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CHAPTER 1. INTRODUCTION

Statement of the Problem

Conflict with parents, peers, teachers and others has been viewed as a hallmark of the extensive changes associated with the period of human development referred to as adolescence (Collins & Laursen, 1992). It is only logical that a time when young people are attempting to establish their own identity, as well as declare their independence and establish autonomy, would involve some degree of conflict. In addition, conflict has been viewed as important to social development. Sullivan (1953) and Piaget (1932) both posited that “true cooperation” between children emerges out of interpersonal conflict. Youniss (1980) describes the positions of Sullivan and Piaget, “Children learn how to deal with differences of opinion. Specifically, they construct procedures of discussion, debate, argument, negotiation and compromise” (p. 32). Parker and Asher (1987) contend that the best early predictor of adult adaptation is the adequacy with which children and adolescents get along with their peers.

Shantz and Hobart (1989) describe social development as involving two life-long goals: individuation, developing a distinct and unique sense of self and simultaneously, connectedness, being connected to others – a sense of being an accepted and valued group member. They contend that both goals are evidenced by the very existence of conflict between individuals. When peers disagree, they are affirming that one another’s behavior is of significance. In addition, conflict with others enhances individuation of self, because conflicts are markers of incidents
where one takes a stand in opposition to another and another takes a stand in opposition to self. The self is made aware of its' difference(s) from the other.

In regards to connectedness, conflict in and of itself is a sign of the interdependence of one another's behavior(s); how an individual goes about trying to influence another and the strategies used, reveal the perceptions that individual has of the other. Therefore, if one recognizes similarities between self and another (or considers the other to be a close friend), he/she is more likely to listen to that person's objections, try to persuade and/or compromise with that individual so that the other's needs are partially met as well as one's own needs. If the perception is that there are no similarities between self and the other, he/she is more likely to use coercive tactics, insults and/or threats (Shantz & Hobart, 1989).

The word adolescence is derived from the Latin verb *adolescere*, "to grow into adulthood" (Steinberg, 1993, p. 4). Adolescence is indeed a time of “growing up.” Adolescents are growing up biologically and physically from a boy or girl to a young man or young woman. They are also growing cognitively with the emergence of more sophisticated thinking abilities including abstract reasoning and metacognition.

As adolescents work to establish a personal identity separate from their family of origin and declare their own independence, they are growing emotionally. Social growth is also evident, as the focus of interpersonal relationships moves toward the development of the capacity for intimacy with peers. In addition, there is movement toward the attainment of adult status in society, bringing with it changes in rights, responsibilities and privileges.
While adolescence is referred to as a time of change and a time involving growth from immaturity to maturity biologically, socially and cognitively, it is most often defined by chronological age. The adolescent years extend roughly from age 11 to 22. Most consider the onset of puberty, or the beginning of sexual maturity, as the marker distinguishing childhood from adolescence (Balk, 1995). Social scientists often distinguish among early adolescence, age 11 to age 14, middle adolescence, age 15 to age 18, and late adolescence or youth, age 18 through age 21 or 22.

The unique features which distinguish adolescence from other stages in the life-span are accompanied by challenges that are also unique. During adolescence, the rapid and extensive physical, cognitive and social changes necessitate interpersonal adjustments in order to maintain the functional interdependencies of both familial and extrafamilial relationships; conflicts often occur in this realignment process (Collins & Laursen, 1992). This includes the area of conflicts with peers and how to manage these conflicts effectively in a manner viewed as positive by society.

As professionals concerned with human development, it is important to examine more closely the uniqueness of conflict during adolescence, as well as the factors which may influence the type of conflict resolution strategies used by adolescents in conflict with their peers. One influence is the role that personality characteristics of the adolescent play in the choice of conflict resolution strategies chosen for resolving conflict with friends.

The purpose of this study is to examine the impact of three major personality dimensions, extraversion, neuroticism (emotionality/emotional stability) and psychoticism (toughmindedness) on the tendency to engage in a particular style of
conflict management (integrating, obliging, dominating, avoiding and compromising) when adolescents are involved in conflict with a best friend of the same gender. The role of the adolescent's self esteem as intervening in this relationship between personality and conflict management style will be examined. Gender differences in conflict management styles will also be explored.

Rationale

Conflicts are a part of life which begin early in childhood and continue throughout the life span (Shantz & Hartup, 1992). The ability to manage conflict effectively is viewed as necessary to the development of social competence. Conflict management skills are linked with several positive aptitudes including enhanced perspective taking and social understanding (see Dunn & Slomkowski, 1992, for review), successful peer group entry (see Putallz & Sheppard, 1992, for review), and the formation and maintenance of friendships (Gottman, 1983). As friendships develop, conflicts provide a means through which children and adolescents work out the terms of the relationship as well as gain a better understanding of friendship roles (Rizzo, 1992). Conflicts can also contribute to developmental problems. Consistent use of inappropriate resolution strategies can lead to difficulties in peer relations (see Perry, Perry & Kennedy, 1992, for review). Children and adolescents of all ages report conflict as the greatest threat to a friendship (Selman, 1980).

If adolescence is an important time in the development of social skills, particularly in relationships outside the family, then how adolescents resolve conflicts may have significant consequences as to how they will resolve conflicts in
adulthood. Destructive conflict may lead to the termination of otherwise positive relationships (Jensen-Campbell, Graziano & Hair, 1986). More specifically, destructive conflict resolution strategies tend to aggravate conflict and lead to inequitable solutions and discontinued interactions between individuals (Sternberg & Soraino, 1984); whereas constructive strategies such as negotiation may allay conflict and allow for continued social interaction (Laursen & Hartup, 1989).

In examining the processes used by adolescents in resolving conflict, an understanding of underlying differences within individuals may lead to further awareness of factors which influence adolescents in the choice of conflict resolution strategies. Previous studies have examined age-related changes in conflict resolution (Laursen 1993a, 1993b, 1996; or see Shantz, 1987, for a review). These studies have indicated that cognitive advances, changes in perspective taking (Selman, 1980, 1981), as well as the increased significance of peer relationships during adolescence (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990) all impact the choice of conflict resolution strategies selected by children and adolescents when involved in conflict with peers. However, only a limited number of studies (i.e., Graziano, Jensen-Campbell & Hair, 1996; Jensen-Campbell, et al., 1996) have examined the relationship between the personality characteristics of the individual and his/her conflict management style. The dimensions of personality could be related to the choice of these strategies. Graziano, et al., (1996) found that individual differences in agreeableness, one dimension of personality posed in the five-factor model (McCrae & Costa, 1987), predicted the perception and resolution of interpersonal conflict in college-aged students. Perhaps a similar correlation can be found in
young adolescents as well as possible links between other personality dimensions and choice of conflict resolution strategies.
CHAPTER 2. LITERATURE REVIEW

There are many aspects related to this research question which should be explored. These include the development of peer relationships from childhood to adolescence, conflict with peers and how conflict is resolved. A great deal of research has been done related to the development of peer relationships and the importance of these relationships to children and adolescents. Since the nature of a relationship may impact whether or not conflict arises, the issues which lead to conflict, as well as how conflicts may be resolved will be addressed in this chapter. This review will also include research examining gender differences in relationships with peers, conflict issues and conflict during childhood and adolescence. There has been only a limited study of personality attributes as they relate to conflict resolution and conflict management styles. The chapter will conclude with a review of the studies that have been done in this area.

Peer Relationships from Childhood to Adolescence

In examining the importance of peer relationships, it is helpful to begin with the evolution of the role that peers and friendships play from childhood into adolescence. Relationships with peers during adolescence also show considerable continuity with peer relationships during childhood (Collins & Repinski, 1994). Relative success in forming friendships and maintaining them in adolescence is highly correlated with childhood friendships (Epstein, 1986; Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990).

Both children and adults, during their lives, have “love” relationships, “friend” relationships and “acquaintance” relationships, each with a set of
norms governing actions and goals and each associated with different feeling states (Lewis & Feiring, 1989). Acquaintance relationships tend to be the least enduring and the most specific to the particular interactions that bring them into existence. They usually occur as a result of a particular and highly structured social exchange. These relationships vary along a dimension of familiarity, from ones in which members recognize one another, know each other's names and exchange information to less familiar interactions with people whom we greet casually as we pass them in the street. These casual contacts can, at times, lead to more familiarity and may result in the development of a friendship (Berscheid & Walster, 1978). For both children and adolescents, classmates would be considered acquaintances whose relationship may be of a casual nature or may lead to a friendship over an extended period of time.

Friendship has generally been conceptualized as an affective bond, a relationship charged with positive feeling (Fine, 1981). Research and theory suggest that throughout the life-span, friends are those individuals who make us feel good about ourselves, enhancing our self-esteem, self-worth and self-pride (Berndt & Perry, 1986; Sullivan, 1953). In fact, ego enhancement may be one of the earliest characteristics to emerge from friendship (Bigelow & La Gaipa, 1975). Throughout the life-span, friends can also be sources of information for solving emotional and other kinds of problems (Berndt & Perry, 1986).

Sullivan (1953) was among the first to describe developmental changes in the need fulfilling role of friendships. Some of these changes are brought on by the emergence of new concerns and needs, whereas other changes involve
reorganizations in terms of which network members are most depended upon to address established needs (Buhrmester, 1996). Buhrmester and Prager (1995) viewed these changes as resulting from a number of cognitive, pubertal and sociocultural changes that take place during early adolescence and give rise to increased concern about social validation, self-clarification and obtaining coping assistance. These concerns then lead to changes in the types of interactions and relationship features that adolescents seek in friendships. Young teens come to want and need intimate confidants with whom they can share and explore their opinions about others and about themselves (Harter, 1990a; Parker & Gottman, 1989).

Friendships among preschool and elementary children revolve primarily around playmate activities and group acceptance (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Sullivan, 1953). Indeed, the single most important and unchanging function of friends across the life course may be the fulfillment of needs for enjoyable companionship. During childhood, adolescence and adulthood, "playing together," "hanging out," and "doing things together" are consistently reported as among the most important features of friendships (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990). However, research and theory does indicate the increased importance of intimacy and confidentiality in adolescent friendships. In particular, Sullivan (1953) contends that as children enter early adolescence, there is increased impetus to depend on intimate friendships to address social needs.

By adolescence, the role of peer friendships as a source of activities, influence and support increases rather dramatically (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990).
During early adolescence, a certain degree of distancing from parents occurs as adolescents become preoccupied with concerns related to autonomy and self-governance. These emergent concerns set in motion a transformation of the dependency structure of parent-child relations (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Thus, in theory, dependence on friends to address needs for intimacy and support is increasing at the same time that dependence on parents to address certain needs is decreasing.

In describing the nature of adolescent friendship, Savin-Williams and Berndt (1990) found that teens typically mentioned two features not commonly found in children's descriptions. First, friends must be loyal to one another; they should “not talk about you behind your back.” Commitment and genuineness in attitudes, values and interests are demanded. Second, much importance is attached to the intimacy of friendships - that is, the ability to share one’s feelings with a friend. The increased intimacy of friendship contributes to the development of social skills such as the ability to empathize with and understand the point of view of others; these skills are learned and practiced during these relationships.

Intimacy as a quality of relationships appears to emerge sometime between childhood and adolescence (Collins & Repenski, 1994). With regards to friendships especially, intimacy becomes salient in descriptions of friendship that emphasize sharing of thoughts and feelings (e.g. Berndt, 1982; Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Furman & Bierman, 1984). Intimacy differentiates middle childhood from adolescence more sharply than any other aspect of friendship relations (Berndt & Savin-Williams, 1993; Hartup, 1993).
The emergence of a need for intimacy has long been regarded as the social threshold of adolescence (Sullivan, 1953). Shared feelings and self-disclosure appear in descriptions of friends during the transition to adolescence and increase steadily thereafter (Berndt, 1982; Bigelow & LaGaipa, 1980; Furman & Burmeister, 1992). Adolescents display greater knowledge of such information (thoughts and feelings) than do children (Diaz & Berndt, 1982). Other studies indicated that adolescents emphasize self-disclosure, openness and affection as elements of friendships more so than younger children (Bigelow, 1977; Bigelow & LaGaipa, 1975; Douvan & Adelson, 1966; Furman & Bierman, 1984; Hunter, 1984; Smollar & Youniss, 1982). It should be noted that at least one research team, Camerena, Sarigiani and Petersen (1990) concluded that there may be different gender paths to intimacy. They concluded that self-disclosure is important to emotional closeness for both genders, but that shared experiences and activities are an alternative path for boys.

Friendships are based on reciprocity and commitment between individuals who see themselves more or less as equals. Friends interact on an equal power base; friendships are egalitarian relationships. These three conditions — reciprocity, commitment, and egalitarianism — are first fully understood in adolescence (Hartup, 1993).

Adolescent friendship is viewed as having important implications for both short and long term socioemotional functioning (Buhrmeister & Furman, 1987; Sullivan, 1953). In childhood, being a friend involves knowing how to enter ongoing games, being a fun and “nice” playmate and refraining from insulting or being
aggressive towards one's friend (Asher, 1983). Adolescent friendships demand
greater ability in a number of "close relationship" or "interpersonal" competencies.
To a greater extent than younger children, adolescents must be capable of initiating
conversations and relationships outside of the classroom context. They must be
skilled in appropriately disclosing personal information and tactfully providing
emotional support to others (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). Adolescents also are
expected to express their opinions and dissatisfactions honestly with each other,
while at the same time effectively managing conflicts (Bigelow & La Gaipa, 1980;
Shantz, 1987). These interpersonal relationship skills are similar to the skills called
for in mature adult relationships.

During adolescence, friends significantly influence a wide range of attitudes
and behaviors. Friends influence adolescents' educational aspirations and their use
of alcohol, marijuana and other illicit drugs. They also influence many attitudes and
behaviors that affect the physical and mental health of adolescents, including their
nutrition, sexual behavior, physical activity and tendencies toward risky driving
(Berndt, 1996). Yet when peer influence is assessed in terms of similarity between
friends or increases over time in friends, the nature of their influence is as likely to be
positive as negative (Savin-Williams & Berndt, 1990).

Indeed, research has identified some of the positive influences of peers on
adolescents' behaviors. For example, although an individual adolescent's grades
may fall if his or her friends do not do well in school, motivation to do well may
increase if one's friends care about academic success (Berndt, 1982). In one study,
middle and high school students who initially scored high or low on measures such
as college plans, English and math standardized achievement and self-reliance and who had high scoring friends received higher scores one year later than students with low-scoring friends (Epstein, 1986). These examples indicate that peers can exert a positive influence on each other.

Almost all children and adolescents identify one or more friends as best friends. Indeed, adolescents typically have several best friends (Epstein, 1986; Hartup, 1993). Keefe and Berndt (1996) supported this in a recent study of seventh and eighth graders. When they asked these students to name three best or close friends, 91% named three friends at two different administration times approximately five months apart. About 8% named only two friends and about 1% named only one or no best friends.

Best friends are generally characterized by adolescents as being mutually recognized as such and almost no one admits to not having a best friend (Hartup, 1993). Contact among best friends usually occurs on a daily basis with these contacts consuming several hours of the day (Csikszentmihalyi & Larson, 1984). It would seem logical that individuals an adolescent refers to as best friends would have a greater impact on the adolescent. One team of researchers (Morgan & Grube, as cited in Berndt, 1996), found that the best friends' influence did seem greater than that of other friends in influencing cigarette smoking, drinking and using other drugs. If one agrees with this line of thinking, it would follow that conflict with a "best" friend may have a greater significance for an adolescent. Thus, an adolescent may approach the resolution of a conflict with a best friend differently than one with other peers. For the purpose of this study, a "best friend" will be
defined as an individual the adolescent meets regularly, with whom he/she shares a lot of things and with whom he/she feels close (adapted from Claes, 1992).

