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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Overview

Marketing research interested in conflict management in channels of distribution has focused primarily on the construct of power to the neglect of other psychological constructs (e.g., Hunt, Ray, and Wood 1985, Michie and Sibley 1985, Stern, L., El-Ansary, A., and Brown, J. 1989). An increasingly large number of conceptual and empirical research has examined the conflict-power relationship with the aim of specifying the conditions under which the use of a particular source of power to manage a particular conflict would or would not be appropriate. For example, a homogeneous and stable task environment was identified in one study to be more conducive to the use of coercive sources of power in managing the conflict than a heterogeneous and changing environment. Conversely, a heterogeneous and changing task environment was found to be
more conducive to the use of noncoercive sources of power than a homogeneous and stable environment (Lucas and Gresham 1985).

Despite the wide recognition of the conflict-power relationship, there is no universally accepted agreement on the causal sequence of this relationship. For example, some researchers focus on the use of power as a major response to conflict (e.g., Dahl 1963) while some others consider the exercise of power to be a major cause of conflict (e.g., Raven and Kruglanski 1970). Since it is not clear whether conflict (a presumed cause) has temporal precedence over the use of power (a presumed effect), it is difficult to conclude that the conflict-power relationship is causal and that the use of power would be the appropriate response to conflict. Additionally, even if the temporal sequence of conflict and power is correctly specified, there is a great possibility that the conflict-power relationship is spurious and due to a third factor that is creating the conflict as well as the temptation to use power. For example, channel members competing for a scarce resource may find themselves conflicting with each other as well as performing some type of coercive or noncoercive actions toward each other.
Similarly, empirical findings of the power-conflict relationship have been inconsistent and can be described as equivocal at best. For example, some research reported that the use of coercive and noncoercive sources of power increased conflict (e.g., Brown and Frazier 1978) while some other research reported that the use of noncoercive power decreased conflict (e.g., Lusch 1976). It seems that it would be erroneous to conclude that the use of power is the appropriate response to conflict.

A psychological construct that may have great promise in explaining and predicting conflict-management behavior is the construct of attitude toward conflict. To date, many theorists have emphasized the critical role of behavioral dispositions or attitudes and behavior in the evolution of conflict. For example, Pondy (1967) and Thomas (1976) gave these two concepts a central position in the development of their process models. In the channels literature, Firat, Tybout, and Stern (1974) postulated a causal chain perspective between the cognitive and affective states (attitudes) of channel members and their behavior. However, empirical testing and validation of this causal relationship has not been provided.
Although it is difficult to conceive of member firms in a channel as holding attitudes, the total firm seldom interacts, i.e., sells or buys, with the total of another firm (e.g., Gill and Stern 1969). Gill and Stern maintains that in systems of interactions in which the actors are groups, contacts are generally made by designated individuals (1969 p. 26).

In fact, in many small to medium-sized firms, a single person may have the sole responsibility for most interactions with other channel members. Even in large organizations with very complex relationships where committees assume this responsibility, a leader or a chairperson is likely to emerge, based either on consensus or persuasion, and make the required interactions, e.g., for handling a conflict. Since individual managers become the interacting components in conflict situations, a behavioral system is established (e.g., Alderson 1965) and the attitudes of those managers toward the conflict will have potential significance for their conflict-management behavior.
Statement of the Research Problem

Channels research that has examined the use of power to manage conflict has produced inconsistent results (e.g., Gaski 1984, Lucas and Gresham 1985, Lusch and Ross 1985). It appears that the power-conflict perspective for investigating the phenomenon of conflict management in channels of distribution may give way to a broader behavioral perspective that examines the effects of attitude toward conflict on conflict-management behavior. As Eliashberg and Michie (1984) note, little effort has been made to develop more comprehensive and testable models of conflict. The purpose of this dissertation is to develop and test a multidimensional model of the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of managing conflict in marketing channels of distribution. The basic tenet of this model is that the constructs of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior are multicomponent entities and that different components of attitude toward conflict influence different components of conflict-management behavior.
How attitude toward conflict influences conflict-management behavior.

Generally, the presence of dyadic conflict generates different conceptualizations of the same objective characteristics of the conflict situation. The manner in which a channel member involved in a conflict defines the conflict situation constitutes his/her attitude toward the conflict. For example, the availability of information about the situation and the knowledge of the positive and negative consequences of the different courses of action may help the manager to establish a cognitively-based or an objective attitude toward the conflict. Alternatively, the absence of cognitively-based information about the dimensions, causes, and consequences of the conflict accompanied with the presence of emotionally-based psychological representations such as being concerned, angry, and/or repulsed may help the manager to form an emotionally-based or a subjective attitude toward the conflict.

Attitude is generally defined as being "a state of readiness, a neural representation, or a learned predisposition that exerts a directive or dynamic influence on behavior" (e.g., Allport 1935,
Breckler and Wiggins 1989, Petty and Cacioppo 1981). Although it is postulated that attitude has a directive influence on behavior, research findings regarding the effects of attitude on behavior have been inconsistent (e.g., Ajzen 1987, Ajzen and Fishbein 1977, Bagozzi and Burnkrant 1979, Wicker 1969).

To clarify the postulated effects of attitude on behavior, it is necessary to examine the manner in which the attitude-behavior relationship has been explored. Historically, research has attempted to analyze the relationship between a general evaluation of attitude and a particular behavior (e.g., Ajzen 1987, Millar and Tesser 1986). In addition to missing the richness of the concept of attitude as being a multicomponent entity, this approach seems to overlook the notion that not all behaviors are of the same conceptual nature. Horney’s (1945) categorization of interpersonal behavior into movement against and movement toward the other seems relevant here. For example, some behaviors may be undertaken with the intention to move aggressively against while others may be undertaken with the intention to move gently toward an issue or a person.
Therefore, to understand the directive influence of attitude toward conflict on conflict-management behavior, it may be necessary not only to examine the internal structure of the attitude concept, but also to differentiate conceptually between a behavior that is mainly confrontational and another that is mainly lenient.

**Research Questions**

The present research focuses on attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict in marketing channels of distribution. Since channels of distribution are characterized by specialization and interdependence (e.g., Eliashberg and Michie 1984), conflict is likely to be pervasive throughout the channel and its management is likely to gain rising importance. Theoretically, among all the factors that determine the continuity of healthy channel relations, perhaps the behavioral orientations of conflict management are the most important. For example, if a key channel member deals with all types of conflict in the same aggressive manner (toward the other member or the issue of conflict) irrespective of the nature and intensity of the conflict, some conflicts may intensify to the point of no return.
(e.g., Rosenberg and Stern 1970, Rosenbloom 1983). Alternatively, if a key channel member deals with all types of conflict in the same lenient manner (compromises or accommodates the other member's demands), s/he may jeopardizes the channel's long-term relations and objectives. Therefore, the task of explaining, predicting, and controlling conflict-management behavior appears to be of paramount importance to channel theory and research.

An important question that arises is why at some times a particular behavioral orientation is adopted by a channel member while at other times another may be considered? It may be more likely that the availability of information about all the facets of the conflict issue enhances the channel member's confidence that he is in control of the conflict situation. For example, the channel member having more information may feel that he could more easily evaluate the conflict situation than the member having less. Therefore, the behavior of the channel member who possesses an objective attitude, based on cognitive information, is expected to be confrontational or aggressive toward the conflict or the opponent simply because s/he feels that s/he can handle the situation or the other member. Alternatively, the
behavior of the channel member who possesses a subjective attitude, based on feelings, is expected to be non-confrontational or lenient toward the conflict or the opponent just for the opposite reason.

The selection and manifestation of a given behavior appear to depend largely on the possession or lack of substantive information about the conflict situation. This information may include but is not restricted to the perceived: (1) intensity of conflict, (2) outcomes of varying courses of actions, (3) distribution of power, dependence structure, and compatibility of goals of both members. Since channel members are more likely to demonstrate a constructive rather than a destructive conflict-management behavior, the key question is: what are the effects of a channel member’s attitude toward conflict on his/her conflict-management behavior?

The present research addresses the following questions:

1. What are the structural antecedents (causal determinants) of attitude toward conflict?
2. What are the structural antecedents (causal
determinants) of conflict-management behavior?

3. What is the conceptual organization of attitude toward conflict?

4. What is the conceptual organization of conflict-management behavior?

5. What are the effects of attitude toward conflict on conflict-management behavior?

Research Objectives

The research objectives are designed around the research questions posed. The primary objective is to construct and test empirically a conceptual model of the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of managing conflict in channels of distribution. This model describes the effects of a channel member's attitude toward conflict on his/her conflict-management behavior. Closely related to the primary objective is the identification of the conceptual organization of the constructs of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior and their structural determinants. In other words, this research constructs multicomponent models for the concepts of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior and
provides empirical support for both models. In addition, the structural antecedents of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior are identified.

Research Design

The research questions were addressed in the following manner:

First, literature pertaining to conflict management and attitude-behavior relationship from the marketing, social psychology, and organization behavior was reviewed for the purpose of providing substantive theory for the conceptual models that were developed and for the research hypotheses.

Second, four decision making exercises (experimental manipulations) were developed. Each exercise was designed in a way that required participants to adopt the appropriate experimental moods. The inclusion of these exercises in the questionnaire created four different versions. The questionnaire was designed to assess attitude toward the conflict, conflict-
management behavior, and the success of the decision making exercises in creating the desired experimental conditions.

Third, a conflict scenario was developed and used in the main experiment and in two pilot studies. The purpose of the two pilot studies was to construct the attitudinal and behavioral measurement scales that were used in the main experiment.

Fourth, a laboratory experiment involving the participation of college students was used as a vehicle for testing the research models and hypotheses. The preference of a laboratory over a field experiment and over other means of data collection was governed by the conceptual nature of the present research. The present research is based on the assumption that the relationship between attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior is causal and that the direction of causality is from attitude to behavior. Therefore, there must be no plausible explanations of behavior other than attitude. In other words, the relationship between attitude and behavior must not be due to a third variable that is causing the variability in both attitude and behavior. Confounding (third) variables such as managerial experience, direct orders from top management, or strict
standard operating procedures are substantially less likely to be operative in a controlled laboratory setting than in other settings. Additionally, the controlled administration of the experiment in a laboratory setting guarantees the temporal precedence of the cause (attitude toward conflict) over the effect (conflict-management behavior) while other data collection methods do not.

Fifth, members of the sample were randomly assigned to four experimental conditions and a control cell. These conditions were:

1. Objective attitude-confrontational behavior,
2. Objective attitude-lenient behavior,
3. Subjective attitude-confrontational behavior,
4. Subjective attitude-lenient behavior, and
5. control cell.

Sixth, the data was divided into two sub-samples. The first was treated as an exploratory sample and the second as a validation sample.
Seventh, the data was analyzed using appropriate statistical procedures in order to determine the strength of the empirical support for the research hypothesized relationships. These procedures included exploratory factor analyses for uncovering the factor structures of attitude and behavior, frequency analyses for assessing general associations between some experimental variables, ANOVA's for assessing the strength of experimental manipulations and analyzing the co-variation among experimental variables, confirmatory factor analyses for model building, and linear structural relations analyses (LISREL) for estimating the hypothesized causal relationships between the observed variables and the latent constructs. Finally, the results were thoroughly discussed and conclusions were drawn from the research findings.

Scope of the Research

This dissertation focuses on the relationship between attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior in the context of dyadic relationships in marketing channels of distribution. This research did not go beyond the hypothesized
attitude-behavior relationship. In more specific terms, no attempt was made to investigate the relationship between sources or consequences of conflict such as goal incompatibility, channel performance, and/or channel satisfaction and conflict-management behavior. In addition, no attempt was made to investigate the effects of persuasion and attitude change on dynamic conflict management processes. Therefore, this study was carried out from the perspective of one member of the conflict situation. No attempt was made to investigate the effects of the other member's attitude toward the same conflict on his/her conflict-management behavior.

Though it is recognized that conflict management is a small portion of a larger channel-management behavior, no attempt was made to address the latter issue directly or indirectly. In other words, no attempt was made to relate conflict-management behavior to successful or unsuccessful channel management in administering the channel programs.

The study was not restricted to a particular type of administrative patterns such as conventional or contractual
channel systems; in addition, the study was not restricted to channels that handle any particular product or product group.

Potential Contributions of the Research

This research examines conflict management in marketing channels of distribution from a psychological perspective. The concepts of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior are considered to be dual rather than single-component entities. The conceptual organization and antecedents of and the causal relationships between these concepts are examined in greater depth than that of the extant literature in marketing. As a result, the current research has potential theoretical, methodological, and managerial contributions.

Theoretical Contributions

1. This research provides an integrated review of conflict management and attitude-behavior relation from the marketing, organization behavior, and social psychology literatures.
2. The findings shed some light on the internal cognitive processes of managers handling dyadic conflict in channels of distribution.

3. The findings render additional support to the inclusion of affective and cognitive stages in current conflict models in the distribution channel literature.

Methodological contributions

1. This study is the first in conflict research to apply causal modeling techniques for the purpose of isolating causal relationships among the observed and latent variables. Therefore, it may pave the way for a wave of future research that examines the covariance structure of channel variables instead of concentrating on the simple association between these variables.

2. The findings can be used as a basis for future comparative analyses. The findings of similar research using field experiments as vehicles to collect data may be compared to the findings of this research in order to give additional support to the use of laboratory experiments in channel research.
3. The measurement scales of attitude and behavior in the context of conflict that are developed and used in this research can be used in future research. If similar results are obtained, additional support will be rendered to the reliability and validity of these scales.

Managerial Contributions

1. This research provides managers with a conceptual framework that would enhance their understanding of conflict-management behavior.

2. This study provides empirical evidence that attitude toward the conflict is an important factor in determining conflict-management behavior. Therefore, managers could ideally look into their opponents' attitudes toward potential conflicts for the purpose of speculating about their opponents' behavior.

Limitations of the Research

1. The main purpose of this research is the development and validation of a conceptual model of attitude-behavior
relationship in the context of conflict in channels of distribution. Therefore, no claims of generalizability to different settings, different times, or different subjects are made in this research.

2. The present research does not take into consideration the unique characteristics of individual channels. Therefore, the results may not be applicable to any particular channel. However, the results from any similar research in any channel can be compared to the findings of the present research in order to enhance the conceptual interpretation of causal relationships.

3. This study does not consider the dynamic interplay between attitude and behavior. Acquiring new information about the conflict situation may alter the attitude toward conflict as well as conflict-management behavior.

4. Different conflict situations as well as different causes of conflict may result in different attitudes toward the conflict thereby generating different conflict-management behaviors. The present research does not look into these possibilities.
5. The present research does not look at cooperation as a possible opposite to conflict on a continuum of conflict-cooperation. Therefore, it will not be known whether the understanding of cooperation is a prerequisite for the development of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior.

6. The present research does not look at competition as a viable alternative to conflict. Therefore, it will not be known whether the understanding of competition is necessary for the development of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior.

7. The present research looks at a single-issue conflict. Therefore, problem-solving behavior of multiple-issue conflicts cannot be explained in this research.

Order of Presentation

The reader was provided in chapter one with an overview of the conflict management concept, a statement of the research problem, issues, and objectives, and was introduced with the
research approaches, scope, contributions, and limitations. A review of the literature that is deemed to be relevant to conflict management, attitude, and behavior is provided in chapter two. Conceptual definitions of the constructs of conflict, attitude toward conflict, and conflict-management behavior and a discussion of the structural antecedents of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior are also provided in this chapter. The structural organization of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior and the attitude-behavior relationship are discussed in chapter three. The research models, hypotheses, and the research methodology and design are developed in chapter four. The findings are presented in chapter five. Finally, a summary and discussion of the findings, the implications of the research, and recommendations for future research are presented in chapter six.
CHAPTER II
THE STRUCTURAL ANTECEDENTS
OF ATTITUDE TOWARD CONFLICT
AND CONFLICT-MANAGEMENT BEHAVIOR

Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to review the literature pertaining to the theoretical constructs of conflict, attitude, and behavior in the areas of marketing, organization behavior, and social psychology. The specific objectives are: (1) to examine extant conceptual definitions of conflict, attitude, and behavior and select or develop definitions that best fit the purposes of the present research, (2) to identify the structural antecedents of attitude toward conflict, and (3) to identify the structural antecedents of conflict-management behavior.
Conflict: Definition and Elaboration

In most general sense, conflict has been viewed as a clash between divergent goals, interests, or values. More elaborate definitions view conflict as a dynamic process that includes: (1) causes of conflict, (2) feelings of tension, stress, or hostility, (3) managerial behavior to manage the conflict, (4) reaction of the other member subject to conflict-management behavior, and (5) consequences of conflict or conflict aftermath (e.g., Pondy 1967).

Behavioral sciences have not agreed on a universally accepted definition of the theoretical construct of conflict. For example, organization behaviorists define role conflict as being the competing response tendencies stemming from the requirements of different roles assumed by the same individual (e.g., Kahn, Wolfe, Quinn, Snoek, and Rosenthal 1964). Alternatively, channel theorists define role conflict as being the incompatibility of actual and desired performance as reflected by the viewpoints of the role holder on one hand and the role subject on the other (e.g., Etgar 1979).
Impediments to a Unified View of Conflict

Perhaps the easy acceptability (e.g., Pearson 1973) and the elastic nature (e.g., Lusch 1976, Pondy 1967, Thomas 1976) of the concept of conflict have impeded the development of a unified view of this concept. Likewise, similarities between conflict and other concepts such as competition (e.g., Fink 1968) have further impeded the conceptual delineation of the construct of conflict. For example, in a review of the conflict literature, Fink (1968) found a large number of different definitions of conflict. Furthermore, Fink suggested several criteria for simply distinguishing between conflict and competition.

The Need to Define Conflict

The extant definitions of conflict fall short of conveying the conceptual and empirical meanings of this theoretical construct. What is required for the purpose of this research is reifying and narrowing this and other major theoretical constructs to serve several purposes. These purposes are:
1. Any confusion or ambiguity about the theoretical and empirical meanings of the construct must be removed.
2. Any similarities between the construct and other related constructs must be differentiated.
3. All relevant aspects of the construct must be distinguished from other irrelevant dimensions through empirical measurement techniques.
4. All aspects of the construct that are subject to change must be easily identified.
5. All causes of change in the experimental constructs must be clarified.
6. All effects in the experimental constructs must be easily attributed to its proper causes.

Taking clues from past research, it is necessary that the focal attitude and behavior object (conflict in the present research) be clearly identified to the extent that the development of the conceptual and operational definitions of other related constructs is facilitated. A classical but not an isolated example of failing to clearly identify the attitude and behavior object is found in LaPiere's (1934) research. It was reported that LaPiere and a young Chinese couple traveled widely in the United States.
While seeking accommodations at hotels and restaurants, LaPiere observed the behavior of the service providers at these facilities toward the couple. Later, LaPiere mailed a questionnaire to the facilities' proprietors asking them how would they feel toward receiving and serving members of the Chinese race. LaPiere reported that there was little correlation between attitude and behavior.

However, one of the major problems of LaPiere's research was the failure to identify appropriately the focal attitude and behavior object. It was very likely that contrary to the assumption that the salient attitude and behavior object was members of the Chinese race, the actual salient attitude and behavior object was some thing like a young couple, a married couple, or customers.

The marketing literature examining channel conflict has not been immune to similar misidentifications of theoretical constructs. For example, the failure of Ross and Lusch (1982) to provide evidence in support of the hypothesized relationship between domain dissensus and perceptual incongruity on one hand
and felt or perceived conflict on the other can be attributed to a lack of clear definitions of these constructs.

Requirements in the Definition of Conflict

In the context of the current research, it is essential to isolate the focal attitude and behavior object (conflict) from other possible salient objects by identifying the construct of conflict in correct verbal labels. Labeling the construct of conflict in appropriate verbal terms requires the identification of its conceptual attributes. No agreement has been reached about what conceptual attributes should be included in or excluded from the definition of conflict. Most dyadic conflict, as indicated by past research, occurs in cycles or episodes rather than occurring as a continuous process (e.g., Pondy 1967, Walton 1969). Even when conflict is happening as an on-going process, there is a tendency among the conflicting parties to fractionate the conflict into small and manageable episodes, each of which becomes defined as a salient issue (e.g., Fisher 1964, Walton 1969).
Though it is recognized that conflict may be cumulative, the tendency to fractionate large conflicts into small episodes and to consider each episode as a salient issue suggest the following:

1. Results of past episodes of conflict, channel members' behavior which caused the conflict, and the consequences of conflict-management behavior of the current episode should be excluded from the definition of conflict.
2. Conflict is a perceptual rather than a physical entity.
3. Since a conflict episode becomes defined as a salient issue to at least one member of the dyad, a mental representation of conflict and its conceptual attributes and associations is perceived.
4. The degree of appreciation of each conceptual attribute depends on the perception that the attribute contributes to the satisfaction or dissatisfaction of the channel member perceiving the conflict.

The Definition of Conflict

Therefore, conflict is defined by the author of the present research as being "a mental representation of the perceptual
divergence of attained and desired states of affairs, organized through the experience of the conflict episode, and associated with attitudinal and behavioral orientations."

**Attitude Toward Conflict**

Social sciences interested in understanding, predicting and controlling social behavior have displayed a similar interest in the concept of attitude. For example, one can find research dealing with attitude toward blacks (social psychology), attitude toward the brand (consumer behavior) and attitude toward a task (organization behavior). However, a comprehensive search of conflict literature has failed to find any theoretical or empirical research treating the concept of attitude toward conflict.

**The Concept of Attitude in Conflict Research**

The neglect of the concept of attitude in conflict research is apparently not due to a lack of awareness of the importance of attitude in the evolution of conflict. Indeed, most popular models of conflict propose that a conceptual or an attitudinal stage is central to understanding the causes and consequences of conflict.
and in influencing conflict-handling behavior. For example, in the development of his process model, Thomas (1976) defines conflict to be "a process which includes the perceptions, emotions, behaviors, and outcomes (p.891). Regarding perceptions and emotions, attitude theory proposes that these are the two major components of individual attitudes toward an object/issue (e.g., Allport 1954, Hilgard 1980, McGuire 1985, Rosenberg and Hovland 1960).

Furthermore, in his alternative treatment of conflict as an on-going process (the structural model), Thomas postulates that behavioral predispositions, social pressures, and incentive structure are the main variables affecting conflict-management behavior (1976, p. 912). These variables were found to be a mirror reflection of the main three variables (attitudes toward behavior, subjective norms, perceived behavioral control) postulated to be influencing behavior in one of the prominent attitude theories in social psychology, namely theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1985, 1989, Ajzen and Madden 1986).

Channel researchers have followed the lead of Pondy (1967) and Thomas (1976) in the development of conceptual frameworks
for channel conflict. For example, Firat et al. (1974) proposes that channel members involved in a conflict first move in a cognitive/affective stage. Other researchers also accept the "latent-affective-manifest" framework in their treatments of intrachannel conflict (e.g., Brown 1977, Eliashberg and Michie 1984, Etgar 1979, Rosenberg 1974, Stern and El-Ansary 1977, Stern and Gorman 1969).

**Conceptual Attributes of Attitude**

Since the construct of attitude toward conflict has not received attention from channel researchers, no serious attempts have been made to provide explicit theoretical and operational definitions of this construct in the channel literature. Therefore, a channel researcher who is interested in examining this construct has to borrow from related disciplines, primarily, social psychology. Yet there is no agreement on how attitude should be conceived of in social psychology. Instead, one can find a wide array of conceptual and operational definitions, each of which was constructed to fit the specific perspective of a particular stream of research. For example, Attitude is viewed in one sense as being an association between a given object and a
given evaluation (e.g., Fazio 1986, 1989, Fazio, Chen, McDonel, and Sherman 1982) while in another it is viewed as being the evaluation itself or the pro-con or the positive-negative dimension of a behavioral response (e.g., Ajzen 1989, Bem 1970, Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum 1957).

Although formal definitions of the concept of attitude vary (see table 1 for a compact portrayal of selected definitions), they tend to emphasize some important characteristics. These attributes are:

1. Attitudes are states of readiness, mental and neural representations, or predispositions (e.g., Allport 1935, Breckler and Wiggins 1989, Insko and Schopler 1972). Generally, attitudes are considered to be hypothetical constructs or latent variables that are inferred from measurable responses (e.g., Ajzen 1989). Being inaccessible to direct measurement, the attitude concept has not shown considerable consistency with respect to its conceptual attributes such as the attribute of driving or influencing behavior (e.g., Abelson 1972, Wicker 1971).
Table 1

Selected Definitions of the Concept of Attitude

1. Attitude is a mental and neural state of readiness, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence upon the individual's response to all objects and situations with which it is related (Allport 1935, p. 810).

2. Attitudes are likes and dislikes (Bem 1970, p. 14).

3. Attitudes are mental and neural representations, organized through experience, exerting a directive or dynamic influence on behavior (Breckler and Wiggins 1989, p. 409).

4. Attitude is a learned predisposition to respond in a consistently favorable or unfavorable manner with respect to a given object (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975, p. 6).

5. Attitude is the affect Associated with a mental object (Greenwald 1989, p. 432).

6. Attitudes are dispositions to evaluate favorably or unfavorably (Insko and Schopler 1972, p. 1).

7. Attitudes are responses that locate objects of thought on dimensions of judgment (McGuire 1985, p. 239).

8. Attitudes are cognitions, values, thoughts, beliefs, and opinions (McGuire 1989, p. 38).

9. Attitude is a general and enduring positive or negative feeling about some person, object or issue (Petty and Cacioppo 1981, p. 7).

