, 1996). According to Canary and Stafford (1994), openness is about the willingness to engage in direct discussions about the nature of relationships. Even though openness cannot guarantee a good quality in the relationship (Hung, 2000a), Bok (1989), in discussing secrets in power difference relationships, pointed out those with greater power have the obligation to prove that preservation of information is in the interest of those with less power.

Assurances of Legitimacy

Jensen (1997) stated that an organization interacts with and has relationships with its environment. She introduced the idea that the "legitimacy" of the activities of an organization should be granted by its publics.

The traditional view of "legitimacy" lies in the free economic system, where it is the market that decides a company's survival. Therefore, investors, suppliers, and customers make

---

[2] I acknowledge Dr. J. E. Grunig and Dr. L. A. Grunig for sharing these concepts with me.

decisions based on their own interests and preferences. Furthermore, being "legitimate" also is related to "power." Usually, power is exercised by an agent that is empowered by an authority in a limited field of action.

Further exploring the concept of legitimacy, Jensen (1997) argued that a company is legitimate to a certain group of people in society if that group recognizes some activities as necessary or desirable. As a result, a company is enabled and constricted in some fields. Publics expect that a company will confine its activities to the "granted" field. Hence, a company should be responsible to the publics that legitimize its activities. Even though a company cannot serve beyond its granted boundary, it can still develop its field. To reach that end, I believe, maintaining quality relationships with stakeholders in the environment is crucial, because, the more credibility organizations build in their environment, the more publics will be willing to cooperate and the more trust they will have in the organization.

Chinese people always say, "Water sinks and floats boats," in which water can be interpreted as referring to publics and boats to organizations. Without support and legitimacy from publics, organizations will face difficulties in their operations and threats to their survival. The evidence of the benefits from legitimizing publics is more satisfaction and commitment from both sides (Hung, 2000a).

<u>Networking</u>

This strategy means 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).

Sharing of Tasks

Organizations and publics do their fair share to solve problems of concern to the other. Hon and J. Grunig (1999) provided examples of tasks, such as managing community issues, providing employment, making a profit, and staying in business, which are in the interests of either the organization, the public, or both.

The next strategy is asymmetrical:

Distributive

According to conflict management theories, these strategies are considered asymmetrical because one party benefits at the cost of another by seeking to maximize gains and minimize losses in a win-lose situation. Distributive strategies impose one's position onto that of the other party without concern for his or her welfare.

Dual Concern

Dual concern strategies are relevant for public relations practices, inasmuch as they take into consideration the role of balancing the interests of publics with the interests of the organization. These strategies also can be called mixed-motive or collaborative advocacy (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999).

Some dual concern strategies are asymmetrical because they emphasize the organization's interest over the public or vice versa and will not be effective in developing and maintaining the most positive relationships over the long term:

Contending. The organization tries to convince the public to accept its position.

Avoiding. The organization ignores the conflict either physically or psychologically.

Accommodating. The organization yields, at least in part, on its position and lowers its aspirations.

Compromising. The organization meets the public part way between its preferred positions, but neither is completely satisfied with the outcome.

Several other dual concern strategies are symmetrical and are most effective at building and maintaining a relationship over the long term:

Cooperating. Both the organization and the public work together to reconcile their interests and to reach a mutually beneficial relationship.

Being unconditionally constructive. From Fisher and Brown (1988), this negotiation strategy means “it will be both good for the relationship and good for me, whether or not you follow the same guidelines” (p. 37). The organization does whatever it thinks is best for the relationship, even if means giving up some of its position and even if the public does not reciprocate.

Saying win-win or no deal. If the organization and public cannot find a solution that benefits both, they agree to disagree – no deal (Plowman, 1995). A strategy of no deal is symmetrical because it leaves open the potential to reach a win-win solution at a later date.

These concepts of maintenance strategies suggest additional research question.

Research Question 3: How does(do) the type(s) of organization-public relationships a multinational company develops influence its choice of relationship maintenance strategies for its Chinese publics?

External Factors Influencing Organization-Public Relationships

In order to provide a holistic picture of how relationships are developed and maintained, I considered it important to examine the dynamics from the macro perspective. As a result, I adapted Verèiè, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig’s (1996) global concept, in which researchers need to consider the influences from culture, economic systems, political systems, media systems, level of development, and level of activism when practicing public relations. I chose to delimit my research area to the impact of culture. My reasons are as follows: Adler (1997) pointed out the importance of cultural sensitivity for multinational companies doing business in another country. Gao and Ting-Toomey (1998) stated that the concept of self and OTHER has influenced greatly how Chinese people choose their communication behavior (I will elaborate more in the conceptualization of culture).

Culture

According to Hofstede (1984, 2002), there are four dimensions that can be used to categorize cultures in different regions, masculinity/femininity, power distance, uncertainty avoidance, and individualism/collectivism. However, there are many specific concepts in Chinese culture, which cannot be covered by the four dimensions mentioned above. The complexity of Chinese culture has resulted in scholars discussing it from the perspective of various characteristics, for example, the concept of face (Bond, 1991; Bond & Lee, 1981; Chang & Holt, 1994; Goffman, 1955; Hu, 1944; Huang, 2000; Hwang, 1987; Ting-Toomey, 1994), favor (Chang, 1992; Huang, 2000, 2001; Hwang, 1987), the other-oriented self (Chu, 1985; Fairbank, 1991; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998; King & Bond, 1985; Wu, 1984), and Confucianism (Chen, 1991; Cheng, 1990; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1994; MacCormack, 1991; Yum, 1991). In addition, the unique Chinese culture has been discussed in relation to different topics, for example, identifying organization-public relationship outcomes (Huang, 2001a, 2001b), negotiation and conflict management, organizational communications (Cai, 1998), and intercultural communications (Chiu, 2000).

In this section, I will describe in detail the characteristics of Chinese culture and provide a rationale for how Chinese culture influences communication.

The Characteristics of Social Orientations in Chinese Culture

Yang (1992) has discussed the different characteristics of Chinese social orientations. Two major ones are discussed here: family orientation and relational orientation.

Family Orientation

Traditionally, Chinese people have considered “family,” instead of individuals, to be the basic unit for society’s structure and function. Chinese people’s belief that family is the core unit of economic and social life has resulted in a unique familialism (Lee, 1985; Yang, 1971, 1985, 1992; C. Yang, 1988). Under this premise, Chinese people tend to consider family to be more important than individuals. Family leads individuals, and family comes first. To be more specific, familial reputation is perceived as more significant than an individual’s and familial collective work has priority to individual achievements (Yang, 1992). However, this tendency is limited to what Schwartz (1990) called “ingroup collectivism,” not “universal collectivism.” Hence, Yang (1992) called this kind of collectivism “familial collectivism” (p. 96).

This social orientation creates the concept of self and other in the communication process in Chinese society. With different social groups, members tend to provide more favors for other individuals in the same group, because these individuals are “insiders” ( ) (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1992).

Concepts of self-OTHER

Likewise, as conceptualized by Hofstede (1980, 2002) and Triandis (1988), in a collectivist culture like the Chinese, people emphasize fitting in with and belonging to the in-group; and they focus on a “we” identity (Hofstede, 1980, 2002; Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998). Triandis (1988) argued that this in-group concept is considered significant in collectivistic cultures, in which the needs, goals, and beliefs of the in-group often take precedence over those of the individual. Consequently, the concept of self-OTHER has led Chinese people to develop the idea of “insider” and “outsider” (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1992).

Relational Orientation

Yang (1992) identified the following explicit aspects of the relationship concepts: formalization, reciprocity, harmony, fatalism, and determination.

Role formalization. In Chinese society, greatly influenced by Confucianism, five cardinal relationships (, Wu Lun) are emphasized. These are the relations between ruler and subordinate, father and son, elder brother and younger brother, husband and wife, and friend and friend. All human relationships in the society can be derived from one or a combination of these five fundamental relationships (Chen, 1990; Shih 1988; Yang, 1992). This emphasis has nurtured Chinese people to respect their elders and leaders, but the hierarchy also exists in interpersonal relationships. It has long been recognized that one of the most significant features of Chinese culture is its emphasis on a harmonious society and the appropriate arrangement of interpersonal relationships (Hwang, 1987).

Relational interdependence (reciprocity). In Chinese society, each role is defined by the interactions and consequences with other individuals in the family and the society. For example, parents should take care of their children and children should show filial piety to their parents. Each role is obligated to provide some benefits mentally or physically to other members in the family or in the society. Hence, this obligation creates reciprocity and interdependence. Yet, the different kinds of relationships determine different degrees of reciprocity and interdependence (Yang, 1992).

Yang considered interdependence and reciprocity to be the basic tenets in balancing the gives and takes of a relationship, because each individual recognizes their dependence on other members in the society. The sense of obligation of maintaining relationships and taking care of others feelings make the concept of <u>bao</u> important (King, 1995). <u>Bao</u>, meaning reciprocity in English, is very important in interpersonal transactions; and it is other oriented (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998).

In Chinese society, both giver and receiver have responsibilities for maintaining relationships. A relational debt comes when one receives a favor from others. Receivers usually don't want to owe a relational debt to others. One would choose not to return the favor. Yet, the outcome will bring isolation from others or self-isolation. Another way is to return more favors to others so that "a receiver" will become "a giver." Relational reciprocity is an important concept, because it is where face (, <u>mian zi</u>) and favor (, <u>ren qing</u>) come from.

<u>Ren qing (favor) and mian zi (face).</u> Because of concerns regarding relationships and harmony, Chinese culture includes some germane concepts: <u>Renqing</u> (King, 1980; Hwang, 1987), and <u>mianzi</u> (Ho 1974; Hu 1944; Hwang 1987) have greatly influenced the way Chinese deal with things, especially when asking a favor from someone.

Traditional Chinese people value hierarchical status in social relations. They tend to adopt multiple standards of behavior for interacting with different persons around them (Fei, 1948). Hwang's (1987) research also showed that Chinese tend to use the skills of personal relationships when asking a favor from a more superior person. However, when the superior is approached by a petitioner, he will also first carefully consider, "what is the *guan-xi* between us? How strong is our *guan-xi*?" He and Ho (1976) claimed that in order to maintain personal harmony and social order among persons situated in hierarchically structured relations, the higher status person usually gives the "renqing" (favor), for the sake of "*guan-xi*," and "mianzi" (face).

Relational harmony. Sun (1990) and Chian (1979) pointed out that Chinese people emphasize harmony in interpersonal relationships and harmony with nature. Harmony comes from achieving the expectation from others. Chaos comes when harmony is destroyed (Yang, 1992). As a result, Chinese people always try their best to maintain relational harmony, even though they sometimes have to sacrifice some of their own benefits.

Relational fatalism. As mentioned earlier, stability and harmony in relationships are very important, inasmuch as they produce a stable and continuing family and society. Yet, relationships are not always stable and harmonious; and people are not always satisfied with the relationships they have with their family and others. In order to provide an explanation for this condition, Chinese people created the concept of "yuan" (Lee, 1982; Yang, 1988; Yang & Ho, 1988) or "facilitative conditions" (Cai & Hung, in press, p. 21), which have decided the relationship types, the duration of relationships, and their outcomes before the relationships start. "Yuan" has in some ways soothed people's anxiety when a bad relationship occurs, because this kind of relationship was decided long ago and people should just only accept it (Yang, 1992).

Relational determination. The difference in closeness in relationships determines different kinds of relationships - for example, familial relationships, friendships, and work relationships (Yang, 1992). Since Chinese people see a significant difference between the self and other, so do the responsibilities in the different relationships vary.

Chinese culture, therefore, has a significant effect on relationships, which suggests an additional proposition and research questions.

Research Question 4: How do the characteristics of Chinese culture, family orientation, self-Other, and relational orientation, influence a multinational company's relationship maintenance with its Chinese publics?

Relationship Outcomes

Hon and J. Grunig (1999) have identified four relationship indicators: trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction. These indicators have been adopted in several studies (J. Grunig & Hung, 2000; Hung, 2000a; Brunner, 2000; Len-Rios, 2001; Jo, 2002). I will also adopt these indicators to evaluate an organization's relationship with its publics.

Trust[3]

Trust is an important foundation for relationships. As a concept, trust is widely used to measure relationships in both interpersonal and organizational communication research (Becerra, 1998; Canary & Cupach, 1988; J. Grunig & Huang, 2000; Huang, 1994; Huang 1997; Johnson-George & Swap, 1982; Krimsky & Plough, 1988; Larzelere & Huston, 1980). More specifically, trust has been studied in manager-employee relationships (Lewicki & Bunker, 1998; Whitener, Brodt, Korsgaard, & Werner, 1998), how organizations deal with crises (Mishra, 1998), how trust enhances close relationships (Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985), and the role of trust in conflict management (Lulofs, 1994) and negotiation (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). Recently, Doney, Cannon and Mullen (1998) conceptualized how national culture influences the development of trust. In an early study of trust in relationships, Rotter (1967) defined trust as a generalized expectancy held by an individual or a group that the word, promise, or verbal or written statement of another individual or group can be relied on. Rotter's emphasis on reliability in expectations of the other party has been echoed by other researchers involved in exchange relationships, such as negotiation scholars Pruitt and Carnevale (1993) who defined trust as "the expectation that the other party will cooperate in the future" (p. 133). Moorman, Deshpande, and Zaltman (1993) characterized trust as "a willingness to rely on an exchange partner in whom one has confidence" (p. 23), and Morgan and Hunt (1994) described trust as the confidence in another's reliability and integrity. The focus in these definitions is on whether the other party will behave as expected.

In public relations, J. Grunig and L. Grunig (1998) defined trust as "the extent to which both management and publics express willingness to make themselves vulnerable to the behavior of the other - confidence that the other party will take its interests into account in making decisions" (p. 4). In summary, trust emphasizes one's confidence in the other party and the willingness of one to open himself or herself to the other party.

Scholars have explored dimensions of trust in interpersonal and organizational communication (Becerra, 1998; Cai & Hung, 2000a; Cai & Hung, 2000b; J. Grunig & Hung, 2000; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Mishra, 1996; Rempel, Holmes, & Zanna, 1985). Hovland, Janis, and Kelley (1953) were the first to look at the multidimensional aspects of trust, contending that a person's expertise and his or her motivation to lie influence others' perceptions of trust in that person. Over the next four decades, more than 20 studies have tested dimensions of trust. The most frequent dimensions used in these studies include integrity or honesty, ability or competence, benevolence or goodwill, and dependability (Becerra, 1998; Butler, 1991; Cook & Wall, 1980; Deutsch, 1960; Frost, Stimpson, & Maughan, 1978; Good, 1988; Grunig & Hung, 2000; Jones, James, & Bruni, 1975; Kee & Knox, 1970; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Lieberman, 1981; Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman, 1995; Mishra, 1995; Ring & van de Ven, 1992; Rosen & Jerdee, 1977; Schoorman, 1995; Sitkin & Roth, 1993; Solomon, 1960; Strickland, 1958). Dimensions measuring trust in a supervisor or an organization include integrity, competence, and dependability (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; J. Grunig & Hung, 2000), whereas dimensions of interpersonal trust include these as well as benevolence, honesty, and faith (Becerra, 1998; Canary & Cupach, 1988; Larzelere & Huston, 1980; Mayer et

[3] Most of the conceptualization on trust was adapted from Cai and Hung (in press).

al., 1995; Mishra, 1996, Rempel et al., 1985). In a review of trust in organizational communication literature, Mishra (1996) identified four components of trust that effectively summarize the meaning of trust in the preceding definitions. These components include competence, openness, concern, and reliability.

Given the dimensions suggested by extant research, I employed three dimensions of trust that appear frequently in literature: dependability, competence, and integrity.

Dependability

McGregor (1967), Ouchi (1981) and Gabarro (1987) argued that inconsistencies in words and behaviors decrease levels of trust. As Rempel, Holmes, and Zenna (1985) explained, "[A]s relationships progress, there is an inevitable shift in focus away from assessments involving specific behaviors, to an evaluation of the qualities and characteristics attributed to the partner. Thus trust is placed in a person, not their specific action" (p. 96).

Competence

Competence is the ability a party has to capably perform his or her duties and obligations. Mayer, Davis, and Schoorman (1995) and Mishra (1996) declared that competence is especially important in organizational relationships, such as relationships between supervisors and their employees. Sako (1992) further argued for the importance of competence in the context of organizational relationships.

Integrity

Integrity relates to parties' sense of justice and whether the parties' behaviors are consistent with their words (Mayer et al., 1995). This dimension serves as a basic foundation in both interpersonal relationships and organizational relationships (Butler, 1991; Lieberman, 1981; Mayer et al., 1995; Ring & van de Ven, 1992). Trust in a close friend should be related to intimacy, disclosure, and risk taking. These aspects are not as relevant in relationships with a supervisor and the organization. Therefore, integrity should be most likely found in a relationship with a close friend.

Control Mutuality

Stafford and Canary (1991) conceptualized control mutuality as “the degree to which partners agree about which of them should decide relational goals and behavioral routines” (p. 224). They recognized that there is an imbalance of power in relationships; and therefore, added that each side can agree either that one or both have the ability to influence the decision-making process. This concept is similar to Kelley's (1979) notion of bilateral control, in which both sides have equal say in the decision-making process. Ferguson (1984) also pointed out the importance of distribution of power in a relationship. L. Grunig et al. (1992) argued that, even if power distribution is unequal in relationships, a quality relationship could still be produced if parties followed a norm of reciprocity. Stafford and Canary (1991) concluded that the sense of control mutuality in interpersonal and organization-public relationships is critical to interdependence and relational stability.

Relational Commitment

Kelley (1983) pointed out that commitment has been applied to actions, processes, states, and dispositions. From the study of interpersonal relationships, Rosenblatt (1977) defined commitment as an avowed intent of a person to maintain a relationship. More specifically, Michaels, Acock, and Edwards (1986) defined it as “one’s desire and intent to maintain, rather than terminate, a relationship” (p. 162). Morgan and Hunt (1994) described commitment from the relationship marketing perspective as occurring when exchange partners recognize the importance of an on-going relationship and are willing to put maximum efforts into maintaining this relationship. Canary and Zelley (2000) said commitment is about "the extent to which a person wants to remain in the relationship and has feelings of attachment" (p. 308).