In his book, All Grown and No Place to Go, Elkind (1984) describes how social interactions differ from childhood to adolescence in regards to the formation of peer groups. Whereas children’s play groups and friendships are often determined by who lives nearby; adolescents find that belonging to a group is often determined by qualities such as social status and ethnic background. Therefore, individuals who felt accepted by their peers as children may find themselves excluded as young teenagers. This may be a major contributing factor to the formation of gangs by adolescents. Gangs can become a group for those who have been excluded from other groups in the adolescent culture. Dacey and Kenny (1994) contend that the gang often offers youth the fulfillment of basic needs - protection, acceptance and recognition of the desire to feel wanted. In fact, gangs are often formed along ethnic and socioeconomic lines, the very factors that may have excluded them from these other groups. This is of concern in the area of conflict resolution, since gang violence has increased dramatically in the past decade (Dacey & Kenny, 1994).

Elkind goes on to say that in the “culture of adolescence,” social intercourse also becomes more complex. Friendships in childhood are based on cooperation, mutual trust and loyalty. Friendship means the sharing of information with each other. Adolescents may find that while they are continuing to operate under that same framework, others are operating in a more strategic fashion - obtaining, hiding and/or conveying information for personal gain. This type of manipulation may be especially difficult in the dating relationships that are also beginning at this time.
One adolescent may be assuming that this type of intimate relationship means being open and honest with each other, while the other is operating strategically in order to manipulate the relationship for personal advantage. Thus, these changes in social interaction open up an entirely new set of conflicts for the adolescent.

The need for acceptance by the peer group which becomes significant in adolescence may also prompt adolescents to “proceed with caution” in resolving conflicts with their peers. They come to realize that this type of relationship is more susceptible to damage and/or loss of the relationship altogether than conflict experienced with family members or with peers in childhood. Relationships with close friends and romantic partners may be viewed as somewhat tenuous and easily disrupted. Close peer relationships can be ended over a single dispute - a situation that adolescents readily recognize and anticipate (Hartup, 1992). A further discussion of open-field versus closed field relationships will be addressed later in this chapter.

Not only are adolescents concerned about acceptance by individual peers, they are also very concerned about popularity and/or status within the peer group. Therefore, they may avoid conflict or be more willing to compromise their values to maintain their status with peers. This could be especially true of females whose view of “success” often depends on how well liked and accepted they believe they are.

Peer Conflict from Childhood to Adolescence

Conflict has been described as a state of incompatible behaviors (Shantz, 1987), disagreement (Garvey, 1984) and/or opposition (Hay, 1984). The structure of
conflict continues to be debated (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Some view conflict as requiring only a single instance of opposition (Garvey, 1984; Hay, 1984). A influences B, B opposes A, a two-event, unilateral definition of conflict. While others contend that conflict is a dyadic state of mutual opposition consisting of at least three events including A responding to B's initial objection by persisting in the original behavior or offering counter opposition (e.g. Maynard, 1985; Shantz, 1987 and Shantz & Hobart, 1989).

For the purpose of this study, the more liberal, two-component, single opposition definition will be used. This is in keeping with the work of Collins & Laursen (1992) and Laursen (1993a). Laursen contends that this definition is more inclusive and focuses on opposition as the central feature; thus distinguishing conflict from negative affect and aggression. Anger and even violence may be a part of some conflicts but they need not be and more often are not.

Conflict is by definition neither good nor bad, but is a type of social interaction arising in all relationships that holds constructive as well as destructive potential (Deutsch, 1973; Shantz, 1987). Deutsch (1973) characterized destructive conflict as an interpersonal process in which the conflict expands and escalates beyond the initial issue and relies on threats and coercion as strategies. Constructive conflict was described as issue-focused and resolved by mutual problem solving. This distinction recognizes that not all conflict is harmful to relationships but conflict may have beneficial functions, which enhance a relationship. Experiences with peer conflict are thought to reduce egocentrism (Piaget, 1966), promote social understanding (Dunn & Slomkowski, 1992), enhance discourse skills (Garvey,
1984; Goodwin & Goodwin, 1987), and provide opportunities for learning how to regulate negative emotion (Katz, Kramer, & Gottman, 1992).

Children’s conflicts with peers are often centered on struggles over objects or possessions or take the form of arguments (Chung & Asher, 1996). Numerous studies have focused on conflicts among children in preschool and elementary years (e.g., Caplan, Vespa, Pederson & Hay, 1991; Eisenberg & Garvey, 1981; Hay & Ross, 1982; Laursen & Hartup, 1989; Miller, Danaher & Forbes, 1986; D. Shantz, 1986; Shantz & Shantz, 1985; Sheldon, 1990). Research in early childhood conflict behavior has consistently revealed that the most common conflict issue for toddlers and preschoolers centers on object possession (e.g. Berndt, 1982; Shantz, 1987).

These young children are making ownership claims. Bakeman and Brownlee (1982) found that even young children appear to operate under the “prior possession” rule (i.e., the first to possess the object should enjoy ownership rights). In addition, Eckerman, Whatley and McGhee (1979) observed that one-year-olds showed more interest in a toy if another child had the toy. This desire to “own” material objects often extends into adulthood. Both Bakeman and Brownlee (1982) and Hay (1984) noted that conflicts over possessions and resources continue throughout the life span.

Hay and Ross (1982) found that a toddler sometimes abandoned a toy in an effort to take an identical toy from a peer; this suggested that it is not solely the object that is at issue. Issues of “face” may be involved. A child may seek to assert his/her own identity at an early age by attempting to take another’s toy.
In a review by Shantz (1987), conflict over another child's actions or lack of action (i.e., threatening a peer or refusing to assume a role during fantasy play) appeared to be the second largest category of conflict during childhood. Other issues that provoked conflict included social intrusiveness and rule violation. As children get older, intrusiveness conflicts become centered less on the physical environment (i.e., objects and space) and more on the actions of interference of others on one's goals (Hay, 1984; Shantz, 1987). Shantz concluded that the events that led to conflicts between children were similar to those of adults: valued possessions, controlling other behaviors, rule violation, facts and truth.

During middle childhood (age 7-11), the conflict topics most important to 7-year-olds were person control issues including teasing, name-calling and psychological harm. Other issues identified were physical harm, violation of social and friendship rules and differences over facts and opinions (Shantz, 1993).

The developmental changes of adolescence (age 12-18), also impact the issues which lead to conflicts during this period. Hartup (1992) reported that conflicts over objects were largely nonexistent for adolescents. Laursen (1993a) concluded that adolescent conflicts with friends were primarily concerned with the interpersonal standards expected of friendships and heterosexual relationships. Youniss and Smollar (1985) found that these included untrustworthy acts, lack of adequate attention, disrespectful acts, unacceptable behavior and lack of communication. Additional areas of conflict for this age group were differences over ideas and opinions, teasing/criticism and annoying behaviors (Laursen, 1993a). In one study, adolescents reported that acting in an untrustworthy manner was the
most frequent cause of conflict with friends, followed by “disrespectful acts” (boys) and “lack of adequate attention” (girls) (Youniss and Smollar, 1985).

However, as children become older, they become increasingly aware of the important role conflict plays in the formation, maintenance and termination of social relationships (Hartup, 1992; Selman, 1980). During adolescence, teens become aware that the impact of conflict on relationships is determined by the degree to which participants are mutually satisfied with its’ resolution (Selman, Beardslee, Schultz, Krupa, & Podorefsky, 1986).

According to equity theory (Kelley, Berscheid, Christensen, Harvey, Levinger, McClintock, Peplau, & Peterson, 1983), individuals with personal histories of rewarding social exchanges strive to maintain relationships and the rewards offered by these relationships by reducing distress and inequity. When inequity develops, the challenge is to offset the imbalance without jeopardizing ongoing relations (Laursen, 1993a). To maintain rewarding exchanges, adolescents must be sensitive to the possibility that a short-term conflict victory achieved at any cost may result in a long-term disruption of the relationship. Unlike younger children, adolescents realize that conflict holds the potential for irreparably damaging a relationship as well as providing an impetus for growth and communication (Laursen, 1993a).

However, even among young children, there is evidence that they recognize differences in conflict between those considered friends and other children with whom they associate. In a study involving 3-5 year olds, Hartup and colleagues (1988) found the mutual friends managed their conflicts in different ways from neutral associates. Their conflicts were less “heated” and they withdrew from a
conflict more frequently than with non-friends. The "cooler" and less insistent strategies used between friends brought about different outcomes. Equality was more common between friends than non-friends.

Laursen (1996) asserted that during adolescence, young people recognize that interpersonal relationships are comprised of two distinct groups in which the principles of interdependence are not applied equally. These include involuntary or closed-field relationships and voluntary or open-field relationships. Closed-field relationships are those with parents and siblings where kinship, customs and laws impact behavior. These types of relationships change slowly and are inherently stable and not likely to be easily disrupted. In contrast, open-field relationships with peers and romantic partners are voluntary and consequently, more likely to change. These relationships may even be tenuous because the interactions are based on trust and commitment not on familial bonds (Laursen, 1993b; Laursen, 1996).

However, adolescents are not heavily invested in some open-field relationships, such as with teachers, employers, classmates/associates and co-workers; nor are they concerned with maintaining these relationships if they are not rewarding (Laursen, 1993b).

Laursen (1993b) found that relationship closeness and malleability also appeared to impact conflict process and outcomes during adolescence. In close peer relationships, friends and romantic partners evinced minimal anger and continued amicable relationships following disputes. In fact, social interaction almost always continued afterwards and relationships frequently improved as a result. In all other relationships, disagreements were associated with lingering anger and
discontinued social interaction. While adolescents perceived that the latter had little bearing on family relationships (i.e., parents and siblings), they reportedly worsened relations with other peers, teachers and employers.

Another characteristic of close peer relationships, which contributes to increased negotiated conflicts and equitable outcomes, is the mutual and reciprocal nature of these relationships (Laursen, 1993b). Children and adolescents live in two different social worlds: one with peers, who must share power, and one with adults, who expect submission (Hartup, 1989). Peer relationships are horizontal in nature in that both parties hold approximately equal power. In order for peers to get along, agreement and cooperation need to prevail (Laursen, 1993b). When confronted with an opponent of equal power, cooperation is the most productive and least risky resolution strategy (Deutsch, 1973).

A third attribute of close relationships that promotes equitable conflict management strategies are the issues and activities involved in the interactions. Conflicts with close peers frequently concern interpersonal trust and behavior, whereas conflicts with parents generally involve rules, school and chores. These issues are not as readily negotiable as those issues involved in conflict with peers.

In addition, cognitive advances during adolescence lead adolescents to the realization that open-field relationships are more vulnerable to the disruptions of conflict than closed-field ones (Hartup, 1992). Cognitive advances may also influence how adolescents look at conflict and the conflict resolution strategies that are utilized in conflict with others.
Increasing cognitive abilities should provide a shift in the ability of the adolescent to deal with conflict. The cognitive abilities of the adolescent have become more advanced in four major ways. First, teens are better able to think about what is possible rather than limiting thought to what is real. Second, the emergence of abstract reasoning. Third, adolescents begin "thinking about thinking," the process of metacognition. Fourth, adolescents tend to see things as relative rather than absolute (Keating, 1980, 1990). These abilities indicate that adolescents are more likely to approach a problem by considering the possible outcomes of their actions as well as considering how their potential actions may impact others.

General cognitive development has been found to be positively related to levels of interpersonal reasoning (Pellegrini, 1985, 1986). Each of the four abilities discussed in the previous paragraph, considered individually, could provide further clues as to how the increasing cognitive abilities may influence how adolescents deal with conflict and to some extent the nature of the conflict that develops with peers. The adolescents' ability to think about things in more than one dimension may have consequences both on their behavior and ability to resolve conflict. They recognize that their personality and the personalities of others are not one-sided. Therefore, social situations can have different interpretations, depending on one's point of view (Steinberg, 1993).

Social cognitive theorists have reported age differences in conflict management abilities, including information-processing skills (Dodge, 1985) and the child's understanding of conflict resolution and negotiation (Selman, Schorin, Stone...
& Phelps, 1983). Younger children are less competent than older children at identifying the intentions of others and utilizing the information available to resolve a conflict (Laursen & Hartup, 1989).

Perhaps the most extensive developmental analysis of social cognitive functioning is provided by the work of Selman (1980, 1981). In investigating conflict between friends, Selman proposed a developmental model of social understanding based on perspective coordination - the ability to integrate the thoughts, feelings and intentions of the self and other(s). Shantz (1987) summarizes the model as follows:

At level 0, children appear to operate from a momentary and physicalistic orientation. Conflicts are resolved either by stopping interaction or with physical force. An important feature is added at level 1 - an appreciation of the subjective and psychological effects of conflict. However, these effects are viewed in a unilateral direction - one party needs to stop doing something so the other party will feel better. Conflict is not yet understood as a mutual disagreement.

Level 2 is illustrated by the conflict protocols of children ages 8-14; bilateral ideas about conflict are now used, but not yet mutual ones. Children suggest that one must get agreement from both parties in conflict for a “true” resolution to be reached, but they do not yet appreciate that the agreement should be mutually satisfying.

Levels 3 and 4 are found, respectively, during adolescence and adulthood. At level 3, adolescents recognize that certain conflicts reside within the relationship itself, and thus only mutually satisfying solutions are real solutions. A clear distinction is also made between minor conflicts and those that threaten a friendship,
usually a break in the bond of trust. Brion-Meisels and Selman (1984) analyzed this shift as a qualitative shift - a change from a less complex kind of social reciprocity to one of mutuality of perspectives. This mutuality of perspectives means that the young adolescent understands social interactions in the following way: each individual is capable of getting outside both her or his own perspective and the other’s as well; each party can take a “third person” perspective that integrates both points of view and considers the mutual effects of behavior on both individuals.

The final level, Level 4, deals with the balance between dependence and independence in friendships. Each individual is growing and changing, thus friendships are recognized as being in a constant process of formation and transformation. Therefore, there is a recognition that friendships may change over time. This final level generally emerges in adulthood.

Adolescent cognitive advances also suggest changing patterns of conflict resolution. Compromise and negotiation, it is argued, are the most cognitively sophisticated resolution strategies requiring advanced stages of reasoning (Selman, 1981; Smetana, 1988 & Youniss, 1980). Therefore, as cognitive abilities advance so too should rates of compromise and negotiation. While cognitive advances offer insight into conflict resolution strategies utilized by adolescents in conflict situations, it is not the focus of this study.

Conflict Resolution

In discussing conflict within families, Vuchinich (1987) identified four specific formats for conflict resolution. These are submission, compromise, standoff and withdrawal. Submission is defined as one party “gives in” to the demands of the
other; compromise as concession from both sides usually achieved through negotiation — each party “gives a little” to accept the compromise. Standoff involves disputants dropping the conflict without any type of resolution — the parties “agree to disagree” and move on to other activities. There is no outcome. Withdrawal occurs when one participant refuses to continue, perhaps by leaving the situation. Another resolution strategy which may be utilized is third-party intervention — participants submit to a solution proposed by an uninvolved individual. Some researchers combine standoffs and withdrawals into a single category referred to as disengagement (Laursen & Collins, 1994).

In addition to work relating to the resolution of conflict within families, methods of handling interpersonal conflict are also discussed extensively in the arena of organizational conflict, that is conflict with superiors, subordinates and peers in an organization or the workplace. Conflict style has been defined as the way a person most commonly deals with conflict (Pruitt & Carnevale, 1993). A scheme for classifying interpersonal conflict-handling styles or modes was introduced in 1964 by Blake and Moulton and was reinterpreted by Thomas and Kilman (Kilman & Thomas, 1977). This scheme identifies five modes of handling conflict and labels them: competing, collaborating, compromising, avoiding, and accommodating (Figure 1). As interpreted by Kilman and Thomas (1977), the scheme is based upon the two separate dimensions of cooperation (attempting to satisfy the other person’s concerns) and assertiveness (attempting to satisfy to satisfy one’s own concerns). As interpreted by Thomas and Kilman (1977), the competing style/mode is assertive
and uncooperative, collaborating is assertive and cooperative, avoiding is unassertive and uncooperative, accommodating is unassertive and cooperative and compromising is intermediate in both cooperativeness and assertiveness.