10. Attitude is a person's evaluation of an object of thought (Pratkanis 1989, p. 72).
2. Attitudes are directed toward tangible and intangible objects (e.g., people, foods, colors, odors, concepts). Greenwald (1989) notes that "researchers have treated virtually any nameable or describable entity as an attitude object (p. 5)." Therefore, it is implied that conflict as a conceptual entity has the potential of generating individual attitudes. The question to be answered is whether the concept of conflict holds some significance to some important aspects of the individual manager's life in order to be at the locus of his/her attention.

3. Attitudes encompass feelings, beliefs, and intentions organized through experience (e.g., Bem 1970, Petty and Cacioppo 1981).

This trichotomy of human thoughts has received considerable attention. As a general proposition, Tulving (1983) suggests that human memory is organized into semantic and episodic storages. The semantic memory consists of knowledge of facts, ideas, plans, and concepts about objects. Alternatively, the episodic memory consists of personal experiences about objects organized in a temporal sequence (p. 21). The conceptual separation between the two memory storages has an important
implication to the study of the concept of attitude toward conflict. That is, the knowledge of the attributes of the conflict episode (e.g., functional dependence, distribution of power) can be separated from the context in which conflict was originally conceptualized (e.g., manager was in bad mood, a feeling that some stimulation was needed).

4. Attitudes influence, drive, or direct behavior (e.g., Ajzen 1989, Allport 1935, Breckler and Wiggins 1989). This attribute has a serious implication. It follows that if the attitude concept fails to exhibit its presumed influence on behavior, it becomes a hypothetical construct that is devoid from empirical meaning.

The Need to Define Attitude

The list of definitions in table 1 is by no means comprehensive nor are the above derived attributes. The danger represented by the myriad of definitions and by their conceptual tolerance lies in adopting one of these definitions and steering the research to conform conceptually and operationally with the chosen definition. For example, some restricted definitions (e.g., Bem's 1970) identify the attitude concept with affect (an
episodic memory activity) to the neglect of cognitions (a semantic memory activity). Hence, these definitions imply a no-relation status between feelings (such as this conflict is bad) and cognitions (such as this conflict is dangerous). Alternatively, some elaborated definitions (e.g., Allport’s 1935) imply that there is a need for measuring motor and visceral activity in order to ascertain with any degree of confidence that attitude influences behavior.

Another caveat is also in order. Some of the definitions appear to be derived from the conceptual organization or structure of the attitude concept (e.g., Ajzen’s 1975, McGuire’s 1989) and/or empirical measurement (e.g., McGuire’s 1985, Pratkanis’ 1989). Because the structure of the concept of attitude varies (e.g., unidimensional vs. multidimensional logic of attitude structure) and empirical measurements also vary (e.g., Thurstone vs. Likert scale), the theoretical status of the concept of attitude may be reduced to an empirical meaning.
Requirements in the Definition of Attitude

In order to preserve the theoretical status of the concept of attitude and to ascribe it with most of the agreed upon and valid characteristics, the following requirements should be met in defining attitude:

1. Attitude should be conceived of as a theoretical construct that can be inferred from, but is not dependent on, observable measurement or scaling techniques.

2. Attitude representation should not be restricted to a single memory storage such as semantic or episodic. Instead, attitude should be thought of as being a representation of the contents of all memory storages about the attitude object/issue (i.e., conflict).

3. There must be a reference to the association between the mental representation of attitude and that of the attitude object/issue.

4. Attitude is conceptually organized through a process of information learning through contextual and personal experience.
5. **Attitude influences immediate or initial reaction or behavior.**

The Definition of Attitude

Guided by the aforementioned requirements, attitude toward conflict is viewed in the context of this research to be "a mental representation of the association between an object/issue that has some significance to an important aspect of the individual's life and this aspect, organized through learning and experience, exerting a directive influence on initial behavior."

Structural Antecedents of Attitude Toward Conflict

One of the objectives of the current research is the identification of the conceptual antecedents of the concept of attitude toward conflict. Attitude theory and channel research provide enough evidence suggesting that the concept of attitude exists as a function of different types of information associated with the attitude issue/object. This information can be thought of as the objective characteristics of the issue/object and the contextual cues that are associated with it. The following
sections provide a discussion of what extant attitude definitions, functional theories of attitude, persuasion research, and channel research suggest about the structural antecedents of attitude.

**Attitude Definitions**

Different definitions of attitude suggest that this construct is a multidimensional composite of feelings and thoughts rather than a unidimensional structure of either one. Since definitions are considered to be an integral part of a theory that help "delimit the phenomena and organize observations (e.g., Lazarus 1984)," definitions of attitude are expected to provide some evidence of the theoretical constituencies of the concept of attitude.

A close look at the list of definitions provided in table 1 reveals a broad range of loose assumptions about the causal antecedents of the concept of attitude. For example, some definitions (e.g., Bem 1970, Greenwald 1989) reduce the concept of attitude to the affect generated by confronting the attitude issue/object. However, it is still not known whether this affect is acquired by instrumental learning (i.e., reward-punishment).
cognitive learning (i.e., knowledge of the objective characteristics of the issue/object), or classical conditioning (i.e., considering the configural cues that are associated with the issue/object).

Additionally, the definitions that emphasize thoughts and beliefs (e.g., McGuire 1989, Pratkanis 1989) do not say much either about the intervening process (i.e., instrumental learning vs. cognitive learning vs. classical conditioning) or the causal antecedents of attitude (i.e., reward-punishment vs. objective attributes vs. configural cues associated with the issue/object). Nevertheless, if we consider both types of definitions at the same time we may be able to conclude that both information about the attitude issue/object and/or contextual cues associated with it should be available for the individual in order to form an attitude.

**Functional Theories of Attitude**

Functional theories of attitude (e.g., Katz 1960, Kelman 1961, Smith, Bruner, and White 1956) propose that individual attitudes serve some psychological needs for the individual. As
Allport (1935) once wrote: "Attitudes determine for each individual what he will see and hear, what he will think and what he will do (p. 806)." The functions that have been proposed to be served by attitudes include knowledge function, social-identity function, and ego-defensive function. Other functions that have been suggested in consumer behavior literature include utilitarian and hedonic functions (e.g., Batra and Ahtola 1987).

Moreover, Shavitt (1985, 1987) suggests that objects have differing potentials to engage particular attitude functions (cf. Shavitt 1989). In this regard, Shavitt argues that the purpose of functions that an issue/object can serve should exert an important influence on the functions served by that attitude toward the issue/object. Shavitt also maintains that the functions served by issues/objects can stem from characteristics of the object including its physical and non-physical attributes (e.g., size, price, color, societal and cultural perceptions such as elegant, outdated).

Regardless of which function is served by a particular attribute, functional theories seem to agree on an interesting implication for persuasion and attitude change. That is, the
persuasive appeal should include information about the physical and/or the non-physical (configural, Batra 1986) attributes of the attitude object. Hence, in studying the issue of attitude toward conflict in the context of the current research, both information about the conflict and about other configural attributes of the conflict (i.e., situational cues) should be considered in the determination of attitude.

**Persuasion Research**

A substantial body of research has investigated how peoples' evaluations of issues and objects are affected by communication (persuasive) messages. Two of the principal frameworks that have provided some conceptual order for the vast amount of spawning research are the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1989) and the elaboration likelihood model of persuasion (ELM, Petty and Cacioppo 1986).

**Theory of Planned Behavior**

The theory of planned behavior reserves the term attitude to the overall evaluative response and postulates attitude as
being a function of beliefs about the attitude issue/object (Ajzen 1989, p. 247). Each belief about the attitude issue/object associates the attitude issue/object to a certain attribute, characteristic, outcome, or event. The subjective value of the attributes contributes to attitude in direct proportion to the conviction of the individual or the strength of the belief. Therefore, to assess attitude toward an issue/object, the belief strength is multiplied by the attribute evaluation and the products are summed up across all salient beliefs.

It appears that the theory of planned behavior views attitude formation and change as a product of information processing. As a matter of fact, the theory of planned behavior does not stand alone in contending that information about or the objective attributes of the attitude issue/object are the sole determinants of attitude. Other theories such as the inoculation theory (McGuire 1964), cognitive response theory (Greenwald 1968, Petty, Ostrom, and Brock 1981), information integration theory (Anderson 1981), and the theory of reasoned action (Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Fishbein 1980) also support the same contention.
The Elaboration Likelihood Model of Persuasion (ELM)

The ELM of persuasion considers attitudes to be a general evaluation of the attitude issue/object (Petty and Cacioppo 1986, p. 127). But unlike the theory of planned behavior, it does not confine the generation of attitudes to cognitive experiences. In addition to cognitive experiences, the ELM postulates that attitudes can be based on behavioral and affective experiences.

In an attempt to integrate the findings of the research of attitude formation and change, the ELM suggests that there are two routes to persuasion. One, called the central route, assumes that persuasion results from a thoughtful consideration of the true merits of the available information about the attitude issue/object. The second, called the peripheral route, posits that attitude change is not necessarily a result of a diligent consideration of the available information rather attitude change may result from simply attending to simple contextual cues associated with the attitude issue/object. Moreover, the ELM asserts that it is possible to distinguish between persuasion resulting from thoughtful information processing and persuasion resulting from considering the contextual cues.
Channel Research

Channel research has in some instances equated the stage of conceptualization of the conflict issue (Thomas 1976, process model of conflict) to an affective/cognitive or an attitudinal stage (Firat et al. 1974). The acceptance of this conceptual equivalence has some interesting implications for the formation of an attitude toward conflict. Thomas postulates that there are “three dimensions of a party’s definition of a given issue.” Two of these dimensions are: “egocentricity and insights into underlying concerns (1976, p. 896).” Thomas also brings the notion of “subjective reality” into perspective which implies that “the way a man defines his situation constitutes for him its reality” (Allport 1955, p. 84). Therefore, defining the issue in an insightful manner constitutes a reality (attitude) that is conceptually different from defining the same issue in an egocentric manner. That is because an insightful definition of the conflict situation requires the consideration of “basic concerns which are responsible for both parties’ stands” while an egocentric definition may only require the consideration of “own concerns.” Further, Thomas distinguishes between “less substantive (emotional)” and “more substantive (acceptable
issues)" concerns and points out that more substantive concerns may become very difficult to resolve without considering emotional concerns (pp. 896-897).

It appears that a conflicting party (i.e., channel member) can arrive at different subjective realities about a conflict (i.e., attitudes) by considering different aspects of the issue of conflict. Therefore, it can be suggested that different types of information might be considered in arriving at these different attitudes. These types are the attributes of the conflict situation and the contextual or configural cues of the conflict situation.

Conflict-Management Behavior

Behavior in Conflict Research

The concept of conflict-management behavior has not been treated thoroughly at the conceptual level in the channel literature. A comprehensive literature search has failed to discover any research in the literature of channels of distribution
that treats behavior at an appropriate level of abstraction (i.e., something conceptually higher than the observable act). It appears that channel researchers have been preoccupied with developing and empirically testing mechanistic approaches to conflict management rather than with the task of developing conceptual frameworks for conflict-management behavior.

The importance of conflict-management behavior as a theoretical issue is apparent in the vast amount of channel research that has examined the relationship between this construct and other psychological constructs such as channel management, channel satisfaction, and channel performance (e.g., Brown and Stoops 1982, El-Ansary and Stern 1972, Etgar 1979, Hunt and Nevin 1974, Lusch 1975, Lusch and Brown 1982, Raven and Kruglanski 1970, Sibley and Michie 1983, Wilkinson 1979). However, conflict-management behavior has not been defined in the channel literature. Some particular forms of this concept (e.g., the exercise of power) have been operationalized at the empirical level by utilizing different measures of conflict-management behavior. For example, Walker (1972) found in a
laboratory setting that powerful bargainers were capable of securing agreements with less powerful bargainers that were satisfactory to the powerful and dissatisfactory (i.e., evocative of conflict) to those subject to power. It can be interpreted to mean that the existence and/or the exercise of power was considered in this study to be an empirical operationalization of a particular form of conflict-management behavior. In effect, most of the channel behavior literature investigating the impact of sources of power (e.g., coercive-noncoercive or economic-noneconomic sources of power) on intrachannel conflict can be considered to have operationalized a particular form of conflict-management behavior.

However, considering the use of power as being the only empirical realization of conflict-management behavior is a restricted conceptualization. In more specific terms, conceptual and operational definitions of power that are advanced in the literature cannot be used to substitute behavior definitions in the present research. Thus, a comprehensive search for definitions of behavior in related disciplines is needed in order to find/develop a definition that would fit the purposes of the present research.
Unfortunately, the construct of behavior has not received as much attention to the development of definitions as its sister the construct of attitude. Some authoritative definitions of some specific forms of behavior and of behavior in general are portrayed in table 2. Most behavior theories view the concept of behavior to "refer to any and all observable acts" (Cacioppo, Harkins, and Petty 1981, p. 49). However, the definitions that were offered for some particular forms of behavior indicate that this view of behavior can be misleading. For example, Millar and Tesser (1986) differentiate between two instances of puzzle playing (observable acts) by asserting that one instant of puzzle playing could be undertaken to please self and the other to gain analytic ability. Similarly, it can be argued that any single type of behavior (e.g., instrumental behavior) can be performed for different purposes. For example, an act of driving a car (observable act) may be undertaken for the purpose of getting to work or for the purpose of testing the performance of the car (e.g., the engagement capability of the transmission).
Table 2

Selected Definitions of the Concept of Behavior

1. In point of fact, both verbal and nonverbal responses are observable behavior (Ajzen 1989, p. 245).

2. Congenial behavior includes all activity, whether collective or solitary, which is expected to yield direct satisfaction and hence is pursued as an end in itself (Alderson 1957, p. 169).

3. Instrumental behavior includes all activity which is designed to achieve some goal (Alderson 1957, p. 171).


5. Consumer behavior: those acts of individuals directly involved in obtaining and using economic goods and services, including the decision processes that precede and determine these acts (Engle and Blackwell 1982, p. 9).

6. Instrumental behavior: behavior that is cognitively driven (Millar and Tesser 1986, p. 271).

7. Consummatory behavior: behavior that is affectively driven (Millar and Tesser 1986, p. 271).

8. [By] Repeated behavior, we mean any action that is taken more than one time (Ronis, Yates, and Kirsch 1989, p. 213).

9. Behavior is considered to have three components -orientation, strategic objectives, and tactics (Thomas 1976, p. 900).
Conceptual Attributes of Behavior

Based on the differences and similarities between the different conceptualizations of the construct of behavior that were observed in few definitions and numerous empirical treatments, the definition of behavior that would serve the purposes of the current research should account for the following attributes:

1. Behavior should be considered as a mental representation of latent tendencies to respond in particular forms of expression with respect to a topic of thought or an issue/object of behavior. Berkowitz (1962) indicated that people can be thought of as possessing a hierarchy of responses for dealing with conflict situations rather than a single response. In one of the most exciting streams of research in attitude-behavior consistency, Ajzen (1987, 1989 and Fishbein 1977) differentiates conceptually and empirically between specific acts (e.g., going to church on Sunday mornings) and patterns of behavior (e.g., attending religious classes, donating money, saying dinner prayers).
Based on the principle of correspondence or compatibility, Ajzen and Fishbein hypothesized and provided empirical evidence for their contention that specific attitudes predict specific instances of behavior but not patterns of behavior which can be predicted from global attitudes.

2. Behavior is directed toward a topic of thought or an object of behavior (i.e., conflict, in the present research) that has some significance to an important aspect of the individual’s life and can be expressed in different modalities and forms. To date, most attitude-behavior research has provided subjects with objects/issues of attitude and behavior (e.g., puzzles, shaving razors, political issues such as voting to a presidential candidate) and attempted to create some significance in the object of behavior (e.g., pleasure evoking, analytic ability enhancing, fewer cuts and nicks, fewer taxes) to an important aspect of the individual’s life (e.g., need for emotional discharge, need for information, smooth face, disposable income). For example, Millar and Tesser (1986) used puzzles in this study of attitude-behavior consistency. They informed a
group of subjects that the puzzles were designed to improve their analytic ability and told another that the puzzles were for pleasure. Further, Millar and Tesser emphasized to one group of subjects that they would receive an analytic ability test at the end of the experiment and to another that they would be tested on social sensitivity. It appears that by following the above described experimental procedures the researchers introduced the topic of thought to their subjects (puzzles), attached a significant attribute to the object (potential by design either to improve analytic ability or to provide pleasure), and instructed subjects that an aspect of their lives was important (analytic ability or social sensitivity).

3. Behavior patterns encompass a variety of action tendencies (i.e., verbal, nonverbal) that are organized through learning and experience. The notions of repeated behavior (e.g., Ronis, Yates, and Kirsch 1989), planned behavior (e.g., Ajzen 1989), and habitual behavior (e.g., Ronis et al. 1989) all imply that people learn and store action tendencies for future references. For example, the
notion of planned behavior is considered to include the consideration of the attributes of the issue/object, the perceived social influence of significant others, and the perceived behavioral control; these cognitive processes cannot be thought of as occurring in an impulse fashion or as involving a single memory storage. Alternatively, the notion of habitual behavior may imply that behavior has been repeated for several times to the extent that it is no longer directly influenced by beliefs, outcomes of behavior, attitudes, or a conscious decision to behave in a certain way; it can be said that these responses (habitual responses) were learned and eventually stored in memory for future references.

Requirements in the Definition of Behavior

The conceptual definition of behavior that is provided in the current research encompasses the conceptual attributes of behavior in the literature and remains within the conceptual boundaries envisioned in past research. Hence, the following criteria are used in this study to define behavior.
1. Behavior is a conceptual entity that can be inferred from verbal and nonverbal measurable responses.

2. Behavior cannot be confined to a specific mode of mental representation (i.e., semantic memory, working memory, procedural memory); rather it is represented mentally in different memory storages.

3. Behavior is associated with an object/issue (topic of thought).

4. Behavior is conceptually organized through learning and experience processes.

5. Behavior is associated with anticipated consequences.

The Definition of Behavior

In accordance with the preceding criteria, behavior is viewed in this research "as a mental representation of patterns
of interrelated responses that can be directed toward a topic of thought that has some significance to an important aspect of the individual’s life, organized through learning and experience, and has potential for remedial results.”

Structural Antecedents of Conflict-Management Behavior

The second question in this research concerns identifying the structural antecedents of the psychological construct of conflict-management behavior. Unfortunately, the extant body of theory and research in behavioral sciences does not specify the primary mental elements comprising the construct of behavior. However, there is enough evidence to suggest that this construct is a multicomponent entity existing as a function of different types of information about behavioral resources (i.e., facilitating or impeding factors) and behavioral opportunities (i.e., organizational and personal interests). The following sections provide a discussion of what extant definitions of behavior, social psychology literature, and conflict research suggest about the structural antecedents of conflict-management behavior.
Behavior Definitions

One approach to specifying the causal determinants of behavior is by examining its different definitions. As exemplified in table 2, the usage of the term behavior has been diverse. Some restricted definitions treat the term behavior at the methodological rather than at the theoretical level. These definitions identify the concept of behavior most closely with observable acts (e.g., Cacioppo et al. 1981). Specifically, these definitions postulate that mental activities involved in similar observable acts cannot be distinguished from each other. However, this is not universally true. For example, two different managers involved in different conflict situations may respond to their conflicts similarly (e.g., give a 10% volume discount) but for different reasons. This could be the case where one of the managers is punishing his/her opponent for conducting an undesirable behavior by reducing the normal volume discount from 15% to 10%. However, the other manager may be averting the pressure of his/her opponent by increasing the normal volume discount from 5% to 10% and as demanded.
Some of the other definitions indicate that the construct of behavior exists at the conceptual level as a multidimensional rather than a unidimensional entity. Alderson (1957) classified consumer behavior into congenial and instrumental forms. He differentiated between the two components not only on the basis of their outcomes (i.e., pleasure, goal achievement) but also on the basis of their structural antecedents. Congenial behavior was viewed to be a function of pleasurable excitations furnished by the environment and the actor's repertoire of pleasurable experiences. Alternatively, instrumental behavior was viewed to be a function of the actor's own power in terms of his/her capacity and resources.

More recent definitions (e.g., Engle and Blackwell 1982, Millar and Tesser 1986, Thomas 1976) also imply that the concept of behavior is a multicomponent entity existing as a function of different types of information. For example, the dichotomy of behavior into instrumental and consummatory (Millar and Tesser 1986) specifically designates objective information as a necessary antecedent for instrumental behavior and subjective information for consummatory behavior.
Social Psychology Literature

Another approach to identifying the causal determinants of the concept of behavior is to examine its empirically documented relationship to other psychological constructs such as attitude. A substantial body of research has examined the attitude-behavior relationship with the aim of answering the question, "Do people behave in accordance with their attitudes?" Research on this issue has proposed several solutions, two of which are the match-mismatch hypothesis (Millar and Tesser 1986) and the theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1985, Ajzen and Madden 1986).

Match-Mismatch Hypothesis

The match-mismatch hypothesis was proposed in an attempt to provide a resolution to past contradictory findings in attitude-behavior relationship research. Prior to the experiment of Millar and Tesser (1986), several studies have reported high attitude-behavior correlations while several others have reported low correlations. For example, Fazio, Zanna, and Cooper (1978) stimulated their subjects to think about some experimental
puzzles by instructing them to empathize with a similar individual who was videotaped playing with the same puzzles. Fazio et al. reported that subjects who were led to focus on the puzzles behaved in accordance with their reported attitudes whereas subjects in the control condition did not (who were not instructed to think about the puzzles). In sharp contrast, Wilson, Dunn, Bybee, Hyman, and Rotondo (1984) conducted a conceptual replication of Fazio et al's (1978) and found results that were contradictory to those reported by Fazio et al.

Millar and Tesser (1986) proposed that behavior (playing with puzzles) should be considered as a two-component entity composed of an instrumental component and consummatory component. They suggested that "[T]here are probably a number of dimensions that would make either the attributes of the object or the feelings the object evokes more important in directing behavior [italics added]." Since those dimensions are the primary reason for considering the observed action (i.e., playing with puzzles) to be conceptually labeled either as instrumental or as consummatory behavior, it is appropriate to suggest that those dimensions are the primary causal elements of behavior. The
question remaining to be answered is what are those dimensions? Millar and Tesser gave an example of one dimension (antecedent of behavior) for each behavioral component. For the instrumental component, they mentioned the development of, and the effect on the analytic ability of their subjects and for the consummatory component, the opportunity for pleasure derived from playing with the puzzles was considered to be the primary factor driving behavior. Moreover, Millar and Tesser provided empirical evidence for the hypothesis that people behaved in accordance with their attitudes if behavior was consummatory and attitude was affective or behavior was instrumental and attitude was cognitive (match situation) and people did not if otherwise (mismatch situation).

Theory of Planned Behavior

The theory of planned behavior (Ajzen 1985, Ajzen and Madden 1986) proposes that the intention to perform an act captures the motivational factors that have an impact on behavior. Two of the proposed factors are the subjective norm, which is considered to be a social factor, and the degree of
perceived behavioral control. The underlying determinants of the social factor are the normative beliefs about how significant other people feel the actor ought to act, weighted by the motivation of the actor to comply, and summed over all important others. The immediate antecedents of the perceived behavioral control, on the other hand, are the beliefs about the presence or absence of requisite behavioral resources and opportunities, weighted by the perceived ease or difficulty of performing the act, and summed over all requisite resources and opportunities.

A great deal of research has been conducted within the framework of the theory of planned behavior. Considerable evidence has accumulated in support of the postulate that the immediate antecedents of intentions are the subjective norm and the perceived behavioral control factors. For example, Schifter and Ajzen (1985) used this theory to the prediction of weight loss intentions and actual weight loss among college students. They measured the subjective norm element on a scale of 0-7 by asking subjects whether people who were important to them thought they should loose weight. The perceived behavioral control factor was measured on a 0-100 scale by asking subjects
about the likelihood whether an attempt to reduce weight would be successful. Schifter and Ajzen applied a hierarchical regression analysis and found that the subjective norm and the perceived behavioral control factors had significant regression coefficients and each had made a significant contribution to the prediction of intentions. Knowing that intentions are considered to be an "immediate antecedent of behavior" (Ajzen 1989, p. 25), it seems that the theory of planned behavior implies that behavioral resources and opportunities are the immediate causal antecedents of behavior.

Conflict Research

The conflict literature has widely examined conflict management. However, this literature has referred to the casual determinants of conflict-management behavior only in few instances. Stern and Gorman (1969) categorized conflict-management behavior "into two broad conceptual categories: (1) the exercise of power and (2) intraorganizational change" (p. 161). Stern and Gorman emphasize that the first reaction to conflict situation is the use of the power alternative to remove
the cause of conflict. If the power alternative is not used, then
an attempt is made to institute a change in the frustrated party's
ends and means. Classifying conflict-management behavior into
the power and intraorganizational change classes implies the
following: (1) a manager opting for power in managing a conflict
should know that s/he possesses the requisite behavioral
resources for resolving the conflict (i.e., possession of power)
and (2) a manager selecting intraorganizational change should be
aware of his/her opportunities in changing own behavior, goals,
or relationships.

Finally, the structural model of conflict behavior (Thomas
1976) views behavior to be shaped by several structural factors.
These are the behavioral predispositions of the conflicting party,
social pressure, incentive structure, and rules and procedures
governing the behavior of both members of the conflict. Thomas
considers the factor of behavioral predispositions to be stemming
from the motives (e.g., need for a affiliation) and abilities (e.g.,
power) of conflicting members of the dyad. It is assumed that a
member of a conflict situation has a hierarchy of responses for
dealing with the conflict. At the top of this hierarchy is the
dominant response or the behavior that the manager "tends to use habitually and feels most comfortable with." (p. 913).

Thomas sees the social pressure factor as the explicit and implicit demands of immediate and remote interest groups with respect to the most desirable conflict behavior and behavioral outcomes. This factor is also seen to be influenced by the group's abilities (e.g., possession of competitive orientation, excellent negotiation skills) and motives or opportunities (e.g., unity of purpose, take a pound of flesh of the company).