J. Grunig and Huang (2000) contended that parties lose autonomy in commitment. However, I don't quite agree with their contention. For an organization-public relationship to be successful, all parties involved in the relationships must communicate with each other to achieve commitment. L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Ehling (1992), J. Grunig and Repper (1992), and J. Grunig (1996) discussed the approaches of organizational effectiveness, in which the competing-values approach highlighted the necessity of an organization to incorporate the values of the strategic constituencies into its goals so that the organization can attain the goals of most value to its strategic constituencies. I agree with this approach, because an organization can show its concern and good will for constituencies, besides only concentrating on making its own profits. While achieving organizational effectiveness, organizations will also gain more support and commitment from publics, inasmuch as an organization replaces its own goal with joint goals. Hinde (1997) also stated, "This does not mean about a loss of autonomy in the sense of a loss of control over one's own actions, because the choice has been made in accordance with one's own needs and values" (p. 273).

Relational Satisfaction

Though Hinde (1997) considered satisfaction to be a complicated concept to measure in relationships, it is widely accepted as an attribute for evaluating organization-public relationships (Ferguson, 1984; J. Grunig & Huang, 2000; L.Grunig, J. Grunig, & Ehling, 1992; Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Huang, 2001a. 2001b; Hung, 2000a, 2000b; Stafford & Canary, 1991).   Stafford and Canary (1991) explained relational satisfaction from a social exchange perspective by saying that a satisfying relationship is one in which "the distribution of rewards is equitable and the relational rewards outweigh costs" (p. 225). They also pointed out that positive relational satisfaction is affected by perceptions of partners' constructive maintenance behaviors. Therefore, satisfaction is based on the link of the discrepancy between an individual's expectation of a relationship and what actually is experienced (Hinde, 1997).

In addition, When L. White (1990) examined the context in a marriage relationship, he could not found substantial evidence between relational satisfaction and relationship stability.

The literature on relationship outcomes suggests the research question.

Research Question 5: What are the relationship outcomes between a multinational company and its Chinese publics?

OPERATIONALIZATION

I am now elaborating on the following: the appropriateness of qualitative research, the method I will use in collecting data, the concepts of equivalent to validity and reliability in qualitative research, and some ethical concerns in conducting my research.

The Appropriateness of Conducting a Qualitative Study

Patton (1990) outlined the differences between qualitative and quantitative research. Quantitative researchers use a standardized approach so that participants respond to a predetermined set of answers. The advantage is that it is possible to measure the responses of participants in a limited set of questions and compare and statistically aggregate the data. Qualitative research provides researchers with methods to evaluate selected topics in depth and in detail. Therefore, data collection is not constrained by predetermined categories; and researchers are able to find the depth and details of the topics selected.

Qualitative research is best used for exploratory or descriptive research that tries to uncover and understand what lies deeply in the complexity and process of any little-known phenomenon or innovative system by conveying the interaction of context, setting, and the participants' frames of reference (Marshall, 1985, 1987; Marshall & Rossman, 1999; Strauss & Corbin, 1990). Little is known, for example, about how the macro environment influences relationship building at the organizational level; and no research has yet been done in studying the complexity of relationships among different publics and organizations. Furthermore, I also need to determine how certain types of relationships are developed.

In Huberman and Miles' (1994) point of view, qualitative studies are especially suited to research on causal relationships. They contended that researchers could observe a series of events and how these events led to some specific outcomes. Moreover, qualitative studies can explore how and why an event happened, which allows researchers the opportunity of observing the causal relationship of an issue under study. In my dissertation, one of research questions asked how relationship maintenance strategies influence relationship outcomes, such as control mutuality, trust, commitment, and satisfaction. The argument of causality in qualitative research supports my choice of method in exploring the answer for this research question. Thus, the foci of my research lead me to qualitative rather than quantitative methods.

Qualitative Interviewing

My method included a mixture of cross-cultural interviews, long interviews, elite interviews, and active interviews.

According to Rubin and Rubin (1995) and Gubrium and Holstein (2002), qualitative interviewing is a way to find out what others feel and think about their world. Through qualitative interviews, researchers will be able to understand experiences and rebuild events even though they do not participate in them. However, it does not mean that my data collection method is only interviews, without giving the attention to the dynamics in interviews.

First, the interviews fit what Ryen (2002) called “cross-cultural interviewing” because the research data will be collected across cultural and national borders. In addition, the assumption that researchers usually serve as instruments in qualitative studies makes me believe that talking with my participants from companies from different parts of the world is actually cross-cultural communication.

Long interviews emphasize the duration of interviews in the field (McCracken, 1989). Active interviews acknowledge the interactions between interviewer and interviewees, and reality is constructed between interviewers and interviewees. In addition, participants give and take and transform facts and details as the interview unfolds (Holstein and Gubrium, 1995).

According to Holstein and Gubrium (1995), active interviewing is an ongoing interpretive process, in which interviewers and interviewees create meanings, because socially constructed meaning is naturally collaborative. Hence, any active interview situation depends on the interactions between the participants and the investigators. This method is especially important and suitable for my dissertation because one of the research questions explores other types of organization-public relationships. Even though I have identified communal, exchange, exploitive, covenantal and contractual relationships in this prospectus, there actually may be more types of relationships. By collaborating with my participants, I am convinced there are relationships out there that cannot be described by any kind of relationship we have identified so far.

The elite interviews, as Dexter (1970) stated, are the kind of interview wherein interviewees are not subjected to standardized questioning. Elites, as defined by Dexter (1979), are not the rank-and-file of a population but the influential, prominent, and well-informed of their fields (Dexter, 1970; Marshall & Rossman, 1999). In this kind of interview, the interviewee "introduces to a considerable extent his notions of what he regards as relevant, instead of relying upon the investigator's notions of relevance" (Dexter, 1970, p. 5). I would want to include this approach for my dissertation because these elites, who usually are involved in the strategic management for their companies, are able to elaborate on what they consider organization-public relationships to be because of their close contacts to their work environment.

Elite interviews and active interviews are similar because, first, researchers usually can benefit from interviewees, by letting them teaching the researcher the situation and the problem. Second, both active interviews and elite interviews allow researchers to find different interpretations toward a problem because of the joint efforts between interviewees and researchers.

In my data collection, I planned to acquire an in-depth understanding of the context, expect to have interactions with my interviewees, and to seek information from those who are highly knowledgeable of their work environment. Therefore, I intended to have more interactions during interviews with elites who are able to provide me information for my research question. Yet, I understood some research questions cannot be answered in a short period of time and need consume considerable time for building meaning by collaboration. As a result, I call my method long, active interviews with elites in an intercultural setting.[4]

The Participating Organizations

In qualitative studies, the richness and depth of data is most important; the quantity of sample is not the main concern (McCracken, 1988; Patton, 1990). Therefore, I plan to conduct qualitative interviews from multinational companies in China, following Patton's (1990) suggestion on qualitative sampling.

Qualitative sampling is especially suited for purposeful sampling, in that researchers are able to select information-rich cases that will fully respond to the questions under study. Therefore, size and specific cases depend on the study's purpose (Patton, 1990). Among the 16 purposeful sampling strategies Patton (1990) suggested, I first started by choosing theory-based sampling. Qualitative researchers sample events, time periods, or people based on their "manifestations or presentation of important theoretical constructs" (p. 177). By doing so, researchers will be able to elaborate and examine the construct.

---

[4] I thank Dr. L. Grunig's recommendation on describing the nature of the interviews I conducted with my participants.

In recruiting participants, I used information from an Asian magazine, <u>Commonwealth</u>, which is like <u>Fortune</u> magazine in the U.S. and which annually reports the top 1,000 companies. I first sent emails to those companies to introduce myself and my research. Usually, they were very polite in responding to my emails. After receiving their replies, I made telephone contacts.

In addition to the theory-based sampling, I also applied snowball sampling. Usually researchers ask questions such as, "Do you know whom I should talk to?" or "Who else knows _____?" Hence, by repeatedly asking these kinds of questions, the researcher gets more and more potential participants. In my experience in this study, when companies that gave me a firm refusal to participate, I asked them if they knew any other companies that might help me in my research. Besides, some very kind companies volunteered to provide me the information as to which companies I should include in my research.

Yet, in looking for participants within the Chinese context, I found it inevitable that I had to go through acquaintance introductions. As indicated by Patton (1990), convenience sampling is the most common and the least desirable sampling strategy. Patton pointed out that researchers usually face time and budget constraints and are forced to pick those that are easy to access and inexpensive to study. He contended that this sampling is neither strategic nor purposeful and should be the last factor to be taken into consideration in recruiting participants.

I concurred with Patton (1990) and in all the recruiting process and have done my best not to apply convenience sampling. Yet, China is the society where "*guan-xi*" still has great influence for people in determining whom they want to meet or build relationships. As a result, I sometimes experienced the frustration of being rejected because they did not know me and I did not have the connection to persuade them to participate in my research. When this happened, in order to recruit more participants for my dissertation, I had to turn to my family and a family friend for help. I did not just take whatever company they provided. When they provided me lists of companies, I chose those with solid reputations, so that these companies would have a lot to share with me on how they successfully build relationships in China.

I have thought many times about this situation. Besides their commitment, what else caused them to spend so much time for a graduate student's research? As indicated in an early part of this chapter, some participants were recruited through acquaintance's introduction. Was it because of "*guan-xi*" that broke the boundary of self-Other? That is, was it because someone who was the acquaintance of both the participant and me introduced us that made the participant feel I was the "insider?" If "*guan-xi*" carries a negative connotation, then this situation provides one evidence of the positive side of "*guan-xi*." *Guan-xi* could be the lubrication in facilitating relationships, as long as neither side exploits the special kind of relationships.

When I was doing my internship in the research and measurement department of Ketchum, New York, I first obtained a list of the World 500 from Fortune Magazine; and I surfed the websites of these companies to find contact information. The Fortune 500 companies are multinationals from all over the world. Therefore, I did not focus only on multinational companies from one country. In addition, these companies have offices worldwide, which allow them to be more culturally sensitive when communicating in another country.

McCracken (1988) said that an efficient number for qualitative interviews is eight (p. 17). However, the participating companies I obtained were more than the number McCracken suggested, because I was afraid that some companies might decline to participate. Hence, as a contingency in case some companies decided not to participate later, I also have contacted additional Taiwanese and multinational companies to take part in my research.

All the interviews was conducted in China, in these participating companies' offices in Beijing, Shanghai, Suzhou (a historical city close to Shanghai), Kunshan (an industrial city close to Shanghai), Guangzhou, Dong Guan (a city close to Hong Kong), Hong Kong, and Taipei. The interviewees included CEOs or public relations managers in the companies. For the sake of protecting the participating companies' identities, the companies' identities will be confidential in this study.

I also summarized the number and duration of my interviews in the following table.

Table 1

Data Collection Summary of Interviews

Interview	**Multinational Company**
All Interviews	**40**
Number of Companies	**36**
Number of Participants	**40**
Mean Length of Interviews (Minutes)	**102.5**
Range Length of Interviews (Minutes)	**45 – 240**

Note. **[a]Total time for interviews (40 x 102.5) = 68.4 hours**

Pretests

The advantages of pretest not only lie in finding inappropriate protocol items, but also help researchers get ready for the fieldwork. I conducted four pretests for qualitative interviews. Two were with Taiwanese companies and two with multinational companies. In the multinational company part, I included one Taiwanese or Chinese and one foreigner who work in multinational companies. Many multinational companies in China usually hire Taiwanese or local Chinese as their CEOs or public relations managers, because they understand the local culture and language better than foreigners. However, some multinational companies send their own people, to serve in high ranking positions in China offices. Therefore, it is important to have pretests for both Chinese/Taiwanese and foreigners. The interview protocol used for data collection is attached in Appendix A.

Language Consideration

I collected data mostly in China and one interview in Hong Kong. Therefore, the languages I used are Chinese, Taiwanese, and English. Usunier (1998) indicated that the ignorance of language in cross-cultural studies would result in biased and impoverished findings. Therefore, there were some issues I considered before going into the field:

First, internationally, the consent form and the interview protocols were initially designed in English. Therefore, I needed to translate them into Chinese. Furthermore, by translating the interview protocols into Chinese, I could accurately conduct my interviews. Even though it was I who asked questions of my interviewees, I also needed to provide a copy of my interview protocols to my participants, so that they knew what to expect.

Secondly, some multinational companies are from Taiwan, where its people use traditional characters, instead of the simplified ones in China. As a result, I provided two forms of Chinese interview protocols: one in the traditional form and the other in the simplified. Fortunately, the Chinese system of Microsoft Word® has this converting system, which saved me much time typing interview questions.

Finally, as Campbell and Werner (1970) and Usunier (1998) suggested in back-translation, I considered whether my Chinese interview protocols express the same meaning as the English originals. As a result, after translating English questionnaires to Chinese, I also translated them back into English to see if both languages convey the same thing.

When discussing cross-cultural interviews, Patton (1990) acknowledged that words could be translated differently in different cultures, thus impart different meanings. Even though he spoke about the risk of using an interpreter in conducting interviews, I also considered the possible risk I faced when doing interviews in China because of my Taiwanese background.

I did not do direct quotes much. As Patton (1990) and Sha (1999) put it, there are words and ideas that simply cannot be translated. There are words that people from those cultures know well in meanings but just cannot find the proper words in the translation.

Data Analysis

The Approaches to Qualitative Data Analysis

Miles and Huberman (1994) discussed three approaches to qualitative data analysis: interpretivism,[5] social anthropology,[6] and collaborative social research. I used the collaborative social approach for this study.

Collaborative social researchers use one of two standard forms: 1) the researcher keeps continues to query or questioning or 2) "dialectics," in which investigators and participants may have opposing interpretations of the data (Miles & Huberman, 1994). Miles and Huberman described the collaborative approach as a holistic perspective in which researchers and participants work closely to act on reality instead of being acted on. Investigators and participants take a critical view to uncover the underlying themes and patterns.

I have chosen to use the collaborative social research approach. Even though the social ethnography approach emphasizes scholars revising a developed theoretical framework by collecting data in the field, my research method is primarily on interviewing and does not include observation.

In addition, as Schegloff (1992) and Ryen (2002) indicated, the construction of meanings in a cross-cultural study requires the collaborative work between researcher and participant. If I

---

[5] The interpretivism approach, widely used by phenominologists, relies mostly on how one interprets what he or she finds in natural settings. Researchers in this approach emphasize the collaboration between participants and researchers. However, they do not use coding but assume that, by repeated reading of the material, they can reach "the essence of an account" (Miles & Huberman, 1994 p. 8). The problem with this approach is that researchers use only the few instruments they established in advance; therefore, they will find more external information in the setting, thus, bring difficulties in the data analysis.

[6] Researchers using the social anthropology approach usually stay close to the naturalist setting. They stay in close contact with the research field and focus on individuals' perspectives and interpretations of their world. Compared with other approaches, social anthropologists rely much on audio and visual equipment and observation to conduct their research. Noted by Miles and Huberman (1994), scholars using this approach depend on multiple sources of data to reach conclusions. Moreover, social anthropologists are usually concerned with the refinement of theory. They develop a conceptual model and bring it to the field to test and refine it. Many of the applied studies take this approach.

did not engage in greater discussions with my participants, I would be unable to figure out why they chose certain behavior in maintaining relationships with their Chinese publics.

I intended to build and construct meanings by working with my participants, which is emphasized in the collaborative social research approach. My participants helped me define the types of relationships they consider important.

Hence, the collaborative approach is more appropriate for my data analysis.

For this study, I mainly used Wolcott's (1994) perspective on "analysis." Researchers collect, reduce, and organize data into categories of the research topics. Likewise, Miles and Huberman (1994) considered the three elements of data analysis as data reduction, data display, and conclusion drawing and verification.

Elements of Data Analysis

Data reduction is "the process of selecting, focusing, simplifying, abstracting, and transforming the data that appear in written-up field notes or transcriptions" (Miles & Huberman, 1994, p. 10). It is an on-going process, even before data collection, because when scholars decide which data to code and which to discard before they develop a theoretical framework. As a result, a great deal of data reduction occurs in the data collection process, because researchers choose themes to write about memos or field notes.

In the interview process, as I planned to use the active approach, I listened carefully to what the participants told me and took extensive notes. During the process, I also corroborated some points I did not understand with my participants or asked my participants to elaborate on the points that I thought were significant to my study. By doing so, I was able to eliminate some irrelevant information and include more data needed for the study. This collaborative approach also allowed me to elicit more information from my participants. There were some cultural issues I never thought about but those really influenced the relationship building processes. For example, people in North China tend to be more direct than people in the South. Yet, the Southerners' indirectness shows they are more cautious and prudent in handling each issue. The difference in the North and the South also reflected in their relationship maintenance behaviors.

Data display is a method for visualizing the data collected. It is an organized, compressed form of information from which researchers can draw conclusions (Huberman & Miles, 1994; Miles & Huberman, 1994). This process enables researchers to systematically look at the data as a basis for drawing conclusions. Stake (1995) also suggested the method of <u>categorical aggregation</u> to collect instances from data and establish <u>patterns</u> from two or more categories.

When I was in China, I hired one woman who was very good in transcribing interviews. This person, however, did not understand English. Therefore, for many interviews that combined both mandarin Chinese and English, she usually marked a lot of "K" indicating the English content. I found this to be more difficult when analyzing the data, because, for many sections in interview transcripts, all I could see were a lot of Ks, and I ended up using the exact remarks of the participants. I therefore applied Sha's (1999) suggestion regarding the summarized transcriptions, in which it "captured the interviewee's central assertions and did not result in the loss of major information" (p. 175).

In displaying my interview data, I created tables to sort participants' comments in categories. For example, one research question asks about the type of relationships companies develop with their publics. I put the participants' words on the relationships they developed in the "type" category. I believed, by doing so, it made it easier for me to identify patterns for the research.

Conclusion drawing and verification is what Wolcott (1994) called "data transformation." Researchers draw meanings from displayed data. Verification can be a simple second thought coming to the researcher's mind in the writing process that stimulates him or her to go back to the field notes, or it can be a thorough intention to elaborate more on the meanings of the data.

Ethical Considerations

I recognized special ethical considerations that involve issues of harm, consent, deception, privacy, and confidentiality of data[7]. Therefore, before starting each interview, I showed my interviewees the consent form in which I described my purpose of study to assure them that the content of the interview will remain absolutely confidential.

Moreover, in the consent form, I provided information on the possible risks and benefits that result from the study. In exchange for participants' cooperation in my study, I also stated in the consent form that, after the research is completed, participants will be able to obtain an executive summary of the research results.

Researcher and Participant Relationships

McCracken (1988) said that qualitative studies require a more complicated relationship between investigator and participants. I want to elaborate on this issue.