Rahim (1983) modified the same scheme in the development of a measure for examining organizational conflict. He labeled the five styles or modes as dominating, integrating, compromising, avoiding and obliging. Rahim and Magner (1995, p.123) described the five styles of handling interpersonal conflict as follows:

**Integrating (IN)** - This style involves high concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. It is concerned with collaboration between parties (i.e., openness, exchange of information and examination of differences) to reach a solution acceptable to both parties.

**Obliging (OB)** - This style involves low concern for self and high concern for the other party involved in conflict. An obliging person attempts to play down the differences and emphasizes the commonalities to satisfy the concerns of the other party.
Dominating (DO) - This style involves high concern for self and low concern for the other party involved in conflict. It has been identified with a win-lose orientation or with forcing behavior to win one's position.

Avoiding (AV) - This is associated with low concern for self as well as for the other party involved in the conflict. It has been associated with withdrawal, passing-the-buck, sidestepping, or "see no evil, hear no evil, speak no evil" situations.

Compromising (CO) - This style involves a moderate concern for self as well as the other party involved in conflict. It is associated with give-and-take or sharing whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision.

This model has also been referred to as the dual concern model (Rubin, Pruitt & Kim, 1994) with the two underlying dimensions referred to as concern about the other's outcomes and concerns about the Party's own outcomes. These concerns are identified as ranging from indifference at the zero point of the coordinates to high concern at the outer end of the coordinates. The dual concern model also implies that conflict style is determined by the strength of the two individual dimensions - concern about satisfying the other's needs and concern about satisfying one's own needs.

However, Thomas (1992) emphasized that the two-dimensional model is purely a classification scheme or taxonomy of five conflict-handling intentions, classified according to the two underlying dimensions of intent. Thomas contends that this distinction allows for the investigation of the modes distinct from the dimensions themselves. For the purpose of this study, the five conflict management strategies as described by Kilman and Thomas (1977) and Rahim (1983,) will be used.
When adolescents are involved in conflict with peers, do they demonstrate a preferred conflict management style? What factors influence the choice of conflict resolution strategies or conflict management style? Can a conflict style be identified or predicted? Age does seem to impact the choice of strategies used by adolescents in conflict situations. Age-related improvements in the knowledge of appropriate skills and strategies for negotiated responses are evident in studies in which adolescents have been asked to indicate appropriate strategies for responding to hypothetical conflicts (Laursen & Collins, 1994). Results indicated that a greater emphasis was placed on negotiation as compared with submission, power assertion or disengagement; endorsement of and skill at negotiation varies as a function of social-cognitive abilities of adolescence (Levya & Furth, 1986; Selman, et al., 1986).

A strong age-related phenomenon is a decline in the use of power assertion for the resolving of conflicts from early to late adolescence. In peer interactions, conflict increasingly involved power assertion at the same time that friendship expectations increasingly concern trust and reciprocity (Bigelow, 1977; Hartup & Laursen, 1993). As indicated earlier, emphasis on friendship reciprocity is especially evident among early and middle adolescent females (Youniss & Smollar, 1985).

An increased emphasis on negotiation as the preferred resolution strategy has been reported by early adolescents both in conflicts with close friends and classmates. In a study by Jensen-Campbell, et al. (1996), when responding to vignettes about conflicts, young adolescents were asked to rate several strategies for conflict resolution in terms of how good or bad they thought the strategy would
be. The respondents consistently rated negotiation as the best type of strategy. Almost identical strategies were recommended for friends and classmates (nonfriends).

Responses to actual conflicts in adolescence, however, do not always indicate a dominant tendency toward negotiation or negotiated resolutions (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). The research of Youniss and Smollar (1985) found that when confronted with a conflict-causing situation, the resolution given most frequently by females was to resolve the conflict by talking over the problem. In contrast, males were more likely to report that the conflicts were simply forgotten or that the violation was accepted, with the largest number of respondents stating that the conflict was not resolved at all.

However, in a meta-analysis summarizing twelve studies of adolescent conflict management, Laursen (1993b) found that rates of compromise among close peers were higher and submission and disengagement lower than in conflict with parents suggesting that differences in open-field versus closed-field relationships impact conflict management. He also found that adolescents were more likely to consider mitigating factors in conflict with friends and romantic partners than with either non-friends or siblings, a trend that accelerated with age. This too, reinforces the notion that adolescents make a distinction between open-field and closed-field relationships. Negotiation was the most common method of resolving conflicts between close peers. Coercion-dominated conflict with non-friends and siblings; negotiation in these relationships was rare.
In adolescent telephone reports, Laursen and Koplas (1995) concluded that the conflict resolution strategy, affective intensity of the conflict and outcome combined to produce readily identifiable conflict management sequences. Generally, win/loss outcomes followed submission, equality resulted from negotiation and no outcome was a result of disengagement. Anger was associated with conflicts dealt with through disengagement or where no outcome resulted. Friendliness was related to negotiation (and equal) outcomes; mutual effect was more often linked to submission and win/loss outcomes.

Personality Factors and Conflict Resolution

Connolly, White, Stevens, and Burnstein (1987) found a significant relationship between the frequency and quality of social relations and various personality dimensions such as self-esteem and personal adequacy. Since conflict between friends affects the quality of a relationship, personality factors may be significant in how individuals deal with conflict. Terhune (1970) reported that conflict tends to be worsened when one or more participants in the conflict exhibit personality characteristics such as aggressiveness, authoritarianism, need for dominance and suspiciousness, whereas conflict tends to be mitigated when one or more participants exhibit personality characteristics such as egalitarianism, trust and open-mindedness.

Stagner (1971) took another view of the relation between personality and conflict-resolution style. At least for major conflicts, Stagner argued that “level of aggressive drive or hostility . . . can, in some degree, be ignored as both a theoretical and a practical problem” (p. 100). Stagner focused on perceptual style
rather than on personality attributes as a basis for understanding conflict resolution. Herrara and Dunn (1997) also suggested that children may very well have characteristic styles of approaching arguments that persist developmentally and are expressed regardless of opponent. They contend that children take with them to every interaction the same underlying characteristics, such as temperament and emotionality, and that these characteristics undoubtedly help shape the child's behavior during conflicts with opponents. It should be noted that several studies have suggested that the way children argue and resolve disputes differs depending on the identity of their opponent (Dunn & Munn, 1987; Eisenberg, 1987; Hartup, Laursen, Stewart and Eastenson, 1988).

However, Sternberg and Soriano (1984) found that individuals do have more or less preferred styles of conflict resolution and that these styles reveal cross-situational consistencies both within and across interpersonal and interorganizational domains of conflict. They found that styles of conflict resolution can be predicted rather well from a combination of intellectual and personality characteristics. They concluded that, consistent with the view of Terhune (1970), certain personal variables (including intellectual level and personality) are at least moderately predictive of more and less preferred styles of conflict resolution. Their data did not support Stagner's (1971) view that conflict resolution is wholly a matter of perceptual style rather than of personality predispositions.

In three later studies involving undergraduate students, Sternberg and Dobson (1987) corroborated the work of Sternberg and Soriano (1984) in suggesting that there are consistent styles of conflict resolution which extend across actual and
hypothesized relationships. However, these results did not strongly support the notion that consistency is predicted by standard personality scales. These studies however had serious limitations in that the number of participants was very small (n = 40) and in the uniformity of the participants, all were Yale undergraduates, age 18-21.

In a recent study by Graziano, et al. (1996), evidence was found to support a link between one of the Big Five dimensions of personality (McCrae & Costa, 1987), Agreeableness, and conflict resolution style. The data suggested that the personality dimension of Agreeableness may underlie cross-relationship consistency in the evaluation of power assertion tactics. They found, while both low- and high-agreeable participants concurred that negotiation tactics are effective in managing conflict, low-agreeable participants evaluated power assertion tactics as more effective.

Recent studies examining relationships between personality and conflict are limited, especially among the adolescent population. Research in this area can contribute to an increased understanding of conflict resolution.

While personality factors may play a major role in helping to explain the conflict management style of adolescents, the self-esteem of the adolescent involved in the conflict may intervene in the impact of personality on conflict management style.

**Self-esteem and Conflict Resolution**

To explore the role of self-esteem, a definition must be established. Self-esteem is the degree to which persons accept and respect themselves as persons of
worth (Rosenberg, 1965). To further understand this construct, it is important to examine different perspectives on self-esteem. Self-esteem can be viewed as global self-esteem defined by a single score averaging across items that involve general satisfaction with oneself as a person or as being domain-specific where an individual’s self worth may vary as a function of the relational context (Harter, Waters, & Whitesell, 1998). Still others have proposed that individuals display both which may be referred to as trait and state self-esteem.

The global view will be used for the purposes of this study as even those currently exploring the relational contexts of self-esteem still suggest that global self-esteem remains a powerful phenomenological reality in the lives of children, adolescents and adults (Harter, 1998). Findings have revealed that beginning in middle childhood, individuals can make global judgements of their worth as well as provide domain-specific evaluations (Harter, et al., 1998). Both Harter and Rosenberg (1986) have concluded that adolescents’ perceptions of the attitudes of significant others are highly related to global self-esteem. Thus, adolescents who feel supported and positively regarded by significant others such as parents and peers will express positive regard for self in the form of high self-esteem. Conversely, lack of perceived support and regard from significant others will take the form of low self-esteem. Since global self-esteem is in part determined by adolescents’ perceived social acceptance, positive features of friendship should also be related to global self-esteem (Keefe & Berndt, 1996).

However, the perception of support from others is not the only factor contributing to self-esteem in adolescents. Rosenberg’s theory of self-attribution
(1981) contends that individuals form conclusions about themselves by observing their own performance and attainments. This was supported in a recent study by Owens, Mortimer and Finch (1996) which examined whether the perceptions of freedom and autonomy in three contexts of adolescent development – family, school and work – are generalized and attributed to the self, increasing self-esteem. They concluded that the greater the adolescents' perception of self-determination, manifested by feelings of freedom and control, the more positive the youth's sense of self-esteem. However, this study involved an all male sample. Gilligan and Hanmer (1989) have pointed to gender differences in this area reporting that men's sense of self-worth is closely linked to autonomy and personal accomplishment, whereas women emphasize connectedness and sensitivity to others. In a longitudinal study, Block & Robbins reported that the self-esteem of females was promoted by the ability to relate to others in an interpersonally positive manner, but in males, lack of emotion, independence and personal uninvolvment were more highly related to high self-esteem. They did find however, that males and females come to be more similar over time. In the same sample, Thorne and Michaelieu (1994) examined the memories of males and females with both low and high self-esteem at age 23. High self-esteem males recalled events in which they had successfully asserted themselves, whereas high self-esteem females recalled examples of wanting to help female friends. Low self-esteem males recounted memories of failures to avoid conflict, whereas females with low self-esteem were concerned with failure to obtain approval from friends.
There have been some links of personality attributes to self-esteem. Adolescents with low self-esteem are more likely to be shy, more likely to be disliked and rejected by their peers (Harter, 1990b). Young adolescents with the most volatile self-image report the highest levels of tension, psychosomatic symptoms and irritability (Rosenberg, 1986). The question remains as to the intervening effect of self-esteem. The theoretical rationale for exploring self-esteem as intervening between the personality dimensions and the conflict resolution management style of adolescents stems in part from the terror management theory of Greenberg, Solomon, Pyszczynski, Rosenblatt, Burling, Lyon, Simon, and Pinel (1992) which proposes that self-esteem functions to buffer anxiety. These researchers concluded that self-esteem is a vital human need. They suggest that because of this, it is important to understand why people need self-esteem and propose people are motivated to maintain a positive self-image because self-esteem protects from anxiety created by an outside threat.

With regards to the personality dimension of neuroticism (N), the typical high N scorer is described by Eysenck (1975) as being an anxious, worrying individual who finds it difficult to get back on an even keel after an emotionally arousing experience. Based on the premise of Greenberg et al. (1992), if this same individual has a high self-esteem, this may serve to buffer those anxious feelings thus intervening in the preferred conflict resolution management style of that individual. Perhaps the same buffering effect may be true for the high or low self-esteem of the adolescence with the areas of extraversion and psychoticism. This study will explore that possibility.
Although adolescent's feelings about themselves may fluctuate somewhat, particularly in early adolescence, from eighth grade on, self-esteem remains relatively stable (Harter, 1990a). Hirsch and DuBois (1991) found that some adolescents show very high stability in self-esteem over time while others do not. These researchers identified different self-esteem trajectories followed by young people during the transition into junior high/middle school. Approximately one-third of the early adolescents were classified as consistently high in self-esteem, approximately one-sixth were classified as chronically low. Half of the sample showed impressive patterns of change over a two-year period. However, about one-fifth were categorized as steeply declining and nearly one-third showed a small but significant increase in self-esteem.

As stated earlier, the importance of the role of peers in an adolescent's life becomes stronger. This also appears to have an impact on self-esteem. For adolescents, the support of peers plays a more important role in self-esteem than it did during childhood when parental attitudes were almost of exclusive significance in a child's self-esteem. In fact, the self-esteem of adolescents was found to be influenced more significantly by classmates than by those adolescents identified as close friends. Acknowledgement by peers in the public domain seems to be more critical than that of friends, because close friends, by definition, provide support. One group of researchers has found that at every developmental level – childhood, adolescence and adulthood - approval from peers in the more public domains such as classmates or peers in work settings, was far more predictive of self-esteem than approval from their close friends (Harter, 1990a). Thus, even though the adolescent
may have one or more close friends, his/her self-esteem may suffer if he/she does not feel supported or highly regarded by their classmates. Mead (1934) theorizes that these opinions of significant others are incorporated into one's own sense of self worth which he refers to as the "generalized other".

However, the role of parental support in self-esteem of adolescents should not be discarded. Although the correlation between peer approval and self-esteem has been found to increase with development, the correlation between parental approval and self-esteem does not decline, at least through adolescence (Harter, 1990a). Peers may become more important during adolescence but parents continue to have a central role (Buhrmester & Furman, 1987; Lamborn & Steinberg, 1993). In fact, Oosterwegel and Oppenheimer (1993) emphasized the importance of parents' opinions of the self well into adolescence.

Thus, adolescents' self-esteem may intervene in the process of conflict management. They may be experiencing higher levels of tension and irritability (Rosenberg, 1986) which may indeed intervene in their choices for solving conflict with a close friend. In addition, a lack of support from parents and classmates may contribute to lowered self-esteem contributing to difficulty in dealing with conflict; whereas, positive self-esteem functions as a basis for socially adaptive behavior by providing adolescents with sufficient self-confidence to engage in and expand their social relationships (Openshaw & Thomas, 1986; Rollins & Thomas in Owens, Mortimer & Finch, 1996).
Gender Differences in Conflict and Conflict Resolution

Age related differences are evident in both conflict issues and conflict resolution as discussed previously. But, in addition, gender differences emerge relatively early in the social issues involved in conflict (Hartup & Laursen, 1993). Boys engage in more disagreements relating to power and abusive behavior than girls do, while girls engage in more disagreements relating to interpersonal relations. These differences extend from the preschool years (Sheldon, 1990) through childhood (Maltz & Borker, 1992) to adolescence (Rafaelli, 1997; Youniss, 1980; Youniss & Smollar, 1985). This was confirmed in a later study by Rafaelli (1997). He found that boys and girls, ages 10-14, differed markedly in the focus of their conflicts with friends. Boys described conflicts centered on power issues or abusive behavior, whereas girls described conflicts stemming from relationship betrayal. Berndt, Hawkins and Hoyle (1986) found that girls commented more often on intimacy in friendship than boys. In addition, girls expressed more concern about the disloyalty or unfaithfulness of friends than boys.