The factor of incentive structure concerns the stakes of each member (the concerns of both members) of the conflict involved in the conflict relationship. These concerns are thought to provide opportunities for different behaviors (Thomas 1976). For example, if the stakes in the relationship are high, the conflicting member is expected to be more assertive in his conflict behavior.

Finally, the factor of rules and procedures is seen to make up the "established decision making machinery" which governs
the negotiations of the two parties (Thomas 1976, p. 918). These rules and procedures are thought to provide the limits on what is and what is not available and what is and what is not acceptable in resolving the conflict.

The four factors which are thought to shape conflict-management behavior in the structural model seem to encompass two broad categories of antecedents of behavior. These are the resources that are available to the conflicting member of the dyad and the opportunities or the motives that may underlie a given behavior. For example, the hierarchy of responses, in the factor of behavioral predispositions, is thought to be established on sufficient information about the availability of behavioral facilitators and/or impediments. It is unlikely to have an assertive-style behavior at the top of the hierarchy unless the individual knows with some degree of confidence that s/he has the power and means to exhibit the behavior. Alternatively, a member of the conflict may succumb to pressure because s/he sees that accommodating the other member's desires provides an opportunity for a continued profitable relationship. Therefore, it is suggested in the context of the current research that these
factors be rearranged under the headings of behavioral resources and behavioral opportunities.

Summary

A multidisciplinary examination of the literatures of marketing, organization behavior, and social psychology was provided in this chapter for the purpose of: (1) defining the theoretical constructs of conflict, attitude toward conflict, and conflict-management behavior and (2) identifying the structural antecedents of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior. It was pointed that there were no universally accepted definitions of conflict, attitude, and behavior. Extant definitions that were originally devised to fit particular streams of research were not found to fit the unique purposes of the current research. Therefore, new encapsulations for these major constructs were provided.

Extant definitions of attitude, current theories of attitude and persuasion, and channel research were examined in this chapter for the purpose of identifying the structural antecedents
of attitude toward conflict. The examination revealed that different types of information about the attitude issue/object (i.e., conflict) are necessary for attitude formation. These types of information are the objective attributes of the attitude issue/object and the contextual or configural cues that are associated with the attitude issue/object. Similarly, the structural antecedents of conflict-management behavior were identified from extant definitions of behavior, social psychology literature, and conflict literature. Supportive evidence was accumulated to demonstrate that the structural antecedents of conflict-management behavior were the behavioral resources and opportunities available to the individual manager.

A discussion of the conceptual organization of attitude and behavior in the context of conflict management is provided in the next chapter. The relationship between attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior is also discussed in the next chapter. The psychological process linking conflict-management behavior to attitude toward conflict is explicated.
CHAPTER III

THE CONCEPTUAL ORGANIZATION OF ATTITUDE AND BEHAVIOR
AND THE ATTITUDE-BEHAVIOR RELATIONSHIP
IN THE CONTEXT OF CONFLICT

Overview

Conceptual definitions of the theoretical constructs of conflict, attitude toward conflict, and conflict-management behavior were provided in chapter two. The causal determinants of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior were identified. Theoretical evidence suggesting that the causal antecedents of attitude toward conflict were different types of information about the attributes of the attitude conflict and the contextual cues associated with it was cited. Additional evidence suggesting that the causal determinants of conflict-management behavior were behavioral resources and opportunities available to the manager was provided.
The purpose of this chapter is to identify: (1) the conceptual organization of attitude toward conflict, (2) the conceptual organization of conflict-management behavior, and (3) attitude-behavior relationship in conflict management.

The Structure of Attitude Toward Conflict

The concept of attitude toward conflict is a latent variable which is not amenable to direct observation. Being inaccessible to direct measurement, attitude toward conflict must be inferred from measurable responses.

Generally, the intellectual aims of the interested researcher determine the use of one or a combination of several standard attitude measures (e.g., self-reports, Likert scale). However, the utilization of any one of these measurement techniques should not be a consequence of any arbitrary decision; rather, it should be governed by an underlying belief about the conceptual organization of the concept of attitude. For example, if a researcher believes that attitude is a general positive or negative feeling (e.g., likes and dislikes) about the attitude issue/object, then s/he may be more inclined to use a semantic
differential or a self-rating scale of good-bad or favorableness-unfavorableness of the attitude issue/object (e.g., Bem 1970, Greenwald 1989, Petty and Cacioppo 1981).

Alternatively, if a researcher believes that attitude is composed of cognitions, values, beliefs, and opinions about the attitude issue/object (e.g., McGuire 1985, 1989), then s/he may be more inclined to decide on a Guttman or a Likert scale of agree-disagree belief statements about the attributes of the attitude issue/object.

It appears that the way a researcher conceives of the mental organization of the concept of attitude is of great importance in determining the estimation technique of this construct and in assessing its theoretical relationship to other psychological constructs such as behavior. Attitude research has suggested several views (models) of the mental structure of the concept of attitude (see for instance, Ajzen 1987, 1989, Ajzen and Fishbein 1977, Bagozzi and Burnkrant 1979, Cacioppo, Petty, and Geen 1989, Cohen, Fishbein, and Ahtola 1972, Kothandapani 1971, McGuire 1989, Rosenberg 1956). By far, the multiattribute
and the multidimensional views of attitude are the most prominent that are vying for the attention of attitude theory and research.

The Multiattribute Approach

Considerable research has used the multiattribute approach for the purpose of isolating the determinants of behavior including attitude. Additionally, this approach has been used to identify the structure of attitudes toward topics of thought (e.g., a brand of toothpaste, channel conflict). In general terms, the multiattribute conceptualization of attitude depicts this concept as being composed of the individual's beliefs about the likelihood that a particular attribute (behavior) will result in a particular outcome multiplied by the individual's evaluation, preference, or desirability of the outcome, the products are summed or averaged to yield a general evaluation of the issue/object.

Several versions of the multiattribute conceptualization of the structure of attitude have appeared in the literature. Depending on the theoretical orientation of the developer of each version, these versions were given different names such as
means-ends, (e.g., Rosenberg 1956), adequacy-importance (e.g., Cohen, Fishbein, and Ahtola 1972), expectancy-value (e.g., Ajzen 1985, 1989, Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Ajzen and Madden 1986), and properties- desirability (e.g., McGuire 1985). Algebraically, attitude in most of these versions is expressed as follows:

\[ A_o = \sum^n Bi \ ai \]

where

\( A_o = \) attitude toward the topic of thought (i.e., issue, object, act).

\( Bi = \) belief about the likelihood that the topic of thought will result in outcome i.

\( ai = \) the individual's evaluation (value importance) of outcome i.

\( n = \) number of beliefs or value states.

Undesirable Properties of the Multiattribute Approach

While there are some desirable features of the multiattribute model of attitude structure such as its simplicity and easy quantification, there are some undesirable properties that deserve special attention. These properties are:
First, humans are postulated to function solely as information-processing machines in the course of developing their attitudes toward issues and objects. Unfortunately, no empirical evidence has been presented to show that people are always interested in thinking about and elaborating incoming information. Miller et al. suggests that “it may be irrational to scrutinize the plethora of counterattitudinal messages received daily. To the extent that one possesses only a limited amount of information processing time and capacity, such scrutiny would disengage the thought process from the exigencies of daily life” (Miller, Maruyama, Beaber, and Valone 1976, p.623). Some other research has also noted that people can be best described as “cognitive misers” in some situations (e.g., Burnkrant 1976, McGuire 1969). Thus, it seems that the notion that all attitudes are based solely on attributes is not universal.

Second, there has been no empirical evidence presented to show that the different versions of the multiattribute conceptualization of attitude yield equivalent findings. Perhaps
the different wordings that are used to measure the different components (e.g., importance of attribute i vs. belief that the behavior will result in outcome i) and the variations in measuring these components (e.g., semantic differential vs. self-reports) lead to statistically different findings in predicting attitudes and/or behavior. Additionally, it is not known whether cognitive algebra follows a summation or an averaging rule in combining the products of attributes X evaluations (e.g., Anderson 1981, Fishbein 1980).

Third, although it is recognized by many researchers that one of the important characteristics of attitude is its affective (pro-con, positive-negative evaluation) dimension, affect is postulated in the multiattribute view as being a post-cognitive activity. While there are some strong believers in the predominance of cognitions (e.g., Lazarus 1982), there are some researchers who argue that feeling and thinking are two independent evaluating systems (e.g., Fisk and Taylor 1984, Zajonc 1980). Fisk and Taylor (1984) subscribe to the notion that affect and cognitions are stored separately in the human brain.
Finally, research in the area of persuasion and attitude change has shown that different variables affect persuasion differently under different conditions of self-relevance. For example, the quality of the argument (pertinent to cognitions) included in a persuasive appeal has had greater impact on persuasion under high rather than low involvement conditions (e.g., Petty, Cacioppo, and Heesacker 1981). Alternatively, contextual cues such as the attractiveness of the sponsor have had greater impact on attitude change under low rather than high involvement conditions (e.g., Chaiken 1980).

It appears that there are conditions under which attitude change would be a result of information processing and there are some other conditions under which attitude change could be a consequence of simply considering the cues that are associated with the attitude issue/object. Because the multiattribute model of attitude structure does not consider those conditions under which attitude is not an outcome of information processing, it would be doubtful to suggest that this model would be an accurate representation of attitude toward conflict.
The Multidimensional Approach

The multidimensional approach has been used heavily to identify the major properties, classes, or components that are denoted by the responses of individuals to an attitude issue/object. The basic assumption of the multidimensional (also called multicomponential) representation of attitude is that this concept is a second-order entity composed of first-order response tendencies (e.g., Allport 1935, McGuire 1969, Rosenberg and Hovland 1960, Scott 1968, Smith, Bruner, and White 1956, Thurstone 1931). The rest of this section will discuss the single-component, two-component, and three-component views of the structure of attitude.

Single-Component View

Thurstone (1931), the father of modern attitude measurement, noted that all researchers and theorists agreed that attitudes possessed an affective dimension which included the properties of directionality and extremity. Having identified the affective dimension, he conceived of an attitude as being the amount of feeling or affect for or against the attitude object, and
constructed a scale for estimating individual differences on the postulated unidimensional continuum. The logic of Thurstone's scale posits that individuals possess a variety of beliefs about the attitude object that might be logically or affectively incompatible with each other. Accordingly, Thurstone defined the attitudinal affect as being equal to the median evaluative scale value of all belief statements. Therefore, the evaluative loading of the information or belief statements about the attitude object, rather than its cognitive content, was postulated to influence the attitudinal affect of individuals.

In agreement with Thurstone's unidimensional view of attitude structure, many researchers have identified the attitude concept with affect. Consider, for example, the following definitions of attitude:

1. Attitudes are likes and dislikes (Bem 1970, p. 14).
2. An attitude is a feeling that an attitude object is good or bad, fair or unfair (Collins 1970, p. 71).
3. An attitude is the evaluative feeling that is evoked by a given object (Fazio and Zanna 1981, p. 162).
4. The major characteristic that distinguishes attitude from other concepts is its evaluative or affective nature (Fishbein and Ajzen 1975, p. 11).

Similarly, Ajzen (1989) noted that attitudes were the individuals' dispositions to respond favorably or unfavorably to the attitude objects. He also pointed out that "most contemporary social psychologists seem to agree that the major characteristic attribute of attitude is its evaluative (pro-con, positive-negative) dimension." Ajzen argues that all attitude scaling techniques result in a score that locates the individual on an evaluative continuum regarding the attitude object. In parallel arguments, Fishbein (1967) and Fishbein and Ajzen (1975) pointed out that although some definitions of attitude refer to three components, it is the evaluative or affective component that is usually measured and treated as attitude. According to this view, alternative measures of attitude should provide the same results and the differences should be attributed to measurement errors and not to the assessment of different attitudinal dimensions or components.
Three-Component View

The unidimensional view of attitude was challenged by an alternative conceptualization which contends that attitude is a multidimensional entity composed of affective (i.e., feelings and emotions), cognitive (i.e., beliefs and thoughts), and conative (i.e., policy inclinations, behavioral intentions) components (e.g., Allport 1935, Ostrom 1969, Rosenberg and Hovland 1960, Scott 1968, Smith et al. 1956). Allport (1935) agreed that many attitudes possess an evaluative dimension but he argued that this feature is primarily characteristic of primitive attitudes. He also noted that:

And yet attitudes are not readily classified (as positive or negative). What shall one do, for example, with a detached, impersonal, or judicial attitude, or with an attitude of neutrality? Complacency, amusement, tolerance, and open-mindedness are not easily reduced to "affect for or against" an object... is the degree of positive or negative affect aroused by the concept of "God" as significant as the qualitative distinctions involved in theistic, deistic, pantheistic, agnostic, intellectualistic, or emotional attitudes? When one speaks of attitudes toward sex, it is obviously the qualitative distinctions that have any intelligible meaning. What is a "serene and benevolent mind?" Certainly not one devoid of attitudes, not yet one that is a battleground of tendencies "for" and tendencies "against." All of these objections to the unidimensional view argue strongly for the recognition of the qualitative nature of attitudes (pp. 819-820).

In recognition of the qualitative nature of attitudes, Smith et al. (1956) conceived of an attitude as having several properties
including salience (i.e., the extent to which the attitude is central in the concerns of everyday life), object value (i.e., was the affective tone engendered by the attitude), and orientation (i.e., behavioral intention aroused by the attitude). Scott (1968) provided another list of attitude dimensions that included attitude direction, cognitive complexity, and overtness. However, subsequent treatments recognized that most of the attitude dimensions that were proposed could be conceptualized as representing three classes of responses: (1) affective responses concerning the feelings and emotions about the attitude object, (2) cognitive responses concerning the thoughts and beliefs about the attitude object, and (3) conative responses concerning the action plans evoked by the attitude object. These classes of responses were considered to be the valid components of attitude by many researchers (e.g., Ostrom 1969, Rosenberg and Hovland 1960).

The model that was offered by Rosenberg and Hovland (1960) is considered by many researchers to be the basis for most contemporary analyses of the attitude concept. This model contends that attitude is a second-order entity comprised of
affective, cognitive, and conative first-order responses. It is also suggested that each response class is mediated by a conceptually independent component. Ostrom (1969) pointed out that the affective, cognitive, and conative response classes could be used to assess how an individual evaluated an attitude object. He concluded that although each class of responses could be used to measure the evaluative reaction, the responses were conceptually independent. Greenwald (1968) suggested that these three components might have different causal antecedents. He suggested that the cognitive component may be formed by cognitive learning, the affective component by classical conditioning, and the conative component by operant conditioning.

The three-component representation of attitude has achieved considerable adoption and recognition (e.g., Greenwald 1989, Kothandapani 1971, McGuire 1969). In an experiment that was designed for predicting contraceptive behavior among low income Negro women, Kothandapani (1971) examined the discriminant and convergent validity of this tripartite conceptualization of attitude. He found convincing evidence both to support this classification and to conclude that conation was a
better predictor of contraceptive behavior than either of the other two components of attitude (cognitive and affective components). However, Bagozzi (1978) reanalyzed Kothandapani's data and did not find evidence of discriminant validity to support the tripartite conceptualization.

**Two-Component View**

The inclusion of conation in attitude organization is not universally accepted. This is because the difficulty of observing direct behavior has resulted in the use of behavioral intentions as a surrogate for behavior by many researchers. This conceptual equivalence may explain the findings of higher conation than affect or cognition-behavior correlations in Kothandapani's experiment. Indeed, many researchers considered intentions to be at a lower level of abstraction than cognitions and affect and treated intentions as dependent effects of affective and/or cognitive factors.

An intermediate position between the tricomponential and the unicomponential representations of attitude is maintained in
the current research. That is, attitude is considered to be a complex entity comprised of affective and cognitive components. The conative component is considered to be a causal consequence of either or both attitude components. Conations (behavioral intentions) are considered to be an evaluative response based on the more accessible, more salient of only two attitude components -affect or cognitions (e.g., Bagozzi and Burnkrant 1979, Millar and Tesser 1986). This position is in full agreement with other positions made by Katz and Stotland (1959) and Rosenberg (1968) who asserted that all attitudes must have both cognitive and affective components although they need not include a conation component. Regarding behavioral intentions, Triandis (1980) disassociated them from the concept of attitude by considering them to be plans or “instructions people give themselves to behave in certain ways” (p. 203).

In accordance with the specific aims of the present research, attitude toward conflict is thought to involve cognitive and affective components. However, the cognitive-affective distinction may imply that each component is completely devoid of the psychological processes of the other. On the contrary,
depending on the availability or lack of substantive information about the conflict situation, the cognitive factors, the affective factors, or a combination of both factors may be dominant and primary in formulating the attitude (e.g., Millar and Tesser 1986, Petty and Cacioppo 1986). Lazarus (1982) pointed out that even basic emotional responses require some primitive cognitive activity. Therefore, the present research prefers to use the terms objective and subjective attitude in acknowledgement of possible cognitive-affective interaction.

The specific cognitions that are employed in the context of conflict in this research are: (1) Knowledge of the distribution of power between the conflicting members of a dyad, (2) beliefs about the compatibility of the goals of both members of the dyad, (3) Knowledge of the outcomes of different courses of action regarding the conflict situation, (4) knowledge of the dependence structure of both members of the conflicting dyad, and (5) knowledge of the degree of the conflict intensity. As has been maintained by many researchers (e.g., Ostrom 1969), the cognitive component of attitude toward the conflict includes beliefs about
the conflict, characteristics of the conflict situation, and relationships of the conflict issue to other issues.

The affective component (subjective component in this research) is considered to contain the encodings of emotional attraction to, or the feelings evoked by the attitude issue/object (i.e., conflict). The English language is full of words that denote different subjective feeling states. However, the literature has proposed different taxonomies based on empirical investigations of affective experiences elicited by different attitudinal issues. One of the most popular taxonomies is Izard's (1977) which proposes ten fundamental affects. These affects are interest, joy, anger, disgust, contempt, distress, fear, shame, guilt, and surprise. Of this list, two positive (interest, joy), two negative (anger, distress) and one neutral (surprise) affects will be used in this research. These affects are selected for the following reasons: (1) they are considered by many researchers to be the most dominant affective responses involved in attitudes (e.g., Zajonc 1980), (2) a balance between the number of positive and negative affective responses is desired in the present research,
and (3) the remaining responses are all negative and might be appropriately captured by the two negative responses that are selected here.

The Structure of Conflict-Management Behavior

The fourth question in the present research concerns the conceptual organization of the psychological construct of conflict-management behavior. Thurstone (1931) pointed out that overt actions of two individuals toward an object may take quite different forms although the two individuals may hold the same attitude toward the object. More recently, Fazio and Zanna have recognized the existence of different classes of behavior that can be predicted from different attitudes. They argued that researchers should start to address the question of "what kinds of attitudes ... predict what kinds of behavior?" (Fazio and Zanna 1981, p.165, Zanna and Fazio 1982, p. 285).
Behavioral Integration and Differentiation

The notion of behavioral integration (having consistency among behavioral tendencies) and differentiation (having inconsistency among groups of behavioral tendencies) has its roots in behavior sciences and is relevant to the current discussion. The clearest support to the notion of behavioral integration comes from works conducted by researchers such as Ajzen (1989, Ajzen and Fishbein 1980, Fishbein and Ajzen 1974, 1975) and Schlegel and DiTecco (1982) in the area of attitude-behavior relationship. Schlegel and DiTecco (1982) suggested that an overall evaluative measure of attitude will capture a behavioral domain to the extent that the domain itself is well integrated rather than highly differentiated. Ajzen (1989) interpreted that to mean that the factor structure of the behavioral domain should be examined and if a single factor is found, then the domain is well integrated.

Support for this hypothesis was provided by experiments conducted by Buss and Craik (1980) and Fishbein and Ajzen (1974). In Fishbein and Ajzen (1974), students' attitudes toward
religion were assessed by means of four different standard scales. Students then indicated whether or not they had performed each one of 100 religious behaviors. Behaviors were rated in terms of the likelihood that it would be performed by individuals with negative and with positive attitudes toward religion. The absolute difference between the two rating scales was used as a measure of behavior's relevance to the attitude. The measure of relevance was correlated with the correlation between attitude and each one of the 100 behaviors. Results showed that the correlation between attitude and any single action could be predicted from the action's relevance to the behavioral domain.

However, a behavioral domain that is considered to be relevant to a general evaluation of attitude is largely defined by some combination of feelings and cognitions. Assuming that a particular evaluation of attitude is mainly comprised of feelings, then the set of behaviors that are largely influenced by feelings would exhibit high integration while other behaviors that are mainly influenced by beliefs and thoughts about the attitude object would not. Following Ajzen's (1989) in his suggestion to
factor analyze the overt actions, the finding of two or more factors exhibiting within-factor consistency and across-factor divergence may mean that for a general evaluation of attitude there are two or more behavioral domains. Since these domains are conceptually differentiated, it may be appropriate to call them conceptual components, categories, or classes of behavior.

**Current Views of Behavior**

Despite the recognized importance of behavioral taxonomies (e.g., Ajzen 1989, Barker 1963), few studies have attempted to describe the conceptual structure of the concept of behavior. Taxonomies that have been proposed include instrumental and consummatory behavior (social behavior, Millar and Tesser 1986) and utilitarian and hedonic behavior (consumer behavior, Batra 1986, Holbrook and Hirschman 1982). In the area of conflict management, the exercise of power and intraorganizational change (Stern and Gorman 1969), coercive and noncoercive (Hunt and Nevin 1974), economic and noneconomic (Etgar 1978) and orientation, strategic objectives, and tactics (Thomas 1976) taxonomies were proposed.
Single Versus Multi-Component Representation of Behavior

A careful examination of the proposed taxonomies reveals that behavior was conceptualized in both unidimensional and multidimensional senses. For example, the intraorganizational change (Stern and Gorman 1969) was not viewed as an explicit response to manage the conflict rather it was viewed as a set of intrafirm adaptation procedures such as goal modification or change of operations instrumental to goal achievement. Thus, their proposed taxonomy collapses to a unidimensional structure of behavior (the power dimension). The taxonomies proposed by Hunt and Nevin (1974) and by Etgar (1978) do not appear to be more than a regrouping effort of the power sources (reward, coercive, legitimate, referent, and expert, French and Raven, 1959) into two categories. Alternatively, The behavioral structures proposed by Millar and Tesser (1986) and by Holbrook and Hirschman (1982) appear to view the concept of behavior as a mental construct composed of two components/dimensions. The consummatory (hedonic) component stems primarily from the pursuit of sensory pleasures, happiness, or any emotional responses consummated coincident with the performance of the
act (i.e., consuming a can of juice, playing with a puzzle for fun). Conversely, the instrumental (utilitarian) component stems primarily from the pursuit of objectives that last beyond the time of the actual overt action (i.e., consuming a can of juice to maintain health, playing with a puzzle to develop analytic ability).

The remaining behavioral taxonomy (Thomas 1976) is of great interest to the current research because it was originated in the area of conflict management. According to Thomas, behavior in the context of conflict management is a tricomponential entity composed of behavioral orientations, strategic objectives, and tactics components. The component of behavioral orientations was thought to encompass competitive, collaborative, accommodative, sharing, and avoidant orientation (1976, p. 900). The five behavioral orientations were defined with respect to the degree a member of the conflict desires to satisfy his/her concerns and the concerns of the opponent. For example, a desire to satisfy own concerns irrespective of those of the opponent represents a competitive behavioral orientation while a desire to satisfy the opponent's concerns irrespective of
own concerns represents an accommodative orientation. Alternatively, a desire to satisfy the concerns of both members of the conflict represents a collaborative orientation while a desire to satisfy some concerns of both parties to the conflict represents a sharing orientation. Finally, if the conflict member does not have the desire to address the conflict, then his/her behavioral orientation is called avoidant or withdrawal.

The component of strategic objectives was viewed with respect to a two-dimensional joint outcome space. The integrative dimension of the space refers to the total amount of satisfaction for both parties to the conflict while the distributive dimension refers to the proportion of that satisfaction realized by each member. The preference of the conflicting member along any one of these two dimensions is thought to interact with the way s/he conceptualizes the issue of conflict (i.e., attitude toward conflict) and the distribution of power between the two members. This interaction results in a better assessment of the most feasible behavioral orientation.
The final component of conflict-management behavior is the tactics component. The behavioral tactics that are available for a manager to handle a conflict are grouped under the headings of competitive tactics and collaborative tactics. The competitive tactics involve the use of power sources to influence the opponent at the bargaining table while the collaborative tactics involve a thorough consideration of the conflict issue in an attempt to find the best solution that would satisfy both members the most and equally.

However, further scrutiny of the two components of strategic objectives and tactics shows that although these so-called components have a great impact on conflict-management behavior, they are not part of this behavior. The strategic objectives are the outcomes sought to be attained by managing the conflict (causal consequences and antecedents of conflict-management behavior). The tactics cannot be considered more than the tools, skills, or instruments by which conflict-management behavior can be exhibited. Indeed, the current research maintains that the causal antecedents (but not components) of conflict-management behavior are the resources
available to the conflicting member (i.e., power) and the opportunities or motives that may underlie a given behavior (i.e., sought objectives). Therefore, conflict-management behavior in the process model (Thomas 1976) becomes a unicomponental entity that is composed of five high-order mental abstracts, namely, the competitive, collaborative, accommodative, sharing, and avoidant behavioral orientations.