In the method of qualitative interviewing, I accept Rubin and Rubin's (1995) point of treating participants as conversation partners. From the standpoint of active interviews, the reality is constructed by the collaboration between the investigator and his or her participants (Holstein & Gubrium, 1995). Hence, there are personal and ethical obligations to the participants. Feminist methodology emphasizes collaboration, gentleness and reciprocity in the interview process. Some feminists emphasize the possible need to be friends with interviewees

[7] Class instructions in the course (1999, Fall): Practicum in Research Proposal and Design, instructed by Professor L. A. Grunig

(Rubin & Rubin, 1995). Even though I may not become friends with my interviewees, as a researcher I was still obligated to protect my interviewers from any harm that may possibly result from my study.

The ethical obligations outlined by Rubin and Rubin (1995) include avoiding deception, asking permission to record, and being honest about the intended use of the research. The same issue of deception and betrayal was also discussed by Wolcott (1995). In addition, I should also insure my participants that they will not be harmed emotionally and physically because they have consented to talk with me. I also provided my participants the opportunity of withdrawing what they said and the opportunity to choose not to disclose their identities. In the issue of confidentiality and protecting the privacy of participants, I followed Wolcott's suggestion of being "candid but discreet" (p. 151). Whatever I disclosed, I revealed accurately and not give the impression that I am selling my participants' story.

Another ethical dilemma between the investigator and the participants is the decision on how hard the investigator will press participants for information. Even though researchers' obligation is to avoid superficial answers, this contradicts the consent form that usually informs participants to feel free to stop whenever they want. One way to resolve such a dilemma, suggested by Wolcott (1995) is to apply a nondirective style to encourage the participants to decide the limits of what they discuss.

Kleinman and Copp (1993), Pollner and Emerson (1983), and Sha (1999) raised the issue of being close with participants. Fieldworkers are usually concerned more with closeness than with distance. As Hammersley and Atkinson (1983) said, "there must always remain some part held back, some social and intellectual 'instance.' For it is in the 'space' created by this distance that the analytic work of the ethnographer gets done" (p. 102), I considered the closeness with some of my participants was an issue I should be aware of in my data collection process. As mentioned earlier, some of my participants were recruited from acquaintances and are very friendly and enthusiastic in helping me in any way they can. However, I had one participant who I felt is kind of reluctant to participate. He did not really reject me but I could tell he did not want me to contact him often. I did not want to exert any pressure on him to participate because his company is owned by my family friend. As a result, when I learned my family friends and my parents vacationed to China together and this participant needs to host them, I immediately emailed to my parents and my family friends to tell them, in order to obey the research ethics, I hoped them not to mention a word of my research when they meet him.

Another ethical issue is particularly more important in this study: how Chinese people regarded me. Recently, a professor and U.S. citizen who was doing research in China was arrested on the "dubious charges of espionage" (Newsweek, July, 2001. p. 40). In my research design, I have deliberately chosen to study relationships from a cultural and economic perspective, avoiding the sensitivity derived from a political perspective. Nevertheless, government agencies are usually the most important and most frequently contacted publics for multinational and Taiwanese companies in China. My interview questions on their relationships with government agencies might possibly hinder my participants' willingness to respond to such questions.

In order to overcome this problem to make my participants feel comfortable in answering my questions and to make my research go smoothly, I wrote very specifically in the consent form, with a letter head from the University of Maryland, on what my research purpose is, participants' freedom to participate or withdraw, and the confidentiality clause.

Offerings in Appreciation to the Participant

As a scholar who is receiving advanced education in the United States, I discovered that ethics in research is not so much emphasized in China, as compared with that in the United States. Besides the issue of the consent form described, I benefited by being an outsider in China. As naive as I was when I entered China, I had never thought of paying participants. Also, all the 40 participants interviewed never asked me to pay them. When I finished my data collection, a senior scholar told me that, in China, researchers should pay participants. As much as I was shocked when hearing about this, I also felt fortunate that no one asked me to pay him or her. All the funds I spent in the research were on my and my assistant's transportation, accommodation, and another assistant who transcribed interviews for me. I later thought that the practice of paying was because this senior scholar did her research about 10 years earlier and the situation had improved since then. Also, the participants were from the multinational companies that the organizational norms in ethics prevented the participants to request payment. On the other hand, my case also showed the feasibility and possibility of conducting ethical studies in China.

After discussing how I conducted this study, I will present the findings in the following section.

RESULT

Research Question 1: How do the different publics of a multinational company influence the company's relationship management?

According to the interviews, the publics around multinational companies in China usually consist of government agencies, vendors and suppliers, consumers, competitors, media, and the community. For interviewees, multiple publics sometimes are coalitions and sometimes are competitors. Regardless of which condition exists, this multinational companies interviewed always try to maintain amicable and professional relationships with their publics. Multinational companies sometimes are allies with government and sometimes are rivals, depending on the issues involved.

Contrary to my study (2000a), in which I found one company's relationship with certain publics definitely influenced this company's relationship with a third party, participants in this study did not express much support for this inquiry. This is probably, the situation that one company's conflict with one public would influence the other one happened in the early 1990s. After a decade of development and the many multinational companies in China, Chinese have learned the Western way to deal with conflicts. However, two phenomena were found in this study: multinational companies' relationships with competitors and associations that multinational companies formed in dealing with local issues.

Usually, multinational companies do not have many interactions with their competitors. They probably meet relative to certain functions, for example, exhibitions or some social activities. In those functions, they usually act very civily to each other. There are competitions, which may sometimes have impact on the company itself. Yet, when some significant issues occur, these competitors will close ranks and try to resolve the problem. One participant from a fast food restaurant told me about his company's joining with one of its competitors to fight the local government's decision to raise taxes:

> We decided to keep silent and do nothing about this decision. But we needed a coalition, because if one fast food restaurant followed this regulation, the rest of us would have to do likewise. So, we contacted eachother and arrived at a consensus of doing nothing or procrastinating on executing this order. Finally, we not only did not

have to pay the high tax but also compiled the government to rescind this regulation!

He further remarked that expressed this action did not have any negative impact on relationships with the local government. “Right now, the government officers are more reasonable than before. They will listen if you can provide a reasonable explanation.”

This finding also supported Vercic’s (1997) argued that, when conflicts arose, organizations usually had to choose one side among the multiple publics. Usually, companies would employ efforts and strategies to have better performance than competitors in the market. However, with the issue that concerned the common interests and one company’s behavior would influence the other one, multinational companies realized the significance of collaborating with each other to overcome problems.

Another coalition building tactic among multinational companies in Taiwan also proved to be a successful one. There are thousands of Taiwanese companies in China. Because of the political opposition, these Taiwanese companies had to deal with all the difficulties by themselves, without the protection from the Taiwanese government. In China, when interacting with governments, there is usually the “hierarchal ladder” these Taiwanese companies have to go through. For example, if one company intended to talk with a local party secretary, the local government would request a Taiwanese representative with “equivalent status” to be present. Consequently, Taiwanese companies felt the necessity to strengthen their position. Therefore, Taiwanese businessmen associations were established in different cities in China, in order to provide services to all the Taiwanese companies. This kind of coalition indeed strengthened the power of Taiwanese companies in China, inasmuch as the president of the association has the similar status of the party secretary and that will enable these Taiwanese companies to voice their concerns to the local government.

Research Question 2: What type(s) of relationship does a multinational company develop with its publics?

Win-win (Covenantal Relationships) Relationships

This question is designed to find out what organizations and publics get out of the relationships they build. Most participants described the nature of the relationships as "win-win" or "covenantal relationships." They considered they not just only invest in China, but also participate in the development of China.

As one participant from a telecommunication company put it they used the term "partnership" in describing the relationships they built with the media in China,

> We understand our company cannot just stand alone doing our business. There is so much we need to count on. Yet, media in China also need information from us to provide them with the newsworthy stories to put in the press. So, we are partners with the media to reach the win-win ground.

Under the Umbrella of the "Win-Win Relationship"

Participants talked about the premise of having a win-win relationship with their companies' publics. Therefore, many of them considered the difficulty of identifying single type of relationships. They think, as one interviewee from a soft drink company said, "We developed different relationships – exchanges relationships, communal relationships, covenantal relationships… or whatever relationships you call it, with the goal of reaching a win-win situation." He further put it, "as long as we don't exploit publics."

Another participant elaborated on this point and described on the reason of this situation,

> We face customers with different demands… of course, we want them to come back again and again. But, in some initial contacts, when you are not sure if you both like each other, what you have in mind is… doing the best you can to satisfy them and get their commitment to come back.

Another participant believed, besides communicating with publics, the function of public relations is to serve the different interests of an organization. So, totally accommodating publics will not be able to make her company function. Therefore, she said, "it's intertwined. You have to balance publics' interests, employees, employees, suppliers' interests, and our company's bottom-line."

This finding also leads to the next finding on the mixture of relationships.

The Mixture of Relationships

Participants in this research have spent considerable time defining the types of relationships existing between their companies and publics. They described the more contractual relationships that exist between employees and between suppliers. Communal and exchange relationships also can be found in the relationships with local government and the community. More exchange relationships can be examined with consumers. Covenantal relationships can exist in relationships with different publics. Yet, participants expressed the difficulty of identifying only one type of relationship. As a general manager from an American auto company said frequently during the interview "they are all intertwined." To be more specific, she said, “Different relationships may exist in accordance with the purpose of behaviors.” Furthermore, one public relations manager from a food company said,

> An exchange relationship has as its function – to get things done in an effective way. But we don’t always apply exchange relationships, even though I do acknowledge that in for-profit companies, it is necessary. However, when we are doing charities, do you think we only have the expectation that the Chinese people will do something in return in the future? If we only concentrate on exchange relationships, we can only focus on the product development, instead of spending so much effort and money on charity.

Different Types of Relationships with Publics

Arguments on Exploitive Relationships

Only few participants discussed in detail the exploitive relationships they have with publics. Most participants believe they do not develop exploitive relationships with publics. They believe exploitive relationships will shorten companies’ life in China. As a participant from a fast food chain company expectation,

> What we want here is long-term. We do not have the expectation like those investors in China in the early days, when many of them just came here for short-term investment. They left with all the money they “earned,” without thinking about how they have exploited and cheated the people… What we want here is the long-term partnership with the consumers, the government, and the community…

Two participants argued about whether exploitive relationships are really “exploitive.” They consider, probably the publics may be exploited at the beginning, but the long-term result is for the benefit of thousands of people in China. These two participants, one is a Singaporean, who works as a public relations manager for an international hotel in Shanghai, and the other is a Beijing native working for a multinational Internet company. Even though there is a difference in nationalities, their points of views are similar. I will quote first the Singaporean:

> I don’t think exploitive relationships are bad. You know we draw resources of the community, they will reciprocate as well. Because by being here, it would be an example of what luxury should be. They are able to learn from us as well.

Surprisingly in a similar vein, the Beijing native in the Internet company said,

> Well, in terms of being exploited, for the short term, yes. It looks like we are being exploited, because multinationals came to China for the cheap labor and the bountiful resources. But, China is still like a baby in the eyes of the world… We are young and there is a lot to learn. It is fine that we are exploited right now, we know that we also learn something from them. Yup. We are exploited. But, so what? A few decades later, the multinationals will be surprised to find out they have gradually nurtured many talents in different fields for China.

Communal Relationships and Arguments on Communal Relationships

Many participants remarked about having win-win relationships, while some participants stressed the perception of responsibilities of publics by building communal relationships. Yet, when mentioning communal relationships, it was usually discussed on the level of community relations or on corporate social responsibility. One public affairs manager from a famous consumer product company remarked,

> When we help, I don't expect anything specifically in return. I never asked for anything in return. So, it's not like, I help you in this, you help me in that. Never. That's because, to me, even though that's very acceptable in China, I feel it's beyond the established ethics in [my company.]

In a similar tone, a public relations manager from a famous soft drink company stated,

> Each year, our company sponsors many sport activities in China. Not only do we sponsor sport events, we also participate in the Project of Hope, to help poor students in the rural areas further their education. We do this without any expectation of reciprocity. We want to promote the concept of good corporate citizen and we also want to be a good world citizen.

However, for some participants, building communal relationships does not come easy. Corporations are not charity units but need to pay attention to the bottom-line. Though participants agreed on expecting nothing in return, they also recognized that they must assure the survival of the company. One CEO from an accessory company stated,

> What? Are you saying I am the fool, who keeps donating? Our bottom line is not to be exploited. But it does not mean we have to continuously donate… I have thousands of employees to feed… Well, there are always different terms for showing communal responsibility. When I was discussing my employees' working shifts, I tried to provide flex-time to the married, because they have families to take care of. I don't think it is an exchange relationship. I think… it is human nature to think

for others, about as much as the circumstances allow.

Even though participants have different points of view on whether a profit company should develop communal relationships with publics, evidence shows that, the more communal relationships a company developed, the more public support is generated. Some companies aim at contributing regional development without expecting something specific in return, but, in the end, they find out the positive feedbacks from the community also contribute to the company's development.

When I was in a city in South China, I interviewed a CEO from a high-tech company. This company had its own industrial park, where there are, besides the gigantic factory buildings, movie theaters, disco, hospital, and counseling centers for its employees. It was quite like tremendous complex in that area. However, the CEO maintained a very humble attitude in responding to my questions and stated that the company's success was because of the support from the community and the local government. As humble as he was, he did not indicate whether the support from the local government is out of exchange norms. He described the outcome brought by communal relationships as follows:

> We started early here, when there was not much foreign investments in this area. When we first came here, the resources we obtained were minimal. However, the local government showed its pleasure by providing everything we needed – free duty, and a good package for us to stay here. So, right now, we are the largest corporation in this area. There is only one company in this industrial park – our company! We want to reciprocate. Our company just started the business for the domestic markets. So, there are no direct interests involved in

the relationships [with the community]. For example, this area needed a new road. The local government did not have the budget, so they came to ask our president for assistance. Our president immediately agreed to donate millions of dollars for paving the road. In addition, the equipment and facility in the local fire fighting department needed updated. We also volunteered to donate money to improve the equipment. Our company also values education. So, we donated the money to build new schools in this area. Why do we do this? Isn't this like what Chinese are usually like, "taking from the society and returning to the society?" What we want to do is to remember all the help we received from the community and the local government.

So, we are doing what we can to develop this area. But, it is true that, the more we devote ourselves to this area, the more the government is willing to help us and listen to us. Would you consider this as an exchange relationship? I cannot predict what the local government thinks. But, what I want to do is be a good corporate citizen. I think it is more communal.

Reaching for a Mutual Communal Relationships

Clark and Mills's (1993) discussion on communal relationships focus on the psychological perspective, which translates into how a person thinks when providing benefits or other welfare needs to others. Yet, the outcomes from communal relationship are seldom discussed. Obviously, both exchange relationships and communal relationships can exist concurrently (J. Mills, personal communication, Oct. 16, 1999).

As a communal relationship is defined "the norm… is to give benefits in response to needs or to demonstrate a general concern for the other person" (Clark & Mills, 1993, p. 684), Clark and Mills, in discussing the difference between communal and exchange relationships, mentioned a relationship wherein both sides' show a concern for each other, mutual communal relationships that will make parties feel fulfilled in relationships. Many times, communal relationships started one-sided or relationships may start with an exchange relationship, as long as one keeps following the communal norm of the relationship. There will be a stronger mutual relationship between an organization and its publics, as evidenced from the remarks from the CEO of the high-tech enclave in Dong Guan, who considered one of his responsibilities was to help promote local development.

Contractual Relationships

Participants had divergent points of views on contractual relationships. In essence, many agreed that a contractual relationship exists when both sides indicate in writing the conditions governing their working relationships. Therefore, participants identified their relationships with employees and suppliers as contractual. However, they did not totally agree on what Benette (2001) considered the power asymmetry in this type of relationship. Signing a contract was in a way to protect the weak's benefit. Participants said, "Now, there are more varieties on the job market. If they don't like the package we offer, they just look elsewhere." Therefore, one participant said the perspective employees have more power, because they have more choices in selecting jobs.

Other Type of Relationships

Power in Relationships

Though not many participants mentioned power differences in relationships, some did emphasize this point directly. The power difference can be examined from two aspects: supervisor-subordinate relationships and multinational companies' relationships with local governments.

As for **the supervisor-subordinate relationships**, which is commonly the case, one participant said,

"There is, of course, the power difference in the supervisor-subordinate relationship. I don't mean that employees cannot voice their concerns or fight for themselves, but… sometimes, power is really relative. For example, even though my boss told me I could be frank and tell him whatever is on my mood, do you think I really will do so? Of course not! I have a family to raise and I don't want to lose my job in this company!"[8]

Upon hearing the statement from this participant, I could not help but ask him what he would do if he were unhappy with his company at all. He gave a sigh first and answered, "of course, you have the freedom to change jobs. But, you probably cannot find a better job than this one. This is the way it is. This is life, right?"

On the other hand, one participant, from the United States, described his relationships with his subordinates:

> Yes, a covenantal relationship is what I have always want to maintain. It is difficult sometimes. In the United States, the working relationship is more equal than it is here. Living in Asia, you just automatically learn the accepted hierarchy of relationships. Sometimes when you cannot get your employees support in some issues, you just want to exercise more authority to make them follow you… Deep in your heart, you know it is not right…. It is hard… So I try hard to get rid of that thought right away and encourage

> my staff to express their points of view and I listen to them. My employees know I am trying, so they, in turn, are more willing to listen to what I want them to do.

Inevitably, multinational companies sometimes assume the superior part in the relationships, because of the advanced know-how and the much broader worldview they hold. One participant elaborated on the influence of power by saying, "Power can leverage the efficiency in achieving the company's goals." Another participant from an auto company described how he asymmetrically resolved the conflict with the local government when the local government mentioned about the insufficient funding for erecting the factory buildings:

> The city mayor came to my office and told me it would cost more to fill and level up the land. So, he was asking if we could just build the factory buildings on the land as it exists. I told him he should follow what the contract agreed; that is, it is their responsibility to create a good environment for my company to invest here. The city mayor kept calling me and told me he could not make it. I finally told him that, if he could not improve land, I would go elsewhere to build my factory. The city mayor then had to alter some other budgets to find funds to correct the land problem.

Power plays an important role in both external and internal working environments. According to Spicer (1997), power is about whether one has the ability to influence the other. Salancik and Pfeffer (1989) believed that power is the ability to get things done. However, Thibaut and Kelley believed that power is about the degree to which one's behavior can affect the quality of the other's outcome. Whether it is about the supervisor-subordinate relationship or

[8] In China, multinationals usually pay higher than local companies.

the relationship between the hosting country and the multinational companies, power plays a significant role in the relationship.