Conflict behaviors and resolution strategies utilized also varied according to gender. Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) observed both preschoolers and early adolescents and found that disagreements between boys usually involved power assertion including threats, insults and accusations regardless of age. Girls, however, tended not to use confrontation with one another but reserved these behaviors for conflicts with boys. In fact, Rafaelli (1997) concluded that girls tended not to resolve conflicts with friends, whereas more boys showed a tendency to compromise or give in to their friends. He believed that part of this is due to the
issues quarreled about - the boy's conflicts typically had a clearly defined focus while girls disagreed over more tenuous issues of how friends should treat each other. Girls were found to utilize different strategies in conflict management depending upon the gender of the individual(s) with whom they were in conflict. Boys were less discriminating (Hartup & Laursen, 1993). Miller, Danaher and Forbes (1986) reported greater "conflict mitigation" among girls but greater use of threats and force among boys. Sheldon (1990) noted that girls were not unassertive; rather they attempted to bring about agreement and to maintain interaction more frequently than boys.

Girls and boys also differed in their tendency to resolve conflicts with friends overtly. Rafaelli (1997) found that nearly three quarters of the girls in his study described withdrawal followed by a period of non-interaction, whereas over half of the boys described an immediate resolution involving capitulation or compromise. In response to hypothetical provocation scenarios, boys generated fewer responses to the situation and were only half as likely as girls to endorse passive responses than girls. Girls were also more likely to view withdrawal as a positive response than boys (Feldman & Dodge, 1987). Girls were found to utilize negotiation increasingly with age (Hartup & Laursen, 1993).

In addition, females are particularly sensitive to the potential costs of conflict with friends (Laursen, 1996). Relative to males, females more often emphasize the importance of resolving disagreements through compromise (see Collins and Lausen, 1992, for review). This distinction grows with age, leading Youniss and Smollar (1985) to suggest that a minority of adolescent males has yet to develop a
mature appreciation of the potential costs of conflict and the behaviors required to preserve friendships and romantic relationships.

The final stage of a conflict is the dyad's attempt to restore the relationship to normal. When asked how they repaired their relationships with friends, girls described using overt strategies again, such as apologizing or talking it out; while boys said they ignored it (Youniss & Smollar, 1985). While these sex differences have been widely recognized (for review, see Maccoby, 1996), it should be noted that Hartup, French, Laursen, Johnston, and Ogawa (1993) found that these differences characterized only interactions between friends and were not evident among non-friends.

School Achievement and Conflict Resolution

Finally, the school achievement of an adolescent may play a role in the resolution of conflicts between friends. For the purposes of this research, school or academic achievement will be defined as performance in educational settings (Steinberg, 1993) as measured by grade point average (GPA). Several studies have found that, although achieving high grades was never a means of achieving social success, members of high-prestige adolescent social groups had above average grades (Henderson & Dwech, 1990). In fact, a survey of research literature on interpersonal skills concluded that they are generally associated with academic performance (Spitzberg & Cupach, 1984).

Research results are contradictory in efforts to examine the relationship between peer relationships and academic success, with some finding that adolescents shun academic success because of anticipated peer reactions
(Ishiyama & Chababassol, 1985) and others finding high correlations between GPA and peer status (Clasen & Brown, 1985). Other studies have attempted to examine the impact of peer relationships on school achievement. Wentzel (1991, 1993; Wentzel & Caldwell, 1997) concluded in longitudinal studies that prosocial behavior appears to explain significant associations between sixth grade peer relationships and eighth grade achievement in school. Therefore, Wentzel suggests that prosocial behavior might be linked to learning in meaningful ways. In contrast, having a friendship characterized by high levels of companionship or conflict might not facilitate and perhaps detract from academic performance. This is supported by Hallinan's (1983) hypothesis that friends' influence is enhanced when the friends have a close and harmonious relationship. Therefore, the resolution of conflicts may be significantly different for varying levels of school achievement.

**Research Question**

Based on the theories and information gathered from the review of literature, a model is proposed to explore the relationship between personality, self-esteem and conflict resolution styles (Figure 2). The model uses the three major personality dimensions of Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism as exogenous variables with both direct effects on conflict resolution style and indirect effects as mediated by self-esteem. This study will examine the impact of the three major personality dimensions Psychoticism, Extraversion, and Neuroticism and self-esteem as predictors of engaging in a particular style of conflict management (Collaborating or integrating, Accommodating, Dominating, Avoiding and Compromising) when early adolescents are involved in conflict with a best friend of the same gender.
Figure 2. Hypothesized Model
the same gender. An adolescent's self-esteem is believed to serve as an intervening variable in the role of each personality factor as illustrated in Figure 2. School achievement and gender will be explored as moderating these effects. Therefore, these two variables are not included in the model but will be explored by analyzing the model independently for males versus females as well as for high achieving versus low achieving students.

**Hypotheses**

Six hypotheses and related predictions were formulated related to the model exploring the relationship between personality dimensions, self-esteem and conflict resolution style for adolescents. They are as follows:

1. There will be significant mean differences in personality dimensions and self-esteem for males and females.
   a. Males will have higher Psychoticism scores than females.
   b. Males will have higher self-esteem scores than females.

2. There will be significant mean differences in personality dimensions and self-esteem for high and low achieving students.
   a. High achieving students will have higher self-esteem than low achieving students.
   b. Low achieving students will have higher Psychoticism and Neuroticism scores than high achieving students.

3. There will be significant effects of the personality dimensions on each of the conflict management styles.
   a. Eysenck (1975) describes an extrovert as tending to be aggressive and to
lose his/her temper quickly. These qualities lead to a prediction that the individual who ranks high on the Extraversion scale will be more likely to exhibit a stronger preference for the Dominating style of conflict management as opposed to the introvert. Therefore, a significant and positive relationship between Extraversion and the Dominating style of conflict management is predicted. Those who score lower on the Extraversion scale are described as introspective and likely to keep feelings under control, seldom behaving aggressively (Eysenck, 1975) may exhibit a stronger preference for the Collaborating, Accommodating and Compromising styles. Therefore, a significant negative relationship between Extraversion and the Accommodating, Avoiding and Compromising styles of conflict management is predicted.

b. The highly neurotic individual is characterized as overly emotional and constantly concerned with things that might go wrong (Eysenck, 1975). Therefore, the individual who rates as high on Neuroticism might be likely to worry about difficulties with a best friend and thus be more likely to show a preference for the Avoiding conflict management style – a significant positive effect of neuroticism on Avoiding is predicted. The emotionally stable individual who is characterized as calm, even-tempered, controlled and unworried would be more likely to choose the Collaborating or Compromising styles of conflict management – a significant negative effect for Neuroticism on the Collaborating and Compromising styles is predicted.
c. The individual with a high Psychoticism score is identified as lacking concern for human feelings and for fellow beings (Eysenck, 1975) thus indicating low concern for others. This individual would be more likely to engage in the Dominating or Avoiding conflict management styles that involve low concern for others — a significant positive effect of Psychoticism on the Dominating and Avoiding styles of conflict management is therefore predicted.

4. Self-esteem will have a significant effect on conflict resolution style directly and serve as a mediator between the personality dimensions and conflict resolution style.

5. There will significant differences in the relationship of personality and self-esteem for conflict management styles of males and females.
   a. Based on the review of literature including descriptors of the personality dimension of Psychoticism, it is predicted that Psychoticism will be of greater significance in predicting the dominating style of conflict resolution for males.
   b. It is also predicted that the personality of Neuroticism will be of greater significance in predicting the Avoiding and Accommodating styles of conflict resolution for females.

6. There will be significant differences in the relationship of personality dimensions and self-esteem for the conflict management styles for high achieving and low achieving students.
   a. It is predicted that Extraversion will be of greater significance in predicting the Compromising/Collaborating style for high achieving students.
   b. It is predicted that Neuroticism will be of greater significance in predicting
the Avoiding and Accommodating styles of conflict resolution for low achieving students.
CHAPTER 3. METHODS

Sample

Subjects for this study were eighth grade students selected from twelve middle schools in eastern South Dakota with a grade configuration of grades 6-8 and enrollments of at least 50 students in the eighth grade. Personal contacts were made with the principals of each of the twelve middle schools in November of 1998 and February and March of 1999. The purpose of the study and the measures were shared with these administrators. Confidentiality of the student and the school were ensured. A follow-up letter seeking permission for the school to participate was sent one week following the personal contact with each principal. Five of the twelve schools agreed to participate in the study. Those schools which chose not to participate indicated that either school policy prohibited participation or the administration and faculty did not want to take time from the school day for the study.

The enrollment of eighth graders at the five schools ranged from 50 to 210 students. However, at the school with the enrollment of 210 students, some students were not available to participate, approximately 25 students, because of a schedule conflict. The adolescents ranged from 13-16 years of age and were approximately 50% male and 50% female. While the students represented a wide range of diversity, the majority was white Caucasian; the representation of other races was very limited, less than 2% ($n = 7$). Race or ethnicity was not requested on the data background sheet. This information was obtained from the principals. The total number of respondents was 411. Of the instruments completed, 393 were
determined to be acceptable for data analysis. Elimination of respondents was based on whether all measures had been thoroughly completed \((n = 13)\), if a "pattern" emerged in the selection of responses \((n = 4)\) and age; those under age 12 and over age 15 \((n = 1)\) were eliminated.

**Demographics.** The demographics of the study sample are reported in Table 1. The researcher eliminated student responses to mother and/or father's most recent job or occupation because several students responded with the business or place of employment rather than the job or occupational title. Contacts were made with the Department of Labor for the state of South Dakota to determine annual average annual pay in each of the counties where the five schools were located to determine if a wide discrepancy in socioeconomic status existed from community to community. This information appears in Table 2. The information provided is based on the annual per capita income in 1998, the most recent information available from the Department of Labor. The figures include all workers in South Dakota covered by unemployment insurance, approximately 93% of the population (South Dakota Department of Labor, (SDOL), 1998). As is evident by the data indicated in the table, income levels ranged from $17,484 to $21,094.

A one-way ANOVA was computed using the personality dimensions and self-esteem as the outcome variables and school as the predictor variable. This was done to determine if the income level differences for the schools as displayed in Table 2 played a significant role in differences in scores. The one-way ANOVA did report significant differences in the Psychoticism and Extraversion scores. However, when post-hoc tests, Tukey's HSD and Scheffe, were run using the harmonic mean...
Table 1

Demographics of Study Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age in years</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>20.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>72.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>191</td>
<td>49.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>197</td>
<td>50.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>388&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Family Structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Living with both parents</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with one parent &amp; a stepparent</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>13.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with single parent – mother</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>10.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with single parent – father</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Living with legal guardian other than parent</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No response</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>393</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup>Totals for males and females do not equal total number of respondents due to non-responses for the gender category
Table 2

Annual pay for South Dakota Workers in Selected Counties

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Annual Pay(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>South Dakota</td>
<td>$22,748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (School A)</td>
<td>$21,010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (School B)</td>
<td>$20,277</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (School C)</td>
<td>$21,094</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (School D)</td>
<td>$19,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County (School E)</td>
<td>$17,448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\)1998 data, South Dakota Department of Labor

for school size (school sizes ranged from 43 to 144), no significant main effects were reported.

Since the number of students living with either a single parent or a legal guardian was very small (see Table 1), these were combined, and family structure was identified as either living in a two parent family (n = 341) or living in a one parent/guardian family (n = 49). Therefore, the number of family structures was reduced to two from the five identified on the background data sheet prior to data analysis.

A similar decision was made in regards to GPA. The overall mean for the data was at the high end of a twelve point scale (M = 9.39). Therefore, the scores
for GPA were trichotomized into three groups: those with GPAs of 11 and 12 (A students, \( n = 142 \)), those with GPAs of 8, 9 and 10 (B students, \( n = 171 \)) and those with GPAs of 7 or below (C or below students, \( n = 79 \)). The last group of students will be identified as C students for ease of discussion.

**Measures**

The study consisted of four questionnaires: (1) assessment of personality traits, (2) assessment of global self esteem, (3) measurement of responses to statements describing styles of handling conflict, and (4) school achievement.

**Assessment of Personality Traits.** Students were asked to complete the age appropriate version of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ; Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). This questionnaire consists of 81 yes-no items and yields scores for introversion-extraversion, neuroticism, psychoticism and tendencies to give socially acceptable responses referred to as the Lie scale. Eysenck (1990) labels these dimensions as Extraversion as opposed to Introversion (E), Neuroticism versus Emotional Stability (N) and Psychoticism as opposed to Super-Ego Control (P), which he views as the three major dimensions of personality. This measure deals with normal behaviors, not with symptoms or abnormal behaviors. Therefore, Eysenck and Eysenck (1975) have suggested that in the interest of communication with users who are not familiar with the underlying theory the terms “neuroticism” and “psychoticism” be dropped and the terms “emotionality” and “toughmindedness” be substituted. These terms were used when discussing this measure with school administrators, parents and the students.
The personality dimensions are measured using responses to items in the questionnaire with each yes scored as a 1 and each no scored as a 0. The total score can range from 0-24 for Extraversion, 0 to 17 for Psychoticism, 0 to 20 for Neuroticism and the Lie scale. Test-retest data for older children (age 11-14) reported by Eysenck indicated reliabilities of the E, N and L scales in the .7 to .9 range; those for P are slightly below the .7 value (Eysenck & Eysenck, 1975). For purposes of group testing, these values were acceptable. Consistency reliabilities (alpha coefficients) were also quite high. For 13 and 14 year olds, they are as follows: P from .67 to .73, E from .74 to .81, N from .85 to .86 and L from .77 to .81 (Eysenck, 1975). These coefficients would also be considered satisfactory.

Assessment of Self-Esteem. Self-esteem was measured using Rosenberg’s ten-item self-esteem scale. The Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale (Rosenberg, 1965) is a self-administered ten item scale designed as a unidimensional global self-esteem measure (Rosenberg, 1979). Respondents indicated how often they felt the way described in each statement on a five-point Likert scale ranging from almost always (5) to never (1). The scores from all items were summed and could range from 10-50, with higher scores indicating higher levels of self-esteem.

Although no age-range is suggested for the scale, item vocabulary seemed to be appropriate for respondents as young as 12 years of age (Bracken, 1996). The scale is widely used due to its brevity and ease of administration (Bracken, 1996).

Test-retest reliabilities range from .82 to .85 (Fleming & Courtney, 1984; Gerson, 1984; Silber & Tippert, 1965). Coefficients of internal consistency
Cronbach's alpha) of .88 (Silber & Tippert, 1965) and .70 (Gerson, 1984) reflect acceptable item consistency.

**Assessment of Conflict Management Style.** The third measure is a revision of the Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory - II (Rahim, 1983). The ROCI -II is a self-report measure designed by Rahim to assess an individual's typical, hypothetical style for handling conflict, specifically for the organizational (i.e. work) context (Canary, Cupach & Messman, 1995). Rahim assessed conflict styles for conflict with a boss, subordinates and peers in the workplace by using these words in different forms of the instrument. The original form consisted of 35 yes or no items - 7 for each of the five conflict management styles. An individual responds to each of the statements on a 5-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree).

Because this measure was designed for adults and for the workplace context, the instrument was revised to make the statements more appropriate for adolescent audiences and to focus on interpersonal conflict. Permission was granted by Consulting Psychologists Press, Inc. for the use of the revised instrument (see Appendix). The revised instrument was tested in a pilot group of 10 eighth graders (see Appendix). The form focused on conflict with a best friend of the same gender. The definition for "best friend" and conflict were reinforced orally at the time of administration. Interviews were conducted to determine any difficulties in comprehension. Students felt that the measure was readily understood and that the directions were easy to follow. Because the pilot group was so small, the scores
from the pilot group were not used for reliability coefficients for the revised instrument.

School/Academic Achievement. School/academic achievement was measured using the self-reported grade point average (GPA) based on a 12 point scale as follows: A = 12, A- = 11, B+ = 10, B = 9, B- = 8, C+ = 7, C = 6, C- = 5, D+ = 4, D = 3, D- = 2 and F = 1. Students indicated their GPA based on their most recent report card. Students were instructed to consider the average of the grades they received for the academic areas of mathematics, language arts, science and social studies only.