Two-Component Representation of Behavior

Thomas (1976) pointed out that some researchers tend to group the proposed five behavioral orientations into cooperative and uncooperative components. He argued that the more complex five-category scheme was more desirable to him than the two-category scheme. His logic was that the two-category scheme appears to oversimplify the range of available options and to confuse the two categories with each other or even to reduce them to a single dimension (i.e., a continuum of cooperative orientation with a range of 0 cooperative to full cooperative).
In contrast to the above view, the five behavioral orientations can be easily rearranged along Horney’s (1945) categorization of interpersonal behavior into movement against, movement toward, and movement away from the other. A competitive orientation that entails the use of power to force a resolution to the conflict that would benefit only the powerful member irrespective of the other member’s concerns can be seen as a movement against the other member of the conflict. Similarly, a collaborative orientation that requires addressing the other member of the conflict on equal footing and tackling all the aspects of the conflict while considering the concerns of both members to the conflict can be viewed as a movement against the conflict issue. The common factor between these two behavioral orientations is that they both are some type of aggressive behavior that is directed either toward a person or toward an issue.

Conversely, when a member of the conflict is less powerful than his/her opponent and attempts to accommodate his/her opponent’s demands by sacrificing some of his/her concerns, then s/he would be moving carefully and gently toward the opponent,
may be as a symbol of identification. Similarly, if the member of the conflict is willing to give and take, gain something and let the opponent gain, then s/he would be keeping an eye on the opponent while moving carefully and gently toward resolving the issue of conflict. Finally, if the conflict is not severe enough to require attention, the manager sensing the conflict may avoid addressing the issue of conflict or even bring it to the attention of the opponent.

Based on the preceding discussion, conflict-management behavior is viewed in the context of the current research as a two-componential entity composed of confrontational and lenient components. The confrontational component is comprised of the competitive and collaborative orientations and the lenient component is comprised of the accommodative and compromising (sharing) components. The avoidant orientation, on the other hand, is not regarded to be a component of behavior because it is defined as an absence or lack of conflict-management behavior. The current view of behavior addresses the concerns of Thomas (1976) in the following manner: (1) the proposed available range of behavioral orientations is preserved but rearranged into
confrontational and lenient components of behavior, (2) the avoidant orientation is considered as non-behavior, and (3) the two behavioral components are conceptually different in terms of their structural antecedents, i.e., behavioral resources precede confrontational and opportunities precede lenient component.

**Attitude-Behavior Relation**

The final question in this research concerns the effects of attitude toward conflict on conflict-management behavior. The relationship between attitude and behavior has been the focus of an increasingly large number of empirical and conceptual research in social psychology. Early conceptions assumed that people’s behavior toward an issue/object can be accurately predicted from their attitudes toward the same issue/object. Indeed, most definitions of attitude stress the notion that this concept has a dynamic or directive influence on behavior (e.g., Allport 1935, Campbell 1950, Green 1954). For example, Green (1954) asserted that “the concept of attitude implies a consistency or predictability of responses” (p. 336).
However, the notion of one-to-one correspondence between attitude and behavior was not universally accepted. Festinger (1964) observed a lack of evidence to support the hypothesis that attitude change resulted in a corresponding change in behavior. Perhaps the greatest challenge to the notion of attitude-behavior consistency was put forth by Wicker's (1969) extensive review of the literature. Wicker concluded that "these studies suggest that it is considerably more likely that attitudes will be unrelated or only slightly related to overt behaviors than that attitudes will be closely related to actions" (p. 65). Wicker reported that correlations between attitude and behavior were rarely above .30 and often were near zero. More recent, several researchers have described the research findings of attitude-behavior relationship as equivocal at best (e.g., Ajzen 1987, Ajzen and Fishbein 1977, Bagozzi and Burnkrant 1979, Millar and Tesser 1986). These and more similar cautionary notes have not gone in vain. A great number of social psychologists began to examine the attitude-behavior consistency under different conditions and have suggested some areas (conditions) under which attitude and behavior would or would not correlate. An area that has captured much attention, and is also the focus of the present research, is
the effect of reflecting on mental states about the attitude issue/object on attitude-behavior consistency.

**Effects of Thought on Attitude-Behavior Relation**

Several experiments have demonstrated that varying the context of thought about the attitude issue/object affected the attitude-behavior relationship. The context of thought was varied by different researchers by administering different procedures such as projecting subjects on a self-awareness scale (e.g., Fenigstein, Scheier, and Buss 1975, Scheier, Buss, and Buss 1978), providing some subjects with a mirror (e.g., Pryor, Gibbons, Wicklund, Fazio, and Hood 1977), or instructing different subjects to think about the attitude issue/object in different ways (e.g., Millar and Tesser 1986, Wilson et al. 1984). The main supposition underlying this line of research is that reflecting on mental states about the attitude issue/object enhances the saliency of true attitudes thereby making them good predictors of behavior.

In one experiment, Scheier et al. (1978) hypothesized that people high in self-awareness (presumably reflect more on their
mental states) would behave more in accordance with their reported attitudes than people low in self-awareness (presumably reflecting less on their mental states). The researchers used a self-awareness scale that was developed by Fenigstein et al. (1975) to classify subjects into high and low on the self-awareness dimension and used a hostility inventory scale that was developed by Buss (1975) to assess the subjects' aggressive behavior. Scheier et al. reported higher attitude-behavior correlation for people who were rated high on the self-awareness dimension ($r=.66$) than for people who were rated low on the same dimension ($r=.09$). Similar results were reported by several other experiments that were conducted in the same area of interest. For example, Pryor et al. (1977) presented a group of subjects with a mirror during the administration of a questionnaire that was designed to assess sociability while another group in the same experiment was not presented with a mirror. Later, each one of the subjects was observed interacting with a confederate from the opposite gender who assumed a passive role. The subjects' behavior was inferred from sociability ratings provided by the confederates and from the number of words emitted by each subject. The study reported
higher attitude-behavior correlations for subjects with a mirror 
(r=.55 and .73) than for subjects without a mirror (r=.03 and .28).

However, it is unreasonable to think that managers in 
natural settings should be provided with mirrors or should be 
asked to fill self-consciousness scales each time they are faced 
with conflict. What is more probable is that a manager would 
attempt to bring to consciousness all available information about 
the conflict issue and about the means by which the conflict 
could be managed. Information that is made salient about the 
issue of conflict would then be the decisive factor in formulating 
a general evaluation (attitude) of the conflict. If this 
information is comprised mainly of beliefs and thoughts, then the 
general evaluation will be more objective than subjective. 
Conversely, if what is made salient is mainly feelings and 
emotions evoked by the presence of conflict, then the evaluation 
will be more subjective than objective. Additionally, a 
knowledge of thorough understanding of the conflict issue coupled 
with feelings of power over the opponent raises the manager's 
confidence of mastering the situation, thereby producing a 
tendency to be more confrontational (i.e., direct to the point) than 
lenient in managing the conflict. However, if the manager feels a
sense of helplessness and a lack of mastery over the conflict situation, then it would be more likely that opportunities for maintaining higher degrees of personal and organizational satisfaction (i.e., affiliating with opponent, continuing a rewarding relationship) will come to play and insight the manager to be more lenient in probing possible solutions.

The Psychological Process Linking Behavior to Attitude

Even though both concepts of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior have been decomposed into two components per each, it is still possible to argue for a weak or even a no relationship between the two concepts. Therefore, the conceptual feasibility of separating the components of attitude and those of behavior will not be fully comprehended unless the components of attitude exhibit differential impact on the components of behavior. That is, the same component of attitude should not have equal influence on both components of behavior and the same component of behavior should not be equally predicted by both components of attitude. Hence, the question is what type of behavior (confrontational, lenient) is driven by what type of attitude (objective, subjective)? In other words, what is
the psychological process that links behaviors to attitudes? A satisfactory answer to the previous question was found in the literature. Snyder (1982) proposes that attitude-behavior consistency is mediated by two principles. These are the availability principle and the relevance principle.

**The Availability Principle**

The availability principle contends that “only individuals who know what they believe and who know the implications of what they believe for what they do are in a position to put their belief into practice” (p. 113). Applying this principle to a conflict situation implies that the availability of substantive information about the conflict issue and about conflict-management alternatives would result in “putting belief into practice” or high attitude-behavior correlations. Because the availability of substantive information about the conflict situation results in formulating an objective evaluation and the availability of substantive information about courses of conflict management leads to a confrontational behavioral tendency, it stands to conclude that objective attitudes produce confrontational behaviors.
The opposite scenario is that when a manager does not know what s/he believes, due to a lack of substantive information, and does not know the implications of different behavioral actions. In this situation, the manager will turn to the context in which the conflict was faced and attend to peripheral cues that would help in understanding the issue. Since these cues are more likely to be configural (i.e., time of conflict, psychological state of manager, the links between this issue and other issues) than factual, the cues are more likely to trigger feelings and emotions than facts. Moreover, the manager’s confidence as being in control of the situation is reduced substantially due to a lack of knowledge about alternative courses of action. Because in this case, feelings are more likely to be “put into practice” rather than solid beliefs, it is appropriate to suggest that the resulting behavioral tendency will be less aggressive and more lenient. Hence, it is concluded that a subjective attitude produces a lenient behavior.

The Relevance Principle

The relevance principle suggests that “only when individuals explicitly define their attitudes as relevant and
appropriate guides to action (can they) be expected to turn to their general attitudinal orientations for guidance in making their behavioral choices" (p.114). This principle enhances the conviction that attitudes and behaviors that are stemming from the same source (beliefs or feelings) tend to correlate higher than those stemming from different sources (one from beliefs and the other from feelings). This implies that objective (subjective) attitudes should have more influence on confrontational (lenient) than on lenient (confrontational) behavior. These conclusions are in full accord with Snyder's proposition that increasing the "availability of knowledge of one's general attitudes and the specific behavioral implications of one's general viewpoints" and/or increasing the "relevance of attitudes as guides to actions" increases attitude-behavior consistency (pp. 113-114).

Snyder's (1982) proposition of increasing the availability and/or the relevance of attitudes as guides to actions increases attitude-behavior consistency was unintentionally tested (because there was no mention of it) by several researchers (e.g., Fazio, Zanna, and Cooper 1978, Millar and Tesser 1986). These two experiments were described earlier and there is no need to reiterate. However, the instructions that were given to the
subjects in one experimental condition in both experiments were
designed to increase the availability of information about
attitudes and the relevance of these attitudes to actions. For
example, Millar and Tesser (1986) instructed half of the subjects
in a 2 X 2 factorial design to analyze why they felt the way they
did about each puzzle (i.e., puzzle was complex) and instructed
the other half to analyze how they felt (i.e., felt anxious while
playing) while they were performing each puzzle. Additionally,
half of each one of the aforementioned groups was told that they
would be given a test to measure their analytic ability and the
other half was told that they would be given a test to measure
their social sensitivity. The instructions created four
experimental cells: (1) Why and Analytic-ability test cell
(cognitive attitude and instrumental behavior), (2) How and
Social-sensitivity test cell (affective attitude and consummatory
behavior), (3) Why and Social-sensitivity test cell (cognitive
attitude and consummatory behavior), and (4) How and Analytic-
ability test cell (affective attitude and instrumental behavior).

It is clear that Snyder's (1982) principles of availability
and relevance were operative in the first two cells (a match
situation) but not in the last two (a mismatch situation). Millar
and Tesser (1986) reported higher attitude-behavior correlations for the first two cells than for the last two.

**Summary**

A theoretical analysis of the conceptual organization of attitude and behavior and attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict has been provided in chapter three. The two major approaches to the study of attitude structure are the multiattribute and the multidimensional approaches. The multiattribute approach views attitude as being composed of the individual's beliefs about the likelihood that a particular attribute (behavior) will result in a particular outcome multiplied by by the individual's evaluation, preference, or desirability of the outcome, the products are summed or averaged to yield a general evaluation. This approach has some undesirable features such as: (1) humans are postulated to function as information-processing machines and (2) affect is postulated to be a post-cognitive activity.

The multidimensional approach depicts attitude as being a second-order entity composed of first-order affective, cognitive,
and conative response tendencies. The main views of this approach are the single-component, the two-component, and the three-component representations of attitude. These views were analytically compared against each other and the two-component representation (objective-subjective attitude) was found to be more appropriate for the purposes of the present research.

Similarly, current views of the concept of behavior which included a single-component, a two-component, and a multi-component representations were discussed. These representations were critically analyzed and the two-component representation of behavior (confrontational-lenient behavior) was found to fit the present research better than the other two.

The relationship between attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior was also discussed in light of the chosen structures of attitude and behavior. The effects of thought on this relationship was thoroughly examined. It was pointed that if individuals reflected on their subjective (objective) component of attitude and viewed their behavior as being lenient (confrontational) then the attitude-behavior relationship would be stronger than if they considered their
behavior to be confrontational (lenient). The psychological process linking behavior to attitude was found to be a function of the availability and relevance principles.

The research design and method proposed for the purpose of providing empirical evidence to the research models and hypotheses are discussed in the next chapter. Three models and seven hypotheses are proposed therein.
CHAPTER IV
RESEARCH STRUCTURE AND METHODOLOGY

Overview

A discussion of the conceptual organization of attitude toward conflict, the conceptual organization of conflict-management behavior, and the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict was provided in chapter three. The purpose of chapter four is to describe the measurement models of attitude, behavior, and the attitude-behavior relationship. The research hypotheses derived from these models will be introduced. Additionally, a complete description of the experiments and the experimental procedures employed in constructing the measurement scales of attitude and behavior and those procedures employed in data collection is given in this chapter. The statistical analyses that are used for hypothesis testing will be described last.
Measurement Models and Research Hypotheses

Attitude Measurement

One of the objectives of the present research is to provide empirical tests of the validity of a single-component and a two-component (objective-subjective) representations of the structure of attitude toward conflict. To do these tests, the concept of attitude toward conflict should be estimated by means of one or more attitude scaling techniques. The present research employs five scales in the assessment of attitude toward conflict (a similar number of scales is used to assess conflict-management behavior). The decision to use several scales is not arbitrary rather it is dictated by a number of factors. These factors include:

1. There is no single perfect scale to measure the constructs of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior. In using different scales, random irrelevancies inherent in these scales tend to cancel out.
2. The evaluation of multidimensional models requires the use of factor analysis and LISREL statistical techniques. These techniques are based on the measurement of the co-variation of a number of observed variables (measured) to uncover a smaller number of latent variables (unmeasured). In order to obtain a covariance structure that is amenable to analysis, the number of observed variables (measured by different scales) must be greater than the number of latent variables.

3. Objective and subjective responses are considered to be conceptually independent and to have different causal antecedents. Therefore, the scales used to measure one type of responses (e.g., objective) may not be appropriate if used to measure the other type (e.g., subjective). Similarly, confrontational and lenient responses have the same characteristics of independence as the objective and subjective responses, hence different scales should be used in measuring different behavioral responses.
4. Evidence of convergent and discriminant validity of the latent constructs must be provided in this research. Since single instants of a theoretical construct may not represent the construct's whole domain, several scales are needed in order to capture the maximum possible of the constructs of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior.

Five attitude scaling techniques are commonly used in attitude research. These are Thurstone, Likert, Guttman, semantic differential, and self-reports. If upon the measurement of attitude components all the aforementioned techniques provide similar results (all estimates converge into a single factor), then it could be concluded that attitude toward conflict is an undifferentiated, undecomposable entity (i.e., attitude is composed of only a subjective feeling state). If, on the other hand, the results diverge into two statistically-significant different factors, then it could be concluded that attitude toward conflict is composed of two components - subjective and objective components.
Among the five attitude scales, which ones should be used to assess the subjective component and which ones should be used to assess the objective component? Semantic differential and/or self-report scales have typically been used by attitude researchers to measure the subjective (affective) component of attitude. Rosenberg (1956, 1960) viewed the affective component of attitude as being the overall positive or negative response to an object which is compatible with the view of the semantic differential scale of good-bad ratings and the view of the self-report scale of favorable-unfavorable subjective judgments. He also viewed the cognitive component as being the beliefs and thoughts about the attributes of the attitude object and their instrumentality in attaining the desired states of affair. The latter view is in full agreement with the stated intentions of Thurstone's, Likert's, and Guttman's scales of agree-disagree choices with statements about the attributes of the attitude object.

In an article about the internal affective-cognitive consistency of the attitude structure, Rosenberg (1968) proposed to rank-order the measures of the affective and the cognitive
components of attitude and compute the absolute differences between the two ranks as an evidence for the consistency of two separate components of attitude. In a similar vein, Katz and Stotland (1959) identified the affective component of attitude with good-bad judgments about the attitude object. Osgood, Suci, and Tannenbaum (1957), the founders of the semantic differential scale, viewed attitude as the projection of a concept on a semantic differential space (see also, Davidson and Jaccard 1975, McGuire 1969, Norman 1975 for similar treatments).

Many other researchers have followed the lead of Rosenberg in the affective and cognitive measurement of attitude. For example, Ajzen and Fishbein (1980), Fishbein and Ajzen (1975), Kothandapani (1971), and Ostrom (1969) employed semantic differential and self-report scales in measuring the affective component of attitude and Thurstone, Likert, and Guttman scales in measuring the cognitive component. Guided by past research that was concerned with affective-cognitive differentiation, the present research employs semantic differential and self-report scales in the assessment of the subjective component of attitude.
toward conflict and Thurstone, Likert, and Guttman scales in the assessment of the objective component.

**Attitude Models and Hypotheses**

Figure 1 shows path diagrams of a single-component and a two-component (objective and subjective) models of attitude toward conflict. The full meaning of all abbreviations that are used in all figures and throughout the remainder of this dissertation to denote experimental variables is given in table 3. It is possible to test the validity of both models by means of a confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL VII (Joreskog and Sorbom 1989).

The single component model achieves convergent validity if the following conditions are met (Bentler and Bonett 1980, Campbell and Fisk 1959, Long 1983):

1. All measures of attitude exhibit high intercorrelations.
2. Insignificant chi-square is obtained.
Figure 1: Path Diagrams of a Single (panel a) and a Two-Component (panel b) Model of Attitude Toward Conflict.
Table 3
The Full Meaning of Abbreviations Used to Denote Experimental Variables in All Figures and the Remainder of This Dissertation

1. ATH=Attitude measured by a Thurstone scale.
2. ALK=Attitude measured by a Likert scale.
3. AGT=Attitude measured by a Guttman scale.
4. ASD=Attitude measured by a semantic differential scale.
5. ASR=Attitude measured by a self-report scale.
6. BTH=Behavior measured by a Thurstone scale.
7. BLK=Behavior measured by a Likert scale.
8. BGT=Behavior measured by a Guttman scale.
9. BSD=Behavior measured by a semantic differential scale.
10. BSR=Behavior measured by a self-report scale.
11. BEH=Behavior.
12. CONBEH=Confrontational behavior.
13. LENBEH=Lenient behavior.
14. ATT=Attitude.
15. OBJATT=Objective attitude.
16. SUBATT=Subjective attitude.
3. Root-mean-square residual should not exceed 0.10.

4. Rho-statistic should not be less than 0.90.

The two-component model achieves discriminant and convergent validity if the following conditions are met (Bentler and Bonett 1980, Campbell and Fisk 1959):

1. Within-component correlations are high.

2. Across-component correlations are logically consistent and significantly lower than within-component correlations.

3. Rho-statistic is within an acceptable range (ρ >= 0.90).

4. The root-mean-square residual is within an acceptable range (RMSR <= 0.10).

A final test of the overall fit of both models based on an inferential evaluation of nested models can also be carried out in order to determine which model best fits the data. Based on the preceding analysis, it is now possible to state the first two hypotheses for testing:
H1: A two-component (objective and subjective) model of attitude toward conflict achieves discriminant and convergent validity whereas a single-component model does not achieve convergent validity.

H2: A two-component (objective and subjective) model of attitude toward conflict fits the data better than a single-component.

Behavior Measurement

Another objective of this dissertation is to provide empirical tests of the validity of a single-component and a two-component (confrontational-lenient) representations of the conceptual structure of conflict-management behavior. This requires that the concept of conflict-management behavior be estimated by a variety of measurement techniques. If all estimates of behavior converge into a single factor (all measurements provide similar results), then the concept of conflict-management behavior is a unidimensional entity. If, on the other hand, the results diverge into two factors, then it would
be appropriate to conclude that conflict-management behavior is a two-component entity composed of confrontational and lenient components.

Past research has not provided clear guidelines for the measurement of behavior. Ajzen (1982) has noted that "investigators have been rather cavalier in their approach to the measurement of behavior." Some researchers have used self-reports of past behavior (e.g., Bentler and Speckart 1979) while others have constructed different behavioral indices based on past behavior, duration of action, or number of different single acts that were deemed to be representative of the behavioral domain (e.g., Bagozzi and Yi 1989, Millar and Tesser 1986). For example, in a study of attitude-behavior relationship, Bagozzi and Yi (1989) presented their students with a written follow-up of a marketing case analysis that was discussed in the class. They assessed behavior by three items. The first item asked subjects how much time they had spent on reading the follow-up, the second asked subjects how much did they read of the follow-up, and the third asked subjects 10 questions in a form of multiple-choice recognition test about the content of the follow-up.
However, Ajzen (1982) pointed out that it was possible to use the standard measures of attitude such as Likert or Thurstone scales to measure behavior. Additionally, Fishbein and Ajzen's (1974) experiment in attitude-behavior relationship provides empirical support for the appropriateness of using the standard attitude measures in assessing the concept of behavior. They asked their subjects to check the acts that they had performed from a list of 100 religious acts. Then the researchers constructed additional four multiple-act criteria. The first criteria was the total sum of the acts checked, the second was a Guttman scale of 8 acts, the third was a Likert scale of 20 acts, and the fourth was a Thurstone scale of 13 acts. In the current research, it is felt appropriate to follow the lead of Fishbein and Ajzen (1974) in the measurement of behavior. However, instead of constructing the scales from a selected set of acts, subjects will be presented with five standard scales and will be asked to indicate their behavior on each one of them. These scales are self-reports, semantic differential, Likert, Guttman, and Thurstone. The first two scales will be used to assess the lenient component of behavior and the other three scales will be used to assess the confrontational component of behavior.
Behavior Models and Hypotheses

Figure 2 shows path diagrams of a single-component and a two-component (confrontational and lenient) representations of the concept of conflict-management behavior. The validity of both representations will be tested by means of a confirmatory factor analysis using LISREL VII (Joreskog and Sorbom 1989).

The single-component model achieves convergent validity if the following criteria are met (Bentler and Bonett 1980, Campbell and Fisk 1959, Long 1983):

1. All measures of conflict-management behavior exhibit high intercorrelations.
2. Insignificant chi-square is obtained.
3. Root-mean-square residual should not exceed 0.10.
4. Rho-statistic should not be below 0.90.
Figure 2: Path Diagrams of a Single (panel a) and a Two-Component (panel b) Model of Conflict-Management Behavior.
The two-component representation of conflict-management behavior achieves discriminant and convergent validity if the following criteria are met (Bentler and Bonett 1980, Campbell and Fisk 1959):

1. Within-component correlations are high.
2. Across-component correlations are logically consistent and significantly lower than within-component correlations.
3. Rho-statistic (Bentler and Bonett 1980) is within an acceptable range ($p \geq 0.90$).
4. The root-mean-square residual (RMSR) is within an acceptable range ($RMSR \leq 0.10$).

The last test of the overall fit of both representations based on an inferential evaluation of nested models can be carried out in order to determine which representation best fits the data. It is now possible to state the following two hypotheses for testing:
H3: A two-component model (confrontational and lenient) of conflict-management behavior achieves discriminant and convergent validity whereas a single-component model does not achieve convergent validity.

H4: A two-component (confrontational and lenient) model of conflict-management behavior fits the data better than a single-component.

**Attitude-Behavior Relationship Models and Hypotheses**

The current research takes advantage of Snyder's (1982) principles in testing the attitude-behavior relationship by using an experimental paradigm that is similar to the one used by Millar and Tesser (1986). The instructions are designed to vary the context of thought about the issue of conflict and about alternative behavioral orientations. Some subjects will be stimulated to consider substantive information about the conflict issue while others will be stimulated to attend to peripheral cues associated with the conflict issue in formulating their attitudes. Additional instructions will be given to subjects in order to vary
the type of behavior that they will consider in managing the conflict. A separate group of subjects will not receive these instructions and will be considered as a control group for comparative purposes. A full description of all experimental procedures will be provided later in this chapter.

Figure 3 shows path diagrams of a partial model and a full model of attitude-behavior relationship. The validity of both models will be tested by using LISREL VII (Joreskog and Sorbom 1989). The partial model achieves convergent validity if (Bentler and Bonnet 1980, Campbell and Fisk 1959, Joreskog and Sorbom 1989):

1. All measures of attitude toward conflict exhibit high intercorrelations.
2. All measures of conflict-management behavior exhibit high intercorrelations.
3. All factor loadings are significant.
4. An insignificant chi-square is obtained.
5. Root-mean-square residual is within an acceptable range (RMSR<0.10).
Figure 3: Path Diagrams of a Partial (panel a) and a Full (panel b) Model of Attitude-Behavior Relationship in the Context of Conflict.
The full model achieves discriminant and convergent validity if (Bentler and Bonett 1980, Joreskog and Sorbom 1989):

1. Factor loadings of the objective component of attitude on the Thurstone, Likert, and Guttman scales are significant.
2. Factor loadings of the subjective component of attitude on the semantic differential and the self-reports scales are significant.
3. Factor loadings of the confrontational component of behavior on the Thurstone, Likert, and Guttman scales are significant.
4. Factor loadings of the lenient component of behavior on the semantic differential and the self-reports scales are significant.
5. The path coefficient between the objective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior is significant.
6. The path coefficient between the subjective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior is significant.
7. All other factor loadings and path coefficients are insignificant.

8. An insignificant chi-square is obtained.

9. The root-mean-square residual should be within an acceptable range (RMSR<0.10).

The following three hypotheses will be tested:

H5: The objective component of attitude toward conflict has more influence on the confrontational component of conflict-management behavior than on the lenient component.

H6: The subjective component of attitude toward conflict has more influence on the lenient component of conflict-management behavior than on the confrontational component.