Hage and Aiken (1970) interpreted power as “the capacity of one social position to set the conditions under which other social positions must perform” (p, 19). Usually, in many situations, the one with more power is usually likely to impose the rank for getting things done. However, as Price and Mueller (1986) argued, “just because one person gains power does not mean that another person must lose power” (p. 41-42), J. Grunig (1992) considered using collaboration in increasing power of everyone in the organization, so that everyone would be benefited.

In reflecting what J. Grunig’s (1992) argument, the quote from the public relations manager from the United States showed the willingness to empower employees enhanced more commitment in relationships.[9]

Likewise, studies on power in organizations or interpersonal relationships recognized the imbalance of power in relationships (Hon & J. Grunig, 1999; Hung, 2000a). Hinde (1997) contended that in relationships, one holds power in some certain areas and the others holds power in others. He also argued that the controlled side in relationships is not always powerless; for example, the owner of an organization seems to control the tangible resources, but workers can initiate strikes or seek employment elsewhere. Furthermore, he believed that the distribution of power is the outcome of negotiation between parties involved in relationships.

In public relations, Ferguson (1984) also pointed out the distribution of power in a relationship. L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Ehling (1992) argued that, even if power distribution is unequal in relationships, a quality relationship could still be produced if parties followed a norm of reciprocity.

Another Type of Relationships: Manipulative Relationships

A few participants mentioned their relations with the media. They understood that media can serve as a useful channel for companies to transmit out messages. At the same time, they also understood that having good relationships with media will really fulfill a company's interests. One public relations director from a home appliance company spoke about his relationships with the media by saying, "well, one of our jobs is to build relationships with the media, so that we can leverage many things. How do you put it? To manipulate the media." In elaborating about the context of a manipulative relationship, a public relations manager in a Japanese auto company told me her experience with the media as follows:

> One time I had some problems on housing loans. It actually was my mistake. However, I was very upset about the attitude the government staff showed. So, I called the reporters covering auto news and told them to call this staff. Everywhere in the world, people don't want the media to bug them, especially when something bad happens. I knew it was not right, but I just wanted to do something.

Manipulative relationships, sometimes, can benefit the interests of both sides. From time to time, some celebrities manipulate the media to generate more publicity and, at the same time, the media gets some scoops to cover. However, the intention and the behaviors can be questionable. In this case, the public relations manager felt dated about doing something in "revenge" and the media got the material to report. However, the whole process opens the question as to whether the behavior is ethical or not. Hence, I believe, people in manipulative

---

[9] Relationship outcomes, such as trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction will be discussed later.

relationships sometimes use this win-win situation as a cover, but actually an individual's interest is served.

Other Type of Relationships: Symbiosis Relationships

Departments in an organization have their obligations to fulfill, in order to maintain and continue this organization's survival. Or, different organizations in an environment do not have any specific relationships but they interact because of the job. One participant from an international hotel in Shanghai talked about her department's (public relations) relationship with the food and catering department.

> Our departments contact and interact with each other because of the work need. They provide us the food and equipment for our public relations functions because their job requires them to do so. They do this for us, not because they are thinking of our benefits or they are expecting something in return. It is just their job requirements. And vice versa.

Nevertheless, this participant acknowledged that, when they were doing their job to fulfill the responsibilities, they knew they were doing something to contributing the hotel's competitive position in Shanghai.

Research Question 3: How does(do) the type(s) of organization-public relationships a multinational company develops influence its choice of relationship maintenance strategies for its Chinese publics?

Win-win Relationships and Positivity, Assurances of Legitimacy and Being Unconditionally Contructive

Participants also stated that the more they build the win-win relationships with publics, the more they are willing to engage in dialogues and listen to publics:

> In general, our approach really is trying to create a win-win situation. I think it's very important for every party to really feel like they're having a proactive exchange dialogue. That's why, as I mentioned before, it's so important to continue dialogues and discussions with our various publics and key audiences. It's really to exchange information and continue the flow of information. So, we never seem one-sided. It's not good business to cause the other party to feel either not treated properly or cheated."

A public relations manager from a telecommunication company also mentioned that they legitimized some publics in China by treating them as "strategic partner." He considered the current market in China requires different groups to collaborate, instead of vigorously competing with each other.

In addition, fostering a win-win relationship with consumers made multinational companies apply more strategies in <u>being unconditionally constructive</u> and <u>positivity</u>. As China is still a developing country, where public education still needs to be instituted. With millions of expensive products imported from overseas, there is much counterfeiting in China. However, counterfeits usually translated into poor quality and sometimes endanger consumers' health. Yet, consumers sometimes would buy from the multinational companies that sell the "genuine products." Hearing the complaints from consumers, one interviewee from a multinational company in a textile industry exchanged the counterfeits for the real ones for the consumers. His approach was to create a win-win situation:

> The reason why we decided to do so was to educate consumers to the differences between genuine products and counterfeits. Consumers usually want to get something at the lowest price. However, what they pay for is also what they get. Of course, they are not satisfied with the bad quality of counterfeits. In providing the genuine products, we can educate consumers to tell the difference between a genuine product and its counterfeit. In addition, after they enjoy the satisfaction coming from the genuine product, they become more aware of the real product and reject the counterfeits. Consumers in China need more education. We don't want to punish them when they are already suffering because of lack of knowledge.

This general manager also agreed that, when being unconditionally constructive, consumers became more supportive and more responsive to the company.

Communal Relationships and Sharing of Tasks

China is a country with great business potential, because of its bountiful resources and huge consumer and labor population. Yet, with the door open just a bit more than two decades ago, this gigantic land is developing unevenly, with coastal cities more market-oriented and interior territories more planned and less developed economy. Many inner cities in China have suffered from illiteracy and poverty. Multinational companies understand that one of their contributions to China is to participate in its development. Hence, according to the interview records, almost all the multinational companies interviewed participated in the Project of Hope, a program that sponsors education for poor children in the rural provinces and cities. Besides the Project of Hope, multinational companies also serve in their own ways by sponsoring different charities, depending upon which industry they are in. For example, one participant from an international Internet company described how her company devoted its efforts to high technology education in China:

> I think, in China, we cannot behave too pragmatic. What I mean here is we cannot just only focus on our own bottom-line. So we set our company on the road to educating talents in high technology. We have a commitment to China. We not only do business here. We also want to help cultivate talents. We are not afraid that the students or employees we have trained go to work elsewhere, not in our company. We will be very happy to see that we joined in the task of building China. We like our job and we hope to help more Chinese love this field as much as we do. Many people ask, 'What do you expect in return?' We actually never think of this. We just hope there will be more experts in this field in China.

Her remarks also concur with Clark and Mills' (1993) argument on communal relationships. Even though communal relationships occur when no benefit is expected in return, it is something intangible, for example, joy and satisfaction that rewards the party providing the benefits.

Another participant from a telecommunication company also spoke about how his company has contributed in the development in China from a long-term perspective.

> When we entered China, we received a lot of support from Chinese people and the

> government. Because of the support, our company has become
> the top telecommunication in China. Will you ask what they want us in return?
> Well, this is not the point. That is how our company has committed to this land. Many people asked us about our intention in joining the Project of Hope. Our answer is very straightforward: We don't expect every one to come to buy our cell phones. We don't expect them to say how excellent our products are. We have been here for a long time and we just want to do something for this country.

His remarks correspond with Clark and Mill's (1993) that communal relationships usually involve shared experiences and knowledge. In addition, this public relations manager's also mentioned the role of the time factor in the cultivation of communal relationships. Clark, Powell, and Mills (1986) contended that communal relationships do not have to last long. However, Ledingham, Bruning, and Wilson's (1999) study did provide the evidence about the difference time could make.

Exchange Relationships and Legitimacy

Exchange relationships happen when one expects something in return from the other or one gives benefits in order to return the favor he or she received before. Therefore, several participants agreed that legitimacy plays an important role in relationships, inasmuch as, when one could not legitimate the others in relationships, one may easily exploit the other. One participant from a Japanese electric appliance company said, "I don't know how not to legitimize the others when my company is asking a favor from them."

Another participant, who considered exchange relationships meet the needs for both organization and publics and is a form of win-win situation; therefore, "when you are thinking the benefit of the others, even though it is in an exchange form, you acknowledge the other's existence and expectation."

Research Question 4: How do the characteristics of Chinese culture, family orientation, self-Other, and relational orientation, influence a multinational company's relationship maintenance with its Chinese publics?

Cultural Influence

Participants from the United States and Europe did not dwell much on how their own countries' culture influenced the relationship maintenance. But, one general manager from an auto company in the United States related how her American culture influenced her dealing with Chinese people: "being straightforward and honest is one of the best ways, because people know that when talking with me, I don't have a hidden agenda. I think it then can be the basis for trust. Then you have trust, you have relationships." However she also mentioned how she dealt with the complicated Chinese culture that has involved a dufferebt approach than her own country.

> The characteristics are the unspoken rules of the playing field here. You have to take all of them into consideration. You have to keep a balance. Otherwise, it wouldn't work. In accord with a code of ethics, professionalism, and the aim of what you want to achieve, you also take into consideration what they want to achieve. They also want something from you.

Her view on how she interacted with Chinese also reflected on how the three characteristics of Chinese culture played a role in her communication: being indirect, face, and favor. Relational harmony is considered significant in relationships in the Chinese society (Sun, 1990; Chian, 1979); as a result, in order to maintain an amicable relationship, Chinese people sometimes need to beat around the bush when requesting or discussing some serious issues.

Another point more salient from this general manager's remark is about favor and exchange relationships. Even though Chinese do not especially emphasize exchange relationships, whenever one receives something from another, it usually creates a sense of indebtedness and feeling of obligation to return this favor (Gao & Ting-Toomey, 1998; Hwang, 1987; King, 1980). This situation can readily be seen in the current development in China. In order to catch up with the world, the Chinese government has spent a major effort attracting foreign investment. Yet, when providing excellent packages and excellent environments for the financially sound multinational companies, what they want from these multinational companies is their long-term commitment and investment in China.

Some participants from American companies, like this general manager, understood the nuances of the Chinese culture but also stood firm on what their own culture has nurtured in them. Hence, like a public relations manager from an American bank put it, "So, it has to be balanced and it's very, very complicated."

American companies, among all the interviewees that participated in this study, seemed not just only to adopt themselves to the Chinese society but also to be persistent in their own cultural values and indoctrination. One public relations manager from a consumer product company spoke about how he combined the two different approaches of being straightforward but also saving the face for the other party:

> We always show the friendly and easy-going side to the Chinese people. Whenever they make some requests, even though they are sometimes indirect, we can catch the nuances of the meanings and cooperate with them. But, we also show them that we have our own principles and we need to follow our company's policies. Will they stop doing business with us because we cannot fully provide them with what they want? Absolutely not! Once they understand our principles and our bottom-lines, they will respect us and will not force us to do something against our will or contrary to our best interests.

In contrast to the American style mentioned by the participants from American companies, the participants from a Japanese auto company are more inclined to adapt themselves to the Chinese culture and are more low-profile. In probing the cause for such behaviors, the vice president from this company explained the similarity between Chinese culture and Japanese culture in which both highlight the hierarchy in relationships. Moreover, Japanese companies seems to be more rigid in the reporting system:

> In China, a society that puts a lot of emphasis on *guanxi*, you can usually easily have things done when you know someone important. But, for the Japanese community, if you bypass the person who is actually in charge and report to a staff in a higher position, you will be questioned about [the inappropriate behavior]. Japanese people will think you made a mistake by going directly to a higher supervisor.

This rigid hierarchal reporting system is also reflected in the office physical layout. When I entered Japanese companies in China, the most salient characteristic was a huge office with rows of desks. All the employees worked in this huge office, without partitions between desks. Supervisors usually have desks at the head of each row. I did not have the opportunity to visit Japanese companies in other countries. However, the strong Chinese hierarchy in relationships as the social norm of relational determination that Yang (1992) has described allows the Japanese organizational structure to fit especially well in China.

In addition, Japanese companies usually are more careful in interacting with Chinese publics. This is because of history, when China was invaded by the Japanese military in early the 20th century and thousands of Chinese were killed. Many Chinese people still feel a strong hatred toward Japanese people. The general manager from an American fast food chain restaurant in China also expressed the same reaction experienced in an elevator with a Japanese once:

> I was in an elevator with a Japanese and several other Chinese. In less than 30 seconds in the elevator, I sensed the hatred these Chinese felt toward the Japanese. I believe the Japanese could feel it too. But, what can you say?

The vice president of the Japanese auto company also described this difficult situation from his own experience:

> We, the management and the employees we hired, know well about what happened in history in World War II. Even though it happened many decades ago, Chinese people remember it well. Many Chinese people now still are angry about how the Japanese military treated Chinese people at that time. It is also why we entered the

> Chinese market much later than those American or German auto companies… In the office, though no one mentioned the history, it is still like an unspoken reminder about what happened in the past… so, management is always very cautious in interacting with employees. We don't want to give the impression again that we torture Chinese people.

This vice president, as a result, articulated the prudent attitude they usually exists when dealing with Chinese publics. They understand that if something is not handled properly, the Chinese anger against the Japanese may flare up again.

In contrast to the multinational companies from the United States of America and Europe, multinational companies from other Asian regions,[10] such as Taiwan, seems to observe and conduct themselves according to the cultural norms in China. It is because Chinese culture prevails among all in Asian countries.

As for interviewees from Taiwan, they usually described their companies' relationships with publics from the perspective of interpersonal relationships. It is because, in China, it seems building business relationships starts from cultivating personal relationships. As one Taiwanese put it, "you have got to spend a lot of time cultivating your own network and win their trust, so that they will think you are part of their circle."

The norm of self and Other that people tend to provide more favors to those whom they consider "insider" is more prevalent in the business world between Asian companies and their publics in China than that in multinational companies from Europe or the United States. And, because of the emphasis on being "zi ji ren" (insiders), Asian multinational companies usually spend more time on building networks, that is, what is usually called "*guan-xi*." One general manager from a Taiwanese multinational company used a folk saying in describing the function of “*guan-xi*:” “They always say here, ‘if you don’t have *guan-xi*, do go find one as soon as possible. Once you have *guan-xi*, nothing will be serious any more.’”

But, with the overarching concern for a company’s bottom-line, *guan-xi* is not really as important as it was before. Companies are “selectively” seeking the personal networks. As a result, when employees approach management about having their relatives to work in the company, “we always have to tell them that they need to go through all the required procedures, for example, taking examinations.”

Another reason for multinational companies in China trying to get rid of the concept of *guan-xi* is because they need to take care of their reputations. Even though one participant acknowledged the advantage of *guan-xi* by saying that it facilitates things, participants were more concerned about how publics think of the company. One computer company official said, “We have to show that we are a company with a sound structure and integrity.”

Family orientation in the Chinese culture is what made Hofstede (1984; 2002) categorize China as a collectivist society, inasmuch as group values is superior to individual values.

Many multinational companies, whether from Europe, the United States, or Asia, considered it necessary to participate in activities of public welfare. One multinational company from Taiwan that has built an empire in the Dong Guan area in China considered it a cultural trait:

> Chinese people usually say “taking from the society and returning to the society ( ).”When we started here, we got a lot of help from the government and the community. What we want to do is remember all the help

[10] I use “regions,” instead of “countries” here to avoid any sensitive political issues.

> we received from the community and the local government. So, we are doing what we can to develop this area.

This remark shows "*bao*" (reciprocity) in the relationships. Yang (1992) considered there is interdependence in relationships, that is, each individual recognizes his or her dependence on other members in the society. Therefore, the principle of reciprocity serves as the foundation to balance the gives and takes in relationships. Even though this kind of concept cannot only be described as exchange relationships, people in the Chinese society have long been accustomed to the norm that one should think about others, because groups are usually more important than individuals. In sum, there does exist the contradiction of the concepts of "insider" and the family orientation, inasmuch as the traditions of seeking *guan-xi* and obligations to the society are so common in daily practice.

Relationship Hierarchy, Role Determination, and Legitimacy

Confucianism has long been mentioned on the emphasis on hierarchy. Some participants mentioned the new cultural phenomenon influenced by the Cultural Revolution and said many Chinese people now do not really show much respect to senior persons. However, multinational participants from Asian countries, like Taiwan and Japan, considered the hierarchal influence still existed. Because of the emphasis on the ladder of hierarchy, many Taiwanese companies were unable to talk with some government officials. "We were told that we needed to have one representative who has the equivalent status with the representative from the other side, so that we can have dialogues," one Taiwanese said so.

The Taiwanese companies in China have become victims of the political opposition between Taiwan and China. Since both sides do not acknowledge each other's legitimacy in regime, the Taiwanese government, therefore, does not have any official offices in China to take care these Taiwanese companies. When Taiwanese companies in China have problems, personal or business, they have to handle these problems on their own. This situation orphaned all the Taiwanese companies there. Whenever they contacted higher governmental officials in China, they were rejected, because "the status from both sides are not equivalent," described by a Taiwanese participant with a sigh:

> Taiwanese companies in China really suffer a lot! Even though we brought a lot of advanced technology to China and help the development in many parts of the country, we are still sometimes discriminated. The government in Taiwan's insist on the political legitimacy is strongly denied by the Chinese government. So, an official office from the Taiwanese government is not allowed. When conflicts arise, there is not a strong unit to mediate or resolve the conflicts… Whenever we approach the government officers in China, they would ask, 'Who are you? Go find someone with higher position and we can talk!'

In resolving the serious problem of being "orphans" in China, Taiwanese companies in different cities formed many regional Taiwanese businessmen's associations. The Presidents of these associations represent Taiwanese companies in dealing with higher government officials.

Another phenomenon shows the role determination in relationships is influenced by Confucius' saying, "If you are not in the position, do not get involved ( )." What Confucius said here means one should concentrate on his or her job and do not walk across the line to interfere or do others' jobs. Yet, this concept caused some jobs' delays because no one in the government agencies wanted to take responsibilities. One participant said, "We were rejected many times. They did not want to cooperate… I don't know if it is the problem of bureaucracy or no one wants to take the responsibility. But it is our companies that suffer."

However, for cities with more business functions, like Shanghai, this problem is not common. It is because Shanghai is now trying to be one of the leading cities in the world, and the Shanghai government understands the importance of efficiency.

***Guanxi*, Relational Orientation, and Networking**

One participant told me, "My supervisor told me to social with the local custom bureau to cultivate the relationships, so that it will be easier in the future to get things done." I was not surprised to hear so; actually, I expected to hear it.