Procedures

Arrangements for administration of the research measures were made through the school principal. In four of the five schools, the researcher was allowed to administer the measures to the eighth grade students. In one of the schools, the classroom teachers administered the measure following written instructions provided by the researcher. Instructions were written to replicate those given by the researcher as closely as possible.

Every effort was made to accommodate the schedule of each individual school. The researcher administered the instruments during the regular school day during one or more class periods depending on school enrollment. The total time for administration of all measures was approximately forty minutes; therefore, directions were given, instruments distributed, completed and collected within one class period. Data were collected in April and May of 1999.
Each of the students was provided with a two-pocket brightly colored folder containing a letter introducing the researcher and explaining the research project, a background data sheet and the three measures described earlier in this chapter (see Appendix). The instruments for each student were coded with a number to identify the student and a letter to identify his/her school. Codes were removed following the data analysis. Copies of the letter, background data sheet and the instruments are provided (see Appendix).

Students were first asked to remove the letter and background data sheet from the left-hand side of the folder and leave the other measures in the folder. The researcher read the letter aloud to the students as they followed along and asked if the students had any questions. The background data sheet requesting demographic information about each respondent was then completed. This included gender, age, self-reported grade point average (GPA), family structure and parent(s) or guardian(s) most recent job or occupation. Following completion of the background data sheet, students were asked to return both the letter and the completed data sheet to the left-hand side of the folder.

Next, students were asked to complete the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire. Students removed this measure from the right-hand side of the folder and closed the folder. This was done to ensure that students were not distracted by the other measures and would focus on the one measure being administered. The researcher or teacher read through the instructions aloud from the front of the questionnaire and students completed it and were asked to wait until all students had completed it before returning it to the folder. The same procedure was
followed for the Rosenberg Self-esteem Scale completed following the EPQ and finally, all students completed the revised Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory (ROCI).

It should be noted that data collection took place in April and May of 1999 just shortly after the shooting at Columbine High School in Colorado where several students and one teacher were killed. Several students made verbal comments as to whether this study was related to the incident. Therefore, responses of the students at the time of this study may have been influenced to some extent by this event.
CHAPTER 4. RESULTS

The purpose of this study was to explore the relationship between the personality dimensions of Psychoticism, Extraversion and Neuroticism and self-esteem as predictors of engaging in a particular style of conflict management (Collaborating or Integrating, Accommodating, Dominating, Avoiding and Compromising) by early adolescents when involved in conflict with a best friend. A model was developed to examine the direct relationship between each of the personality dimensions and each of the four conflict management styles as well as the effects as mediated by self-esteem. The role of gender and school achievement as moderators was to be explored by analyzing the model independently for males versus females as well as for high achieving versus low achieving students.

As data was entered, it was evident that some students did not respond to some of the items. If students failed to provide responses to one or more items related to the demographic information and to no more than two responses on the revised ROCl II inventory, the response was entered as missing using a specific assigned value. The other two measures are dependent upon response to all items. If more than two missing responses on the ROCl II and/or any missing response on the EPQ or Rosenberg Scale, these individuals were excluded from the analysis.

Data analysis began with a factor analysis of the revised ROCl II inventory. This was necessary since the model proposed for this study relied on the conflict management styles to be identified in the factor analysis as the dependent variables. Also, since this instrument had been revised for use with an adolescent group and
interpersonal conflict, the factor analysis was important to see if the items reflected styles similar to those identified by Rahim for adults in the workplace.

All data analysis procedures were completed using the SPSS 9.0 computer program with the exception of the structural equation model path analysis. The SPSS AMOS 3.6 program was used for these procedures.

**Factor Analysis**

The 35 items on the revised ROCI-II instrument were subjected to a principal-axis factor analysis with varimax rotation. The results indicated the emergence of four factors (Table 3). The criteria used for the factor solution included Eigenvalues greater than one (Pedhazur, 1991), a scree test and factor loadings. Responses to those items having high (0.45 or higher) and unambiguous (no high loadings on other factors) loadings on these factors were used to identify the four conflict resolution styles for adolescents. The items with the loadings identified in Table 3 were then totaled to provide a score for each of the four conflict management styles.

The first factor was composed of items related to compromising and negotiating to reach a conflict resolution. The second factor seemed to reflect items related to the Accommodating style of resolving conflict, a tendency to "give-in" when involved in conflict. The third factor was made up of items indicating a Dominating style of conflict resolution, one concerned with having power in resolving conflicts. The fourth factor was composed of items reflecting Avoiding conflict. The four factors were identified as four distinct conflict resolution styles and labeled as Compromising/Collaborating (Comm/Coll), Accommodating (Acc), Avoiding (Avoid) and Dominating (Dom). These labels were chosen as they reflected the same
Table 3

Factor Loadings for Items on the Revised Rahim Organization Conflict Inventory II

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item Number</th>
<th>Factor 1</th>
<th>Factor 2</th>
<th>Factor 3</th>
<th>Factor 4</th>
<th>Communalities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comm/Coll</td>
<td>Acc</td>
<td>Dom</td>
<td>Avoid</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.55</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.66</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>.68</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td>.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.63</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>.52</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td>.33</td>
<td>.44</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>.75</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>.71</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Comm/Coll = Compromising/Collaborating; Acc = Accommodating; Dom = Dominating; Avoid = Avoiding

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
styles identified by Rahim (1983) with the Compromising/ Collaborating factor representing a latent variable composed of aspects of these two distinct styles identified by Rahim. The total amount of variance explained by the extracted factors is reported in Table 4.

**Descriptive Statistics**

Descriptive statistics including means and standard deviations for Extraversion (E) scores, Neuroticism (N) scores, Psychoticism (P) scores and the Lie scale (L) scores were calculated for males and females as separate groups. These data are reported in Table 5. These scores compared favorably to the means and standard deviations provided by Eysenck (1975) for adolescents age 14. The appropriate items on the

**Table 4**

**Total Amount of Variance Explained by Extracted Factors for the Revised ROCI-II Instrument**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Variance</th>
<th>Cumulative %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.04</td>
<td>17.25</td>
<td>17.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>7.20</td>
<td>24.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.66</td>
<td>4.74</td>
<td>29.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>32.63</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring
Table 5

Means and Standard Deviations for the Personality Dimensions of the Eysenck Personality Questionnaire (EPQ-Jr.) and Self-esteem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Males(^a)</th>
<th>Females(^a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(n = 191)</td>
<td>(n = 197)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>19.42</td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>9.36</td>
<td>4.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>6.12</td>
<td>3.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lie Scale</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>3.78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self esteem</td>
<td>40.62</td>
<td>7.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GPA</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>2.31</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. \(^a\)Totals for males and females do not equal total number of respondents due to non-responses for the gender category.

Rosenberg Self-Esteem Scale were recoded. The ten items were then totaled to yield the total self-esteem score for each respondent. The reliability for the total self-esteem scale was .90 using Cronbach's alpha. Means and standard deviations for the total self-esteem scale were calculated and are reported in Table 5 also. In addition, means and standard deviations for grade point average for males and females are provided.
Following the identification of the four conflict resolution strategies, scores for each respondent for each style were calculated using the items identified in the factor loadings. The possible range of scores for each of the conflict management styles were as follows: Compromising/Collaborating (Com/Coll) from 14 to 70, Accommodating (Acc) from 6 to 30, Avoiding (Avoid) from 3 to 15 and Dominating (Dom) from 5 to 25. Descriptive statistics for each of the four styles appear in Table 6. In addition, inter-item consistency reliabilities (alpha coefficients) were calculated for each of the four conflict management styles. The scores were .88 for the Compromising/Collaborating style, .72 for the Accommodating style, .67 for the Dominating style, and .57 for the Avoiding style.

Table 6
Means and Standard Deviations for Conflict Resolution Strategies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>Males</th>
<th>Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Means</td>
<td>SD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Com/Coll (14-70)</td>
<td>51.91</td>
<td>8.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acc (6-30)</td>
<td>13.17</td>
<td>3.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dom (5-25)</td>
<td>17.72</td>
<td>3.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoid (3-15)</td>
<td>10.96</td>
<td>2.64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. Com/Coll = Compromising/Collaborating; Acc = Accommodating; Dom = Dominating; Avoid = Avoiding
Avoiding style and .62 for the Dominating style. The scores for the Avoiding and Dominating styles are not high (.7 or above), but fewer items, 3 and 5 items respectively, were involved in the calculation of the total score.

Correlations

Intercorrelations for the three personality dimensions, total self esteem and the four identified conflict management styles are presented in Table 7. These were computed as partial correlations controlling for the Lie scale, since this scale measures the tendency to give socially acceptable responses as opposed to a specific personality dimension. The correlations between the personality dimensions are generally low ranging from .01 to .17 reaffirming a distinction among each of the personality dimensions. The correlation between the total self-esteem score and the neuroticism score is the only correlation at a .50 level or above.

Mean Differences

To examine the effects of gender (M, F), age (13, 14 and 15), family structure (two-parent family, one-parent family) and GPA (A, B, C or below) on the personality dimensions and self-esteem, a $2 \times 3 \times 2 \times 3$ multivariate analysis of variance (MANOVA) was computed. Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism and self-esteem were the four outcome variables in the analysis. After examining assumptions necessary for MANOVA, the analysis was run using the SPSS GLM multivariate procedure. With the use of Wilk's Lambda criterion, the combined dependent variables were significantly affected by age, $F(8, 373) = 2.18, p < .05$, gender, $F(4, 377) = 13.59, p < .001$, family structure, $F(8, 373) = 3.67, p < .01$, and
Table 7

Partial Correlation Coefficients Controlling for Lie Scale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>P</th>
<th>E</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>COM/COLL</th>
<th>ACC</th>
<th>AVOID</th>
<th>DOM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COM</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COLL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AVOID</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DOM</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. P = Psychoticism; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; SE = self-esteem; COM/COLL = Compromising/Collaborating; ACC = Accommodating; AVOID = Avoiding; DOM = Dominating

p < .00
GPA, $F(8, 373) = 3.99, p < .001$. Only one interaction effect of these variables was found to be significant, that of age and GPA $F(16, 365) = 1.98, p < .01$.

To investigate the impact of each main effect on the individual dependent variables, univariate analysis was performed. The analysis used Type III sums of squares which takes into consideration unbalanced cell sizes. The Scheffe post-hoc test was computed to test significance. Age had a significant main effect on self-esteem $F(2, 379) = 5.57, p < .01$; students ages 14 and 15 had significantly higher self-esteem than those age 13 (Means 39.59, 39.74 and 37.78, respectively).

A significant main effect for gender on Psychoticism was also found in the analysis $F(1, 380) = 40.28, p < .001$. Males had significantly higher scores than females (Means 6.12 and 2.75, respectively). Gender also had a significant main effect on Neuroticism $F(1, 380) = 4.68, p < .05$. Females had significantly higher scores than males (Means 11.47 and 9.36, respectively).

Family structure had a significant main effect on self-esteem scores $F(1, 380) = 12.49, p < .001$. Students from two-parent families had significantly higher self-esteem scores (Means 40.06 and 33.51, respectively).

GPA had a significant effect on Psychoticism scores $F = .3.91, p < .05$ with C-students having significantly higher scores than B-or A-students (Means 3.54, 4.39 and 5.86, respectively). A significant effect of GPA on Extraversion scores was also reported $F(2, 379) = 6.35, p < .01$. A and B students had significantly higher scores on extraversion than C students (Means 19.97, 19.46 and 18.56, respectively). GPA also had a significant effect on self-esteem. Again, both A and B students had significantly higher scores than C students (Means 41.69, 38.80 and 36.01...
respectively). In the univariate analysis, no significant interaction effects for any of the dependent variables were reported.

A second MANOVA using the same predictor variables and the four conflict management styles as the outcome variables was computed. Results indicated no significant main effects or interaction effects on the combined outcome variables.

Further exploration of the univariate analyses was conducted. Again, the Scheffe post-hoc test was used to test significance. This analysis indicated a significant main effect of gender on the Compromising/Collaborating style of conflict management, $F(1, 351) = 5.86, p < .05$, with females having significantly higher scores than males (Means 55.77 and 51.91, respectively). A significant interaction effect for gender and family structure was found for the Avoiding style of conflict management $F(1, 351) = 6.96, p < .01$. Males in one-parent families had significantly lower scores (Mean = 8.90, $n = 22$) on the avoiding style of conflict management than males in two-parent families (Mean = 11.21, $n = 163$) and females from two-parent families (Mean = 10.57, $n = 166$) or one-parent families (Mean = 11.72, $n = 25$).

Multiple Regression

Prior to the path analysis of the structural equation model, a simultaneous multiple regression was computed with Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, the Lie scale and self-esteem entered as the predictor variables and each of the conflict management styles as the outcome variable. These are the same variables that will be used in the path analysis. This was done to allow for comparison of the model to the results of the multiple regression.
Multicollinearity diagnostics were reviewed. Tolerance scores were moderate to high ranging from .62 to .88 for the predictor variables used in the regression model. All of the variance inflation factors for the predictor variables were less than two, indicating that multicollinearity is not a serious problem (Bowerman & O'Connell, 1990).

In the first analysis computed, Psychoticism, Extraversion, Neuroticism, the Lie scale and self-esteem were entered simultaneously as the predictor variables and the compromising/collaborating conflict management style as the outcome variable. Table 8 presents the unstandardized (b) regression coefficients, the standard errors and standardized regression coefficients (β). This was repeated with the same predictor variables and each of the remaining conflict management styles as the outcome variable: Accommodating, Avoiding, and Dominating. The adjusted $R^2$ of .16 indicates that 16% of the variance in the scores for the Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style can be accounted for the independent variables entered in the analysis. While the amount of variance accounted by these predictor variables is modest, all of the variables are significant in their contribution to the regression model. Extraversion, Neuroticism and self-esteem had positive slopes while Psychoticism had a negative slope.

Table 9 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (b), standard errors and standardized regression coefficients (β) computed when using a standard multiple regression analysis with the same predictor variables and the Accommodating conflict management style as the outcome variable.

The adjusted $R^2$ of .10 indicates that 10% of the variance in the scores for the
Table 8

**Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis for Personality Dimensions and Self-esteem Variables on the Compromising/Collaborating style of Conflict Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-.46**</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>-3.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.26*</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>2.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.36**</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>3.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>2.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>4.83</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

R² = .17

Adjusted R² = .16

**Note.** b = unstandardized coefficients; β = standardized coefficients; P = Psychoticism; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; L = Lie scale; SE = Self-esteem

* p < .05  **p < .01

Accommodating conflict management style is accounted for by these predictor variables. The amount of variance accounted for by these variables is very small and only the Lie scale was found to be significant in a positive direction. The Lie scale is a measure of the selection of socially acceptable responses on the personality questionnaire.
Table 9

Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis for Personality Dimensions and Self-esteem Variables on the Accommodating Conflict Management Style

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>2.89</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>-1.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>1.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>.12**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>2.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.49</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .03$

Adjusted $R^2 = .10$

Note. b = unstandardized coefficients; $\beta$ = standardized coefficients; P = Psychoticism; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; L = Lie scale; SE = Self-esteem

* $p < .05$ ** $p < .01$

Table 10 presents the unstandardized regression coefficients (b), the standard errors and the standardized regression coefficients ($\beta$) when the same predictor variables are used with the avoiding style of conflict management as the outcome variable.