H7. The full model of attitude-behavior relation in the context of conflict management fits the data better than the partial model.
Methodology

Subjects

Data was collected from graduate and undergraduate business students at a major mid-western university. An important issue in this research was whether to collect data via a field (mail questionnaire) or a controlled laboratory experiment. The selection of a laboratory over a field experiment was governed by a number of practical and theoretical considerations. These were:

1. There was no reason to believe that the mail questionnaire would be forwarded to the appropriate manager who usually is in charge of managing conflict. Separating the responses of managers who handle the conflict from those of ordinary managers would be impossible. Therefore, there would be no way of knowing whether the observed relationships between dependent and independent variables were true or spurious.
2. Field managers might elected to ignore the experimental instructions that were intended to create different experimental conditions for different individuals. Therefore, isolating and categorizing responses would be impossible because there would be no way of knowing whether experimental moods were adopted or not. Hence, it would be very difficult to interpret the results.

3. Results might became contaminated by confounding variables playing at the time of self-administering the questionnaire by field managers. Therefore, there would be no way of knowing whether the observed relationships were due to the creation of different levels of experimental variables or to extraneous factors such as experience, prevailing mood, and/or consideration of opponent's reaction.

4. Field managers might have a tendency to respond to all questions in a consistent (i.e., always check middle points or one of the extreme points) or in a random manner (i.e., follow the lead of the pen). Therefore, the desired
variability in the within-subject covariance structure of experimental variables might not be obtained.

On the other hand, graduate and undergraduate business students provided an excellent sample for the following reasons:

1. The fact that the students were already disengaged from the exigencies of daily business life and involved in an educational environment facilitated the success of experimental manipulations in creating the different levels of dependent and independent variables.

2. Because students were engaged in a systematic learning process, it was felt that they would be more willing to contribute to theoretical research than field managers who might be more willing to contribute to applied research.

3. The use of students guaranteed the collection of the required number of observations that was necessary for the utilization of the proposed statistical analysis techniques.
4. Confounding variables that were likely to be playing in the field were unlikely to be playing in the class environment. Therefore, results obtained from students would be easier to interpret than those obtained from field managers.

Approximately 595 graduate and undergraduate business students were recruited for two pilot studies (n=30/study) and for the main experiment (n=535). Voluntary participation was essential and no subject was forced to participate fully or partially in the experiment. The only incentives for participation were the intellectual gains from looking into and analyzing a conflict situation, the satisfaction generated by contributing to marketing research, and extra course credit for undergraduates. No promise of any future gains was given to subjects.

Scale Construction

Five different measurement techniques were utilized in this research to estimate attitude toward conflict and five others to estimate conflict-management behavior. These techniques were: (1) Thurstone, (2) Likert, (3) Guttman, (4) semantic
differential, and (5) self-reports. The first three techniques were used in the assessment of the objective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior. The last two techniques were used in the assessment of the subjective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior. Although the construction procedures for any two scales from the same measurement technique were the same, no two scales that were designed to assess different constructs were the same.

**Pilot Study 1**

**Preparation of Statements to be Included in the Scales**

Pilot study 1 consisted of two stages. Thirty undergraduate business students participated in both stages. In stage 1, Students were required to: (1) read a description of a contrived conflict situation (see appendix A), (2) generate and write statements about how they felt about this conflict, and (3) go back to their statements and categorize each statement as to whether the individual expressed a positive, negative, or neutral feeling or belief in his/her statement. In stage 2, the same students were required to: (1) read a description of behavioral
alternatives that might be available to manage this conflict (see appendix A), (2) generate and write statements about all behavioral alternatives that might be considered in managing this conflict, and (3) go back to their statements and categorize each statement as to whether the individual expressed a positive, negative, or neutral feeling or belief about each behavioral alternative.

The collected statements were edited for redundancy and misfit (a total of 63 attitudinal and 56 behavioral statements was retained). One third of the edited statements in categories 3 and 4 were combined with all the statements remaining in category 5 and formed a new group of statements that were used in the construction of a Thurstone scale for the measurement of attitude. Another third of the edited statements in categories 3 and 4 was combined and formed another group of statements that were used in the construction of a Likert scale for the measurement of attitude. The remaining statements in both categories 3 and 4 were combined together and formed a third group of statements that were used in the construction of a Guttman scale for the measurement of attitude. And finally, all edited feeling statements (positive and negative) were combined
together and formed a fourth group of statements that were used in the construction of a semantic differential scale for the measurement of attitude. The same procedure was followed in formulating four groups of behavioral statements that were used in the construction of Thurstone, Likert, Guttman, and semantic differential scales. Table 5 shows the final composition of the different groups of attitudinal and behavioral statements that were used in constructing attitudinal and behavioral scales.
Table 4

Categories of Statements Generated by the Students

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Attitude statements</th>
<th>Behavior statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. + feeling about conflict</td>
<td>6. + feeling about an act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. - feeling about conflict</td>
<td>7. - feeling about an act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. + belief about conflict</td>
<td>8. + belief about an act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. - belief about conflict</td>
<td>9. - belief about an act</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Neutral about conflict</td>
<td>10. Neutral about an act</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5

The Final Composition of the Different Groups of Statements That Were Used in Scale Construction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Attitude statements</th>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Behavior statements</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>T</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>All neutral</td>
<td>All neutral</td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
<td>L</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
<td>G</td>
<td>1/3 + belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
<td></td>
<td>1/3 - belief</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>All feelings</td>
<td>SD</td>
<td>All feelings</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: T=Thurstone scale; L=Likert scale; G=Guttman scale; SD= semantic differential scale.
Pilot Study 2

Statement Rating

The stimulus material (conflict scenario) that was used in pilot study 1 was used again in pilot study 2. The booklet (questionnaire) used in the study contained: (1) the description of the conflict situation followed by the four groups of attitudinal statements that were formed earlier and (2) the description of behavioral alternatives followed by the four groups of behavioral statements. Each group of statements was on a separate page. Pilot study 2 consisted of two stages (see appendix B). Thirty students participated in both stages. In stage 1, students were required to: (1) read the description of the conflict situation, (2) indicate on 1-5 scale how much they liked or disliked the conflict situation, and (3) evaluate each attitudinal statement according to special rating instructions as to how much the statement reflected the individual's own attitude toward the conflict. In stage 2, students were required to: (1) read the description of behavioral alternatives, (2) Indicate on a 1-5 scale how lenient or confrontational the individual would be in managing the conflict, and (3) evaluate each behavioral statement according to special
rating instructions as to how much the statement reflected the individual's own conflict-management behavior.

Item Selection

The completed booklets were decomposed into attitude and behavior booklets. Based on subjects' attitude scores on the like-dislike attitude scale, attitude booklets were regrouped into pro (score=4 or 5), con (score=1 or 2), and neutral (score=3) attitude toward conflict. Behavior booklets were regrouped into lenient, confrontational, and neutral behavior by using the same method. The booklets that were classified neutral were discarded. In the remaining booklets, values of attitudinal and behavioral statements were summed and averaged across individuals in order to come up with a single score for each statement. From the first class of statements in attitude booklets, the two highest, the two lowest, and the median scoring statements were selected for inclusion in the attitude Thurstone scale. From the second class of statements, the two highest and the two lowest scoring statements were selected for inclusion in the attitude Likert scale. From the third class of statements, the two highest (most agreed with) and the two lowest (least agreed with)
scoring statements were selected for inclusion in the attitude Guttman scale. And finally, from the fourth class of statements, the two highest, the two lowest, and the median scoring statements were selected for inclusion in the attitude semantic differential scale. The same selection procedure was used in selecting the behavioral statements that were included in the different scales of behavior. The fifth scale for the measurement of attitude was in the form of indicating on a scale of 1 to 11 how favorable or unfavorable the individual felt about the conflict situation, where 1 indicated very favorable and 11 indicated very unfavorable. The fifth scale for the measurement of behavior was in the form of indicating on a scale of 1 to 11 how lenient or confrontational the individual would be in managing this conflict, where 1 indicated very lenient and 11 indicated very confrontational.
Main Experiment

Procedure

The stimulus material that was used in the previous two pilot experiments was used in the main experiment. A booklet containing the conflict scenario and a description of behavioral alternatives, a thought and feeling listing question, five scales for estimating attitude toward conflict, five scales for assessing conflict-management behavior, and biographical questions (see appendix C) was administered to graduate and undergraduate students in their respective classrooms. To insure the exclusion of subjects who participated in the scale construction process, students were asked whether they had participated in a previous experiment with the same experimenter this year. No time restrictions were applied. However, the average time for completion was 21 minutes. Subjects were told not to go back to any previous page that was finished. Students were randomly assigned to four experimental conditions and a control condition. Subjects in the control condition received filler material that was comparable in length and reading time to experimental manipulations.
Experimental Manipulations

All subjects received an introductory paragraph that contained information about the experiment. Some information was included for the purpose of reducing hypothesis guessing on subjects' side. This paragraph was the following:

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.
Participants in the confrontational behavior condition were informed that:

“This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given an analytic ability test. This test is designed to assess your analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve in similar situations.”

Participants in the lenient behavior condition were informed that:

“This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given a social sensitivity test. This test is designed to assess your social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility in similar situations.”
Another set of instructions was given to subjects. Those in the objective attitude condition received the following:

"However, in order to prepare yourself for the analytic ability (social sensitivity) test, please analyze why you feel the way you do about this conflict. In other words, go over in your mind and think about all the reasons that make you feel the way you do about this situation. The main question to consider is, why do you feel the way you do about this conflict. To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list your reasons for finding this conflict situation good or bad."

Participants in the subjective attitude condition received the following:

"However, in order to prepare yourself for your social sensitivity (analytic ability) test, please reflect on how you feel about this conflict situation. In other words, look into yourself and reflect upon all the feelings that you have while working intimately with this situation. The main question to consider is, how do you feel about this conflict."
To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list all the feelings that you have about this conflict situation.

Participants in the control condition did not receive any of the previously mentioned instructions. Instead, they were given the following:

"Previous experiments on several case studies about conflict indicated that some of these case studies were similar in structure, content, and utility. We think that the similarity was caused by the inclusion of more than one case study in a single experiment. Therefore, we decided to rerun our experiments using one and only one case study per experiment. It is important to note that if we obtain results that are similar to those of previous experiments, then we have no other way but to conclude that the number of case studies in a single experiment makes no difference. However, if we obtain similar results, we have to draw a lottery and select one case study from each group of similar case studies and use it for future class discussion."
These instructions created the following conditions:

1. Objective attitude-confrontational behavior.
2. Objective attitude-lenient behavior.
3. Subjective attitude-confrontational behavior.
4. Subjective attitude-lenient behavior.
5. Control condition.

All subjects were asked to list all the thoughts and feelings that they had while working on the conflict scenario immediately after they completed reading the scenario. The purpose of the thought and feeling listing task was to assess the success of the experimental instructions in creating the required experimental conditions. The experimental questions were titled either analytic ability or social sensitivity test.

**Independent Measures**

The five different scales constructed in this research (ATH, ALK, AGT, ASD, and ASR) were utilized to assess subjects' attitudes toward conflict. On a Thurstone scale (ATH) composed of five statements, subjects were required to check all the
statements with which they agreed. The five statement scores were 1, 8, 6, 4, and 7, respectively. An individual's attitude score was the median scale value of all the statements checked. On a Likert scale (ALK) composed of four statements, subjects were asked to indicate how much they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Scores for each statement were between 1 and five and half of the statements were reverse scored. An individual's attitude score was the sum of the item scores. On a Guttman scale (AGT) composed of four statements, subjects were required to indicate whether they agreed or disagreed with each statement. Scores for each statement were 0 or 1. An individual's attitude score was the number of checked responses with the value of 1. On a semantic differential scale (ASD) composed of six statements, subjects were required to check a point between the two extreme ends for each statement. The semantic differential space was divided into seven intervals with numerical values between -3 and +3. An individual's attitude score was the sum of scale scores. Finally, on a self-report scale (ASR), subjects were required to check a point between very favorable and very unfavorable. The scale was divided into 11 equal intervals and assigned numerical values between 1 and 11. An individual's attitude score was the numerical value
corresponding to the point checked. The scores for the first four scales were reserved with the researcher and used later in coding subjects' responses.

Dependent Measures

The steps for assessing subjects' behavior (BTH, BLK, BGT, BSD, and BSR) were similar to those followed in the estimation of their attitudes. However, the numerical values given to the five statements in Thurstone scale (BTH) were 7, 9, 6, 2, and 4, respectively. The fifth scale of behavior measurement (BSD) had the endpoints of very lenient and very confrontational.

At the end of the experiment, subjects were debriefed, asked not to talk about the experiment, and thanked for their participation.

Summary

Chapter IV is a discussion of the research design and methodology used to test the theoretical conclusions that were reached in chapter III. These conclusions were:
1. The construct of attitude toward conflict is a two-component entity composed of objective and subjective components.

2. The construct of conflict-management behavior is a two-component entity composed of confrontational and lenient components.

3. The objective (subjective) component of attitude toward conflict has more influence on the confrontational (lenient) component of conflict-management behavior than on the lenient (confrontational) component.

Measurement models of attitude toward conflict, conflict management behavior, and the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict were developed. Seven hypotheses concerning the validity and fit of these models were also introduced. Two pilot studies that were used in the construction of five scales for the measurement of attitude and five other scales for the measurement of behavior were also described. And finally, the main experiment that was used as a vehicle to collect data was fully described.
The next chapter will be a description of the statistical analysis procedures that were used in analyzing the exploratory and validation samples. The findings of the study are also presented therein.
CHAPTER V

STATISTICAL ANALYSES AND RESULTS

Overview

The measurement models of attitude, behavior, and the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict were described and the research hypotheses were introduced in chapter four. A complete description of the research methodology was also provided in that chapter. The purpose of the present chapter is to describe the statistical analyses that were used in testing the research models and hypotheses and to provide the research findings. The following sections will provide: (1) a full description of the sample, (2) statistical analyses of the exploratory sample in terms of general associations and exploratory factor analysis, and (3) statistical analyses of the validation sample in terms of ANOVA (analysis of variance), confirmatory factor analysis of attitude variables, confirmatory factor analysis of behavior variables, and LISREL (linear
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structural relations) analysis of the attitude and behavior variables combined. The purpose of the statistical analyses in point two above is to provide guidance and additional support for the hypothesized relationships. The purpose of the statistical analyses in point three is to test the strength of experimental manipulations and the hypothesized relationships and models.

**Sample Profile**

Five hundred and thirty five students were randomly assigned to one of 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) conditions and a control condition. Of this number, 510 students provided usable responses and 25 questionnaires were discarded because of incompleteness. Twenty five questionnaires were randomly selected from each experimental condition (a total of 100) and were used as an exploratory sample. The remaining 410 questionnaires were used as a validation sample.
**Exploratory Sample**

Forty eight female and 52 male students participated in the exploratory sample. The sample contained 77 undergraduate and 23 graduate (M.B.A.) students. Only graduate students had actual managerial experience. No student participated more than once in this study and no student guessed the real purpose of the study.

**Validation Sample**

One hundred and eighty four female and 226 male students participated in the validation sample (a total of 410). Of this number, 302 were undergraduate and 108 were graduate students. Only graduate students had actual managerial experience. Eighty seven subjects were assigned to the control condition, 82 to the objective attitude-confrontational behavior condition, 79 to the subjective attitude-confrontational behavior condition, 79 to the objective attitude-lenient behavior condition, and 83 to the subjective attitude-lenient behavior condition. No student participated more than once in this study and no student guessed the real purpose of the study.
Coding the Responses

Participants' written responses to the thought-listing task were independently coded by two judges, who were trained by the researcher, into feelings and beliefs. These judges judged whether the statement expressed a reason for or a feeling of liking or disliking the conflict situation in the scenario. If the statement described an attribute of the conflict (e.g., this conflict is complex) then it was coded a belief. Alternatively, if the statement described a feeling state that was experienced by the subject (e.g., I feel surprised) then the statement was coded a feeling. After the coding task was finished, the two judges met and worked out the remaining differences between the two ratings until they completely agreed on the ratings.

Self-report scales for the measurement of attitude and behavior had their corresponding numerical values printed on the scales. Numerical values for other attitude and behavior measures, which were generated in the second pilot study, were reserved with the researcher. After the main experiment was finished, the researcher assigned students' responses their corresponding values. The dummy variables (biographical
variables, type of attitude, and type of behavior) were assigned numerical values that corresponded with their respective levels (e.g., male=1 and female=0). And finally, the last item on the questionnaire asked subjects to rate the usefulness of the conflict scenario in future class discussions. Numerical values for this scale were printed on the scale.

**Exploratory Sample Analyses**

**General Associations**

General associations between some experimental variables were tested using the SAS procedure PROC FREQ. These variables were type of attitude (objective-subjective), type of behavior (confrontational-lenient), the usefulness score of the conflict scenario, and the number of feelings and beliefs elicited by subjects in the thought-listing task.

For each subject, the number of feelings, the number of beliefs, and his/her rating of the conflict scenario were associated with the type of attitude (objective vs. subjective) adopted by the subject. As expected, measures of associations as
expressed by phi between the type of attitude and the number of feelings (phi=0.758) and the number of beliefs (phi=0.810) were found significant. Students in the subjective attitude condition elicited more feelings (M=2.78) than those in the objective attitude condition (M=0.30). Additionally, students in the objective attitude condition produced more beliefs (M=2.92) than their counterparts in the subjective attitude condition (M=0.28). Conversely, association between subjects' scores on the usefulness scale and attitude was not significant (phi=0.375). Subjects in the objective attitude condition did not score higher on the usefulness scale (M=5.84) than those in the objective attitude condition (M=5.70), see figure 4 for a graphical representation of these findings.

Alternatively, when the number of feelings elicited by each participant was associated with the type of behavior (confrontational vs. lenient) adopted by him/her, the association was insignificant (phi=0.247). Subjects in the lenient behavior condition did not elicit more feelings (M=1.56) than those in the confrontational behavior condition (M=1.52). Similarly, no significant association was found between the number of beliefs and the type of behavior (phi=0.145). Conversely, significant
association was found between subjects' scores on the usefulness scale and the type of behavior ($\phi = 0.764$). Subjects in the confrontational behavior condition found the conflict scenario to be more useful in future class discussions ($M = 7.44$) than subjects in the lenient behavior condition ($M = 4.10$), see figure 5 for a graphical representation of these associations.
Figure 4: Mean Feelings, Beliefs, and Usefulness Generated by Exploratory Sample in Different Attitude Conditions.
Figure 5: Mean Feelings, Beliefs, and Usefulness Generated by Exploratory Sample in Different Behavior Conditions.
Exploratory Factor Analysis

In order to identify the factor structure of the attitude and the behavior variables, the exploratory sample (n=100) was subjected to two separate exploratory factor analyses. The method of estimation in both analyses was maximum likelihood and the rotation method was Harris-Kaiser. The number of factors in each analysis ranged from zero to three.

Figure 6 shows path diagrams of one-factor (attitude) and two-factor (objective-subjective) structures of attitude toward conflict. In the one-factor structure (panel a), the factor of attitude loaded high on the first three variables (ATH=0.95, ALK=0.99, and AGT=0.97) and relatively low on the second two variables (ASD=0.51 and ASR=0.37). These loadings are better understood after examining the error terms that are associated with each variable (δ's). The first three error terms were low (δ1=0.10, δ2=0.02, and δ3=0.06) while the second two error terms were high (δ4=0.74 and δ5=0.86). Additionally, an inferential test of the null hypothesis, one factor is enough, against the alternative hypothesis, more factors are needed, based on chi-
Figure 6: Exploratory Estimates of the Parameters of a Single and a Two-Component Model of Attitude Toward Conflict
square was provided. A significant chi-square was obtained ($\chi^2_5=114.755$, $p=0.0001$) and the Tucker-Lewis's coefficient was low ($p=0.64$). Therefore, the null hypothesis (one factor is enough) could not be accepted.

Panel b of figure 6 shows the two-factor structure of attitude (objective-subjective attitude). A close look at the factor loadings shows that the first factor (objective attitude) loaded high on the first three variables (ATH=0.91, ALK=0.97, and AGT=0.95) and the second factor (subjective attitude) loaded also high on the second two variables (ASD=0.80 and ASR=0.99). It is also noticed that the error terms are all low ($\delta_1=0.17$, $\delta_2=0.06$, $\delta_3=0.10$, $\delta_4=0.36$, and $\delta_5=0.02$). The test of the null hypothesis, two factors are enough, against the alternative hypothesis, more factors are needed, provided an insignificant chi-square ($\chi^2_1=0.792$, $p=0.3734$) and Tucker-Lewis's coefficient was high ($p=1.00$). Therefore, the null hypothesis (two factors are enough) could not be rejected.

Similar analyses involving behavior variables were conducted in order to uncover the factor structure of conflict-
management behavior. Figure 7 shows path diagrams of a one-factor (behavior) and a two-factor (confrontational-lenient behavior) of conflict-management behavior. The one-factor structure (panel a) shows that the factor behavior loaded high on the first three variables (BTH=0.99, BLK=0.98, and BGT=0.95) and low on the second two variables (BSD=0.48 and BSR=0.46). Additionally, the error terms were low for the first three variables (δ1=0.02, δ2=0.04, and δ3=0.10) and high for the second two variables (δ4=0.77 and δ5=0.79). Moreover, the chi-square test of the null hypothesis, one factor is enough, against the alternative hypothesis, more factors are needed, resulted in a significant chi-square ($\chi^2_5=76.480$, p=0.0001) and a low Tucker-Lewis's coefficient (p=0.77). Therefore, the null hypothesis (one factor is enough) could not be accepted.

Panel b of figure 7 shows a two-factor structure of conflict-management behavior (confrontational-lenient behavior). The improvement of the two-factor over the one-factor structure is clear. The loadings of the first factor (confrontational behavior) on the first three variables are high (BTH=0.97, BLK=0.95, and BGT=0.91) and the loadings of the second factor
Figure 7: Exploratory Estimates of the Parameters of a Single and a Two-Component Model of Conflict-Management Behavior.
(lenient behavior) on the second two variables are also high (BSD=0.73 and BSR=0.97). Additionally, the error terms were all low (δ1=0.06, δ2=0.10, δ3=0.17, δ4=0.47, and δ5=0.06). The accompanying chi-square test of the null hypothesis, two factors are enough, against the alternative hypothesis, more factors are needed, resulted in an insignificant chi-square (χ²₁=1.443, p=0.2297) and a very high Tucker-Lewis's coefficient (p=0.99). Therefore, the null hypothesis (two factors are enough) could not be rejected.

Validation Sample Analyses

Experimental Manipulations of Attitude

The reasons for and the feelings of liking and disliking the conflict scenario were coded into beliefs and feelings. The number of feelings for each subject was analyzed in a 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X 2 (male vs. female) analysis of variance (ANOVA). The only significant main effect found was the type of attitude (objective/subjective) adopted by subjects.
Participants in the subjective attitude condition produced more feelings (M=2.59) than participants in the objective behavior condition (M=0.37) and in the control condition (M=1.49). Two different tests were conducted to test for significant differences between mean feelings produced by subjects in different conditions. The Ryan-Einot-Gabriel-Welsch (REGW) multiple F-test indicated that all three mean feelings were significantly different from each other ($F_{9,400}=14.22$, $p=0.0001$). Similarly, a Satterthwaite-Cochran T-test showed that the difference between mean feelings produced by subjects in the objective attitude condition (M=0.37) and subjects in the subjective attitude condition (M=2.59) was statistically significant ($|t|_{172}=10.36$, $p=0.0001$).

In a separate analysis, the number of beliefs was analyzed in a 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X 2 (male vs. female) ANOVA. Two main effects were found significant, type of attitude ($F_{1,408}=245.98$, $p=0.0001$) and type of behavior ($F_{1,408}=3.72$, $p=0.05$). However, the huge differences between the two F-values in this analysis and between their respective probability levels indicate that the effect of behavior type on the production of belief statements
was marginally significant compared to the effect of attitude type. This conclusion is further reinforced by the finding that the behavior type was not operative in producing feelings in the same thought-listing task \((F_{1,408}=0.24, \ p=0.62)\). Furthermore, participants in the objective attitude condition produced more beliefs \((M=3.01)\) than participants in the subjective attitude condition \((M=0.41)\) and participants in the control condition \((M=1.57)\). Test of statistically significant differences between mean beliefs produced by subjects in different conditions were conducted. The REGW multiple F-test indicated that mean beliefs produced by different attitude conditions were significantly different from each other \((F_{9,400}=29.36, \ p=0.0001)\). The T-test also showed that mean beliefs produced by subjects in the objective attitude condition \((M=3.01)\) was significantly different from that produced by subjects in the subjective attitude condition \((M=0.41)\) at a 0.0001 significance level \((t_{196}=15.91)\). Figure 8 presents a graphical representation of these findings.
Thought Type

Figure 8: Mean Feelings and Beliefs Generated by Subjects in Different Attitude Conditions in Main Sample.
Experimental Manipulations of Behavior

The purpose of the main experiment was ostensibly to determine the usefulness of the conflict scenario in future class discussions. Therefore, subjects were asked to rate how useful would be the conflict scenario. These ratings were used as a measure to determine the success of behavior manipulations. Because subjects in the confrontational behavior condition were expecting an analytic ability test, they were expected to be more thoughtful about the attributes of the conflict situation than about its symbolic and contextual cues. Conversely, subjects in the lenient behavior condition, who were expecting a social sensitivity test, were expected to pay more attention to symbolic and contextual cues of the conflict than to its attributes.