As discussed in the early part of this section, though some multinational companies said that they strictly enforced the policy of not using personal connections or accepting requests from personal networks, the relationships with government officials are still believed very important in China. As one participant said, "China is ruled by people (   ) So, relationships are very important."

Networking is relatively important in human relationships in China, compared with that in the Western world.   One participant remarked on this point, "Here, when people meet for the first time, they usually started conversations by talking about the common networks they have. They feel, when talking about the persons they both have connections, they will feel more like family." So, when people find the common networks, it sometimes will facilitate things get done sooner.

<u>Double-life of Chinese in Multinational Companies</u>

An interesting aspect found during the interviews is the double lives led by many Chinese in multinational companies. These Chinese, trained in Western companies and fluent in English, conduct business as Westerners. They follow the company's code of conduct well and do not let *guan-x*i get in the way. Many of the participants that I have interviewed said, "I would follow the company's rule. Everything should be done by the company's regulation. I will not involve in any *guan-xi*."

Yet, one Chinese interviewee from a Dutch electric appliance company in the Shanghai area said with candid that he and other behaved this way only at work. "So, after work, we go back to our 'original face.'" In probing this phenomenon and asking how they maintained this kind of double-life, the participant told me,

> Probably it is because of our Chinese nature. Chinese people are hard working and can endure being mistreated for a long time… I don't mean at all that we are mistreated in the multinationals… We can live the life that they request us to live even if it totally different than what we are used to … Another reason is that, after suffering in poverty for a long time, all of us want to have better lives. In addition, multinational companies usually have advanced knowledge and technology. We, as well, want to learn from them.

Does Chinese culture have any influence on this phenomenon? This participant explained as follows:

Well, I think… probably because of the doctrine of '*li*' (, ritual). *Li* explains how people should behave properly… In addition, there is also the hierarchy in the society… So, we know we cannot walk cross the lines and behave impolitely…

China, from the ancient history, has been considered as "The Country of Rituals," that means, there are always the requirement in each behaviors and everyone should behave properly. Even though many Chinese participants commented on the influence of the Cultural Revolution, it seems the impact of *li* still exists and helped Chinese adopt themselves in an organization from other culture.

Incorporating Chinese Culture with Organizational Culture

Just as Confucius said, "thinking of oneself, instead of blaming others" ( ), many Asian multinational companies followed this rule and incorporated it into the company culture. One participant from a Taiwanese high tech company said,

> Behave and educate yourself first. Then regulate the family and rule the state. We are always educated this way, so we are influenced by this aspect. We treat our employees like a part of the family and devote ourselves to the community service.

While many multinational companies tried to avoid the negative connotation so ingrained in the Chinese culture, e.g. *guanxi*, and *renqing* (favor), some companies, especially those from Asia, e.g. Taiwan, creatively and successfully incorporated the Chinese philosophy in the corporate culture. One famous computer company from Taiwan echoed what Confucius said, "Human nature is basically good ( )" as the first principle of the corporate culture. The participant from this company said,

> The company wants to create an effective working environment by empowering and trusting employees. Our CEO encouraged all the employees to express their opinions, take risks, and, most significantly, learn from mistakes. Because of the trust that the company has showed us, we, in return, work harder to show support. I think this is probably one of the main factors why our company is so strong worldwide.

Other Finding: Relationship Maintenance Influenced by Organizational Culture

For some multinational companies, adhering firmly to the corporate culture, means reaching maximum effectiveness. As much as many participants agreed on the values of Chinese culture, participants also worried about how the great emphasis on human beings in the Chinese culture might sometimes hinder companies from reaching success their objectives.

Even though the concept of organizational cultures was not incorporated in the original design for this study, several participants mentioned how the corporate values and corporate culture nurtured their ways of building relationship with publics. One very particular experience was two participants from a well-known international hotel, who were interviewed separately by me and my assistant, showed the corporate motto that they always carried in their wallets. This motto influenced deeply on how they serve guests. In separate interviews with both of the participants from this hotel, they both mentioned about how they provide services, "We ladies and gentlemen serve ladies and gentlemen."

Another reason why participants mentioned the muted influence by Chinese culture was because, in China, multinational companies tend to maintain their competitive edge, as one participant put it, "[The company] is an international professional company. We treat everyone equally and will not be influenced by *guanxi* in China. This is our standard."

Eisenberg and Riley (2001) defined corporate culture as the organizational value that describes how an organization succeeds and how it influences the more successful business outcomes. Multinational companies owed their success to their corporate cultures. One participant from an electronic company said,

> Many people and companies visit our company and asked how we succeed. We always tell them, 'it's simple. Just follow the company's principle: quality, effectiveness, customer satisfaction, and team work,' There is really no better answer. This is what our company has asked us to do. I believe it is also what makes us so successful.

One company that has a textile factory and an auto accessory factory in China has been a very low-profile one in China. While many multinational companies put great effort in promoting their brand names in China, this company is quietly executing its jobs and maintains consistent growth in the market. The CEO of this company said one of the company's principles is being modest on achievements and solicitous of people ( ). Therefore, the company usually shows their commitment to China by applying the principle to its behavior. It has been involved in many local charities and provides know-how and expertise to companies in the same industry as a result of presumed objectives to other companies.

Research Question 5: What are the relationship outcomes between a multinational company and its Chinese publics?

This research question intends to explore the quality of relationships multinational companies have cultivated in China. In answering this question, I employed the relationship quality as Hon and J. Grunig (1999) suggested: trust, control mutuality, relational commitment, and relational satisfaction. I will discuss trust first, which encompasses the three dimensions: integrity, dependability, and competence.

Trust

<u>Integrity</u>

Trust, as agreed by many participants, is the foundation of relationships. In this question, I had one problem in the wording. Participants were confused how I defined "fairly," which means more like "equally" in Chinese. So, participants told me it was hard to judge whether they were being fair, because the quality of relationships they have developed with publics are different; therefore, it influenced the ways of their interactions in relationships. However, most of them felt that their companies treated their publics with respect.

In discussing about being just, many participants related it to behave ethical in the relationships. For some participants from very successful companies, they considered the success of their companies was the result of being justly and ethical. One participant discussed the disadvantage brought by unethical behaviors:

> Bribing is considered, by some companies, a short cut to get things done. It does not earn any respect from people and partners. Besides, if you want to think of long-term influence, the best policy is to follow the law and be ethical.

Corporate culture on integrity also reflects on employees' behaviors. Several participants related how their fairess came from the corporate culture that strongly opposed any illegal behavior. Another participant also expressed his personal and his company's determination to play ethically, " I don't ask for anything that is not ethical, our company is highly ethical… We will not compromise any ethics. I would rather take a million dollar lawsuit than bribe someone…"

Dependability

Participants in answering this dimension have different points of views. First, when being asked how they or their companies keep promises, participants responded by saying, "it shows on how we behave." To elaborate this point, I constantly heard participants say, "We don't like to make promises. We want to show everything by our actions." One participant believed employees' behaviors also reflect what kind of corporation they are in, "If publics constantly see our behaviors in the same way, they will understand what kind of company we are."

Secondly, participants related this dimension to the emphasis of the service programs companies offered. The public relations manager from a hotel company considered the reason why guests keep coming back again and again was because of the guest quality program this hotel has had. She said, "We promised a quality service. We collect their preferences… so, it makes them feel they are welcome here and it's their home."

Next, some participants believed it is because of the company culture that influenced the behaviors of its employees. The public relations manager from the computer company said, "Just look at our company motto: Seeking excellence and being responsible for the society." We want to show that, whenever publics see our employees, they will know right away that it is from [our company]."

Competence

This question asked whether the multinational companies have the ability to achieve what they promise. Again, similar to the answer with the question on dependability, some participants expressed their companies' hesitance in making promises. However, they argued that, "When our company makes a promise, it certainly will carry this promise."

Since many participants talked about their companies' rare promises, they usually would talk more about the evidence of showing the companies' competitive qualities. Some participants referred the behaviors of publics to show their companies' ability. One from the electronics company believed the many visits from different groups of people in a day showed the company's leading role in the industry. He was proud to say, "Our company have a lot of number 1s in this region and also in China." Another participants talked about how her company influenced other companies in the same industry. She said the competitive service program in the company was introduced to other companies by former employees. However, she did not care being copied, "We welcome competition. We are glad they learn from us. It shows we are competitive."

Control Mutuality

In exploring how multinational companies show their attentions to what publics say, I asked how and why multinational companies do in order to show they take publics interests in the decision making process. Not many participants really replied to this question. It shows that, control mutuality is not a salient characteristic in organization-public relationships.

Most of participants who answered this question expressed that, in terms of relationships with employees, the companies usually have mailboxes for employees to raise their concerns. For some companies with a more open culture, employees can email directly to the CEOs or the general managers about the questions they have. When being asked about why they do so, some participants said, “We want to let the employees know they are part of the company and we care about them. We show them our concerns by our actions.” For one very successful company in South China, in order to let employees have a comfortable working environment, this company also set up a counseling center in the company.

According to the responses from participants, not all publics have the certain degrees of control mutuality. For example, the one with more power usually does not listen much to the other side’s concern, especially when calculating the maximum benefits the powerful one can get in the relationship. The same example that used in the exploitive relationship can be explained the lack of control mutuality the powerless one has. The local government needed more budgets for filling the land for a multinational company. When finding short of the budget, the city major visited the general manager of this company and requested for supports. This general manager insisted on what was agreed on the contract and would not offer the money to help solve the problem. In addition, the general manager express the possibility of moving elsewhere if the problem could not be resolved.

Another example shows that customers sometimes hold more power, making companies pay more attention to them. The interviewees from a consumer products company and an international hotel expressed that there were the quality service programs in their companies, so that they would know clients or guests preferences and would tailor the services according to the consumers’ opinions. One participant said,

> We want to let the guests feel like going home when they arrive our hotel. If they like a glass of orange juice whenever they return from outside, they will always find a glass of orange juice waiting for them in their rooms. We sell services. Of course, we have to pay attention to their needs.

Participants from consumer products companies talked about producing quality products to show their concern to publics. One of them said, “We always listen to what our customers tell us and we forward their opinions to our R&D. We show our consumers how we listen to them by producing the products they want.”

Commitment

Commitment is the most significant character among the four relationship qualities studied in this research. Even though participants did not really express their commitment to all publics around their companies, their words show strong commitment to China and they talked about different aspects in showing their commitment. Some Asian companies said their willingness to sign a contract of 50 years showed the companies’ commitment. However, most of them disrespected showing commitment by words. They considered “actions are louder than words.” Some participants said, “Just look at the continuous building of the factory buildings and everyone can tell our commitment to China.”

Some companies had commitment as one of the companies’ motto and the benefit from having commitment in China:

> One of [the company’s] philosophies is commitment. [The company] has never

> left a market after it once entered and started its business there… We let them know that we have a long-term commitment in China. Then we will get the support and understanding from the government officials and we can continue doing our business in China.

Commitment, not only enhance the long-term relationship, but also influence multinational companies' responsibilities to publics and; therefore, it increases the company's success. One public affairs manager from an American auto company described what his company has done in China:

> Our company does not just only have commitment for the long-term relationships in China. We are committed to long-term participation in China. [The company] does not take advantage of any opportunity here. We commit to help develop the auto industry in China and help to bring it to the world market. So, we brought the technology to China… The commitment we have also made us more responsible for the market in China… So, we hired many local people to work with us… What I say here is 'to work with us,' not 'work for us.' We treat them as our partners, not subordinates… I believe, this commitment will lead to China's prosperity and… of course, when China enters the world, our company succeeds too.

This quote not only shows how much commitment this company has, but also demonstrates the evidence that, when an organization commits to develop win-win relationships with publics, there will be more sharing of task, collaboration, and legitimacy.

Satisfaction

Satisfaction is the character that most participants did not know how to evaluate. Many of them expressed the lack of information to show whether the relationships their companies have built resulted in satisfaction. Therefore, many of them instructed me to ask this question to their publics.

Another common answer about satisfaction is “there is always something left for improvement.” Participants considered their companies have done their best to build and maintain relationships in China; therefore, their publics’ feedbacks on satisfaction should be an indicator for companies’ next step for improvements.

My interpretation on participants’ incapability to answer this question can be reflected on Canary and Stafford’s (1991) definition on satisfaction, “the distribution of rewards is equitable and the relational rewards outweigh costs” (p. 225). Even though relationships are on-going processes that involve continuous gives and takes, multinational companies that make profits usually have more degrees of satisfaction, compared with that of publics. As a result, even though multinational companies were satisfied with the profits they have made in China, they were unsure if what they have got equals what different publics obtained from the companies.

This is also why multinational companies were modest in saying the necessity for improvement in relationships and would prefer their publics to answer this question.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

Multiple Publics

Findings from the interviews revealed that multinational companies in China realized the importance of building and maintaining relationships with publics -- not just one public around an organization. Hence, these multinational companies would not damage easily the relationships with different publics. However, because of the different interests multinational companies hold, they sometimes had to choose side and work as a coalition. Multinational companies formed a coalition with competitors in order to have the local government get rid of the unreasonable raise in tax. Some companies from Taiwan, facing the problem of no legitimate protection from the Taiwanese government, established the associations in different cities in order to represent Taiwanese companies to negotiate with local governments and provide information to the association members.

Types of Relationships

Multinational companies in China endeavored to develop win-win or covenantal relationships with publics in China. However, many of them considered it impossible and difficult to just develop one type of relationship with publics. As Hon and J. Grunig (1999) put it, organizations need both communal and exchange relationships with their publics. Participants in this study confirmed that companies needed to reach the bottom-line without exploiting their publics. Hence, under the umbrella of a win-win relationship, there are the mixtures of relationships -- communal relationships, exchange relationships, and covenantal relationships.

Interesting discussions on exploitive relationships were elaborated by two participants, who considered exploitive relationships would not be that bad. Even though organizations had the intention to exploit publics, publics, who received the exploitation, looked forward to the future benefits. Multinational companies invested to China, for the huge market opportunities and the reduction of cost in human and natural resources; therefore, the exploitive behaviors would inevitably show. Since the Chinese employees and publics perceived the learning opportunities, the argument on "being stepped on the shoulder by others" was not seen as important in this regard. Even though this finding probably will lead other researchers to believe that it should be an exchange relationship, because both organizations and publics got something which was not from the communal norm. The limitation on the research design of not including the coorientational approach brought the weakness here, inasmuch as I could not find out how both organizations and publics perceived the types of relationships. However, one indicator on judging whether an organization develops exploitive relationships or not depends on the intention organizations develop. If an organization's motivation is to take advantage of publics, it will still be an exploitive relationship, regardless or how the outcomes turn out.

Communal relationships were developed mostly in the community relations, when organizations want to demonstrate their social responsibilities. Many participants, realizing the current stage of China as the developing country, help to cultivate talents and experts in the industries they are in and participate in the Project of Hope to enhance educations for kids in the rural areas. Companies rejecting only to foster communal relationships considered the benefits of having win-win relationships

Nevertheless, companies acknowledged the unexpected benefits they received from having communal relationships with publics. They found out the more they committed and involved in the community (without anything in return), the more support they received from publics. A company's devotion to the community and publics support resulted the enormous success of the company, as evidence showed for one company in the South China.

Contractual relationships happen mostly in relationships with publics. However, participants did not agree as what Benette (2001) proposed that this type of relationship occurs in a power-imbalanced relationship.

Three more types of relationships were identified in this study: power relationships, manipulative relationships, and symbiosis relationships. Power relationships rise when there is imbalance in resources or status. Some multinational companies would not give in to other publics because they realized they had the superior status -- capitals and know-hows. This situation also enhanced the occurrence of an exploitive relationship. Supervisors-and-subordinates relationships are also another form of power relationships. Yet, as long as the powerful one empowers the less powerful, good relationships can also be fostered.

Some companies manipulated the media, in serving the companies' own interests but with the appearance of providing "the necessary information" to the other side. The appearance of this manipulative relationship could be a win-win, but the nuance difference lies in that the organization have the power to control publics' behaviors.

Symbiosis relationships were identified when organizations or departments in an organization support each other for the job requirements. The mutually beneficial relationships were established, not because of the norms of communal or exchange relationship, but the nature of their jobs. Participants considered the importance of having the symbiosis relationship because, though it was not significant as the relationships with consumers or the government agencies, it is necessary to have this supporting function in order to survive in the environment.

Relationship Maintenance in Types of Relationships

The study on exploring different types of relationships can show researchers a way of how different types of relationships choose the strategies in maintaining relationships. The findings on the maintenance relationships in different types of relationships also confirmed the proposition that symmetrical communication produces a win-win situation. When organizations strive to have win-win relationships with publics, they would be more willing to provide positive feedbacks to publics, assure the legitimacy in relationships and be more constructive in the relationships.

As discussed that communal relationships happened more in the community relations, with the fact that China is still developing that need more participations for the country's construction, many participants talked about how their companies worked together with the government in educating young people. They were happy that they could be part of the collaborative projects that help China be strong. Even though they would not expect any rewards, it was the mental satisfaction that heart-contented these multinational companies.

Exchange relationships help legitimize publics in relationships. Participants believed that, they needed to respect the publics if they want helps and support from them. The opposite form is to exploit publics when organizations just want to get the most of the relationships without acknowledging the existence of the other side.

Cultural Influence

Participants from the United States and Europe adopted themselves to the Chinese culture, while still maintaining their own cultural values. They acknowledged the Chinese cultural influence in business but still insisted on using their own methods in doing business in China. They considered the process as complicated but needed to maintain the balance.

The Chinese culture seemed to provide a more legitimate position for the Japanese culture to exist in the Japanese multinational companies. The emphasis on relational hierarchy offered the opportunity for the Japanese companies to continue the management style in China. Another interesting finding regarding Japanese multinational companies in China was the influence of the history between China and Japan. The invasion of the Japanese military in the early 20th century resulted in Japanese companies being very careful in dealing with Chinese publics, because they did not want to be faced with another national dilemma, a deep rooted animosity of historical origin.

Multinational companies from other Asian countries adapted well in China because of the similarities in cultures. Hence, Chinese culture has considerable influence in the relationship maintenance. The consequence of being an insider resulted in the successful efforts of building connections and having *guan-xi* with important figures in China. However, multinational companies selectively built *guan-xi* with publics whom they considered would have influence on their business. At the same time, considering the company's reputation, these companies would not let the influence of *guan-xi* interfere with doing business too much.