The adjusted $R^2$ value of .00 indicates that less than 1% of the variance in the Avoiding conflict management style can be accounted for by these predictor variables and the overall $F (5, 377)$ is not significant. Psychoticism was
Table 10

Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis with Personality Dimensions and Self-esteem Variables on the Avoiding Style of Conflict Management.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>-.09**</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-2.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-E</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ R^2 = .01 \]

Adjusted \[ R^2 = .00 \]

Note. b = unstandardized coefficients; \( \beta \) = standardized coefficients; P = Psychoticism; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; L = Lie scale; SE = self-esteem

* \( p < .05 \)   ** \( p < .01 \)

significantly and positively related with the Avoiding style of conflict management. Table 11 is a report of the unstandardized regression coefficients (b), standard errors and the standardized regression coefficients (\( \beta \)) when the same predictor variables are entered simultaneously with the Dominating conflict management style as the outcome variable. The adjusted \( R^2 \) of .07 indicates that 7% of the variance in the dominating conflict management style can be accounted for by these predictor variables. Of those variables, only Psychoticism and Neuroticism are
Table 11

Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis with Personality Dimensions and Self-esteem Variables on the Dominating Style of Conflict Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>b</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>t</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>P</td>
<td>.29*</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>4.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>.10*</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-E</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>1.92</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$R^2 = .09$

Adjusted $R^2 = .07$

Note. b = unstandardized coefficients; β = standardized coefficients; P = Psychoticism; E = Extraversion; N = Neuroticism; L = Lie scale; SE = Self-esteem

* $p < .05$  ** $p < .01$

significant and both had a positive relationship with the Dominating style of conflict management.

Analysis of the Model

First, the model as hypothesized (Figure 2, p.43) was analyzed with the three personality dimensions of Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Extraversion serving as the exogenous variables and self-esteem as a mediator in predicting conflict
management style. This analysis was conducted for each of the four conflict management styles determined from the factor analysis: Accommodating (Acc), Compromising/ Collaborating (Comm/Coll), Avoiding (Avoid) and Dominating (Dom). To further explore the mediating effect of self-esteem, the model was analyzed removing the direct effects of each of the personality dimensions and examining the effects only as mediated by self-esteem.

Upon examination of the standardized regression coefficients for Psychoticism, Neuroticism and Extraversion on self-esteem, a relationship present in both models, all were found to be significant. Significance was determined by the reported critical ratios. Critical ratios greater then 1.96 (in absolute value) indicating that the parameter estimate was significantly different from zero at the .05 level were used to identify significance (Arbuckle, 1997). All of the personality dimensions had critical ratios greater than 1.96. The standardized regression coefficients, their standard error measurement and critical ratios are reported in Table 12. The three personality dimensions accounted for 38% of the variance in self-esteem ($R^2 = .38$). A summary of the comparison of the hypothesized model or fully saturated model with the reduced model created by removing the direct effects of the personality dimensions on conflict management style is reported in Table 13.

Several measures of fit can be examined to assess any given model. The adjusted goodness of fit index (AGFI) takes into account the degrees of freedom available for testing a model and only the normed fit index (NFI) is guaranteed to be between zero and one (Arbuckle, 1997). Therefore, these two indices were chosen for comparison of the two models. To further explore the differences
Table 12

**Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Errors and Critical Ratios for the Fully Saturated model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psychoticism</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neuroticism</td>
<td>.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-12.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extraversion</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

p < .05

Table 13

**Summary of the Fit Statistics for the Reduced Model (M2) Omitting the Direct Effects of Personality**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>( \chi^2 )</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>AGI</th>
<th>NFI</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compromising/ Collaborating</td>
<td>38.65</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.82</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>4.46</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.22</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>4.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.98</td>
<td>.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>34.08</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.84</td>
<td>.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note.* AGI = adjusted goodness of fit index; NFI = normed fit index
between the two models, the change in $R^2$ was also compared. Results of this comparison appear in Table 14. Model one (M1) refers to the fully saturated model and Model two (M2) refers to the reduced model. As is evident from the table, the value of $R^2$ remains the same or is smaller in the reduced model. The total amount of variance explained for each of the conflict management styles is equal to or less with the reduced model than with the fully saturated model.

Models with overall fit indices less than .90 can usually be improved substantially (Arbuckle, 1997). Using this reference point to guide decisions, the reduced model (M2) is an excellent fit for the Avoiding (AGI = .98, NFI = .98)

Table 14

Comparison of the $R^2$ Values for the Fully Saturated Model (M1) and the Reduced Model (M2)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conflict Management Style</th>
<th>$R^2$ for M1</th>
<th>$R^2$ for M2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Compromising/Collaborating</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Avoiding</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accommodating</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dominating</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. M1 = Model 1, M2 = Model 2*
and Accommodating (AGI = .98, NFI = .98) conflict management styles. The amount of variance explained by the model was also considered. Given that neither the fully saturated model nor the reduced model accounts for a substantial amount of variance in either of these two conflict management styles or any of the other conflict management styles, an argument for using the reduced model cannot be supported. Since model (M1) is a fully recursive model; no comparisons of fit can be assessed. Considering both the fit indices and the change in $R^2$, the decision was made to explore differences in the hypothesized model for each of the conflict management styles as well as comparison of the models for gender and grade point average.

Comparisons of the Model

Results of the comparison of the fully saturated model for each of the conflict management styles will be considered first. Table 15 reports the summary of the analysis of the Compromising/Collaborating conflict model. Each of the personality dimensions has a significant effect on self-esteem. In addition, each of the paths in this model, direct and indirect as mediated by self-esteem, was found to be significant. The direct paths from both Extraversion and Neuroticism have modest but significant positive $\beta$ weights, while Psychoticism has a significant negative $\beta$ weight. In addition the paths from Psychoticism and Neuroticism to self-esteem are significant in a negative direction whereas the path from Extraversion, as well as the path from to self-esteem to the Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style have significant positive $\beta$ weights. This evidence supports the hypothesis that a particular style of conflict management, in this case the Compromising/
Table 15

**Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Compromising/Collaborating model.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-12.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Com/Col</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>4.93*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Com/Col</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>-5.15*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Com/Col</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>3.58*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Com/Col</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>2.14*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $\beta =$ Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self-esteem; Neu = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Com/Col = Compromising/Collaborating

* p < .05

Collaborating can be predicted by personality dimensions and self-esteem both directly and as mediated by self-esteem.

A summary of the results for the Accommodating conflict model is presented in Table 16. Each of the personality dimensions has a significant effect on self-esteem. However, this model has no significant paths for the personality dimension either directly or indirectly on the Accommodating style of conflict.
Table 16

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Accommodating Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-12.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Acc</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Acc</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Acc</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>1.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Acc</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self-esteem; Neu = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Acc = Accommodating

* p < .05

management. As reported earlier, only a minimal amount of variance in the Accommodating style of conflict management can be explained by the model.

The analysis of the Avoiding model is summarized in Table 17. Again, it should be noted that each of the personality dimensions has a significant effect on self-esteem. In this model, only one additional path is significant, that of Psychoticism as a direct effect. A significant negative β weight is reported. As with
Table 17

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Avoiding Model.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-12.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Avoid</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>-.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Avoid</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-2.08*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Avoid</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Avoid</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.34</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < .05

Note. Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self-esteem; Neu = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Avoid = Avoiding

the Accommodating model, only a minimal amount of variance in the Avoiding style can be explained by the model. The Dominating model is summarized in Table 18. Again, the personality dimensions has a significant effect on self-esteem. This model also has significant positive β weights for two direct paths, the direct paths from Psychoticism and Neuroticism. This model offers some support for the
Table 18


<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pscyh on SE</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.28*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.50</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-12.30*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>6.25*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Dom</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Dom</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>5.40*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Dom</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>2.33*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Dom</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self-esteem; Neu = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Dom = Dominating

* p < .05

hypothesis in that two of the three personality dimensions are significant in accounting for variance in the avoiding style of conflict management. However, the mediating effect of self-esteem was not supported for this model.

Gender Comparisons of Model

Next, the models were compared to explore gender differences. Each model was analyzed for males and females separately. A summary of the results in comparing
gender differences for the compromising/collaborating conflict management model is reported in Table 19. The amount of variance in the compromising/collaborating conflict management style explained by the model was 19% for males and 7% for females. For both genders, the mediating effect of self-esteem was significant with regression coefficients having stronger $\beta$ weights for males than for females.

Another difference between males and females is evident in that Psychoticism and Neuroticism were significant as direct paths for males with Psychoticism having a negative $\beta$ weight and Neuroticism a positive $\beta$ weight. Neither of these variables was significant for females.

Table 20 reports the summary of the results of the analysis for the accommodating model when compared for males and females. The amount of variance in the Accommodating conflict management style accounted for by the model is nearly identical for males and females, $R^2 = .05$ and $R^2 = .04$, respectively. There were no significant paths for females. For males, Psychoticism had a significant negative $\beta$ weight.

Gender comparisons were also considered for the Avoiding model. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 21. In this analysis, Psychoticism had a significant direct effect for males with a negative $\beta$ coefficient. No significant effects were found for females. The total amount of variance in the Avoiding style of conflict management accounted for by the model was 4% for males and 1% for females. A similar comparison for males and females was conducted with the Dominating style of conflict management as the endogenous variable. A summary of this
Table 19

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Compromising/Collaborating Model Comparing Males (M) and Females (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Com/Col</td>
<td>.39</td>
<td>.25</td>
<td>.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Com/Col</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Com/Col</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Com/Col</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Note. β = Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Com/Col = Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style

*p < .05
Table 20.

**Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Accommodating Model Comparing Males (M) and Females (F)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>$\beta$ M</th>
<th>$\beta$ F</th>
<th>SE M</th>
<th>SE F</th>
<th>Critical Ratio M</th>
<th>Critical Ratio F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-3.24*</td>
<td>-2.24*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-5.27*</td>
<td>-9.72*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>5.79*</td>
<td>3.53*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Acc</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>-.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Acc</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>-2.40*</td>
<td>-.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Acc</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.49</td>
<td>-.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Acc</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>1.36</td>
<td>-1.69</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** $\beta =$ Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Acc = Accommodating conflict management style

* $p < .05$
Table 21

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Avoiding Model Comparing Males (M) and Females (F)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Avoid</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Avoid</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>-.09</td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Avoid</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Avoid</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Avoid = Avoiding conflict management style

Comparison appears in Table 22. In the comparison of this model, a significant positive effect for the path from self-esteem to the Dominating style was found for males. Also, the direct path from Psychoticism had a significant positive effect in the model for males. Neither of these relationships was true for females.
Table 22

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Dominating Model Comparing Males and Females

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>M</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>M</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>-.13</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.33</td>
<td>-.55</td>
<td>.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Dom</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Dom</td>
<td>.21</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Dom</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Dom</td>
<td>-.04</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.08</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; M = males; F = females; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; Neu = Neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Dom = Dominating style of conflict management

* p < .05

The amount of variance in the Dominating style of conflict management explained by the model was 6% for both males and females. For all models, the variance in self-esteem which could be explained by the three personality dimensions was 33% for males and 44% for females.
GPA Comparison of Models

A third comparison of the models was conducted for grade point average (GPA). With the Compromising/Collaborating style of conflict management as the endogenous variable and using the fully saturated model, the first comparison of the students considering differences in grade point average was computed. Results of this analysis are reported in Table 23.

It should be noted that in all of the previous models including those involving gender, each of the personality dimensions was significant in accounting for variance in self-esteem. With this model, Psychoticism had no significant effect on self-esteem for either A or B students. It remained significant for the C and below students. A negative β weight was reported for these students.

However, the path from self-esteem to the Compromising/Collaborating conflict style was significant for the A and B students, but not for the C and below students. Significant positive β weights for the direct effects of Neuroticism and Extraversion on the Compromising/Collaborating style were reported for the B students but not for the A or C students. While there are differences in the amount of variance explained in this model when compared for the three groups, the differences are small, 11%, 15% and 13%, respectively for the A, B and C students.

A summary of the results for this same comparison with the Accommodating model are reported in Table 24. As was mentioned earlier in this chapter, the predictor variables in this model seem to contribute very little to Accommodating conflict management style. No significant effects were reported in this analysis as
Table 23

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Compromising/Collaborating Model Comparing Groups Based on Grade Point Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>( \beta )</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Com/Col</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Com/Col</td>
<td>-.24</td>
<td>-.20</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Com/Col</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.29</td>
<td>.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Com/Col</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.17</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Note.** \( \beta \) = Beta weight; A = A- and above students; B = B-, B and B+ students; C = C+ or below students; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Com/Col = Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style

* \( p < .05 \)
well. The only exception was a significant negative effect for Extraversion on Accommodating accounted for this model was 4%, 4% and 9%, respectively for the A, B and C students.

Results for the Avoiding model with comparisons based on grade point average are presented in Table 25. The personality dimension of Neuroticism and the path from self-esteem to the Avoiding style had a significant negative effects on the avoiding style for the A students. No paths were significant for the B or C students. The amount of variance in avoiding explained by this model were 4%, 4% and 9%, respectively for the A, B and C students, a modest difference based on grade point average. This is particularly interesting since no paths were significant for the C students yet more of the variance in Avoiding is accounted for with this group when compared to the A and B students.

A summary of the results for the Dominating model with grade point comparisons is reported in Table 26. The path from self-esteem to the Dominating style had a significant positive effect for the A students in this model. Psychoticism had a significant positive effect for both the A and B students and Neuroticism had a significant positive effect for the A students only. For the A students, 6% of the variance in Dominating was accounted for by the model, 2% and 3% for the B and C students, respectively. Clearly, this model did little to account for differences in the Dominating style of conflict management for either the B or C students. This is particularly true for the C students where no paths were significant.
Table 24

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Accommodating Model Comparing Groups Based on Grade Point Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Acc</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Acc</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Acc</td>
<td>-.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Acc</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>-.19</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; A = A- and above students; B = B-, B and B+ students; C = C+ or below students; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Acc = accommodating conflict management style

* p < .05
Table 25

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Avoiding Model Comparing Groups Based on Grade Point Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on SE</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Avoid</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>-.06</td>
<td>.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on Avoid</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>-.14</td>
<td>-.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on Avoid</td>
<td>-.26</td>
<td>.03</td>
<td>-.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on Avoid</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; A = A- and above students; B = B-, B and B+ students; C = C+ or below students; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Avoid = avoiding conflict management style

* p < .05
Table 26

Standardized Regression Coefficients, Standard Error Measurement and Critical Ratios for the Dominating Model Comparing Groups Based on Grade Point Averages

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>Critical Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>A</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Psych on SE</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>-.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neu on SE</td>
<td>-.58</td>
<td>-.54</td>
<td>-.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ext on S</td>
<td>.16</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE on Dom</td>
<td>.23</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>P On Dom</td>
<td>.26</td>
<td>.30</td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N on Dom</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>-.25</td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E on Dom</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note. β = Beta weight; A = A- and above students; B = B-, B and B+ students; C = C+ or below students; Psych = Psychoticism; SE = Self esteem; N = neuroticism; Ext = Extraversion; Dom = dominating; p < .05
In reviewing the results of the models as compared by grade point average, it becomes apparent that this model does little to account for variance in conflict management styles particularly for the C or below students when compared with A and B students. This was true for all of the conflict management styles. Only one path was significant for the C students, Pscychoticism had a positive effect in the Compromising/Collaborating model.
CHAPTER 5. DISCUSSION AND IMPLICATIONS

The purpose of this study was to explore relationships between personality dimensions, self-esteem and conflict resolution styles of adolescents when involved in hypothetical conflict with a best friend of the same gender. A model representing these relationships (Figure 2) was proposed for analysis based on the review of the literature. This chapter will focus on what was learned as a result of this study. Since determination of the conflict resolution styles was based on a revised instrument, discussion will begin with results related to the use of the revised ROCI-II.

The original version of the ROCI-II was developed to measure five styles of handling interpersonal conflict with superiors, subordinates and peers in the workplace (Rahim, 1983). The revised instrument used for this study was developed to see if similar styles could be assessed for interpersonal conflict in personal relationships, specifically close friendships and with adolescents rather than adults.

The results of the factor analysis in the present study yielded four styles of conflict management rather than the five identified by Rahim, with the Compromising and Collaborating or Integrating styles loading as one factor, labeled as the Compromising/Collaborating style. Rahim's instrument contained 35 items, with seven items designed to measure each style of handling conflict. After extensive validation of his instrument with workplace conflict involving superiors, subordinates and peers, Rahim identified 28 items with factor loadings > .40 (Rahim, 1983). The revised instrument used in this project identified 26 items with factor loadings > .45. In addition, when the items which loaded on each factor on the revised instrument
were compared to those of Rahim with the ROCI-II, results were almost identical. As noted earlier, one important difference was that the Compromising and Collaborating or Integrating styles did not emerge as two separate conflict management styles.