Additionally, the thought-listing task, which ostensibly intended to help subjects on their upcoming tests, asked subjects in the confrontational behavior condition to list their beliefs while subjects in the lenient behavior condition were asked to list their feelings. The differential emphasis (beliefs or feelings) helped subjects to create reinforced memories of one type of thought or the other. When subjects were rating the
conflict scenario, they were expected to recall and use their most salient and most accessible memories about the conflict (either attributes or symbolic and contextual cues). Therefore, because subjects in the confrontational behavior condition could recall more attributes of and beliefs about the conflict scenario than those subjects in the lenient behavior condition, they were expected to rate the conflict scenario higher than their counterparts. Hence, subjects' ratings of the conflict scenario was taken as a measure of the strength of behavioral manipulations.

Subjects' ratings of usefulness were analyzed in a 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X 2 (male vs. female) ANOVA. The only main effect to reach significance was type of behavior (F1,408=243.53, p=0.0001). Subjects in the confrontational behavior condition considered the conflict scenario to be more useful in future class discussions (M=7.37) than subjects in the lenient behavior condition (M=4.12) and subjects in the control condition (M=5.96).

Differences between mean usefulness ratings' were tested for statistical significance. A REGW multiple F-test showed that
all three means were significantly different from each other
\((F_{9,400}=27.39, \ p=0.0001)\). Similarly, a T-test showed that the
difference between mean usefulness ratings produced by subjects
in the confrontational behavior condition (M=7.37) and subjects in
the lenient behavior condition (M=4.12) was statistically
significant \((t_{275}=14.65, \ p=0.001)\). Figure 9 presents a graphical
representation of these relationships:

Analyses of Variance

Scales of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management
behavior were used to construct three measures of attitude and
three other measures of behavior, respectively. The first three
scales measuring attitude toward conflict (Thurstone, Likert, and
Guttman) and the equivalent three measuring conflict-
management behavior were used independently to construct a
measure of objective attitude and a measure of confrontational
behavior (objective-confrontational measure set). The second
two scales measuring attitude (semantic differential and self
report) and the comparable two measuring behavior were used
separately to construct a measure of subjective attitude and a
measure of lenient behavior (subjective-lenient measure set).
Figure 9: Mean Usefulness Generated by Subjects in Different Behavior Conditions in Main Sample.
Finally, all five scales of attitude and all five scales of behavior were used to construct comprehensive measures of attitude and behavior (comprehensive measure set).

The three sets of attitude and behavior measures for each subject were correlated and transformed to Fisher's z scores and analyzed in three separate 2 (objective vs. subjective) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient) X 2 (male vs. female) analysis of variance (ANOVA) using the SAS procedure PROC REG.

Objective-Confrontational Measures

When the measure of confrontational behavior was correlated with the measure of objective attitude, the only interaction effect to cause significant variation in attitude-behavior relationship was the two-way interaction of behavior type X attitude type (F_{1,406}=36.50, p=0.0001). Subjects in the confrontational behavior condition who thought about the attributes of the conflict situation had higher attitude-behavior mean correlations (M=0.88) than subjects who reflected on their feelings about the conflict (M=0.66) and subjects in the control condition (M=0.63). Alternatively, subjects in the lenient
behavior condition who reflected on their feelings about the conflict had higher attitude-behavior correlations ($M=0.96$) than subjects who thought about the attributes of the conflict ($M=0.69$) and subjects in the control condition ($M=0.63$).

Mean correlations of attitude-behavior relationship were tested by using a REGW multiple F-test. The test showed that mean correlations of subjects in the objective attitude-confrontational behavior condition ($M=0.88$) was significantly different from mean correlations of subjects in the subjective attitude-confrontational behavior condition ($M=0.66$) and subjects in the control condition ($M=0.63$). However, there was no significant difference between the last two mean correlations ($F_{5,240}=4.85$, $p=0.0003$). Conversely, attitude-behavior mean correlations of subjects in the subjective attitude-lenient behavior condition ($M=0.96$) was significantly higher than mean correlations of subjects in the objective attitude-lenient behavior condition ($M=0.69$) and subjects in the control condition ($M=0.63$). No significant difference was found between the last two mean correlations ($F_{5,241}=8.52$, $p=0.0001$). Figure 10 presents a graphical portrayal of these findings.
Figure 10: Mean Correlations Between Objective Measures of Attitude and Confrontational Measures of Behavior in Different Experimental Conditions in Main Sample.
Subjective-Lenient Measures

The second set of attitude (subjective) and behavior (lenient) measures were correlated. The only interaction effect to cause significant variation in attitude behavior correlations was type of attitude X type of behavior ($F_{9,350}=4.21$, $p=0.04$). Participants in the lenient behavior condition who reflected on their feelings about the conflict (subjective attitude) had higher mean attitude-behavior correlations ($M=0.67$) than subjects who thought about the characteristics (objective attitude) of the conflict situation ($M=0.57$) and subjects in the control condition ($M=0.25$). Conversely, subjects in the confrontational behavior-objective attitude condition had higher mean attitude-behavior correlations ($M=0.65$) than subjects in the confrontational behavior-subjective attitude condition ($M=0.32$) and subjects in the control condition ($M=0.25$).

Mean correlations were tested for statistically significant differences. A multiple F-test showed that mean correlations of subjects in the lenient behavior condition was significantly higher for those who reflected on their feelings toward the conflict ($M=0.67$) than for those who thought about the attributes
of the conflict (M=0.57) and those in the control condition (M=0.25). However, the first two means were not significantly different from each other but both means were significantly different from the third ($F_{5,210}=3.54$, $p=0.0043$). When mean attitude-behavior correlations for subjects in the confrontational behavior condition were tested, mean correlations of subjects who thought about the attributes of the conflict (M=0.65) was higher than of subjects who reflected on their feelings (M=0.32) and subjects in the control condition (M=0.25). No significant difference was found between the last two means ($F_{5,215}=2.60$, $p=0.0264$). Figure 11 presents a graphical representation of these findings.

**Comprehensive Measures**

The final analysis of variance involved the use of the comprehensive measures of attitude and behavior in testing for significant interaction effects on the attitude-behavior relationship. When the measure of attitude toward conflict was correlated with the measure of conflict-management behavior, no interaction reached significance other than the attitude type X behavior type two way interaction ($F_{1,408}=34.14$, $p=0.0001$).
Figure 11: Mean Correlations Between Subjective Measures of Attitude and Lenient Measures of Behavior in Different Experimental Conditions in Main Sample.
Students participating in the confrontational behavior condition who thought about the attributes of the conflict had higher attitude-behavior mean correlation \((M=0.72)\) than students reflecting on their feelings about the conflict situation \((M=0.37)\) and those participating in the control condition \((M=0.35)\). On the other hand, students participating in the lenient behavior condition who reflected on their feelings had higher attitude-behavior mean correlation \((M=0.80)\) than those who thought about the attributes of the conflict situation \((M=0.52)\) and those students assigned to the control condition \((M=0.350)\).

The three means of attitude-behavior correlations were subjected to a multiple F-test. Results showed that mean correlations of subjects in the confrontational behavior condition who thought about the attributes of the conflict \((M=0.72)\) was significantly different from mean correlation of subjects who reflected on their feelings \((M=0.37)\) and subjects in the control condition \((0.35)\). However, there was no significant difference between the last two mean correlations \((F_{5,247}=6.01, P=0.001)\).

Similarly, students participating in the lenient behavior condition had higher mean attitude-behavior correlations when
they reflected on their feelings (M=0.80) than when they thought about the attributes of the conflict (M=0.52) and when they were not instructed to do either (M=0.35). The multiple F-test showed that the three mean correlations were significantly different from each other ($F_{5,243}=9.04$, $P=0.0001$). Figure 12 shows a graphical representation of the aforementioned relationships.

**Additional Analyses of Variance**

The gender variable was included in the main analyses of variance in order to detect any main or interaction effects on attitude-behavior correlations. Comprehensive measures of attitude and behavior were subjected to a number of additional analyses in order to detect any main or interaction effects of other demographic variables on attitude-behavior relationship. First, a 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X 5 (age groups in the study) analysis of variance was performed. The only interaction effect to reach significance was the two-way interaction of attitude type X behavior type ($F_{1,408}=34.69$, $p=0.0001$). Second, a 2 (objective vs. subjective attitude) X 2 (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X 6 (managerial experience expressed in number of years) analysis of
Figure 12: Mean Correlations Between Comprehensive Measures of Attitude and Behavior in Different Experimental Conditions in Main Sample.
variance was performed. Again, the only interaction effect that caused significant variation in attitude-behavior correlations was the two-way attitude type X behavior type ($F_{1,408}=34.13$, $p=0.0001$).

Finally, a $2$ (objective vs. subjective attitude) X $2$ (confrontational vs. lenient behavior) X $2$ (graduate vs. undergraduate) analysis of variance showed that in addition to attitude type X behavior type effect, there was a behavior type X education interaction effect ($F_{1,408}=3.85$, $p=0.0505$). However, this effect was not present when education was interacted with attitude type ($F_{1,408}=0.08$, $p=0.9207$) and vanished completely when education was allowed to interact in a three-way interaction with attitude and behavior types ($F_{1,408}=1.92$, $p=0.1672$).

A Side Analysis of Association

One of the propositions made in the current research is that power might not be the most often considered behavioral alternative in response to channel conflict. An opportunity was present in this research to test for this proposition. The first
statement in the Thurstone behavioral scale represented the exercise of power (take opponent to court) and had a value of 7 on the scale. This scale was associated with attitude type in a frequency test in order to reveal the general association between the two variables. Logically speaking, subjects in the objective behavior condition should have chosen the power alternative (take opponent to court) more than subjects in the subjective attitude condition and the association between the two variables should be significant. Contrary to logical expectations, the association between the exercise of power and attitude type was very weak ($\phi=0.248$). Additionally, only 21 participants in the objective attitude condition opted for power while 33 participants in the subjective attitude condition wanted to take opponent to court. However, there was no significant difference between the two attitude conditions in the choice of power ($\chi^2_{14}=19.874$, $p=0.134$).

Analysis of Linear Structural Relations

Linear structural relations between attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior were analyzed using LISREL VII. The analysis progressed in three stages. First, confirmatory factor analyses of one and two-component models
of attitude toward conflict were conducted in order to test convergent validity of the single-component model, discriminant and convergent validity of the two-component model, the overall fit of both models, and hypotheses 1 and 2. Second similar analyses of one and two-component models of conflict-management behavior were conducted in order to test the convergent validity of the single-component model, discriminant and convergent validity of the two-component model, overall fit of both models, and hypotheses 3 and 4. Finally, a comparative analysis of a partial and a full model of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict was carried out in order to test discriminant and convergent validity of both models, the overall fit of both models, and hypotheses 5, 6, and 7.

Hypotheses 1 and 2 Restated

H1: A two-component (objective and subjective) model of attitude toward conflict achieves discriminant and convergent validity whereas a single-component model does not achieve convergent validity.
H2: A two-component (objective and subjective) model of attitude toward conflict fits the data better than a single-component model.

Structural Relations of Attitude Toward Conflict

Variables measuring the construct of attitude toward conflict (ATH, ALK, AGT, ASD, and ASR) were used in constructing and testing a single-component and a two-component models of attitude toward conflict. The single-component model would achieve convergent validity if all five measures of attitude exhibited high intercorrelations, an insignificant chi-square, a low root-mean-square residual (RMSR), and a high Bentler and Bonett’s rho ($\rho$) coefficient.

The upper left quadrant of table 6 shows correlations among attitude measures. The correlations between the first three measures (0.615, 0.673, and 0.749) and correlations between the last two measures (0.837) are relatively high while correlations
Table 6

Correlation Matrix of Attitude and Behavior Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>ATH</th>
<th>ALK</th>
<th>AGT</th>
<th>ASD</th>
<th>ASR</th>
<th>BTH</th>
<th>BLK</th>
<th>BGT</th>
<th>BSD</th>
<th>BSR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALK</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>0.749</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>0.453</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>0.418</td>
<td>0.219</td>
<td>0.383</td>
<td>0.837</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTH</td>
<td>0.413</td>
<td>0.550</td>
<td>0.539</td>
<td>0.434</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.520</td>
<td>0.558</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>0.371</td>
<td>0.840</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGT</td>
<td>0.295</td>
<td>0.510</td>
<td>0.372</td>
<td>0.298</td>
<td>0.213</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td>0.673</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.461</td>
<td>0.523</td>
<td>0.431</td>
<td>0.448</td>
<td>0.478</td>
<td>0.291</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSR</td>
<td>0.405</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.501</td>
<td>0.497</td>
<td>0.390</td>
<td>0.475</td>
<td>0.481</td>
<td>0.344</td>
<td>0.787</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

between the first three measures (ATH, ALK, and AGT) on one hand and the last two measures (ASD and ASR) on the other are relatively low. Therefore, the first condition for the single-component model of attitude toward conflict to achieve convergent validity was not met.

The one-component confirmatory factor analysis performed on attitude measures resulted in a significant chi-square ($\chi^2_r = 368.16, p = 0.00$) and a high root-mean-square residual
(RMSR=0.232). In order to calculate Bentler and Bonnet's rho-statistic, it was necessary to define a null model (no latent factors) and obtain its chi-square statistic through a confirmatory factor analysis. The resulting chi-square was high ($\chi^2 = 720.54, p=0.00$). After obtaining chi-square statistics for a zero-factor and one-factor model, it was possible to test the null hypothesis that the one-factor model does not fit the data better than a zero-factor model, against the alternative hypothesis a one-factor model fits data better than a zero-factor model. If the calculated rho-statistic is equal or greater than 0.90, then the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. But if the calculated rho-statistic is less than 0.90, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The resulting rho-statistic was low ($p=0.64$). Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.

As illustrated, none of the conditions necessary for the single-component model of attitude toward conflict to achieve convergent validity was met. Therefore, the single-component model could not be accepted without testing an alternative structure of attitude toward conflict (two-component model).
For the two-component model of attitude toward conflict to achieve convergent and discriminant validity, it was hypothesized that some conditions must be met. These are:

1. Within-component correlations should be high.
2. Across-component correlations should be logically consistent and significantly lower than within-component correlations.
3. Root-mean-square residual (RMSR) should not exceed 0.10.
4. Rho-statistic should be equal to or greater than 0.90.

Again, a look at table 6 shows that correlations between the first three variables (ATH, ALK, and AGT) measuring the objective component of attitude are very high (0.615, 0.673, and 0.749), correlation between the last two variables (ASD and ASR) measuring the subjective component of attitude is also high (0.837), but correlations between the first three variables on one side and the second two on the other are relatively low (range = 0.219 to 0.481). Therefore, the first two conditions for the two-component model to achieve discriminant and convergent validity were met.
The two-component confirmatory factor analysis performed on the attitude measures resulted in a marginally significant chi-square ($\chi^2_3=24.84, p=0.00$). However, the improvement in chi-square statistic from the one-component to the two-component model was huge ($\chi^2_4=343.32, p=0.00$). The resulting root-mean-square residual from the same analysis was very low (RMSR=0.039) and rho-statistic was significantly high ($p=0.95$). Therefore, it was concluded that the two-component (objective and subjective) model of attitude toward conflict achieved discriminant and convergent validity whereas the single-component did not achieve convergent validity (hypothesis 1).

To obtain support for hypothesis 2, it was necessary to perform an inferential evaluation of the overall fit of the one and the two-component models. Because the free parameters in the one-component model constituted a subset of the free parameters in the two-component model, the one-component model was nested in the two-component model. The null hypothesis, the two-component model does not fit the data better than the one-component, was tested against the alternative hypothesis, the two-component model fits the data better than the one-
component model. The resulting chi-square was significant ($\chi^2_4=343.82, p=0.00$). Therefore, the null hypothesis (the two-component model does not fit data better than the one-component model) could not be accepted. These results provided the required support for hypothesis 2 in this research. Figure 13 shows LISREL estimates of the parameters of a single and a two-component model of attitude toward conflict.

**Hypothesis 3 and 4 Restated**

H3 : A two-component model (confrontational and lenient) of conflict-management behavior achieves discriminant and convergent validity whereas a single-component model does not achieve convergent validity.

H4 : A two-component model (confrontational and lenient) of conflict-management behavior fits the data better than a single-component model.
Figure 13: LISREL Estimates of the Parameters of a Single and a Two-Component Model of Attitude Toward Conflict
Structural Relations of Conflict-Management Behavior

A single and a two-component (confrontational and lenient) model of conflict-management behavior were constructed from all five variables (BTH, BLK, BGT, BSD, and BSR) measuring conflict-management behavior. The single component model would achieve convergent validity if all five measures of behavior exhibited high intercorrelations and an insignificant chi-square, a low RMSR, and a high rho statistic (p) were obtained.

The lower right quadrant of table 6 shows the behavior variables' intercorrelations. As it is clear, correlations between the first three variables are very high (0.673, 0.727, and 0.840), correlation between the last two variables is very high (0.787), but correlations between the first three variables (BTH, BLK, and BGT) on one hand and the last two variables (BSD and BSR) on the other are very low (ranging from 0.281 to 0.482). Therefore, the first condition for the single-component model of behavior to achieve convergent validity was not met.
In order to test for conditions 2 and 3, a one-component confirmatory factor analysis involving all five behavior variables was performed. The analysis produced a significant chi-square ($\chi^2_e=242.54, p=0.00$) and a high root-mean-square residual (RMSR=0.150). Condition 4 (high rho statistic) involved defining a null model of conflict-management behavior (no latent factors) and performing a confirmatory factor analysis on that model in order to obtain its chi-square. The analysis produced a high chi-square for the null model ($\chi^2_5=613.89, p=0.00$). After obtaining the chi-squares for the zero-factor and the one-factor models, it was possible to test the null hypothesis, the one-factor model does not fit the data better than the zero-factor model, against the alternative hypothesis, the one-factor model fits the data better than the zero-factor model. If the calculated rho-statistic is equal to or greater than 0.90, then the null hypothesis cannot be accepted. Alternatively, if rho-statistic is less than 0.90, then the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The resulting rho-statistic was low ($p=0.68$). Therefore, the null hypothesis could not be rejected.
None of the conditions necessary for the one-component model of conflict-management behavior to achieve convergent validity was met. Hence, the single-component model could not be accepted as a valid representation of conflict-management behavior before testing an alternative representation (two-factor model).

It was hypothesized that the two-component representation of conflict-management behavior should meet some conditions in order to achieve discriminant and convergent validity. These conditions are:

1. Within-component correlations should be high.
2. Across-component correlations should be logically consistent and significantly lower than within-component correlations.
3. Root-mean-square residual (RMSR) should not exceed 0.10.
4. Rho-statistic should not be less than 0.90.

Table 6 shows that correlations between the first three variables (BTH, BLK, and BGT) measuring conflict-management behavior are high (0.673, 0.727, and 0.840), correlation between
the second two variables (BSD and BSR) is high (0.787), but correlations between the first three variables on one hand and the second two variables on the other are relatively low (ranging from 0.281 to 0.481). Hence, the first two conditions for the two-component model of conflict-management behavior to achieve convergent and discriminant validity were met.

In order to test for conditions 3 and 4, a two-component confirmatory factor analysis involving all five measures of conflict-management behavior was performed. The analysis resulted in an insignificant chi-square ($\chi^2 = 13.49, p = 0.009$) and a low root-mean-square residual (RMSR = 0.029). The calculated rho-statistic was high ($\rho = 0.98$). Therefore, it was concluded that the two-component model of conflict-management behavior achieved convergent and discriminant validity, whereas the single-component model did not achieve convergent validity (hypothesis 3).

The test of hypothesis 4 involved the performance of an inferential evaluation of the overall fit of the single-component and the two-component (confrontational and lenient) models of conflict-management behavior. Because the single-component
was nested in the two-component model, it was possible to test
the null hypothesis, the two-component model does not fit the
data better than the single-component, against the alternative
hypothesis, the two-component model fits the data better than
the single-component. The test produced a significant chi-square
($\chi^2 = 229.05, p = 0.00$), therefore, the null hypothesis could not be
accepted. This result provided the required support for
hypothesis 4 in this dissertation. Figure 14 shows LISREL
estimates of the parameters of a single and a two-component
models of conflict-management behavior.
Figure 14: LISREL Estimates of the Parameters of a Single and a Two-Component Model of Conflict-Management Behavior.
Additional Analyses of Structural Relations

The two-component structures of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior were contrasted theoretically and empirically with single-component structures. However, an alternative three-component view could be hypothesized to represent the structures of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior and to fit the data better than both single and two-component structures. Although the present research has not theoretically analyzed this alternative view, this research tested the three-component representations. From attitude variables, the first two variables (ATH and ALK) comprised the first component, the second two (AGT and ASD) comprised the second and the last (ASR) comprised the third component of attitude toward conflict. Behavior variables were treated similarly in constructing a three-component model of conflict-management behavior. Two separate confirmatory factor analyses were conducted in order to test the alternative three-component structures. The same conditions of validity and fit used in the two-component structures were used in testing the three-component structures. In the analysis of attitude, the
resulting chi-square was significant ($\chi^2_2=218.75$, $p=0.0$), root-mean-square residual was high ($\text{RMSR}=0.132$) and rho-statistic was low ($p=0.24$). The chi-square difference between the two and the three-component structures of attitude was negative ($\chi^2_1=-193.91$). Similarly, chi-square in the analysis of behavior was significant ($\chi^2_2=136.90$, $p=0.0$), root-mean-square residual was high ($\text{RMSR}=0.11$) and rho-statistic was low ($p=0.53$). The chi-square difference between the two and the three-component structures of behavior was negative ($\chi^2_2=-123.41$). These findings indicate that the three-component structures of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior did not achieve discriminant and convergent validity and did not fit the data.

**Reliability of Measurement Scales**

Reliability coefficients of measurement scales as expressed in squared multiple correlations were produced by the different confirmatory factor analyses. These reliabilities for single and two-component models of attitude and behavior are shown in Table 7. The scale reliabilities in the one-component
attitude model range between 0.311 and 0.899. However, these reliabilities increased dramatically in the two-component attitude model (ranging between 0.578 and 0.927). Similarly, the lower bound of the reliability coefficient of the scales measuring conflict-management behavior increased from 0.286 for the one-component model to 0.578 for the two-component model of behavior.

Table 7
Reliability Coefficients of Attitude and Behavior Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Structure</th>
<th>Attitude</th>
<th>Behavior</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Thurstone</td>
<td>0.741</td>
<td>0.578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Likert</td>
<td>0.650</td>
<td>0.785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guttman</td>
<td>0.752</td>
<td>0.709</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Semantic-</td>
<td>0.403</td>
<td>0.778</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>differential</td>
<td>0.311</td>
<td>0.927</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypotheses 5, 6, and 7 Restated

H5: The objective component of attitude toward conflict has more influence on the confrontational component of conflict-management behavior than on the lenient component.

H6: The subjective component of attitude toward conflict has more influence on the lenient component of conflict-management behavior than on the confrontational component.

H7: The full model of attitude-behavior relation in the context of conflict management fits the data better than the partial model.

Attitude-Behavior Structural Relations in the Context of Conflict

All five measures of attitude toward conflict and all five measures of conflict-management behavior were used to construct a partial model (one latent factor for each construct) and a full model (two latent factors for each construct) of
attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict. The conditions specified for the partial model to achieve convergent validity are:

1. All measures of attitude toward conflict should exhibit high intercorrelations.
2. All measures of conflict-management behavior should exhibit high intercorrelations.
3. All factor loadings on the measured variables should be significant.
4. An insignificant chi-square should be obtained.
5. Root-mean-square residual should not exceed 0.10.

A look at table 6 shows that the first condition was not met. Intercorrelations between the first three variables (ATH, ALK, and AGT) are high; correlation between the last two variables (ASD and ASR) is high; but intercorrelations between the first three variables on one hand and the last two on the other are relatively low (ranging from 0.219 to 0.481). The second condition involving the behavior variables was not met. Correlations between the first three behavior variables (BTH, BLK, and BGT) are high; correlation between the last two
variables (BSD and BSR) is also high; but correlations between the first three variables on one hand and the last two on the other were low (ranging from 0.281 to 0.481).

The third condition for the partial model to achieve convergent validity required that all factor loadings on the attitude and behavior variables be significant. Figure 15 shows LISREL estimates of the parameters of the partial (panel a) and the full model (panel b) of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict. Panel a shows that the loadings of the factor attitude on attitude variables are all high (range=0.657 to 1.145) and the loadings of the factor behavior on behavior variables are also high (range= 0.595 to 1.000). However, a look at the error terms reveals that a large portion of the variance in ASD variable (0.653) and an even larger portion of the variance in ASR variable (0.749) were not accounted for by the factor attitude. By the same standards, a large portion of the variance in BSD variable (0.703) and a large portion of the variance in the BSR variable (0.676) were not accounted for by the behavior factor. These findings indicate that although the loadings are high, factors other than these in the model may better explain the ASD, ASR, BSD, and BSR variables.
Figure 15: LISREL Estimates of a Partial (panel a) and a Full (panel b) Model of Attitude-Behavior Relationship in the Context of Conflict.
LISREL analysis of the partial model produced a significant chi-square ($\chi^2_{34}=713.46$, $p=0.00$) and a high root-mean-square residual (RMSR= 0.134). Therefore, the last two conditions (4 and 5) required for the partial model to achieve convergent validity were not met. The only condition that was satisfied, but with some reservations, was condition 3 (significant factor loadings on measured variables). Therefore, the partial model could not be accepted as a valid representation of the structural relations between attitude and behavior before testing an alternative representation (the full model).

The full model of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict should achieve discriminant and convergent validity if the following conditions were met.

1. Factor loadings of the objective component of attitude on ATH, ALK, and AGT variables are significant.
2. Factor loadings of the subjective component of attitude on ASD and ASR variables are significant.
3. Factor loadings of the confrontational component of behavior on BTH, BLK, and BGT variables are significant.
4. Factor loadings of the lenient component of behavior on BSD and BSR variables are significant.