The various characteristics of Chinese culture, e.g. the family orientation and the relational orientation intertwined in the business context. One should think about others; therefore, it strengthens the interdependence in relationships. It is not that Chinese people care much for exchange relationships, but Chinese take seriously the obligation to return favors to the others.

In some ways, the emphasis on relational hierarchy damages the legitimacy in business relationships. Relational hierarchy in the current society in China forced some multinational companies from Taiwan to establish the Taiwanese Businessmen Associations in different cities in China, in which the President of the association would have equal status with the high-rank Chinese government officers to negotiate and discuss issues relevant to the Taiwanese business in China. As a result, it probably could explain why it is important to seek *guan-xi* in China. The connection with important people would accelerate the process of dealing and negotiating. Therefore, if organizations do not occupy an the equal position to the party they want to negotiate with, applying *guan-xi* would be a useful alternative.

The norm on role determination also influenced the application of legitimacy in relationships. Chinese people consider the appropriateness of doing one's job when one is in position. Participants considered it a disadvantage in conducting business; however, people in big cities would be more flexible in fitting the needs of multinational companies.

Guanxi also has some influence on networking in the Chinese society. Since knowing important people is central, multinational companies would want to exert efforts in getting to know the right people for the right activity.

Multinational companies from the United States and Europe, though trying to adapt to the Chinese society, highlighted the practices of their organizational culture. Therefore, Chinese in these companies ought to behave according to the company's standard. This phenomenon caused the double-life of Chinese in multinational companies -- behave like other colleagues in office and to live like their countrymen when they are away from work. The different life styles would not bother many of the Chinese employees because they have been trained in the doctrine of *li* (ritual) that one should behave properly.

There are two phenomena that illustrated how organizational culture influenced relationship. One was multinational companies' incorporating the Chinese culture into the company's culture. The other was the dominance of the organizational culture in relationship building and maintenance. The latter did not show any evidence from the influence of national cultures. Even though the influence of organizational culture was not included in the original research design, this finding may bring supplements on cultural influence in relationships.

To sum up, multinational companies' relationship maintenance was found to be influenced by cultures -- national culture and organizational culture. It also supported the argument in the conceptualization that external factors should be taken into consideration when applying the theory of relationship management in a global context.

Relationship Outcomes

Organizational companies considered this part rather difficult to answer, because they consider it would be the role of the publics to evaluate how multinational companies maintained relationships with them. Participants replied to this part with caution. In some ways, it was like a restatement of the participating company's position. Each of the indicators is discussed as follow:

Trust

In terms of integrity, participants did not consider fairness an easy concept to respond to, probably because of the Chinese meaning of this word. Participants related ethics in answering whether their companies' were being just. Bribe was the most mentioned issue in regard to this topic. Most participants agreed on the disadvantage of bribing and being unethical. Their companies' culture also strongly forbade any unethical behavior.

In evaluating dependability, participants considered "actions are louder than words;" therefore, they considered their behaviors would demonstrate consistently how their companies kept promises. It also made some companies reluctant to make any promises. Some participants also considered the quality of services provided by their companies would be an indicator as to whether their companies kept promises. Other participants considered the company's motto influenced employees' behaviors; therefore, publics judged these employees by how they behaved outside the company.

In respect to competence, some companies usually would not make any promises to their publics. Yet, they acknowledged their perfect record of keeping promises. In showing competence, some companies showed some marvelous records of being “number one.” Participants were also confident about the competitive service their companies provided, though it was imitated by other competitors.

Control Mutuality

Control mutuality did not come out clearly in evaluating organization's relationships with publics. Nevertheless, some participants talked about how they listened to employees by providing the general manager’s suggestion box for employees to raise some concerns and problems. Some participants considered the continuous improvement of products could show the signal of control mutuality. Though no participants mentioned this point, after reading the transcripts and listening to the interview several times, I consider the lack of control mutuality also resulted in the exploitive relationship, because the one with more power could be the dominant party.

Since China is considered a collectivist society, where teamwork is highly encouraged, managers in organizations should consider breaking the boundary of hierarchy to allow a greater voice from employees and the community. In addition, the more multinational companies work with the publics, as the Chinese saying goes, “water floats and sinks a boat,” the more support and quality relationships can be developed.

Commitment

With its entering into WTO, China’s future market potential is enormous. Probably it was because of the manpower and market that made multinational companies more committed to this land. Many participants interviewed showed strong commitment in China.

Multinational companies showed various ways of commitment, from the simple act of signing 50 years of contracts to aggressively participate in the nation’s construction program. It also shows that, the more commitment multinational companies have to China, the more responsible and responsive they are to the market and to the community. Yet, the interview data did not show if these multinational companies have commitment to all of the publics. Acknowledging the fact that China will become an important part of WTO and the great consumer population, interview findings do reflect multinational companies’ commitment to the China market. In achieving acceptance from the Chinese government and the Chinese market, multinational companies adopted the Chinese concept of “taking from the society and returning to the society.”

As evidence showed, when organizations have more commitment in their jobs and to their publics, it is usually easier to achieve effectiveness and success. As a result, when multinational companies are striving to obtain acceptance from the China market, they are encouraged to show commitment to all the publics, because the success of a company does not only depend on the support from consumers.

Satisfaction

Many participants did not show much satisfaction in the way they maintained relationships. It can be a good sign, because it shows that organizations were anxious to promote improvements. However, multinational companies ought to evaluate their relationship maintenance and the type(s) of relationships they have developed with publics, inasmuch as, when organizations develop exploitive or manipulative relationships with publics, the responses from publics would not be positive. Thus, as Canary and Stafford defined satisfaction as "the distribution of rewards is equitable and the relational rewards outweigh costs," organizations have to consider what Chinese say, "Reap before you leap." That is, when interviewees modestly expressed the need for improvement, they would need to evaluate the whole relationship development and maintaining process and incorporate publics' goals into company's consideration.

Theory Implication

Relationship Management

This study will enrich the current research on relationship management in the following respects:

First, in terms of evaluating an organization's relationships with publics, this research does not only focus on the relationship outcomes, such as trust, control mutuality, commitment, and satisfaction. Instead, this research provides a framework that considers an organization's ability in identifying strategic publics, maintaining relationships with them and the different types of relationships as the strong influencers for the outcomes. That is, as J. Grunig and Huang (2000) suggested, when discussing "relationship management," researchers should think about the whole relationship process, not just the different degrees of outcomes they have produced.

Next, this study considers culture as the external force in influencing a company's decisions in maintenance strategies, in contrast to Huang's (2001) study on the cultural indicators of face and favor, though the relationship building is a continuous process where by the relationship outcomes could be served as a beginning of another relationship.

Moreover, this study, the same as Hon and J. Grunig's (1999) and Huang's (2001) research, provides more down-to-earth information on relationship management in reality. This study also provides additional advice on how to build relationships in the business setting.

Last but not least, the identification of the types of relationships provides how-to information on an organization's decision in maintaining relationships. Positive relationships, such as communal and covenantal relationships, enhance organization's willingness in applying more symmetrical strategies in communicating with publics. Negative relationships, on the other hand, would usually result in an organization's application of asymmetrical communication.

Global Public Relations

My findings in this study will further the theory of global public relations in the following respects:

First, Verèiè, L. Grunig, and J. Grunig (1996) stated that, when practicing public relations in another country, one should be aware of the influence of culture, economic systems, political systems, media systems, level of development, and level of activism. The findings in this research provide evidence as to how culture affects public relations practices in China.

Secondly, as Wakefield (2001) suggested a new paradigm in studying global public relations, he argued that, even though there are many similarities existing between "what one would do domestically and what one would do globally" (in Heath, 2001, p. 626), the differences in modes of practice contribute to the degree of conflict in communication. Hence, he proposed that a strategic global program make provision for all the domestic programs to be carried out without conflict. By doing so, multinational companies will be able to "balance the global function with local strategies that address local demands" (Wakefield, 2001, p. 643). To elaborate on his remarks, a professional practitioner should study the local behavioral patterns and cultivate a cultural sensitivity in the practice of public relations.

Evaluation of the Research Design: Validity, Reliability, and Generalizability in Qualitative Research

Marshall and Rossman (1999) pointed out that every systematic inquiry in the human condition ought to address the issue of the credibility of the research findings, the transferability and applicability of the findings, ie, whether the findings would be replicated. Lincoln and Guba (1985) said that answering these questions would establish "trustworthiness" (p. 290) in the research, which should contain "truth value," applicability, consistency, and neutrality. In order to reach the goal of a study with trustworthiness, they provided other criteria appropriate to the naturalistic paradigm.

"Truth Value"

According to the conventional inquiry, the ultimate test of internal validity is the extent to which findings show an "isomorphism" (Lincoln & Guba, 1985, p. 294) with a single and tangible reality. Yet, for Lincoln and Guba, such an attempt is impossible, because the inquirer needs to know the nature of this reality a priori. However, in a qualitative inquiry, the nature of this reality is what the inquirer is trying to explore. There is really no need for an inquirer to spend time to explore an already known reality. For national inquirers, the reality is compiled with multiple mental constructions. In order to demonstrate "truth value" in a study, researchers need to show they have adequate support for those multiple constructions; that is, they must have <u>credibility</u> in constructing realities.

The way to show that a natural inquiry is credible is "having [the findings] approved by the constructors of the multiple realities being studied;" that is, to collaborate with the participants in making sure the findings really represent their views of the issues studied. In this research, after interpreting the data from interviews, I contacted 15 participants in China, who had given me valuable input when I talked with them in the summer of 2001. These participants concurred with my interpretation, provided clarifications and provided further material to aid in the meanings that I had come to. This process of consultation, I believe, legitimates this study.

Applicability

From the conventional point of view, applicability is about whether research establishes its external validity or whether the finding can be generalized. Naturalists also reject such an evaluation criterion. What matters most in this category is the <u>transferability</u> of the findings: in instance where similar conditions exist. Hence, the responsibility for showing transferability lies in both the original investigator and the person who attempts to make an application elsewhere. Lincoln and Guba (1995) suggested that original investigators should make the descriptive data as complete as possible to enable future researchers to compare similarities between studies.

In this study, I have worked hard to incorporate as many direct quotes from participants as possible, so that readers and future researchers who are interested in conducting research in organization-public relationships will have clear pictures on how I interpreted the data and what each concept means in this study. I believe my extensive use of quotes and the collaboration with participants in interpreting data are the appropriate methods in showing future researchers how to conduct research and being able to make my findings to be competent for comparative studies.

Consistency

In conventional studies, reliability is usually show by replication; that is, “if two or more repetitions of essentially similar inquiry processes under essentially similar conditions yield essentially similar findings, the reliability of the inquiry is indisputably established” (Lincoln & Guba, 1995, pp. 298-299). Naturalists reject such evaluation because the reality is compiled by multiple mental constructions and cannot always remain unchanged. Hence, instead of applying “reliability” to a natural inquiry, Lincoln and Guba (1985) proposed dependability, which means that researchers look for means to take into account the factors of instability and the factors that enhance change. To make research dependable, Lincoln and Guba adapted the concept of “overlapping methods” (p. 317), which is similar to what Webb, Campbell, Schwartz, and Sechrest (1966) called “triangulation.”

In order to respond to concern regarding replication of research, Marshall and Rossman (1999) made the following point:

First, qualitative inquiries are studied in natural settings. However, the real world changes from time to time. Second, naturalists may keep a journal that records each research decision and its rationale, so that inspectors are able to check the research procedures. Third, the collected data should be well organized and retrievable, so that researchers can always make them available, in case the research is challenged. Kirk and Miller (1986) also suggested a method of recording extensive field notes to ensure the reliability in research.

Following the suggestions by Marshall and Rossman (1999), I have kept a journal since the first day I entered the field. In this journal, I described each data collection process and by doing so, I was able to reflect on whether I conducted the interview properly and how I should improve in the next one. Similar in keeping a journal, in the data collection process, I constantly had email exchanges with my advisor on questions I encountered in the field and updating the research development.

In my research design, I have included 40 interviewees from 36 multinational companies. Therefore, I constantly found consistent patterns from the remarks of these participants in various companies from different countries. Therefore, I believe the findings support the theory I developed in this study. As for the method I used in triangulation, I will describe in the next section.

Neutrality

This category refers to the conventional view of objectivity. It means whether the data, not the investigator are objective or not. Naturalists prefer the concept of confirmability. In reaching confirmability, Guba (1981) proposed triangulation and keeping a journal in the research process. While collecting my data, I kept a journal in the entire process, so that, when writing my journal, it also provided me a way to reflect whether my approach and my conducts were appropriate in each interview and, thus, offered me a direction for improvement in the next interview.

In this study, I only applied qualitative interviews in this study, due to the time and the situation constraints.   Yet, in terms of triangulation, there are different ways of triangulation, e.g. theory triangulation, method triangulation, and analysis triangulation. In my study, I was lucky to hire a research assistant, who also majored in public relations and are familiar with the relationship study, in the data collection process. After each interview, I always had discussions with my assistant about how we thought of the information provided by the interviewee and whether I was being objective in the interview process. In addition, the advantage of adapting the collaborative approach in data analysis allowed me to present the findings to participants in this study and gained more input and revise interpretations for this study. The whole process has greatly reduced the bias I might have in this research.

Limitations of this Study: Theoretical Construct

In this study, I included theories of relationship antecedents, types of relationships, relationship maintenance, and relationship outcomes in building relationship theory. In addition, I also consulted theories on Chinese culture to see how these external factors influence relationship building and maintenance processes. However, in order to have relevant and sufficient findings, I delimit the external factor on relationship maintenance on culture. Therefore, other influencers, such as the economic system (a primary factor in China's current development), were excluded. Furthermore, when I started this study, numerous Chinese-American scholars were arrested in China and charged with spying. In order to avoid obstacles like these, I deliberately downplayed the political system for this study. It is well known that, in China, political issues dominate all. I hope to examine that aspect when the environment is more conducive. Lastly, I considered the importance of building and nurturing substantial relationships with publics plays a significant role in an organization's reputation, as L. Grunig, J. Grunig, and Dozier (2002) suggested. This topic, however, is beyond the scope of this paper and would require a separate paper in order for it to be treated appropriately. Therefore, as with politics, I have refrained from examining reputation in this study. .

Limitation: Research Design and Methods

As previously mentioned, this study was conducted in the summer of 2001, when Chinese-American scholars were under close scrutiny by the Chinese Intelligence forces. In order to ensure that our study could be completed without interference, we decided not to adapt the coorientational approach in studying organization-public relationships. This means that we lacked the opportunities to interview publics around these participating organizations. Yet, Hon and J. Grunig (1999), Huang (2001a, 2001b), Kim (2000), and Brunner (2000) studied relationships from publics perspective, so their research provide evidence on how to evaluate relationships from public's side.

Lastly, because of the difficulties in getting access in China, I only employed interviews in this study. Another powerful evaluation on relationships is using participant observation, because, by being a part of the relationship, researcher will be able to probe more dynamics in relationships and capture more vivid information.

Yet, I strongly believe, these limitations I list here also provide more directions on future studies, which I will elaborate in the followings.

Future Research Direction

The limitation of this study was the lack of publics' participation. Due to the difficulty brought by the sensitive topic on how publics look at multinational companies and the time constraints in this research, I decided not to include publics. This caused the unavailability of the information on whether publics have positive evaluation on multinational companies' relationships with them. Thus, for future research, it is suggested researchers should adopt J. Grunig and Huang's (2000) proposal on the coorientational approach in evaluating relationships.

Next, this study could be served as the pilot study on J. Grunig and Huang's model of relationship management. Therefore, it is strongly recommended that scholars apply this model and incorporate the concepts of types of relationships and the influences of culture in different settings, such as political communication and community relations, to revise and enrich the model.

In addition, a case study on relationship management is strongly recommended. With the multiple sources of data from case studies, one could explore the dynamics of organization-public relations with the methods of interviews, observations, participant observations, surveys, etc.

Furthermore, this study was conducted from a qualitative perspective. Researchers could apply the relationship framework of relationship antecedents, types of relationships, relationship maintenance, and relationship outcomes from the quantitative approach, so that the degrees of relevance for each component can be explored.

This research unveiled other types of relationships, such as manipulative relationships, symbiotic relationships, and power relationships. Yet, as these types of relationships are the fresh findings, they provide a new research direction in developing items and scales for these types of relationships.

Finally, this study can be extrapolated to the global theory of public relations. Therefore, it is recommended to apply the theory of relationship management in another country and find out the more nuance differences influenced by culture and others, such as political systems and economic systems.

APPENDIX A

ENGLISH-LANGUAGE INTERVIEW PROCOTOL

I. Personal Information

a. Please tell me about your position and your job in your company.

b. What is your nationality?

II. Multiple publics

a. Often, these publics have relationships with each other. Can you give some examples of your publics that might be connected in this way?

b. How do such connections among publics influence your relationships with each of them?

c. Please provide me with examples.

III. The Influence of Culture in Organization-Public Relationships

a. Please tell me how Chinese culture influences the way you build relationships with all of your publics. Do you do it differently than in your home country?

b. How do the characteristics of Chinese culture, for example, face, favor, Zi Chi Ren[11], and *guan-xi* (personal relationships), influence the relationship maintenance between your company and publics?

[11] It is a slang for the "self-Other" concept in Chinese.

IV. Types of Organization-Public Relationships

a. We have discussed the contradictions in the relationships with your publics. I want to explore this topic further. Please think about the kind of relationships you have with each of your publics. What do you get out of it? What does each public get out of it? How do you treat each public?

b. (Probe) There are five kinds of relationships identified in the relationships. Communal relationships, exchange relationships, covenantal relationships, contractual relationships, and exploitive relationships[12]. Which, if any, of these five types really describe your relationships? If they don't, what kinds of relationships do you have?

V. Relationship Maintenance and Maintenance Strategies

a. Earlier, we discussed about the type(s) of relationship(s) your organization have with the publics. Can you tell me how this (these) type(s) influence the way your organization's builds and maintains relationships with its publics?

b. Let's talk about things that your organization has done to maintain a long-term relationship with the publics. These strategies to develop and maintain a relationship could be communication strategies, attempts to resolve conflict, or attempts to show concern for the interests of publics. Please provide as many

[12] **A communal relationship** means an organization is concerned about the welfare of the publics. **An exchange relationship** means an organization and its publics benefit one another in response to specific benefits received in the past or expected in the future. **Exploitive relationships** arise when the organization takes advantage of the publics or the publics take advantage of the organization when either side follows the communal norms or one does not fulfill his/her obligation in an exchange relationship. **A covenantal relationship** means both sides commit to a common good by their open exchanges and the norm of reciprocity. The obligation of the other side is always to listen and provide responses. **Contractual relationships** start when parties agree on what each should do in the

examples as you can. Can you provide other examples of strategies that your organization has used that damaged the relationship.