These results indicate that the ROCI-II instrument appears to measure styles of handling conflict in interpersonal relationships regardless of whether these conflicts occur in the workplace or deal with interpersonal relationships with friends and with adolescents as well as adults. The fact that the Compromising and Collaborating or Integrating styles of conflict management loaded as one factor however may indicate that it is difficult to discriminate between these two styles.

Rahim (1983) describes compromising as give-and-take or sharing whereby both parties give up something to make a mutually acceptable decision. This style involves a moderate concern for self as well as the other party involved. Collaborating or Integrating is described as collaboration between parties (i.e., openness, exchange of information and examination of differences) to reach a solution acceptable to both parties. The Collaborating style involves high concern for self as well as the other party involved. The distinction between these two styles is subtle. The Compromising and Collaborating styles are similar in that both involve a mutually acceptable decision.

Future research needs to be done to explore whether adolescents use similar styles of dealing with conflict with peers regardless of setting or situation. In other words, do adolescents use similar styles of handling conflict with friends, classmates, and older and younger peers in their schools and with co-workers in the
workplace? In addition, do styles of handling conflict with peers in early adolescence continue through late adolescence and adulthood? Repeated use of the measure will help to establish test-retest reliability.

In the first segment of the data analysis, means for each of the personality dimensions and self-esteem were compared to examine differences related to age, gender, family structure and grade point average of the participants. Age had a significant main effect on self-esteem scores. Younger students had lower self-esteem than the older students. While carefully conducted longitudinal studies have revealed gradual improvements in self-esteem over grades seven through twelve (Harter, 1990a), other studies have found that self-esteem begins to decline at age 11 and reaches its low point between the ages of 12 and 13 (Rosenberg, 1986). This is due in part to shifts in school environment as well as pubertal change.

In the current study, students were at the end of their eighth grade year and would be making the transition to high school in the fall. While making the shift in schools in seventh grade, adolescents show greater losses of self-esteem than those who make a school transition in eighth grade (Harter, 1990a). Therefore, the younger students may feel less confident in anticipating the change to high school than their older classmates. In fact, Harter (1990a) has suggested that new school environments provide new social-comparison groups that may prompt a reevaluation of one’s competence and success in various domains. Therefore, these younger students may feel less positive about themselves as they prepare to enter high school.
The onset of puberty and related physical changes can also have an effect on self-esteem. Early maturing girls are the most dissatisfied with their body image and this has a major impact on self-esteem (Brooks-Gunn & Reiter, 1990). Late maturing boys also suffer loss of self-esteem (Petersen, 1988). While there was no way of identifying early or later maturing individuals in the current study, this may also have played a role in the lower self-esteem scores of some of the younger participants.

Most researchers today contend that self-esteem is multidimensional and that young people assess themselves along several dimensions (Harter, 1990). Therefore, it is possible for an adolescent to have varying levels of self-esteem related to different aspects of the adolescent self, such as physical self-esteem related to how the adolescent feels about his/her physical appearance and academic self-esteem related to one's ability scholastically. While all of these aspects contribute to overall self-esteem, further research could include these aspects of self-esteem as individual variables, thus contributing to a greater understanding of the role of self-esteem in the model.

Males had significantly higher scores on the Psychoticism dimension of personality than their female counterparts. The personality dimension of Psychoticism or "toughmindness" as described by Eysenck (1975) includes elements of aggressiveness, hostility, insensitivity and a lack of empathy at the high end of the scale. Several major reviews of research on aggression have concluded that males, at all ages, are more physically aggressive than are females (see, for example, Maccoby & Jacklin, 1974). Therefore, it is not surprising that males had higher scores on Psychoticism. This result is also in keeping with results reported
by Eysneck (1975). In fact, Eysenck reports that the gender differences for adolescents are similar to that of adults with males having higher scores on Psychoticism.

There are differences in socialization for boys and girls that may also play a role in the difference in Psychoticism scores for males and females. Parents have been noted to increase their discouragement of aggression when their daughters reach their teen years (Hill & Lynch, 1983). They have also been found to encourage their daughters to be dependent, affectionate, submissive and gentle. Whereas, sons were encouraged to be independent, competent, assertive and competitive (Hill & Lynch, 1983; Huston & Alvarez, 1990).

A significant main effect related to gender was also found for Neuroticism. Eysenck (1975) stated in his description of the personality dimension of Neuroticism that "if the high N (neurotic) individual has to be described in one word, one might say that he (she) is a worrier; his (her) main characteristic is a constant preoccupation with things that might go wrong and a strong emotional reaction of anxiety to these thoughts" (p. 5). Once again, these results were similar to those reported by Eysenck (1975). He reported higher N scores for females over males at all ages for children and adolescents, as well as for adults.

Caspi (1998) suggests that children's original temperaments may become elaborated into later more differentiated personality traits through transactions with the environment. Shiner (1998) contends that with each developmental transition, then, personality may change for each individual. Both of these ideas offer insight as to why adolescent girls exhibited higher Neuroticism scores than males. This
attribute of worrying or a preoccupation with things that might go wrong as being more significant for females than males could be related to several environmental factors at this time of transition, contemplating entering high school. For example, compared with others, young girls seem to worry a great deal about their looks, dating and being popular in high school (Steinberg, 1993). In western society, the thin female with an hourglass figure represents the cultural ideals of physical attractiveness. About 30 percent of adolescents think of themselves as weighing too much to meet this standard and this is more typical of females than males (Paxton, Wertheim, Gibbons, Szmukler, Hillier & Petrovich, 1991).

Also, young girls may be worried about doing well academically. Adolescent girls may feel that they are caught between pressures to do well academically and pressures to do well socially, especially as they move into secondary school (Steinberg, 1993). This may be especially true for girls since Coleman (1961) reported that getting good grades in school is at the bottom of the list of attributes adolescent girls feel are important for being accepted into the leading crowd.

Several studies have also shown that adolescents who worry a lot about being popular are most likely to feel self-conscious and are most likely to have unstable views of themselves (Simmons & Rosenberg, 1973). Because young girls appear to be more concerned than boys about physical attractiveness, dating and peer acceptance, they may experience a greater deal of anxiety as reflected in the higher Neuroticism scores.

It should be noted that no significant differences for self-esteem for males and females were found in this study. Males did not have significantly higher self-esteem
scores as predicted. This is especially interesting since research has consistently shown that at every age, males' self-esteem scores were higher than females (Block & Robbins, 1993). Further research exploring the role of school size, rural versus urban environment, and other factors unique to the participants in this study is needed to explore what may have accounted for this phenomena.

Family structure also had a significant main effect on self-esteem. Students from two-parent families had significantly higher self-esteem scores than those from one-parent families. This may be due to a multitude of factors related to family structure and factors which are very difficult to sort out given the limited amount of information obtained in this study. Single-parent families, like two parent families can vary greatly. Some single-parent families have the support of other adults while others do not. Another reason that it is difficult to compare two-parent and one-parent families is that the conditions leading to a single-parent family may be very different. A one-parent family may be the result of the death of the other parent or a divorce that was preceded by a period of prolonged parental conflict.

One factor that may account for differences in self-esteem for adolescents from two-parent versus one-parent families are differences related to financial status. Early adolescents are very concerned about having material possessions in order to gain peer acceptance (Balk, 1994). General self-esteem is in part determined by adolescents' perceived social acceptance (Keefe & Berndt, 1996). Pressure from peers related to having the current trends in clothing, electronic games, sporting equipment, etc. is heightened during early adolescence. In fact, conformity to peers is higher during early and middle adolescence than during
preadolescence or later adolescence (Steinberg and Silverberg, 1986). Studies have also indicated that an adolescent’s social class as indexed by his or her parent’s occupations, education or income is an important determinant of self-esteem, especially as the adolescent moves into middle adolescence (Steinberg, 1993).

One dramatic difference most often found between children in one-parent families and those in two-parent families which may contribute to significant differences in the ability of a family to provide these possessions, is that of income. In 1990, nearly 40 percent of one-parent families made less than $10,000 a year and an additional 27 percent made less than $20,000 (Bureau of Census, 1991). In fact, in a three year longitudinal study from 1983-86 conducted by the Bureau of Census, it was reported that for children whose fathers left the family, the family’s income decreased 23 percent over the time of the study and was less than 60 percent of the income in stable, two-parent families. Given that the incomes of South Dakota families are among the lowest in the nation, single-parent families could have even more difficulty in providing for these material needs and wants of adolescents.

Another factor which may contribute to the significant difference in self-esteem scores related to family structure, is a child’s reaction to divorce. Following a divorce, some young people describe being lonely, needy and vulnerable fearing disappointment in their own love relationships (Wallerstein, 1989).

It should not be overlooked, that the majority of the students in this study were from two-parent families ($n = 341$). To some extent, the adolescents who are not in two-parent families may have lower self-esteem simply because they are the minority. This is supported by what has been termed the “deviance” hypothesis
Adolescents who feel that they stand apart from their peers for any reason, in this case, living in a one-parent family versus a two-parent family, may experience more psychological distress than adolescents who "blend in" easily. Given the complexity of issues involved in differences between two-parent and one-parent families, additional research is warranted to further explore differences in self-esteem related to family structure.

A significant main effect for GPA on Psychoticism was found with C students reporting significantly higher scores on this personality dimension than either A or B students. Very little research has been done which explores relationships between these two constructs. However, if one reviews the descriptors for the Psychoticism dimension, there are possible links between social behavior and academic behavior which can be discussed.

Eysenck (1975) characterizes the high P scorer as aggressive, hostile, insensitive and lacking empathy. With respect to social conduct and academic achievement, positive intellectual outcomes have been related to displays of prosocial and empathetic behavior (Feshbach & Feshbach, 1972). In a more recent study by Wentzel (1993), results suggested that prosocial and antisocial behavior were independent predictors of GPA even when the confounding effects of academic behavior, teachers' preferences for students, IQ, family structure, sex, ethnicity and days absent from school were taken into account. Socially responsible behavior contributed to higher GPAs.

The same idea could be related to links between Extraversion and higher GPAs. A significant main effect for GPA on Extraversion with A and B students
reporting higher Extraversion scores than C or lower students was also found. If one reviews the attributes which Eysenck (1975) ascribes to the high E scorer, many of these could be viewed as prosocial behavior just as many of the attributes for Psychoticism could be viewed as antisocial behavior. Eysenck (1975) describes the extravert as gregarious, spirited and sociable among other attributes. These would be viewed as prosocial in nature. Therefore, Wentzel’s (1993) conclusion would hold true for these students as well.

Here again, no differences in self-esteem related to academic achievement, as measured by grade point averages were found. Thus, the prediction that high achieving students would have higher self-esteem was not supported. Further research exploring links between self-esteem and academic achievement is needed.

Additional analyses were computed to examine differences in conflict resolution style by gender, age, family structure and GPA. A significant difference for gender on the Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style was reported. This finding supports the prediction that girls would be more likely to choose the Compromising/Collaborating conflict management style when involved in conflict with a best friend of the same gender and is supported by the work of Miller et al. (1986) discussed in the review of literature. They reported that when conflict occurs, boys were more likely to use threats and force, whereas girls were more likely to use conflict-mitigating strategies. Boys appear to be more concerned with power and status during their interactions, girls with relationships and sustaining harmonious interaction. Rafaelli (1997) also noted that boys described more conflicts centered on issues of power than girls.
Goodwin and Goodwin (1987) found that early adolescent girls tended not to use confrontation with one another but saved these behaviors for conflicts with boys. Girls are not unassertive, rather they attempt to bring about agreement and to maintain interaction more frequently than boys (Sheldon, 1990). Given that this study focused on disagreements with a best friend of the same gender, girls may have selected strategies relating to maintaining harmony such as the compromising/collaborating style.

A significant interaction effect was found for gender and family structure on the Avoiding style of conflict management. Males in one-parent families had significantly lower scores on the Avoiding conflict management style than males or females from two-parent families or females from one-parent families. Further research is needed to explore why males in one-parent families are less likely to use the avoiding style of conflict resolution. Are they given more responsibilities, increasing social competence, thus better prepared to face conflict when it arises?

A major purpose of this study was to assess the effectiveness of the model in predicting conflict resolution style. In a comparison of the four models, the strongest support for the model is evidenced in the Compromising/Collaborating conflict resolution style. All of the personality dimensions individually and self-esteem were significant in their relationship to this conflict management style.

The role of self-esteem as having a mediating effect from the personality dimensions to the conflict resolution styles was supported for the Compromising/Collaborating style. However, with the remaining three models, the Avoiding, Accommodating and Dominating styles, the role of self-esteem as a mediator in
predicting these styles was very minimal. While self-esteem may play a role in predicting conflict resolution styles, it does not appear to be a mediator in the relationship between the personality dimensions explored and the conflict resolution styles. Additional research is needed to explore the role of self-esteem, as well as other factors which contribute to predicting conflict resolution styles for adolescents.

The comparison of the four models also allowed for an examination of the role of each of the personality dimensions directly in predicting conflict resolution style. Psychoticism had a direct effect on conflict management style in three of the four models. The beta weights were negative for both the Compromising/Collaborating and Avoiding models but positive for the Dominating model.

Eysenck (1975) uses the term "toughmindedness" to refer to Psychoticism. As discussed earlier in this chapter, he describes the high P scoring individual as lacking in empathy, insensitive and aggressive. This contributed to the prediction that individuals with higher P scores would be more likely to engage in the Dominating style of conflict management which was supported by the data analysis. Psychoticism had a significant positive influence on the Dominating style of conflict management.

The description of the high P individual also contributes to an understanding of the significant negative beta weight for the direct path for Psychoticism in the Compromising/Collaborating model. While the characteristics of the high P individual described earlier reflect a lack of concern for others, the Compromising/Collaborating management style is indicative of a high concern for others as illustrated in Figure 2.
The prediction that Extraversion would have a positive significant effect for the Dominating style of conflict management and a significant negative effect for the other models was not supported by the data. Extraversion had a significant positive effect only for the Compromising/Collaborating model.

It was also predicted that Neuroticism would have a significant positive influence on the Avoiding style of conflict management, this was not supported by the data, rather Neuroticism appears to have a significant effect in accounting for variance in the Dominating style.

In addition to describing the high N individual as more likely to worry, Eysenck (1975) characterizes this individual as overly emotional, reacting strongly to all types of stimuli. This description offers some insight – perhaps a high N scoring individual may therefore, seek to control a conflict situation rather than to avoid it.

Finally, in the comparison of the models, it becomes obvious that the model has a modest yet significant contribution in accounting for variance in the Compromising/Collaborating and Dominating conflict management styles. However, the model does very little to account for differences in either the Accommodating or Avoiding styles. Other variables such as social support from peers and others, feelings of acceptance or rejection by peers, social competence and others need to be explored for these two models in particular.

Next, a comparison of gender differences in the models was conducted to explore hypothesis five that there would be significant differences for males and females in predicting conflict resolution style. One major influence that becomes evident as the results are explored is that Psychoticism had a significant effect on all
four of the conflict management styles for males but not for females. For males, Psychoticism had a significant negative β weight for all but the Dominating style, with this model, the β weight was positive.

In addition, as discussed earlier in this chapter, differences in socialization and environmental influences may play a role in these gender differences. From an early age, boys typically manifest more aggressive behavior than girls. Aggression in girls is much less tolerated and more discouraged by parents (Hill & Lynch, 1983). This in combination with attributes of high P scorers such as lacking in empathy, aggressive, prone to risk taking and a lack of concern for others (Eysenck, 1975) may account for these gender differences. This may be particularly true for the Dominating and Compromising/Collaborating models.