5. Path coefficient between the objective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior is significant.

6. Path coefficient between the subjective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior is significant.

7. All other factor loadings and path coefficients are significant.

8. An insignificant chi-square is obtained.

9. Root-mean-square residual should not exceed 0.10.

Panel b of figure 15 shows LISREL estimates of the parameters of the full model. As it shows, the objective component of attitude loaded high on the variable ATH (0.759, t=11.922), ALK (1.063, t=15.069), and AGT (1.00, fixed as a unitary scale value), the subjective component of attitude loaded high on the variables ASD (1.000, fixed as a unitary scale value) and ASR (0.841, t=17.329). The loadings of the subjective component on ATH (0.245, t=5.030) and AGT (0.141, t=3.240) were significant but were not as high as other loadings. These findings indicate
that the first two conditions for the full model to achieve convergent and discriminant validity were met.

Conditions 3 and 4 involved the loadings of the confrontational component and the lenient component of behavior. Panel b of figure 15 shows that the loadings of the confrontational component on BTH (1.000, fixed as a unitary scale value), BLK (0.961, t = 24.343), and BGT (0.812, t = 17.751) were all significant. Similarly, the loadings of the lenient behavior on BSD (0.976, t = 16.663) and BSR (1.00, fixed as a unitary scale value) were significant. These findings conclude that conditions 3 and 4 for the full model to achieve convergent and discriminant validity were satisfied.

Conditions 5 and 6 for the full model to achieve convergent and discriminant validity involved the influence of attitude components (objective/subjective) on behavior components (confrontational/lenient). If these two conditions were satisfied, then an unequivocal support would be rendered to hypotheses 5 and 6. Hypothesis 5 states that the objective component of attitude has more influence on the confrontational component of behavior than on the lenient component. The path
coefficient between the objective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior was significant (0.326, t = 3.136) and the path coefficient between the objective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior was insignificant (modification index was zero). These findings indicate that condition 5 was met and hypothesis 5 was confirmed. Hypothesis 6 concerns the relationship between the subjective component of attitude on one hand and the lenient and confrontational components of behavior on the other. The path coefficient between the subjective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior was significant (0.200, t = 2.939) while the path coefficient between the subjective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior was not found to be different from zero (modification index was zero). These findings conclude that condition 6 was met and hypothesis 6 was confirmed.

Condition 7 involved the following: (1) the loadings of the objective component of attitude on the subjective measurement variables (ASD and ASR), (2) the loadings of the subjective component of attitude on the objective measurement variables (ATH, ALK< and AGT), (3) the loadings of the confrontational
component of behavior on the lenient measurement variables (BSD and BSR), (4) the loadings of the lenient component of behavior on the confrontational measurement variables (BTH, BLK, and BGT), (5) path coefficient between the objective component of attitude and the lenient component of behavior, and (6) path coefficient between the subjective component of attitude and the confrontational component of behavior. Table 8 shows the modification indices and the estimated change for each loading if the parameter was set free. The maximum value of these loadings was that of the lenient component of behavior on BGT (-0.142). The automatic modification command (AM) was invoked in LISREL to find whether this loading or any other structural parameter specified in table 6 with a modification index greater than zero would be admitted to the solution. LISREL did not admit any of these parameters and stopped processing (this is equivalent to saying that these parameters were insignificant). These findings provide strong evidence that condition 7 was satisfactorily met.

Condition 8 and 9 and hypothesis 7 involved the fit of the full model to the data, LISREL analysis produced a marginally significant chi-square ($\chi^2_{27}=80.41, p=0.00$). However, the resulting
### Table 8

Modification Indices and Estimated Change of the Parameters of the Full Attitude-Behavior Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Latent Factor</th>
<th>OBJATT</th>
<th>SUBATT</th>
<th>CONBEH</th>
<th>LENBEH</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Variable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALK</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
<td>1.845</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTH</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.330</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>5.439</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGT</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>6.071</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.479</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimated Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ATH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ALK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BTH</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BLK</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BSR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
goodness of fit index was very high (GOFI= 0.950) and the resulting root-mean-square residual was very low (RMSR = 0.03). An inferential evaluation based on the resulting chi-squares of the partial and the full model was conducted in order to test for the overall fit of these models. The test resulted in a significant chi-square ($\chi^2 = 633.04$). Therefore, it was concluded that the full model fitted the data better than the partial model. These findings conclude that conditions 8 and 9 were satisfied and hypothesis 7 was confirmed.

**Summary**

Descriptions of the exploratory and validation samples and the coding process of the subjects' responses have been provided in this chapter. Statistical analysis techniques performed on the data were described and the findings were presented.

The findings indicate that a two-component model of attitude toward conflict and a two-component model of conflict-management behavior achieved discriminant and convergent validity whereas single-component models of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior did not achieve
convergent validity. The two-component models were found to fit the data better than single-component models.

A full model of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict was tested and compared to a partial model. It was found that the full model achieved convergent and discriminant validity whereas the partial model did not achieve convergent validity. The full model was found to fit the data significantly better than the partial model.

The findings of this research are discussed in the next chapter. Theoretical, pragmatic and research implications of these finding are presented therein.
CHAPTER VI
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Overview

The statistical techniques that were used in analyzing the data and the research findings were presented in chapter five. Chapter six discusses these findings and presents theoretical, pragmatic and research implications.

Discussion

Summary of the Study

The present research addressed five questions. These are:

1. What are the structural antecedents of attitude toward conflict?
2. What are the structural antecedents of conflict-management behavior?

3. What is the conceptual organization of attitude toward conflict?

4. What is the conceptual organization of conflict-management behavior?

5. What are the effects of attitude toward conflict on conflict-management behavior?

The theoretical analysis of the literatures of marketing, organization behavior, and social psychology provided in chapter two accumulated sufficient theoretical evidence to answer the first two questions. Attitude toward conflict was found to be a function of different types of information available about the conflict issue. These were the objective attributes of the conflict issue and the symbolic or configural cues that might be associated with the conflict issue. Similarly conflict-management behavior was found to be a function of the behavioral resources and opportunities that might be available at the time of conflict.
The last three questions were answered in chapter three. With respect to the third question, this research argued and presented sufficient evidence to suggest that attitude toward conflict is a two-dimensional entity composed of an objective and a subjective components. The degree of the availability of and attendance to either the objective characteristics or the symbolic cues of the conflict determine the type of the resulting attitude (objective or subjective). However, the interaction between these two types of attitude toward conflict was acknowledged in this research.

Concerning the fourth question, this research presented enough evidence to support the notion that behaviors can be conceptually differentiated from each other albeit similar actions may be used to exhibit different behaviors. Behavior was conceptualized and theoretically supported as being a multidimensional entity composed of confrontational and lenient components. The degree of the availability of and attendance to either the behavioral resources or the opportunities available at the time of conflict determine the type of the resulting behavior (confrontational or lenient). The two types of behavior were not
considered to be mutually exclusive in this research rather they were considered to be interactive.

The final question, concerning the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict, received considerable attention in the present research. Sufficient theoretical evidence was presented to illustrate that the objective (subjective) component of attitude influences the confrontational (lenient) component of behavior more than the lenient (confrontational) component. The availability and relevance principles (Snyder 1982) were used to explain the psychological process that links conflict-management behavior to attitude toward conflict. The basic assumption regarding the dynamics of these two principles is that increasing the availability and/or the relevance of attitudes as guides to actions increases attitude-behavior consistency. The present research took full advantage of this postulate by instructing some subjects to think about consonant attitudes and behaviors and some others to think about dissonant attitudes and behaviors.

The conceptual conclusions of chapter II and III were translated into the research models and hypotheses. Three
models and seven hypotheses were developed in chapter IV for the purpose of providing empirical evidence to support the theoretical assumptions about the conceptual structure of attitude, the conceptual structure of behavior, and the attitude-behavior structural relations in the context of conflict.

Attitudinal and behavioral measurement scales were developed by using a contrived conflict scenario in two pilot experiments. The first experiment generated attitudinal and behavioral statements that were used in the construction of the measurement scales. The second experiment was conducted for the purpose of assigning numerical values to the statements upon which the statements included in the scales were selected.

A controlled laboratory experiment was used as a vehicle for collecting data required for testing the research models and hypothesis. The sample was split into exploratory and validation samples. The exploratory sample was used to uncover the factor structure of attitude toward conflict, the factor structure of conflict-management behavior, and the strength and direction of general associations between several experimental variables. The validation sample was used to test the successfulness of the
experimental manipulations in creating the necessary experimental conditions, analyze the covariation of experimental variables, validate the factor structure of attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior, and analyze the linear structural relations between attitude and behavior in the context of conflict.

Frequency and exploratory factor analyses were performed on the exploratory sample. On the validation sample, several analysis of variance procedures, confirmatory factor analyses, and LISREL were performed.

**Discussion of the Study Findings**

The present study was undertaken to examine the effects of attitude toward conflict on subsequent conflict-management behavior. It was expected that attitude toward conflict composed of beliefs and thoughts about the objective attributes of the conflict issue would be highly predictive of confrontational but not of lenient behavior. Alternatively, attitude toward conflict composed of feelings and emotions about the conflict issue would be highly predictive of lenient but not confrontational behavior.
The findings of this study provide unequivocal evidence in support of the hypothesized relationships. These findings are discussed next with respect to the research models.

**Attitude Model**

Confirmatory factor analyses performed on the attitude measurement variables rendered unequivocal support to the first two hypotheses. None of the conditions that were necessary for the single and the three-component models of attitude toward conflict to achieve convergent validity was met. Conversely, all the conditions that were necessary for the two-component model to achieve discriminant and convergent validity were satisfied. Additional support for the two-component representation of attitude toward conflict was obtained from the exploratory factor analyses performed on the exploratory sample. The two-component model of attitude was the only structure to result in an insignificant chi-square and a high reliability coefficient.

Although the general evaluation of attitude for each subject was a composite of objective and subjective sources, subjects' attitudes were differentiated into objective and subjective
components. The reason is that some subjects were instructed to consider the objective attributes of the conflict issue while some others were instructed to consider the symbolic and contextual cues associated with the conflict issue. The success of these instructions was illustrated in performing analyses of variance on the number of feelings and the number of beliefs elicited by each subject in different experimental condition. Subjects in the objective attitude condition produced more beliefs than subjects in the subjective attitude condition. Alternatively, subjects in the subjective attitude condition produced more feelings than subjects in the objective attitude condition. The principal conclusion is that people (e.g., managers) in real life situations consider whatever information available to them about the attitude issue/object (e.g., conflict) in formulating their attitudes. If the available information is mainly composed of objective attributes (symbolic cues) about the attitude issue, then the resulting attitude will be more objective (subjective) than subjective (objective).
Behavior model

Hypotheses 3 and 4 were confirmed. The confirmatory factor analyses performed on the behavior measurement variables indicated that the two-component model of conflict-management behavior represented and fitted the data better than the single and the three-component models. The conditions specified for the single and the three-component models to achieve convergent and discriminant validity were not satisfied while all the conditions necessary for the two-component model to achieve convergent and discriminant validity were met. Moreover, the two-component representation of conflict-management behavior was the only organization supported in the exploratory factor analyses performed on the behavior measurement variables in the exploratory sample.

The behavioral instructions given to subjects caused subjects to consider their behavior as either confrontational or lenient. The reason is that some subjects were instructed to consider the available behavioral resources while some others were instructed to consider the available personal and organizational opportunities. However, there was a great deal of
interaction between confrontational and lenient behaviors. The success of the behavioral instructions in creating consideration for different types of behavior was illustrated in the analysis of variance performed on the usefulness ratings. Subjects in the confrontational behavior rated the conflict scenario to be more useful than subjects in the lenient behavior condition.

The main conclusion is that marketing managers at first hand are motivated by whatever behavioral resources are available to them in acting on their attitudes (e.g., to resolve a conflict). If no behavioral resources were available, then managers would be motivated by whatever personal and organizational opportunities that might be in the horizon. According to these considerations, behavior will be either confrontational or lenient.

**Attitude-Behavior Relationship Model**

LISREL analyses performed on the attitude and behavior measurement variables combined rendered strong support to the full model of attitude-behavior relation in the context of conflict and the last three hypotheses (5, 6, and 7). Only one condition
for the partial model to achieve convergent validity was met and that was with some reservations. This condition was the high factor loadings of the factor attitude and the factor behavior on their respective measurement variables. However, great portions of the variance of several variables were not explained by the factor attitude and the factor behavior. Additionally, the resulting chi-square and the root-mean-square residual were very high. Therefore, the partial model of attitude-behavior relationship did not achieve convergent validity and was not accepted as a valid representation of this relationship.

Alternatively, all the necessary conditions for the full model of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict were satisfied. The only condition that was not clearly satisfied was the insignificant chi-square condition. In this regard, we ought to remember that chi-square by itself may not be a valid statistical test. The reason is that as the sample size increases, the power of the test increases and the chi-square statistic increases. Therefore, researchers advise that chi-square statistics should be considered in conjunction with the goodness-of-fit index and the root-mean-square residual. The associated goodness-of-fit index was very high and root-mean-square
residual was very low. Therefore, enough evidence was accumulated to suggest that the full model of attitude-behavior relationship achieved convergent and discriminate validity and to confirm hypotheses 5 and 6. Moreover, the inferential test of the overall fit of the partial and full models of attitude-behavior relationship resulted in a significant chi-square suggesting that the full model fitted the data better than the partial model (hypothesis 7).

Because the attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict is the principal core of this research, analyses of variance were performed on three composites of attitude and behavior measures. These composites were: (1) objective-confrontational measures, (2) subjective-lenient measures, and (3) comprehensive measures.

In all three analyses of variance, the only significant interaction effect was behavior type X attitude type. Subjects in the confrontational (lenient) behavior condition had higher attitude-behavior mean correlations when they considered the objective attributes (contextual cues) of the conflict than when they considered the contextual cues (objective attributes).
Although the main three analyses of variance did not find any effect of the gender variable on attitude-behavior correlations, other demographic variables might have caused significant variations in the observed attitude-behavior relationships. These variables were subjected to additional analyses of variance performed on the comprehensive measures of attitude and behavior. The results did not show any significant interaction effects with the variables of age, education, and managerial experience on attitude-behavior correlations.

The principal conclusion is that people (e.g., marketing managers) usually behave in accordance with their attitudes when they believe that their attitudes are appropriate guides to their behaviors. When attitudes appear to be irrelevant to behaviors, inconsistencies between behaviors and attitudes arise.

**General Discussion**

This study demonstrated that: (1) attitudes toward conflict are differentiable into objective and subjective attitudes, (2) conflict-management behavior is differentiable into confrontational and lenient behaviors, and (3) increasing the
availability and relevance of attitudes as appropriate guides to behavior increases attitude-behavior consistency in the context of conflict.

It is important to consider in detail why the two-component representations of attitude and behavior in the context of conflict achieved convergent and discriminant validity whereas other representations did not. First, two types of information that were of different natures about the conflict issue were presented to subjects. The first type was the objective attributes of the conflict that included indisputable information (all what was known) about the independence structure of both members of the conflict, the distribution of power in the dyad, beliefs about the compatibility of the goals of both members, beliefs about the intensity of the conflict, and beliefs about the likely outcomes of different courses of actions. The second type was composed of positive and negative feelings generated by the contextual cues that were associated with the conflict. Those feelings included being distressed or angered by the timing of the conflict, surprised by the way the conflict was brought forth, and interested in exploring new avenues of business. Because these
two types of information were of different conceptual natures, they represented different mental domains.

By the same token, two different types of information about behavioral alternatives were provided to participants. The first type was the behavioral resources that might be available to managers to choose from such as exercising some kind of power (economic or noneconomic) against the opponent and discussing the issue thoroughly in the next face-to-face meeting. The second type was the personal and organizational opportunities such as keeping the account of the other firm and venturing into a new line of business. Although these two types of information were not considered to be mutually exclusive (neither exhaustive of the whole domain of behavior), they were conceptually of different natures. Therefore, they were represented in different mental domains.

Second, the experimental instructions were very clear to the point that there was no doubt in the minds of subjects that they should consider either type of attitudinal information but not both and either type of behavioral information but not both. The success of experimental manipulations in creating the
different experimental conditions was illustrated in this research. This is not to say that all participants were 100% successful in adopting the required experimental mood rather to say that the majority of them did.

Third, attitude instructions did not affect behavior instructions rather both types of instructions interacted successfully. This interaction was demonstrated in the successful creation of four experimental cells with significant differences in mean attitude-behavior correlations among cells. It is also noticed that mean attitude-behavior correlations of control condition was significantly different from two experimental cells (cells with consonant attitudes and behaviors) but not from the rest (cells with dissonant attitudes and behaviors).

Forth, the measurement scales of attitude and behavior were very successful in tapping subjects' mental processes. Scale reliabilities as exemplified by squared multiple correlations were very high when latent factors were decomposed into two components for each but not as high when latent factors were considered to be undecomposable. The reason behind the
success of measurement variables in tapping the different components of attitude and behavior is that the scales were constructed by using independent samples from the same population of the main sample and by using the same conflict scenario that was used in the main experiment.

It appears that when subjects considered their behavior as being confrontational (lenient), instructions to focus on the objective characteristics of and beliefs about (contextual and symbolic cues of) the conflict issue increased the saliency and relevance of objective (subjective) attitude to behavior but not subjective (objective) attitude. Therefore, subjects found their attitudes to be appropriate guides to their behaviors and exhibited behaviors that were congruent with their salient attitudes. This conclusion was illustrated in the analysis of linear structural relations of the measures of attitude and behavior. Path coefficients between objective (subjective) attitudes and confrontational (lenient) behaviors were significant whereas path coefficients between objective (subjective) attitudes and lenient (confrontational) behaviors were not. It is also worth noting that attitude-behavior correlations produced by different analyses of variance exhibited the same trend.
Some alternative explanations to the observed relationships are in order. It could be argued that heterogeneity in the demographic variables (gender, age, education, managerial experience) might have caused the observed relationships. These variables might have interacted with experimental manipulations and affected the significance level of the observed differences in attitude-behavior relationship. The findings of this research argue against these alternative hypotheses. Demographic variables were allowed to play their interactive role (if they had any) in several analyses of variance. The only interaction effect that was observed and could be attributed to these variables was a two-way behavior type X education. This effect disappeared when the type of attitude was introduced and completely vanished when both type of attitude and type of behavior were allowed to interplay with education.

What appears to have happened is that subjects thought about and reflected upon their true attitudes and reported these true attitudes about the conflict issue at hand. These attitudes correlated highly with behaviors when behaviors were of the same conceptual nature and poorly when behaviors were of a different conceptual nature. True objective (subjective)
attitudes correlated highly with confrontational (lenient) behaviors and low with lenient (confrontational) behaviors.

Since attitudes were formulated on the spot (the attitude issue was novel to subjects), there was no worry about shifting attitudes from one direction to another (i.e., positive to negative). By the same token, there was no worry about shifting behaviors from one end to another. Thinking about the objective attributes or considering the contextual cues of the conflict did not require subjects to probe their memories for past attitudes and behaviors. Additionally, subjects were not provided with any additional information that might have changed initial attitudes and behaviors. The only thing that could have happened is that attitudes and behaviors might have gotten a little weaker by different margins by the passage of time (average time to complete the experiment was 21 minutes). However, since the directions of attitude and behavior remained the same, the observed attitude-behavior relationships were not adversely affected.
Implications

This research underscores the dynamic interaction of objective and subjective resources about the conflict in formulating attitude toward the conflict and the dynamic interaction of behavioral resources and opportunities in selecting a conflict-management behavior. The theoretical framework that is developed and supported in this study is a conceptualization of a significant managerial phenomenon in channels of distribution. As a result, this study has theoretical and managerial implications.

Theoretical Implications

The successful integration of sound theory with rigorous methodology and appropriate statistical testing in the present research implies that conflict management is subject to evaluation and control. The present research strived to satisfy the conceptual requirements of all major theoretical concepts. The definition of any concept in this research established its attributes, tendencies, associations, and power or liability of influencing or being influenced by other concepts. Observational
requirements of all theoretical concepts were satisfied by employing different measurement methods. Finally, the soundness of all theoretical propositions was tested by subjecting the data to different statistical techniques.

As noted earlier, previous distribution channel research has characterized the use of power as either a major response or a major cause of channel conflict. While it is not argued in the current research whether the use of power causes conflict, it is suggested that the use of power does not appear to be a dominant response to conflict. Power-attitude association was found very weak in this research. Therefore, it would be a grave mistake for channel-conflict researchers to focus solely on the use of power and neglect other behavioral resources and opportunities in their quest for better understanding of channel-conflict management.

If we accept the hypothesis that increasing the availability and relevance of attitudes as appropriate guides to behaviors strengthens attitude-behavior relationship, past inconsistencies in conflict-management research can be integrated. For example, the finding of Lusch (1976), that noncoercive power decreased channel conflict, can be explained in terms of objective attitudes
being viewed by subjects as appropriate guides to confrontational behaviors. Those subjects might have been well informed about the important aspects of conflict and their possession of requisite behavioral resources (e.g., power sources). Alternatively, the finding of Brown and Frazier (1978), that noncoercive power increased conflict, can be explained in terms of subjective attitudes being viewed by subjects as inappropriate guides to confrontational behaviors. Those subjects might have been ill informed about the conflict. Therefore, subjects turned to contextual cues associated with the conflict and formed subjective attitudes. However, since subjects had to use a source of power in managing the conflict, the conflict was intensified.

The present conceptualization of attitude-behavior relationship in the context of conflict management can be used as an important building block in the development of a larger framework of channel behavior. Since different components of attitude are expected to result in different conflict-management behaviors, variations in other channel variables (e.g., cooperation, satisfaction) that are caused by different conflict-management behaviors can be easily explained. However, the same variations may not fully be understood if attitude toward conflict and
conflict-management behavior were considered to be unidimensional undecomposable entities.

In addition to integrating inconsistencies in previous conflict research, the present conceptualization of attitude-behavior relationship can be applied to explain research inconsistencies in other areas of interest. For example, the finding of weak attitude-behavior relationship in social psychology research (e.g., LaPiere 1934, Wilson et al. 1986) can be explained in terms of the failure of subjects in that research to see their attitudes as being appropriate guides to their behaviors. In LaPiere's study for instance, subjects may viewed their behavior as being motivated by the possession of requisite behavioral resources (e.g., food, room) and their attitudes as being composed of emotional rather than cognitive representations and driven by a stereotype rather than by substantive information about Chinese (i.e., the attitude and behavior object).

A notable feature of the present research is the measurement of conflict attitudes and behaviors. The findings confirm that confrontational behaviors had higher correlations
with attitudes measured by ATH, ALK, and AGT than with attitudes measured by ASD and ASR scales. Similarly, lenient behaviors had higher correlations with attitudes measured by ASD and ASR than with attitudes measured by ATH, ALK, and AGT scales. These findings reinforce the belief that multidimensional psychological variables in channels of distribution (e.g., managerial styles) require multimethod assessment techniques for a better detection of these variables' associations and variations.

The findings of this research could lay the foundations for programmatic research in the area of conflict management. A series of experiments in which a number of different empirical techniques can be used would further enhance our understanding of the conceptual interpretation of the hypothesized relationships. Additionally, the proposed programmatic research could show that a particular realization of attitude toward the conflict (e.g., objective attitude) may lead to a wide variety of different outcomes that are all theoretically associated with conflict-management behavior (e.g., channel performance).
The conceptual frameworks that are developed and tested in this research can provide important bases for future theorizing and empirical research in conflict management with respect to the following: (1) the relationship between conflict-management behavior and channel management, channel performance, and channel satisfaction, (2) effects of sources of conflict on attitude toward conflict and conflict-management behavior, (3) effects of conflict-management behavior on dynamic conflict processes, (4) the integration of initial behavior and bargaining behavior, (5) effects of past conflict episodes on conflict-management behavior, and (6) effects of conflict-management behavior on the evolution of future conflict.

The conceptual frameworks that are developed and supported in this research can provide important bases for theorizing and empirical research in the area of attitude-behavior relationship with respect to the following: (1) effects of situational variables on attitude and behavior, (2) effects of additional information about the attitude object on initial attitude and behavior, (3) effects of the need for cognition on attitude-behavior consistency, and (4) effects of affective-cognitive consistency on attitude-behavior relationship.
Managerial Implications

As an alternative framework to the conflict-power paradigm, the present conceptualization of conflict attitude-behavior relationship suggests that the possession and use of power may not at all be what it is thought to be. The present research found that attitude-power association in the context of conflict management was very weak. Although it was emphasized in the experimental conflict scenario that different sources of power were available for execution, subjects may have not realized either that they possessed or that they could use power. Because the acquisition, maintenance, and execution of different sources of power may be costly, the findings of the present research suggest that it may not be necessary to acquire and maintain all different sources of power.

The present conceptualization of conflict attitude-behavior relationship suggests that channel management can improve conflict management by providing special training for individual managers who are in charge of conflict handling. Channel-conflict managers ought to understand that it may not be a wrong idea to accommodate or compromise if such behaviors help in
materializing good organizational opportunities. Similarly, if the search, acquisition and analysis of substantive information about the conflict issue appear to be costly, conflict managers ought to understand that it may not be a bad idea to seek alternative sources of information such as situational cues associated with the conflict. However, if a conflict manager desires to be aggressive in handling a conflict, it is suggested that organizational and personal opportunities be secured before the actual implementation of confrontational behaviors.

It was noted earlier that the presence of conflict creates different conceptualization of the same issue of conflict and that the manner in which a manager defines the situation constitutes his/her attitude. The finding and validation of objective and subjective components of attitude toward conflict supports this notion. Since a conflict can be conceptualized either objectively or subjectively, it may be appropriate to classify actual channel conflict according to the manner in which it is conceptualized. Although a complete accounting of the existence of conflict requires the detection of both objective and subjective aspects, identifying a conflict as being affective or cognitive may suggest to management a specific course of action. Additionally,
classifying conflict-management behavior into confrontational and lenient may help management to revise and refine its current conflict-management policies.