VI. Relationship Outcomes

We have talked about your relationships with your publics. Now, I want to ask you some questions about quality of your relationships with each of the publics you have mentioned.

a. Trust

   i. Would you describe any things that your organization has done to treat the publics fairly and justly, or unfairly and unjustly? (*integrity*)

   ii. Would you describe things that your organization has done that indicate it can be relied on to keep its promises, or that it does not keep its promises? (*dependability)*

   iii. How confident are you that your organization has the ability to accomplish what it says it will do? Can you give me examples of why you feel that way? (*competence)*

b. Control Mutuality

   i. Do you believe that your organization is attentive to what the public says? Why? Are you satisfied with the extent to which your organization actually has taken the public's interests into account in its decisions and behaviors? Please provide any examples.

---

relationships. It is like writing on a contract in the beginning of a relationship.

c. Commitment

   i. Can you provide me any examples that suggest that your organization wants to maintain a long-term commitment to a relationship with the publics or does not want to maintain such a relationship?

d. Satisfaction

   i. How satisfied are you with the relationship that your organization has had with the publics? Please explain why you are satisfied or not satisfied.

APPENDIX B

CHINESE-LANGUAGE INTERVIEW PROTOCOL FOR COMPANIES

/

1.

1

2

2.

1

2

3.

1

2

4.

1

2

A.

B.

C.

D.

E.

5. [13] [14]

1

2

6.

1

A.

B.

C.

2

A.

B.

3

A.

4

A.

14

REFERENCES

Adler, N. J. (1997). *International dimensions of organizational behavior*. South-western College Publishing.

Aldrich, H. E. (1979). *Organizations and environments.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Aldrich, H.E., & Herker, D. (1977). Boundary spanning roles and organization structure. *Academy of Management Review*, 217-230.

Aldrich, H., & Mindlin, S. (1978). Uncertainty and dependence: Two perspectives on environment. In L. Karpik (Ed.), *New directions in organizational theory and analysis* (pp. 17-45). London, Sage.

Al-Thomali, S. M. (1994). *Environmental uncertainty and public relations unit structure and communication strategies*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill.

An, Gang (1990). Establish public relations with Chinese features. *Gonggong Guanxi* [Public Relations Journal]. Vol. 2

Ardekani, M. (1986). Structural adaptations, to environments. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(1), 9-21.

Atkinson, P., & Hammersley, M. (1994). Ethnography and participant observation. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 248-261). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ayres, J. (1983). Strategies to maintain relationships: Their identification and perceived usage. *Communication Quarterly*, 31, 62-67.

Ballinger, J. (1991). *Relational dimensions of public-organization relationships. Unpublished master's thesis.* San Diego State University, San Diego, CA.

Becerra, M. (1998). *Nature, antecedents, and consequences of trust within organizations: A multilevel analysis within the multinational corporation*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Beck, P. A. (1991). Voters' intermediation environments in the 1988 Presidential context. *Public Opinion Quarterly*, 55, 371-394.

Bennett, John B. (2001, February/March). Teaching with hospitality. *Teaching and learning news*, 10(3), 88-9. College Park, MD: Center for Teaching Excellence.

Bluedorn, A. C., (1993). Pilgrim's progress: Trends and convergence in research on organizational size environments. *Journal of Management*, 19, 163-191.

Bok, S. (1989). *Secrets: On the ethics of concealment and revelation*. New York: Vintage Books.

Bond, M. H. (1991). *Beyond the Chinese face*. Hong Kong: Oxford University Press.

Bond, M. H., & Lee, P. (1981). Face saving in Chinese culture: A discussion and experimental study of Hong Kong students. In A. Y. C. King & R. P. L. Lee (Eds.), *Social life and development in Hong Kong* (pp. 289 – 304). Hong Kong: Chinese University Press.

Bornstein, M. (Ed.). (1985). *Comparative economic systems: Models and cases.* Homewood, IL: Richard D. Irwin, Inc.

Bourgeois, L. (1980). Strategy and environment: A conceptual integration. *Academy of Management Review*, 5(1), 25-39.

Bourgeois, L. (1985). Strategic goals, perceived uncertainty, and economic performance in volatile environments. *Academy of Management Journal*, 28(3), 548-573.

Bowen, S. A. (2000). *A theory of ethical issues management: Contributions of Kantian Deontology to public relations' ethics and decision making*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Bridges, J. A., & Nelson, R. A. (2000). Issues management: A relational approach. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 95-116). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Broom, G. M. (1977). Coorientational measurement of public issues. *Public Relations Review*, 3(4), 110-119

Broom, G. M., Casey, S., & Ritchey, J. (1997). Toward a concept and theory of organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research, 9 (2),* 83-98.

Broom, G. M., & Dozier, D. M. (1990). *Using research in public relations: Applications to program management*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Bruning, S. D., & Lambe, K. (2001, May). *Relationships in public relations: Examining the linkage between relationship attitudes and key public member behavior*. Paper presented at the 51st annual conference of International Communication Association, Washington, D.C.

Bruning, S. D., & Ledingham, J. A. (1999). Relationships between organizations and publics: Development of a multi-dimensional organization-public relationship scale. *Public Relations Review*, 25(2), 157-170.

Brunner, B. (2000). *Measuring students' perceptions of the University of Florida's commitment to public relationships and diversity.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. Gainesville, FL.

Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a condition of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, *17*, 643-663.

Cai, D. A. (1998). Culture, plan, and the pursuit of negotiation goals. *Journal of Asian Pacific Communication*, 8(2), 103-123.

Cai, D. A., & Hung, C. J. F. (2000, June). What is trust anyway? A cross-cultural comparison of dimensions in interpersonal and organizational relationships. Unpublished manuscript, University of Maryland. Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Cai, D. A., & Hung, C. J. F. (in press). Whom do you trust?: A cross cultural analysis. In A. Barnett & G. Cheney (Eds.), *Organizational communication: emerging perspectives*, Vol. 7, Stamford, CT: Ablex/Elsevier.

Campbell, D. T., & Werner, O. (1970). Translating, working through interpreters and the problem of decentering. In R. Naroll and R. Cohen (Eds.), *A handbook of method in cultural anthropology* (pp. 398-420). New York: Natural History Press.

Canary, D. J., & Cupach, W. R. (1988). Relational and episodic characteristics associated with conflict tactics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, *5*, 305-325.

Canary, J. D., & Stafford, L. (1992). Relational maintenance strategies and equity in marriage. *Communication Monographs*, 59, 243-267.

Canary, J. D., & Stafford, L. (1993). Preservation of relational characteristics: Maintenance strategies, equity, and locus of control. In P. J. Kalbfleisch (Ed.), *Interpersonal communication: Evolving interpersonal relationships* (pp. 237-259). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Canary, J. D., & Stafford, L. (1994). Maintaining relationships through strategic and routine interaction. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 3-22). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Canary, J. D., & Stafford, L. (1997, July). *Equity and interdependence predictions of relational maintenance strategy use.* Paper presented at the meeting of the International Network on Personal Relationships, Miami University, Oxford, OH.

Canary, J. D., & Zelley, E. D. (2000). Current research programs on relational maintenance behaviors. In M. E. Roloff & G. D. Paulson (Eds.) *Communication yearbook, 23*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Cancel, A. E., Mitrook, M. A., & Cameron, G. T. (1999). Testing the contingency theory of accommodation in public relations. *Public Relations Review,* 25, (2), 171-197.

Chang, H. C., & Holt, G. R. (1994). A Chinese perspective on face as inter-relational concern. In S. Ting-Toomey (Ed.), *The challenge of facework* (pp. 95 – 132). Albany, NY: State University of New York Press.

Chase, W. H. (1984). *Issue management: Origins of the future*. Stamford, CT: Issue Action publications.

Chase, H., & Crane, T. (1996). Issue management: dissolving the archaic division between line and staff. In L. B. Dennis (Ed). *Practical public affairs in an era of change*. Lanham, MD: University Press of America.

Chen, N. (1994, Spring). Public relations education in the People's Republic of China. *Journalism Educator,* 49(1), 14-22.

Chen, N. (1996). Public relations in China: The introduction and development of an occupational field. In H. Culberton & N. Chen (Eds.), *International Public Relations: A comparative analysis*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Chen, N., & Culbertson, H. M. (1996). Guest relations: A demanding but constrained role for lady public relations practitioners in Mainland China. *Public Relations Review*, 22, 279-296.

Child, J. (1975). Managerial and organizational factors associated with company performance-part II. A contingency analysis. *Journal of Management Studies*, 12, 178-184.

Child, J. (1991). A foreign perspective on the management of people in China. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 2(1), 93-107.

Chu, G. C. (1985). The changing concept of self in contemporary China. In A. J. Marsella, G. Devos, & F. L. K. Hsu (Eds.), *Culture and self: Asian and western perspectives* (pp. 252 – 277). New York: Tavistock.

Chung, Y. K. (1992). The challenges of public relations in the developing economies of the Asia-Pacific countries. *International Public Relations Review*, 15(3), pp. 16-19.

Clark, M., Powell, M., & Mills, J. (1986). Keeping track of needs in communal and exchange relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(2), 333-338.

Clark, M. S., & Mills, J. (1993). The difference between communal and exchange relationships: What it is and is not. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin, 19*, 684-691.

Cook, J., & Wall, T. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment, and personal need nonfulfillment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53*, 39-52.

Coombs, W. T. (2000). Crisis management: Advantages of a relational perspective. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 73-94). Mahwah, NJ:

Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Coombs, W. T. (2001). Interpersonal communication and public relations. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 105-114). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Covey (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people: Restoring the character ethic.* New York: Fireside.

Crable, R. E., & Vibbert, S. L. (1985). Managing issues and influencing public policy. *Public Relations Review,* 11(2), 3-16.

Culip, S. M., Center, A. H., & Broom, G. M. (1999). *Effective public relations*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Delvin, R. A., & Grafton, R. (1998). *Economic rights and environmental wrongs*. Northampton, MA: Edward Elgar.

Deutsch, M. (1985). *Distributive justice: A social-psychological perspective.* New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Deutsch, M. (1960). The effect of motivational orientation upon trust and suspicion. *Human Relations, 13,* 123-140.

Dindia, K. (1994). A multiphasic view of relationship maintenance strategies. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 91-114). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Dindia, K., & Canary, D. (1993). Definitions and theoretical perspectives on maintaining relationships. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 163-173.

Doney, P. M., Cannon, J. P., & Mullen, M. R. (1998). Understanding the influence of national culture on the development of trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 601-620.

Dozier, D. M. (1990). The innovation of research in public relations practice: Review of a program of studies. In. J. E. Grunig & L. A. Grunig (Eds.), *Public relations research annual* (Vol. 2, pp. 3-28). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Eisenberg, E. M., Riley, P. (2001). Organizational Culture. In F. M. Jablin & L. L. Putnam (Eds.), *The new handbook of organizational communication: Advances in theory, research, and methods* (pp. 291-322). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fairbank, J. K. (1991). The old order. In R. F. Dernberger, K. J. DeWoskin, J. M. Golstein, R. Murphey, & M. K. Whyte (Eds.), *The Chinese* (pp. 31-37). Ann Arbor: University of Michigan, Center for Chinese Studies.

Fei, H. T. (1948). *Peasant life in China*. London: Routledge& Kegan.

Ferguson (1984, August). *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.

Fisher, R., & Brown, S. (1988). *Getting together: Building a relationship that gets to yes*. Boston: Houghton Mifflin.

Foa, U. G. (1971). Interpersonal and economic resources. *Science*, 171, 345-351.

Foa, U. G. & Foa, E. B. (1974). *Societal structures of the mind*. Springfield, IL: Thomas.

Foa, G. U., Törnblom, K., Foa, E. B., & Converse, JR., J. (1993). Introduction: Resource theory in social psychology (pp. 1-10). In Foa, U. G., Converse, JR., J., Törnblom, K. Y., Foa, E. B. (Eds.), *Resource theory: Explorations and applications*. San Diego, CA: Academic Press, INC.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (1994). Interviewing: The art of science. In N. K. Denzen & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (pp. 361 – 376). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fontana, A., & Frey, J. H. (2000). The interview: From structured questions to negotiated text. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research* (2^{nd} ed.) (pp. 645 – 672). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Frost, T., Stimpson, D. V., & Maughan, M. R. C. (1978). Some correlates of trust. *Journal of Psychology*, 99, 103-108.

Gabarro, J. (1987). *The dynamics of taking charge*. Boston: Harvard Business School Press.

Gao, G., & Ting-Toomey, S. (1998). *Communicating effectively with the Chinese*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Goffman, E. (1955). On face-work: An analysis of ritual elements in social interaction. *Journal of the Study of International Processes*, 18, 213 – 231.

Goffman, E. (1961). *Asylums: Essays on the social situation of mental patients and other inmates.* Garden City, NY: Anchor Books.

Gollner, A. B. (1983). *Social change and corporate strategy*. Stamford, CT: Issue Action Publications.

Gollner, A. B. (1984). Public relations/public affairs in the new managerial revolution. *Public Relations Review, 10(4), 3-10.*

Gottlieb, M. (1984). *A theory of economic systems.* Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Good, D. (1988). Individuals, interpersonal relations, and trust. In D. Gambetta (Ed.), *Trust: Making and breaking cooperative relations* (pp. 31-48). New York: Basil Blackwell.

Granovetter, M. S. (1973). The strength of weak ties. *American Journal of Sociology*, 78, 1360 – 1380.

Gruen, T. W., Summers, J. O., & Acito, F. (2000). Relationship marketing activities, commitment, and membership behaviors in professional associations. *Journal of Marketing, 64*, 34-49.

Grunig, J. E. (1992). Communication, public relations, and effective organizations: An overview of the book. *Excellence in public relations and communication management*. (pp. 117-157). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J. E. (1996). *Public relations in strategic management and strategic management of public relations: Theory and evidence from the IABC Excellence Project*. Paper presented to the conference on Strategic Planning in Public Relations, December 17-18, 1996, Department of Mass Communication, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, United Arab Emirates University, Al Ain, United Arab Emirates.

Grunig, J. E. (1997). A situational theory of publics: conceptual history, recent challenges and new research. In D. Moss, T. MacMannus, & D. Vercic (Eds). *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp. 3-48). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Grunig, J. E. (2000). Collaboration, collectivism, and societal corporatism as core professional values in public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 12(1), 23-48.

Grunig, J. E. (2001). Two-way symmetrical public relations: Past, present, and future. In R. H. Heath & G. M. Vasquez (Eds.), *Handbook of public relations*. Newbury, CA: Sage.

Grunig, J. E., & Grunig, L. A. (1998). Does evaluation of PR measure the real value of PR? Jim & Lauri Grunig's Research, *pr reporter*, 41(35), p. 4.

Grunig, J. E., Grunig, L. A., Sriramesh, K., Huang, Y. H., & Lyra, A. (1995). Models of public relations in an international setting. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 7, 163-186.

Grunig, J. E., & Huang, Y. H. (2000). From organizational effectiveness to relationship indicators: Antecedents of relationships, public relations strategies, and relationship outcomes. In J. A. Ledingham and S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 23-54). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, J., & Hung, C. (2000, June). *Development of indices and an initial study of trust, control mutuality, commitment, satisfaction, and communal and exchange relationships as measures of organization-public relationships.* Paper presented at the annual conference of the International Communication Association, Acapulco, Mexico.

Grunig, J. E., & Hunt, T. (1984). *Managing Public Relations*. New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston.

Grunig, L. (1992a). Power in the public relations department. In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communications management* (pp. 482-501). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc.

Grunig, L., Grunig, J. E., & Ehling (1992). What is an effective organization? In J. E. Grunig (Ed.), *Excellence in public relations and communication management* (pp. 65-89). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Grunig, L., Grunig, J., & Dozier, D. (in press). *Excellent public relations and effective organizations: A study of communication management in three countries.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Guo, H. M. (1997, April). *Chung Guo gung gong guan xi tze shung yie shi chang: guo ji hua yu ben tu hua [Public relations in China: globalization and localization].* Paper presented at the Public Relations Conference for Taiwanese and Chinese, Taipei.

Hammersley, M., & Atkinson, P. (1983). *Ethnography: Principles in practice*. New York: Tavistock.

Hatfield, E., Traupmann, J., Sprecher, S., Utne, M., & Hay, M. (1985). Equity in close relationships. In W. Ickes (Ed.), *Compatible and incompatible relationships* (pp. 91-117). New York: Springer-Verlag.

He, Y. H., Chen, H. J., & Chao C. Y. (1991). Relational orientation: An approach to seek answers for the Chinese social psychology methodology. In K. S. Yang & K. K. Hwang (Eds.), *Chinese psychology and behavior*. Taipei, Laurel.

Heath, R. (1999, June). *The vision of academic research: The next generation of public relations research*. Keynote speech at the annual conference of Educator's Academy of Public Relations Society of America at College Park, MD.

Heath, R. L. (2001). Globalization: The frontier of multinationalism and cultural diversity. In R. L. Heath (ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 625-628). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Ho, A. K. (1990). *Joint ventures in the People's Republic of China*. New York: Praeger.

Ho, D. Y. (1976). On the concept of face. *American Journal of Sociology*, 81, 867-884.

Hofstede, G. (1980). *Culture's consequences: International differences in work-related values*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Holstein, J. A., Gubrium, J. F. (1995). *The active interview*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hon, L. C., & Grunig, J. E.(1999). *Measuring relationships in public relations*. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.

Hovland, C. I., Janis, I. L., & Kelley, H. H. (1953). *Communication and persuasion*. New Haven, CT: Yale University Press.

Hinde, R. A. (1997). *Relationships: A dialectical perspective.* East Sussex, UK: Psychology Press Publishers.

Hu, H. C. (1944). The Chinese concept of face. *American Anthropology,* 46, 45-46.

Huang, Y. H. (1990). *Risk communication, models of public relations and anti-nuclear activism: a case study of a nuclear power plant in Taiwan*. Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Huang, Y. H. (1994). *Technological risk and environmental activism: Case studies of public risk perception in Taiwan*. Taipei: Wu-Nan Publishers.

Huang, Y. H. (1997). *Public relations strategies, relational outcomes, and conflict management strategies.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Huang, Y. H. (2001a). OPRA: A cross-cultural, multiple-item scale for measuring organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13(1), 61-90.