Differences in the nature of conflicts for boys and girls may also be of importance. Again, the work of Rafaelli (1997) applies which noted that boys described more conflicts centered on issues of power than girls. As reported in the review of literature, boys engage in more disagreements relating to power and abusive behavior than girls; while girls engage in more disagreements relating to interpersonal relationships (Rafaelli, 1997). Since students were asked to consider a time when they were in conflict or disagreement with their best friend as they completed the conflict inventory, the nature and type of conflict or disagreement considered may have been very different for males and females.

Rafaelli (1997) also concluded that girls tended not to resolve their conflicts with their friends; whereas boys were more likely to compromise with their friends. He believed this was due in part to boys typically having a clearly defined focus in
disagreements while girls disagreed over the more tenuous issues of how friends should treat each other. This provides support for the fact that in exploring gender differences in the models, for males, a much larger variance in the Compromising/Collaborating management style was accounted for.

The final comparison of the models involved comparisons using groups based on GPA. With this set of models, it becomes more difficult to draw conclusions. One difference that should be noted was that in all of the previous models, including those involving gender comparisons, each of the personality dimensions was significant in accounting for variance in self-esteem. With the model comparisons based on GPA, Psychoticism had no significant effect on self-esteem for either the A or B students. It remained significant for the C or below students. A negative beta weight was reported for these students.

This finding alone would be consideration for further research. Why did Psychoticism impact self-esteem for the C or below students but not for the A or B students? One clue might come from the research related to prosocial and antisocial behavior and GPA discussed earlier in this chapter. Several studies have reported that interventions designed to promote the development of socially responsible behavior often result in higher levels of academic performance. Whereas, interventions designed to promote academic achievement do not seem to lead to corresponding increases in socially appropriate forms of classroom behavior (Cobb, 1972; Coie & Krehbiel, 1984; Hops & Cobb, 1974). Perhaps, schools need to do more in developing prosocial behavior in working with low-achieving students.
in addition to programs assisting with study skills and remediation. This is an area for further study as well.

With the exception of a significant positive beta weight for Psychoticism on the Compromising/Collaborating management style, it becomes apparent that this model does little to account for variance in the conflict management styles particularly for the C or below students when compared to the A or B students. This too points to the need for further study as to what accounts for differences in conflict management styles for those students performing at the C or below level academically.

One limitation of this study is that it focused only on conflict with a best friend of the same gender. Further research, examining conflict with same sex classmates and opposite sex classmates is needed to affirm a tendency for a conflict management style which crosses gender and context. Another limitation is that GPA was self-reported, which may or may not be an accurate reflection of the adolescents’ academic achievement. However, it is very difficult to receive GPAs from schools as this an issue of privacy for their students.

An additional limitation is that this is the first time the revised version of the ROCI II was used to assess conflict management styles in interpersonal relationships rather than workplace relationships. Further studies using the revised instrument to assess conflict resolution styles in interpersonal contexts will provide more insight as to the validity of this instrument. Longitudinal studies examining conflict management over time are also needed.
The model explored in this study does provide some insight into predictors for conflict management styles for adolescents when involved in conflict, especially for the Compromising/Collaborating and Dominating styles of conflict management. It does provide some support for the role of personality in predicting conflict resolution styles.

Much attention has been given to the role of gender in predicting conflict resolution outcomes. One implication of this study may be that it is not so much gender as one or more personality dimensions that may contribute to the prediction of conflict resolution outcomes. School administrators, teachers and parents may need to give greater consideration to personality dimensions as a predictor of conflict management style regardless of the gender of the student. An assessment of personality by schools may be beneficial to further awareness of factors contributing to an adolescent's conflict management style. While this may be controversial, as parents are justifiably concerned about privacy issues related to their children, it may prove to be a valuable tool in developing appropriate intervention programs designed to assist adolescents in developing constructive conflict resolution strategies.

While personality assessment may not be possible, school administrators, counselors, school psychologists and teacher educators can play a role in making parents, teachers and future teachers aware of the role of personality in conflict resolution. They can be made aware of students who exemplify characteristics of Psychoticism and/or Neuroticism. Teachers with knowledge gained from research of this nature can recognize that those students who demonstrate characteristics of
Psychoticism may need assistance in recognizing the positive aspects of compromising or collaborating, as well as viewing these strategies as win/win situations. The student who exemplifies characteristics of Neuroticism may need reassurance that in compromising, he/she will not lose control in a relationship or conflict situation but rather gain benefits of shared control.

If personality is viewed as malleable, shaped by experience, curriculum designed to assist middle school students in developing social competence would be important to promoting positive conflict resolution strategies. Exposing students to these strategies and assisting them in developing the skills necessary to use could help young make positive choices in resolving conflict with peers and others.
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I AGREE TO THE ABOVE CONDITIONS.

By Aria Bishop, Permissions Editor

By Debra Debates

Date November 10, 1998

Date Oct 30, 1998
March 22, 1999

Dan Pansch, Principal  
Brandon Valley Middle School  
301 S. Splitrock  
Brandon, SD 57005-1651

Dear Mr. Pansch:

Thank you for your time and consideration of the research which I am conducting examining correlation between personality, self-esteem, and conflict resolution. I trust you have had time to review the materials which I left with you. I want to reassure you that the confidentiality of both the individual student (eighth grader) and your school will be maintained.

Please complete the form at the bottom of this letter and return to me by April 2, 1999. I have enclosed a stamped, self-addressed envelope for your convenience. I look forward to working with Brandon School. If you agree to participate, I will be contacting you after Easter break to determine a date for collecting data which would fit both your schedule and mine.

If you have any further questions, feel free to contact me at 688-4666 or debatesd@cc.sdstate.edu.

Thank you again.

Sincerely,

Debra DeBates  
Ph.D. Candidate  
DD/js

Name of school: ________________________________________________________________

_____ Yes, we will participate in the research project

_____ No, we will not participate in the research project.

If yes, how many eighth grade students are enrolled at your school? _______

Would you be interested in receiving a summary of the research results? _____ Yes  _____ No

Signature ________________________________  Position ________________________________

Date ________________________________
To the Student:

My name is Debra DeBates and I am a student at Iowa State University. As a part of the requirements for my class work, I must complete a research project. I am very interested in finding out more about how teenagers solve problems with their friends, especially their best friend. Your principal has given me permission to have you help me with my research.

To help me with this project, I would like you to complete three questionnaires. Each of the questionnaires has a letter and a number on them. The letter represents your school and the number is for each student in the eighth grade. Neither your name or the name of your school will be made known to others. In fact, I will remove the letter and number from the forms when I am finished with the questionnaires.

Your participation in the project is voluntary. However, I would greatly appreciate your willingness to help me with my research. If you choose not to participate, your grade will not be affected. The completion of the three forms should take 35 to 40 minutes. Thank you for your cooperation.
Background Information

School _______________  Student _______________

Age: _______________  Sex: Male or Female

Do you live with: (circle one)

a. both parents
b. one parent and a step parent
c. single parent — mother
d. single parent — father
e. other guardian

What is your father’s most recent job/occupation?
________________________________________

What is your mother’s most recent job/occupation?
________________________________________

Based on your last report card, which grade listed below most closely matches your current grade average? (place an X before that grade)

________ A
________ A-
________ B+
________ B
________ B-
________ C+
________ C
________ C-
________ D+
________ D
________ D-
________ F
IN EVERY QUESTION, MARK JUST ONE BOX.

1. Do you like plenty of excitement going on around you? YES □ NO □
2. Are you moody? YES □ NO □
3. Do you enjoy hurting people you like? YES □ NO □
4. Were you ever greedy by helping yourself to more than your share of anything? YES □ NO □
5. Do you nearly always have a quick answer when people talk to you? YES □ NO □
6. Do you very easily feel bored? YES □ NO □
7. Would you enjoy practical jokes that could sometimes really hurt people? YES □ NO □
8. Do you always do as you are told at once? YES □ NO □
9. Would you rather be alone instead of meeting other children? YES □ NO □
10. Do ideas run through your head so that you cannot sleep? YES □ NO □
11. Have you ever broken any rules at school? YES □ NO □
12. Would you like other children to be afraid of you? YES □ NO □
13. Are you rather lively? YES □ NO □
14. Do lots of things annoy you? YES □ NO □
15. Would you enjoy cutting up animals in Science class? YES □ NO □
16. Did you ever take anything (even a pin or button) that belonged to someone else? YES □ NO □
17. Do you have lots of friends? YES □ NO □
18. Do you feel “just miserable” for no good reason? YES □ NO □
19. Do you sometimes like teasing animals? YES □ NO □
20. Did you ever pretend you did not hear when someone was calling you? YES □ NO □
21. Would you like to explore an old haunted castle? YES □ NO □
22. Do you often feel life is very dull? YES □ NO □
23. Do you seem to get into more quarrels and scraps than most children? YES □ NO □
24. Do you always finish your homework before you play? YES □ NO □
25. Do you like doing things where you have to act quickly? YES □ NO □
26. Do you worry about awful things that might happen? YES □ NO □
27. When you hear children using bad language do you try to stop them? YES □ NO □
28. Can you get a party going? YES □ NO □
29. Are you easily hurt when people find things wrong with you or the work you do? YES □ NO □
30. Would it upset you a lot to see a dog that has just been run over? YES □ NO □
31. Do you always say you are sorry when you have been rude? YES □ NO □
32. Is there someone who is trying to get back at you for what they think you did to them? YES □ NO □
33. Do you think water skiing would be fun? YES □ NO □
34. Do you often feel tired for no reason? YES □ NO □
35. Do you rather enjoy teasing other children? YES □ NO □
36. Are you always quiet when older people are talking? YES □ NO □
37. When you make new friends do you usually make the first move? YES □ NO □
38. Are you touchy about some things? YES □ NO □
39. Do you seem to get into a lot of fights? YES □ NO □
40. Have you ever said anything bad or nasty about anyone? YES □ NO □

GO RIGHT ON TO THE NEXT PAGE.
41. Do you like telling jokes or funny stories to your friends? ✓ NO
42. Are you in more trouble at school than most children? ✓ NO
43. Do you generally pick up papers and rubbish others throw on the classroom floor? ✓ NO
44. Have you many different hobbies and interests? ✓ NO
45. Are your feelings rather easily hurt? ✓ NO
46. Do you like playing pranks on others? ✓ NO
47. Do you always wash before a meal? ✓ NO
48. Would you rather sit and watch than play at parties? ✓ NO
49. Do you often feel fed-up? ✓ NO
50. Is it sometimes rather fun to watch a gang tease or bully a small child? ✓ NO
51. Are you always quiet in class, even when the teacher is out of the room? ✓ NO
52. Do you like doing things that are a bit frightening? ✓ NO
53. Do you sometimes get so restless that you cannot sit still in a chair for long? ✓ NO
54. Would you like to go to the moon on your own? ✓ NO
55. At prayers or assembly, do you always sing when the others are singing? ✓ NO
56. Do you like mixing with other children? ✓ NO
57. Are your parents far too strict with you? ✓ NO
58. Would you like parachute jumping? ✓ NO
59. Do you worry for a long while if you feel you have made a fool of yourself? ✓ NO
60. Do you always eat everything you are given at meals? ✓ NO
61. Can you let yourself go and enjoy yourself a lot at a lively party? ✓ NO
62. Do you sometimes feel life is just not worth living? ✓ NO
63. Would you feel very sorry for an animal caught in a trap? ✓ NO
64. Have you ever talked back to your parents? ✓ NO
65. Do you often make up your mind to do things suddenly? ✓ NO
66. Does your mind often wander off when you are doing some work? ✓ NO
67. Do you enjoy diving or jumping into the sea or a pool? ✓ NO
68. Do you find it hard to get to sleep at night because you are worrying about things? ✓ NO
69. Did you ever write or scribble in a school or library book? ✓ NO
70. Do other people think of you as being very lively? ✓ NO
71. Do you often feel lonely? ✓ NO
72. Are you always specially careful with other people's things? ✓ NO
73. Do you always share all the candy you have? ✓ NO
74. Do you like going out a lot? ✓ NO
75. Have you ever cheated at a game? ✓ NO
76. Do you find it hard to really enjoy yourself at a lively party? ✓ NO
77. Do you sometimes feel specially cheerful and at other times sad without any good reason ? ✓ NO
78. Do you throw waste paper on the floor when there is no waste paper basket handy? ✓ NO
79. Would you call yourself happy-go-lucky? ✓ NO
80. Do you often need kind friends to cheer you up? ✓ NO
81. Would you like to drive or ride on a fast motor bike? ✓ NO

PLEASE CHECK TO SEE THAT YOU HAVE ANSWERED ALL THE QUESTIONS
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Self Esteem</strong></th>
<th><strong>Almost Always</strong></th>
<th><strong>Often</strong></th>
<th><strong>At Times</strong></th>
<th><strong>Seldom</strong></th>
<th><strong>Never</strong></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I feel that I'm a person of worth, at least on an equal basis with others.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. I feel that I have a number of good qualities.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. All in all, I am inclined to feel that I am a failure.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I am able to do things as well as most other people.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I feel that I do not have much to be proud of.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I take a positive attitude toward myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. On the whole, I am satisfied with myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I wish I could have more respect for myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I certainly feel useless at times.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. At times I think I am no good at all.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rosenberg, 1965
Rahim Organizational Conflict Inventory II
Modified Version

Directions: Think about someone you consider to be your best friend. At times, you and your best friend may disagree about something or may be in conflict. As you read each of the following statements, think about how you usually behave when you are having a disagreement or a conflict with your best friend. Mark the column on the right hand side based on:

- **Strongly** - This is something I am very likely to do when I'm having a conflict or problem with my best friend.
- **Agree** - This is something I am likely to do when I'm having a conflict or problem with my best friend.
- **Not Sure** - I'm not sure if I would do this when involved in a conflict or a disagreement with my best friend.
- **Disagree** - This is something I would not be likely to do when involved in a conflict or disagreement with my best friend.
- **Strongly Disagree** - This is something I never do when involved in a conflict or disagreement with my best friend.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. I try to explore an issue with my best friend to find a solution acceptable to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. In a disagreement, I usually try to satisfy my best friend's needs and wants.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. I try to avoid being &quot;put on the spot&quot; and try to keep the conflict with my best friend to myself.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. I try to combine my ideas with those of my best friend to solve a problem together.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. I give up some of what I want to get some of what I want.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. I try to work with my best friend to find a solution to our disagreement that will satisfy both of us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. I usually avoid openly discussing differences with my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. I usually hold out for my solution to the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. I try to find a &quot;middle ground&quot; so that my best friend and I can solve our differences.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. I use my influence with my best friend so that he/she will come to accept my ideas.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Strongly Disagree</td>
<td>Disagree</td>
<td>Not Sure</td>
<td>Agree</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>I use my authority to make a decision in my favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>I usually try to meet the wishes of my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>I usually give in to the wishes of my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>When my best friend and I are trying to solve a disagreement, I make sure to give accurate information.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>I sometimes help my best friend to make decisions in his/her favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>I usually allow some giving in to my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I argue my side of things with my best friend to help him/her see the importance of my position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>I try to play down our differences to reach a compromise.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>I usually suggest a middle ground for breaking deadlocks.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>I am willing to bargain with my best friend so that a compromise can be reached.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I try to stay away from disagreements with my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>I avoid a difficult situation with my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I use what I know (and what my best friend doesn't) to work for a decision in my favor.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25.</td>
<td>I go along with the suggestions of my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26.</td>
<td>I use &quot;give and take&quot; so that a compromise can be made.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.</td>
<td>I am usually firm in telling my side of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28.</td>
<td>I try to bring my concerns out in the open and encourage my best friend to do the same so that our disagreement can be solved in the best way possible.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I talk things over with my best friend to come up with solutions acceptable to us.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.</td>
<td>I try to satisfy my best friend by letting him/her solve the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31.</td>
<td>I sometimes use my power to win a competitive situation.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32.</td>
<td>I try to keep my disagreement with my best friend to myself in order to avoid hard feelings.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.</td>
<td>I try to avoid unpleasant discussions with my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I generally avoid an argument with my best friend.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35.</td>
<td>I try to work with my best friend for a better understanding of the problem.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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