Huang, Y. H. (2001b). Values of public relations: Effects on organization-public relationships mediating conflict resolution. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 13(4), 265-302.

Huberman, A. M., & Miles, M. B. (1994). Data management and analysis methods. In N. K. Denzin & Y. S. Lincoln (Eds.), *Handbook of qualitative research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hung, C. J. F. (March, 2000a). *Organization-public relationships, relationship maintenance strategies, and relationship outcomes*. Paper presented paper to Educator's Academy, Public Relations Society of America, Miami, FL.

Hung, C. J. F. (October, 2000b). *Global Public Relations: A Study of Public Relations in China From Economic Systems Perspectives* . Paper presented to the Educator's Academy, Public Relations Society of America, World Congress, Chicago

Hwang, K. K. (1987). Face and favor: The Chinese power game, *American Journal of Sociology*, 92(4), 944-74.

Infante, D. A., Rancer, A. S., Womack, D. F. (1993). Building communication theory (2nd ed.). Prospect Heights, IL: Waveland Press.

Jacobs, B. (1979). A preliminary model of particularistics in Chinese political alliances: 'ranqing' and 'quanxi' in a rural Taiwanese township. *China Quarterly*, 78, 237-273.

Jauch, L., & Kraft, K. (1986). Strategic management of uncertainty. *Academy of Management Review*, 11(4), 777-790.

Johnson-George, C., & Swap, W. (1982). Measurement of specific interpersonal trust: Construction and validation of a scale to assess trust in a specific other. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 43 (6), 1306-1317.

Jones, A. P., James, L. R., & Bruni, J. R. (1975). Perceived leadership behavior and employee confidence in the leader as moderated by job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 60,* 146-149.

Kaur, K. (1997). *The impact of privatization on public relations and the role of public relations management in the privatization process: A qualitative analysis of the Malaysian case.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Kee, H. W., & Knox, R. E. (1970). Conceptual and methodological considerations in the study of trust. *Journal of Conflict Resolution, 14*, 357-366.

Kelley, H. H. (1979). *Personal relationships: Their structure and processes*. Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum.

Kelley, H. H. (1983). The concepts of love and commitment. In Kelley, H. H., Berscheid, E., Christensen, A., Harvery, J. N., Huston, T. L., Levinger, G., McClintock, E., Peplau, L. A., & Peterson, D. R. (Eds.), *Close relationships* (pp. 266-270). New York: Freeman.

Kelley, H. H., & Thibaut, J. W. (1978). *Interpersonal relations*. New York: Wiley.

Kelley, L., & Luo, Y. (1999). *China 2000: Emerging business issues*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

King, A. Y. C. (1996). State Confucianism and its transformation: The restructuring of the state-society relation in Taiwan. In W. M. Tu (Ed.), *Confucian traditions in east Asian modernity: Moral education and economic culture in Japan and the four mini-dragons* (pp. 228-243). Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

King, A. Y., & Bond, M. H. (1985). The Confucian paradigm of man: A sociological view. In M. S. Tseng & D. H. Wu (Eds.), *Chinese culture and mental health* (pp. 29 – 45). Orlando, FL: Academic Press.

Kirk, J., & Miller, M. L. (1986). *Reliability and validity in qualitative research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kleinman, S., & Copp, M. A. (1993). *Emotions and fieldwork*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Kluckhohn, C. (1951). The study of culture. In D. Lerner & H. D. Lasswell (Eds.), *The policy science*. Stanford, CA: Stanford University Press

Krimsky, S., & Plough, A. (1988). *Environmental hazards: Communicating risks as a social process.* MA: Auburn House.

Larzelere, R. E., & Huston, T. L. (1980). The dyadic trust scale: Toward understanding interpersonal trust in close relationships. *Journal of Marriage and the Family*. 42, 595-604.

Ledingham, J. A., & Bruning, S. D. (1998). Relationship management in public relations: Dimensions of an organization-public relationship, *Public Relations Review*, 24(1), 55-65.

Ledingham, J. A., Bruning, S. D. (2000). *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Ledingham, J. A., Bruning, S. D., & Wilson, L. J. (1999). Time as an indicator of the perceptions and behavior of members of a key public: Monitoring and prediction organization-public relationships. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 11(2), 167-183.

Lee, Y. Y. (1985). Harmony and balance. In Li (Ed.), The hollow and compensation in the modern mindset. Taipei: Yu Zo Kuang.

Len-Rios (2001). *Playing by the rules: Relationships with online users.* Research paper submitted to the Institute for Public Relations for the 2000 Ketchum Walter K. Lindenmann Scholarship. Gainesville, FL: Institute for Public Relations.

Lerbinger, O. (1997). *The crisis manager: Facing risk and responsibility*. Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Lewicki., R. J., & Bunker, B. B. (1996). Developing and maintaining trust in work relationships. In R. M. Kramer & T. R. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in organizations: Frontiers of theory and research* (pp. 114-130). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Liao, Weijian (2000). *Gung gong guan xi xue [Public relations theory]*. Beijing: Higher Education Publisher.

Lieberman, J. K. (1981). *The litigious society.* New York: Basic Books.

Lincoln, Y. S., & Guba, E. G. (1985). *Naturalistic inquiry*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Lindolf, T. R. (1995). *Qualitative communication research methods*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Lulofs, R. S. (1994). *Conflict: From theory to action*. Scottsdale, AZ: Gorsuch Scarisbrick.

Luo, Y. (1999). The dominance of Greater China multinationals' investment in China: Economic, cultural, and institutional perspectives. In L. Kelley & Y. Luo (Eds.), *China 2000: Emerging business issues* (pp. 235-252). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Marshall, C. (1985). Appropriate criteria of trustworthiness and goodness for qualitative research on education organizations. *Quality and Quantity,* 19, 353-373.

Marshall, C. (1987). *Report to the Vanderbilt policy education committee*. Vanderbilt University, Nashville, TN.

Marshall, C., & Rossman, G. B. (1999). *Designing qualitative research* (3rd ed.). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mathur, I., & Chen, J. S. (1987). *Strategies for joint ventures in the People's Republic of China*. New York: Praeger.

Mayer, R., Davis, J., & Schoorman, F. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.

McAllister, D. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38,* 24-59.

McCabe, D. L., (1990). The assessment of perceived environmental uncertainty and economic performance. *Human Relations*, 43, 1203-1218.

McCracken, D. G. (1988). *The long interview*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

McCroskey, J. C., & Richmond, V.P. (1996). Human communication theory and research: Traditions and models. In M.B. Salwen & D.W. Stacks (Eds.), *An integrated approach to communication theory and research* (pp. 233-242). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

McElreath, M., Chen, N., Azarova, L., & Shadrova, V. (2001). The development of public relations in China, Russia, and the United States. In R. Heath (Ed.). *Handbook of public relations.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

McGoon, C. (1993). Life's a beach for communicators. *Communication World*. 14.

McGregor, D. (1967). *The professional manager*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

McLeod, J. M., & Chaffee, S. M. (1973). Interpersonal approaches to communication research. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 16(4), 469-500.

Meffert, M. F. (September, 1998). *Political information flow in context: The influence of media sources and personal networks on candidate preferences in the 1992 Presidential election*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Boston, MA.

Meffert, M. F. (September, 1999). *Contextual influences on candidate evaluations: Interactions of mass media sources and personal networks.* Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Political Science Association, Atlanta, GA.

Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. (1984). Testing the side-best theory or organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69, 372-378.

Michaels, J. W., Acock, A. C., & Edwards, J. N. (1986). Social exchange and equity determinants of relationship commitment. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 3, 161-175.

Miles, M. B., & Huberman, A. M. (1994). *Qualitative data analysis*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Millar, F. E., & Rogers, L. E. (1987). Relational dimensions of interpersonal dynamics. In M. E. Roloff & G. Miller, (Eds.), *Interpersonal process: New directions in communication research*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1982). Communal and exchange relationships. *Review of Personality and Social Psychology*, 3, 121-144.

Mills, J., & Clark, M. S. (1988, July). *Communal and exchange relationships: New research and old controversies.* Invited address at the biannual meeting of the International Society for the Study of Personal Relationships, Vancouver, B.C.

Mills, J., & Clark, M. (1994). Communal and exchange relationships: Controversies and research. In R. Erber & R. Gilmour (Eds). *Theoretical frameworks for personal relationships* (pp. 29-42). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associations.

Mintzberg, H (1983). *Power in and around organizations.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Mishra, A. (1996) Organizational responses to crisis: The centrality of trust. In R. Kramer & T. Tyler (Eds.), *Trust in Organization: Frontiers of Theory and Research*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Montgomery, B. M. (1993). Relationship maintenance versus relationship change: A dialectical dilemma. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 10, 205-223.

Montgomery, B. M., & Baxter, L. A. (1998a). Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships. Mahwah, NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Mongtomery, B. M., & Baxter, L. A. (1998b). Dialogism and relational dialectics. In B. M. Montgomery & L. A. Baxter (Eds.), *Dialectical approaches to studying personal relationships* (155- 183), Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Moorman, C., Zaltman, C., & Desphande, R. (1992). Relationships between providers and users of marketing research: The dynamics of trust within and between organizations. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 29, 314-329.

Moorman, C., Desphande, R., & Zaltman, C. (1993). Factors affecting trust in market research relationships. *Journal of Marketing*, 57, 81-101.

Morgan, R. M., & Hunt, S. D. (1994). The commitment-trust theory of relationship marketing. *Journal of Marketing, 58* (3), 20-38.

The crayon that roared. (July 2, 2001). Newsweek (p. 40), New York, NY: Newsweek.

Nurnberger, K. (1998). *Beyond Marx and market*. New York: Zed Books, Ltd.

Parsons, T. (1960). *Structure and process in modern societies*. New York: Free Press.

Ouchi, W. G. (1981). *Theory Z: How American business can meet the Japanese challenge.* Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.

Patton, M. Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Pfeffer, J. (1981). *Power in organizations*. Marshfield, MA: Pitnam.

Pfeffer, J., & Salancik, G. R. (1978). *The external control of organizations: A resource dependence perspective.* New York: Harper & Row.

Plowman, K. D. (1995). *Congruence between public relations and conflict resolution: Negotiating in the organization.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park, MD.

Plowman, K. (1998). Power in conflict for public relations. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 10(4), 237-261.

Pollner, M., & Emerson, R. M. (1983). The dynamics of inclusion and distance in fieldwork relations. In R. M. Emerson (Ed.), *Contemporary field research* (pp. 235-252). Boston: Little Brown.

Porket, J. L. (1998). *Modern economic systems and their transformation*. Oxford: St Antony's College.

Portes, A. (1998). Social capital: Its origins and applications in modern sociology, *Annual Review of Sociology*, 22, 1-25.

Pruitt, D. & Carnevale, P. (1993). *Negotiation in social conflict*. Pacific Grove, CA: Brooks/Cole.

Ramamoorthy, N. (1996). *The influence of individualism-collectivism (I/C) orientations on the administration of and reactions toward performance appraisal and reward systems.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation. University of Maryland, College Park.

Rawlins, W. K. (1989). A dialectical analysis of the tensions, function, and strategic challenges of communication in young adult friendships. In J. A. Anderson (Ed.), *Communication yearbook*,12 (pp. 157-189). Newbury Park, CA: sage.

Rempel, J., Holmes, J., & Zanna, M. (1985). Trust in close relationships. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*. 49(1), 95-112.

Ring, S. M., & van de Ven, A. (1992). Structuring cooperative relationships between organizations. *Strategic Management Journal, 13*, 483-498.

Roloff, M. E., & Cloven, D. H. (1994). When partners transgress: Maintaining violated relationships. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 23-44). San Diego, CA: Academic Press, Inc.

Rosen, B., & Jerdee, T. H. (1977). Influence of subordinate characteristics on trust and use of participative decision strategies in a management simulation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 62, 628-631.

Rosenblatt, P. C. (1977). Needed research on commitment in marriage. In G. Levinger & H. L. Rausch (Eds.), *Close relationships: Perspectives on the meaning of intimacy*. Amhurst, MA: University of Massachusetts Press.

Rotter, J. (1967). A new scale for the measurement of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Personality*, 35, 651-665.

Rubin, H. J., & Rubin, I. S. (1995). *Qualitative interviewing: The art of hearing data.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Rusbult, C. E., Drigotas, S. M., & Berette, J. (1994). The investment model: An interdependence analysis of commitment processes and relationship maintenance phenomena. In D. J. Canary & L. Stafford (Eds.), *Communication and relational maintenance* (pp. 115-139). San Diego, CA: Academic Press.

Ryen, A. (2002). Cross-cultural interviewing. In J. F. Gubrium & J. A. Holstein (Eds.), *Handbook of interview research: Context & method* (pp. 335-354). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Sanderson, S. K. (1995). *Social transformations: A general theory of historical development*. Oxford: Blackwell.

Seib, P., & Fitzpatrick, K. (1995). *Public relations ethics*. Orlando, FL: Harcourt Brace & Company.

Sha, B. L. (1995). *Intercultural public relations: Exploring cultural identity as a means of segmenting publics.* Unpublished master's thesis, University of Maryland, College Park.

Sha, B. (1999). *Cultural public relations: Identity, activism, globalization, and gender in the Democratic Progressive party on Taiwan*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Shepherd, G. J. (1992). Communication as influence: Definitional exclusion. *Communication Studies*, 43, 203-219.

Shi, Z. L. (1998). Review and experience of economic structure reform. In Suliman (Ed.), *China's transition to a socialist market economy* (pp. 3-20). London: Quorum Books.

Shih, C. Y. (1988). National role conception as foreign policy motivation: The psychocultural bases of Chinese diplomacy. *Political Psychology*, 9(4), 599-631.

Sitkin, S. B., & Roth, N. L. (1993). Explaining the limited effectiveness of legalistic remedies for trust/distrust. *Organization Science, 4,* 367-392.

Solomon, L. (1960). The influence of some types of power relationships and game strategies upon the development of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology, 61*, 223-230.

Spicer, C. (1997). *Organizational public relations: A political perspective.* Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Stafford, L., & Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender, and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social Personal Relationships*, 8, 217-242.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Strauss, A. L., & Corbin, J. (1990). *Basics of qualitative research: Ground theory procedures and techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Strickland, L. H. (1958). Surveillance and trust. Journal of Personality, 26, 200-215.

Sriramesh, K. (1991). *The impact of societal culture on public relations: An ethnographic study of south Indian organizations*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, University of Maryland, College Park.

Suliman, O. (1998). *China's transition to a socialist market economy.* London: Quorum Books.

Stake, R. E. (1995). *The art of case study research*. Thousand Oak, CA: Sage.

Stafford, L., Canary, D. J. (1991). Maintenance strategies and romantic relationship type, gender, and relational characteristics. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships*, 8, 217-242.

Synnott, G., & McKie, D. (1997). International issues in PR: Researching research and prioritizing priorities. *Journal of Public Relations Research*, 9(4), 259-282

Tang, S. T. (1994). Introduction to economic systems. *Taiwan Economics and Finance Monthly*, 30(1), 72-81.

Tesch, R. (1990). Qualitative research: Analysis types and software tools. New York: Falmer.

Thibaut, J. W, & Kelley, H. H. (1959). *The social psychology of groups*. New York: Wiley.

Thomlison, T. D. (2000). An interpersonal primer with implications for public relations. In J. A. Ledingham and S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 177-204). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Toth, E. L. (2000). From personal influence to interpersonal influence: A model for relationship management. In J. A. Ledingham and S. D. Bruning (Eds.), *Public relations as* *relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 205-220). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Triandis, H. C. (1988). Collectivism vs individualism: A reconceptualization of a basic concept in cross-cultural psychology. In C. Bagley & G. Verma (Eds.), Cross-cultural studies of personality, attitudes, and cognition (pp. 60-95). London: Macmillan.

Triandis, H. C. (1989). Self and social behavior in differing cultural contexts. *Psychological Review*, 96, 269-289.

Usunier, J-C. (1998). *International & cross-cultural management research.* Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Verèiè, D. (1997). Toward fourth wave public relations: A case study. In D. Moss, T. MacManus, & D. Verèiè (Eds.), *Public relations research: An international perspective* (pp. 264-279). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Verèiè, D., & Grunig, J. E. (2000). The origins of public relations theory in economics and strategic management. In D. Moss, D. Verèiè, & G. Warnaby (Eds.), *Perspectives on public relations research* (pp. 9-58). London: International Thomson Business Press.

Wakefield, R. I. (2001). Effective public relations in the multinational organization. In R. L. Heath (Ed.), *Handbook of public relations* (pp. 639-648). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Webb, E. J., Campbell, D. T., Schwartz, R.D., & Sechrest, L. (1966). *Unobtrusive measures*. Chicago: Rand McNally.

Whitener, E. M., Brodt, S., Korsgaard, M. A., & Werner, J. M. (1998). Managers as initiators of trust: An exchange relationship framework for understanding managerial trustworthy behavior. *The Academy of Management Review*, 23(3), 513-530.

Wilmot, W. W. (1987). *Dyadic communication*. New York: Random House.

Wilson, L. (2000). Building employee and community relationships through volunteerism: A case study. In J. A. Ledingham & S. D. Bruning (Eds.) *Public relations as relationship management: A relational approach to the study and practice of public relations* (pp. 137-144). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Wimmer, R. D., & Dominick, J. R. (1997). *Mass media research: An introduction* (5th ed.). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wolcott, H. F. (1994). *Transforming qualitative data: Description, analysis, and interpretation*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Wood, J. T. (1996). *Everyday encounters: An introduction to interpersonal communication.* Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Worchel, P. (1979). Trust and distrust. In W. G. Auston & S. Worchel (Eds.), *The social psychology of intergroup relations*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.

Wu, P. Y. (1984). Varieties of the Chinese self. In V. Kavolis (Ed.), *Designs of selfhood* (pp. 107 – 131). Cranbury, NJ: Associated University Presses.

Yan, A. (1999). International joint ventures in China: Interpartner characteristics, dynamics, opportunities, and challenges for the new century. In L. Kelley & Y. Luo (Eds.), *China 2000: Emerging business issues* (pp. 131-162). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Yan, A., & Gray, B. (1994). Bargaining power, management control, and performance in United States-China joint ventures: A comparative case study. *Academy of Management Journal,* 37, 1478-1517.

Yang, K. S. (1992). Chinese social orientation: From the social interaction perspective. In K. S. Yang & A. B. Yu (Eds.), Chinese psychology and behavior (pp. 87-142). Taipei: Laurel