The fractionation of large conflicts involving multiple issues into small manageable issues appear to be a sound policy. If different conflicts that are occurring simultaneously are tackled individually, management may have a unique evaluation of and a unique solution to each conflict. However, if several conflicts are considered as one global issue, individual evaluations of these conflicts may be distorted by the dominant evaluation of either the most severe or the most trivial conflict. Although it cannot be suggested in this research that the consideration of multiple issues at once is unhealthy, the success of this research suggests that a proper isolation of the issue of conflict helps in the development of an adequate appreciation of its nature and consequences.

The findings of this research could prove to be advantageous to boundary personnel especially those who are in charge of resolving inter-organizational disputes. This research implies that understanding the opponent’s points of view (i.e., attitude) on
a subject of dispute is an important step toward realizing a satisfactory management of the dispute. More importantly, the findings imply that understanding the originality of ones' views of a matter of conflict enlightens ones' insights about ones' considerations of different courses of action.

The findings of this research can be advantageous to behavior modification practices in marketing in general and advertising in particular. For example, advertisers (organizational sellers) could provide their target subjects with the type of information that would result in obtaining the desired purchase behaviors.

**Directions For Future Research**

The present research is carried out from the perspective of one member of the conflict situation. Therefore, it is still not known whether new information about the other member's attitude toward conflict and his/her conflict-management behavior would modify the first member's attitude and behavior. For example, assume that a channel member who thought that she/had a comprehensive understanding of the conflict situation
had decided to use a particular source of power to manage the conflict. Would that manager's attitude and/or behavior change if she/he was subsequently informed that the opponent might reciprocate by using an effective source of power (e.g., withholding necessary market information)? Future research should investigate this kind of interaction and document the effects of attitude change on conflict-management behavior.

Future research should look into the effects of different sources of conflict on attitude toward conflict and ultimately on conflict-management behavior. For example, some conflicts may be due to poor communications, lack of interorganizational trust or any other source. If these conflicts are taken out of their contexts, conflict-management behavior may be rendered ineffective and they may intensify. It would be interesting to know whether a conflict resulting from poor communications and a conflict resulting from goal incompatibility, for instance, produce similar attitudes and behaviors.

This study took on a single-issue conflict and did not consider multiple-issue conflicts. Future research should attempt to apply the theoretical framework of this study to
multiple issue conflicts and find out whether a manager's attitude toward one of these conflicts would or would not affect his/her attitudes toward concomitant conflicts and ultimately his/her conflict-management behaviors of these issues.

Based on purely conceptual foundations, this research maintained that fractionating large conflicts into small manageable episodes of conflict would result in better conflict management. Future research should examine this theoretical proposition and provide empirical evidence whether or not fractionating large conflicts into small episodes would be advantageous to conflict-management research and practices. If fractionating large conflicts is founded to be better than accumulating small conflicts, to what extent conflicts should be fractionated? Additionally, what would be the conflict intensity (e.g., how much the conflict is liked or disliked) at which channel conflict managers should start working on its management.

The present research constructed conflict attitude and behavior scales by using two pilot studies. The scales exhibited high reliability coefficients in the main experiment. However, the scales were developed with regard to the experimental
conflict scenario that was used in the main experiment. Therefore, it is not known whether or not the scales were issue-specific. Future research should develop similar scales with respect to different conflict scenarios and compare the reliabilities of current scales with those of the new ones.

The present research did not take into consideration the unique characteristics of individual distribution channels. However, this deliberate neglect does not mean that the findings of this research can be generalized to different channels of distribution in different places at different times. Therefore, it is not known whether or not channel managers at different levels of responsibility in different administrative patterns would view a particular conflict or respond to it in the same manner. Future research should replicate the present research and investigate the possibilities of similarities and dissimilarities between empirical findings of this research and its replica.
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APPENDIX A

INSTRUMENT USED IN COLLECTING
ATTITUDINAL AND BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS

Instructions

Most people consider thought-provoking case studies to be very important tools in the learning process. You will be given the opportunity to analyze a case study about a conflict situation in a marketing channel of distribution. However, before considering this particular case study in any future class discussion, it must be evaluated and you have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

The case study is composed of two parts. The first part explains the conflict situation and the second explains the alternative courses of action that might be used in managing the conflict. Each part is followed by brief instructions informing you of the type of help that is required from you.

After you fully understand the above guidelines, please turn the page and read the first part. Take as much time as you need for a complete understanding of this part. Feel free to go back and forth if you need to reread any instructions or to reread any section of this case study.
You are the president of Nile Brokerage Company, a large food broker located in Green Meadows. For the past 5 years, business with suppliers and retailers has been running smoothly with no major changes in companies represented, products handled, operating or marketing policies, or competitive situations.

Green Meadows' metropolitan area contains over 950,000 people. Approximately 80% of retail grocery sales are made through local wholesalers and locally based chain stores. The other 20% of sales are made through a single national chain and a number of convenience stores (see table). Many food companies rely on brokerage firms such as yours to provide marketing and sales representation and support. There are at least 15 brokerage firms operating in Green Meadows City. Nile, your company, is one of the three largest. You represent 20 non-competing food processing companies. Several smaller brokerage firms have been very aggressive in the past three years by adding new accounts and expanding sales for the accounts they represent. Several have made overtures to some of your major accounts. So far, none of your accounts have switched to other brokers as you have always provided excellent service and have usually met or exceeded sales goals established by your principals.

This morning, your spouse called and told you that s/he had been chosen to go to the Bahamas on a business trip and suggested that you go together for a second honeymoon. You felt very happy and sincerely wanted to take a vacation and go. After a few minutes of day dreaming and excitement, your secretary entered and handed you a disturbing letter. The new vice president of marketing and distribution at Hudson Company, one of your large accounts, is demanding that Nile develops an institutional market in Green Meadows for product lines Alpha, Beta, and Gamma within the next two months. Otherwise, the letter continued, he will be forced to explore other methods of marketing these lines in your market. In the past, you have concentrated your efforts on supermarkets and had never attempted to establish an institutional distribution base for your
major accounts. Hudson has never before indicated any interest in having its products sold through institutional food distributors. You thought your relations with Hudson were sound. In fact, you have built one of its lines to the point of having a 70% market share in Green Meadows.

Developing the institutional market would require that you hire and train several new sales and account service representatives as well as additional administrative support personnel. Your current staff is fully occupied in serving the retail food accounts in your territory and could not divert attention to the institutional market without adversely affecting your position in the retail market. You would have to acquire office space, invest in additional computer software, and invest substantial sums in different other areas in order to effectively penetrate the institutional market. Your representatives visit your suppliers and customers on frequent basis, take orders, count stock, replenish shelf stock, deliver supplies and point-of-purchase displays, provide market information for suppliers and retailers, and implement promotional campaigns designed by your principals. Although most of your suppliers and retailers have in-house market information capabilities, you continually provide them with timely information. You do not remember a time where you hesitated to assist both suppliers and customers in every possible way. In fact, your channel partners have given you every indication that you have the best reputation among all brokers in your area. Although it might appear that a little stimulation was needed for improving business practices and fortifying the channel against aggressive competition, you never expected to be treated in such a provocative, distressing and seemingly unfair way.

In retrospect, you have never been treated in such a preemptory manner by any one of your trading partners. The customary way of raising issues of concern in your channel has been to bring these issues up at the next face-to-face meeting. You resent the impersonal manner of the new manager at Hudson Company in raising his concerns and dictating his solutions. What is more distressing is that the problem with the new manager at
Hudson came to your attention immediately after you finished your phone conversation with your spouse and were developing visions of a long overdue vacation.

Hudson brands of lines Alpha, Beta, and Gamma are the best sellers. Your commission from these brands amounts to 20% of your total revenue (a major opportunity for ambitious brokers). However, since you have limited information about the new vice president of marketing at Hudson, you do not know the prospects of a continued relationship with Hudson. The last vice president was a friend of yours, and you had a very strong relationship with him. You have suspected that it will be difficult to develop the same relationship with the new vice president.

Table. Major Retailers in Green Meadows Metropolitan Area

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>no. of Stores</th>
<th>Market Share</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Faris National</td>
<td>Chain</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Haney Stores</td>
<td>Local Chain</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Salem Way</td>
<td>Local Chain</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United Grocers</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sisters’ Super</td>
<td>Cooperative</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Please go to the next page
As the manager confronted with this conflict situation with one of your major suppliers, we want you to tell us your feelings and thoughts about this situation.

First, please analyze how you felt about the different details and aspects of this situation. That is, go over in your mind and tell us if you felt happy, interested, depressed, stimulated, confident, excited, inspired, angered, insulted, irritated, offended, calm, concerned, good, bad, and/or surprised about any thing. Tell us also if you felt indifferent about any thing in this situation. Please tell us your positive, negative, and neutral feelings.

Second, please analyze why you felt the way you did about this conflict situation. That is, go over in your mind what it is about this situation that makes you think that this conflict is good or bad. If you think that an attribute, an event, a cause, and/or a result of any detail or aspect of this conflict situation makes you think that this conflict is good or bad, please tell us. Tell us also if you think that some thing is of marginal value or unimportant to the way you feel.

The best way to tell us about your different feelings and thoughts is to express them in phrases and sentences in writing. Don’t worry about grammar. There are no right or wrong feelings or thoughts. We are interested in the sheer number and variety of your feelings and thoughts. Please start analyzing your feelings and thoughts and begin writing your sentences and phrases in the following space.

Please continue on the next page
Please go back to the phrases and sentences that you wrote about the first part. We want you to put one of the following marks in front of each phrase or sentence. These marks are:

+\(F\) if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a positive feeling about this conflict.

-\(F\) if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a negative feeling about this conflict.

+\(T\) if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a reason that makes you think that this conflict is good.

-\(T\) if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a reason that makes you think that this conflict is bad.

\(N\) if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a neutral feeling or if something that does not contribute to the way you feel.

After you finish placing marks, please go to the next page.
Part II

Please read the second part of this case study very thoughtfully. Take as much time as you need for a comprehensive understanding of this part. Feel free to go back and forth if you need, to reread any instructions, and/or to reread any section of this case study that you feel would help you in providing us with your maximum help.

Please go to the next page
After you had finished reading the letter from Hudson Company, you told your secretary that you wanted to be left alone. For a moment, you thought that there was nothing to worry about. Since you were not interested in the institutional market, Hudson would approach another broker who already had experience in that market. You thought that your position in the retail market and your revenues from product lines Alpha, Beta, and Gamma would not be affected because there was no direct competition between the two markets. Therefore, you thought that the best thing to do was not to do anything and to ignore this situation.

However, this particular dispute with the new manager at Hudson Company might be different. Indeed, you have heard that he is very resourceful and known for his hard work, intensity, persistence, and ingenuity. You were not sure whether or not the threats issued in his letter would be fulfilled if you completely ignored his demand. Therefore, you began to acknowledge the acute nature of this particular conflict and started an intensive search for ways and means to manage it. Luckily, you kept your college notes tidy and handy and you thought that this might be an appropriate time to put the theory of conflict management into practice.

After a thorough consultation of your college notes about conflict management, you realized that there was no "single best way" for managing conflict. Your notes suggested a variety of actions that could be undertaken. One of these actions was that you could reassure Hudson that you would continue to provide the type and quality of services that you normally do. You could also promise that you would exhaust all possible efforts to enhance the market share and profitability of lines Alpha, Beta, and Gamma. Additionally, you had recently utilized an innovative market information analysis technique that no body in Green Meadows had. Therefore, you could promise that you would provide Hudson with future flow of critical insights into volatile market situations that would help in absorbing the uncertainty of unforeseen environmental changes.
However, the new manager at Hudson might needed something else to get him back to his senses. You thought that it might be necessary to teach him a lesson that he would never forget. Indeed, you thought that you had all the means to refuse to establish the institutional market and to inflict a great deal of punishment on this new “arrogant” manager. For example, His company could not maintain its sales level and market share without your technical and informational support, the variety of essential services that you provided to customers, and/or the association of her brands with your excellent reputation as being one of the best brokers in the area. You thought that if you cut down your support or service level to any or all of Hudson’s brands or discontinued distributing one or more of their brands, you would be reprimanding the new manager and he would be discarding his demand of establishing an institutional market.

However, you continued your thoughts, it might appear inappropriate to treat Hudson, a long-term partner, in such a harsh manner just because a new manager raised an issue of concern to them. You thought that you should be reasonable and rational and redirect anger and frustration at the issue of dispute rather than at your opponent. You thought that you would take all your concerns about establishing the new market including your worries about costs, investment, business orientation (expert in retail but not in institutional markets), and capabilities, ask the new manager to bring all his concerns, and discuss the problem in your next face-to-face meeting. You thought that you might come up with a resolution to this issue that might be satisfactory to both of you. In fact, you had always said “don’t hate people but hate what people might do.”

Although Hudson Company has been one of your major principals for years, you thought that it might be unwise to reveal some of your business details to them such as your costs and investment. Their knowledge of such information might cause them to reconsider your trading terms and affect any accounts that you might obtain to replace Hudson. Therefore, you thought that it might be more appropriate to offer, for instance, a reduction of 1% of your commission in exchange of dropping their
demand for establishing an institutional market. If the new manager does not accept this offer, then you might suggest that you substantially increase their retail sales of lines Alpha, Beta, and Gamma. This might require that you expand your territory and/or drop some of your weak accounts. You thought that you could even suggest that you experiment with line Alpha in the institutional market if Hudson was willing to help in your costs in entering this market. As a matter of fact, you thought that there was a lot to be offered and a lot to be gained.

The problem remaining was that what if the new manager accepted all your offerings and insisted on his demand for establishing the suggested market without even carrying any expenses? Looking at the issue from a positive perspective, you thought that establishing a new market might be a good adventure for both of you. Who knows? You thought that you might gain a strong foothold and become one of the leading brokers in that market. There were a lot of restaurants, hospitals, and other institutional food operations in Green Meadows Area. You thought that you would start building the new market.

These were your thoughts about how to manage your conflict with your suppliers.
As the manager responsible for managing this conflict, we want you to tell us your feelings and thoughts about your action alternatives.

First, please analyze how you felt about the different acts that could be undertaken to manage this conflict. That is, if you felt good about an act that could be considered in managing this conflict, please let us know. Let us also know if you felt bad or indifferent about an act. If you felt angered, stimulated, hopeful, depressed, insulted, irritated, excited inspired, confident, or any other feeling about any act, please tell us. Tell us all what you feel (positive, negative, and neutral) about each single act that can be considered in managing this conflict.

Second, Please analyze why you felt the way you did about the different courses of actions that could be considered in managing this conflict. That is, go over in your mind what it is about each act that makes you think that it is good or bad. If you think that an act or a combination of acts are good for managing this conflict, please let us know why you think so. If you think that an act or a combination of acts are bad for managing this conflict, please let us know. Let us also know if you think that an act or a combination of acts are of marginal value or unimportant to the management of this conflict.

The best way to tell us about your different feelings and thoughts is to express them in phrases and sentences in writing. Don’t worry about grammar. We are interested in the sheer number and variety of your feelings and thoughts. Please start analyzing your feelings and thoughts and start writing them on the following space.
Please go back to the phrases and sentences that you wrote about the second part. We want to place a mark in front of each phrase or sentence from the following marks. These marks are:

+F if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a positive feeling about an act by which this conflict should be managed.

-F if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a negative feeling about an act by which this conflict should be managed.

+T if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a reason that makes you think that an act for managing this conflict is good.

-T if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a reason that makes you think that an act for managing this conflict is bad.

N if you think that your phrase or sentence expresses a neutral feeling or something that does not contribute to the way you feel about how to manage this conflict.
APPENDIX B

INSTRUMENT USED IN RATING
ATTITUINAL AND BEHAVIORAL STATEMENTS

Instructions

Most people consider thought-provoking case studies to be very important tools in the learning process. You will be given the opportunity to analyze a case study about a conflict situation in a marketing channel of distribution. However, before considering this particular case study in any future class discussion, it must be evaluated and you have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

The case study is composed of two parts. The first part explains the conflict situation and the second explains the alternative courses of action that might be used in managing the conflict. Each part is followed by brief instructions informing you of the type of help that is required from you.

After you fully understand the above guidelines, please turn the page and read the first part. Take as much time as you need for a complete understanding of this part. Feel free to go back and forth if you need, to reread any instructions, and/or to reread any section of this case study that you feel would help you in providing us with your maximum help.

*(The conflict scenario appears in appendix A)*
Having been in this conflict situation, please tell us on the following scale how much you like or dislike this situation.

1  2  3  4  5

dislike  like
very much  very much
In comparison with your own attitude about this conflict, we want to know how much each of the following statements is favorable or unfavorable to you. On a scale of 1 to 11, please give a value to each statement that best describes how much the statement is favorable or unfavorable to you. A value of 1 indicates that the statement is very unfavorable and a value of 11 indicates that the statement is very favorable to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict costs money that can be used in more profitable areas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Channel conflict does not affect interpersonal relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict does not exist with good communications.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict is a necessary factor for creativeness and innovation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict does not have any impact on performance in a channel of distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict creates new opportunities for aggressive businesses.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Business conflicts should not have any impact on personal lives.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflicts break monotonies in channel relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict complicates things that are already complicated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Channel conflicts do not concern end users in any way.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>We can't be called successful managers as long as we conflict with each other.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict erodes the competitive edge of a channel of distribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict hinders straight managerial thinking.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict is a misunderstanding that clears by time.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict revives businesses by pointing out fatal flaws.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict should be viewed as a result of pursuing goals.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>Conflict should not imply bad channel management.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison with your own attitude about this conflict, we want to know how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. On a scale of 1 to 5, please give a value to each statement that best reflects how much you agree or disagree with the statement. A value of 1 indicates that you strongly disagree with the statement and a value of 5 indicates that you strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| 1     | Conflict means that at least one manager is unwise. |
| 2     | Conflict gives business a differential factor.     |
| 3     | Conflict results in the disintegration of a channel of distribution. |
| 4     | Conflict diverts managerial attention away from more important things. |
| 5     | Conflict prevents the smooth flow of informational exchange. |
| 6     | Conflict hinders progress and advancement.         |
| 7     | Conflict helps businesses to differentiate right from wrong. |
| 8     | Conflict improves business practices.               |
| 9     | Conflict disrupts vital business relations.         |
| 10    | Conflict produces higher levels of customer service.|
| 11    | Conflict helps new good ideas to surface and crystallize. |
In comparison with your own attitude about this conflict, we want to know whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please check the response that best reflects your own attitude toward this conflict.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>agree</th>
<th>disagree</th>
<th>statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict results in a bad evaluation of business performance.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict is an essential stimulant for growth and prosperity.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict may be wrong, but it may be inevitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict shows a new set of different opportunities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict puts managers under unwarranted stress.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict is a dangerous aspect of conducting business.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict results in quality decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict drains customers' pockets.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict should be considered as a challenge to status quo.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict helps in developing good contingency plans.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict creates uncertainty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Conflict has no room in channels with close business ties.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison with your own attitude about this conflict, we want to know how much each of the following statements is favorable or unfavorable to you. On a scale of 1 to 9, please give a value to each statement that best describes how much the statement is favorable or unfavorable to you. A value of 1 indicates that the statement is extremely unfavorable and a value of 9 indicates that the statement is extremely favorable to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is upsetting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is bad.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is irritating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is pressuring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is interesting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is good.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is expected.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is surprising.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict makes me angry.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is worrisome.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is aggravating.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is saddening.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is exciting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is comforting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is boring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is confusing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is joyless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is pleasing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is concerning.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is disappointing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is distressing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is disturbing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>_____</td>
<td>This conflict is enjoyable.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Part II

Please read the second part of this case study very thoughtfully. Take as much time as you need for a comprehensive understanding of this part. Feel free to go back and forth if you need, to reread any instructions, and/or to reread any section of this case study that you feel would help you in providing us with your maximum help.
Having been in this conflict situation, please tell us on the following scale how much lenient or aggressive your actions will be in managing this conflict.

1 2 3 4 5
very lenient      very aggressive
In comparison with your own likely actions in managing this conflict, we want to know how much each of the following statements is favorable or unfavorable to you. On a scale of 1 to 11, please give a value to each statement that best describes how much the statement is favorable or unfavorable to you. A value of 1 indicates that the statement is very unfavorable and a value of 11 indicates that the statement is very favorable to you.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Discuss the problem thoroughly with the new manager in the next meeting.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Establish the institutional market and as demanded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Drop Hudson's largest line.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Conduct an information search about the new manager.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Withhold some of Hudson's products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Take vacation and fly away.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Don't do anything in response to Hudson's demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Ask Hudson to research the feasibility of its demands and to provide you</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Take Hudson Co. to court to enforce the terms of the contract.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Blackmail Hudson Co. in the same manner they are doing to you.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Establish better communication channels with Hudson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Be on the watch for this manager's next move.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Use all your available means to bring new manager to his knees.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Do whatever it takes to satisfy Hudson Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>___</td>
<td>Reduce commission by 1% in order to enhance Hudson's profitability.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison with your own likely actions in managing this conflict, we want to know how much you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. On a scale of 1 to 5, please give a value to each statement that best reflects how much you agree or disagree with the statement. A value of 1 indicates that you strongly disagree with the statement and a value of 5 indicates that you strongly agree.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>value</th>
<th>statement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Drop weak accounts and divert effort to Hudson's lines.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reveal business details to foster better understanding.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increase your commission from Hudson's products.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Test and know your stand with the new manager at Hudson.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Promise Hudson increased informational and technical support.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Take new manager at Hudson Co. to his boss.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do any thing to teach the new manager a lesson in business relations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recommend another broker to establish the new market for Hudson Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Execute all the demands of Hudson Co.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Do a cost-benefit analysis and inform Hudson Co. of findings.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Use your reputation to pressure Hudson Co. to drop its demands.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Reestablish teamwork relationship with Hudson Co.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In comparison with your own likely actions in managing this conflict, we want to know whether you agree or disagree with each of the following statements. Please check the response that best reflects your own likely actions in managing this conflict.

agree disagree statement

_____ _____ Create new levels of competition for Hudson's products carried by other brokers.
_____ _____ Pretend compliance until the heat is gone.
_____ _____ Experiment with one line in the institutional market.
_____ _____ Redefine a set of common goals for both firms.
_____ _____ Give the new manager a dose of his own medicine.
_____ _____ Decrease informational and technical support to Hudson Co.
_____ _____ Broaden distribution base by venturing into the new market.
_____ _____ Form a strategic alliance with other brokers and break the will of the new manager.
_____ _____ Confuse the new manager by asking too many questions about irrelevant matters.
_____ _____ Tell Hudson Co. to split costs and risk 50-50 with you.
_____ _____ Ask Hudson Co. for more information about their goals and plans.
_____ _____ Seek a third-party intervention to reconcile differences.
In comparison with your own likely actions in managing this conflict, we want to know how much each of the following statements is favorable or unfavorable to you. On a scale of 1 to 9, please give a value to each statement that best describes how much the statement is favorable or unfavorable to you. A value of 1 indicates that the statement is extremely unfavorable and a value of 9 indicates that the statement is extremely favorable to you.

value statement

___ It is stupid to compromise in this situation.
___ The idea of compromise irritates me.
___ Skillful management mandates a compromise.
___ Mutual concessions are fair.
___ I am worried that a compromise may endanger my reputation.
___ A compromise may help in avoiding family conflicts.
___ Deserting my goals and objectives is unfair to me.
___ Compromising Hudson Co. may be a good idea.
___ On my part, compromising means unskilful and unprofessional management.
___ Compromising the new manager may send him the wrong message.
___ I feel that it is wise to compromise and meet halfway.
___ Yielding to any of these demands is unacceptable to me.
___ Compromising an arrogant manager may be the worst idea.
___ Striking a deal with Hudson is the right course of action.
___ Deserting any of my interests is completely wrong.
___ Striking a deal with Hudson may alleviate my fears.
___ In principle, it is acceptable to compromise.
APPENDIX C

INSTRUMENT USED IN DATA COLLECTION

Instruction Used in the Objective Attitude-Confrontational Behavior Condition

Instructions

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given an analytic ability test. This test is designed to assess your analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve in similar situations.

However, in order to prepare yourself for the analytic ability test, please analyze why you feel the way you do about this conflict. In other words, go over in your mind and think about all the reasons that make you feel the way you do about this situation. The main question to consider is, why do you feel the way you do about this conflict. To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list your reasons for finding this conflict situation good or bad.

*(Conflict scenario appears in appendix A)*
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Instructions Used in the Objective Attitude-Lenient Behavior Condition

Instructions

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given a social sensitivity test. This test is designed to assess your social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility in similar situations.

However, in order to prepare yourself for the social sensitivity test, please analyze why you feel the way you do about this conflict. In other words, go over in your mind and think about all the reasons that make you feel the way you do about this situation. The main question to consider is, why do you feel the way you do about this conflict. To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list your reasons for finding this conflict situation good or bad.

Please go to the next page
Instructions Used in the Subjective Attitude-Confrontational Behavior Condition

Instructions

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given an analytic ability test. This test is designed to assess your analytic ability, decisiveness, perseverance, and resolve in similar situations.

However, in order to prepare yourself for your analytic ability test, please reflect on how you feel about this conflict situation. In other words, look into yourself and reflect upon all the feelings that you have while working intimately with this situation. The main question to consider is, how do you feel about this conflict. To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list all the feelings that you have about this conflict situation.

Please go to the next page
Instructions Used in the Subjective Attitude-Lenient Behavior Condition

Instructions

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

This conflict scenario is meant to be helpful in developing managerial social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility. Therefore, in order to assess the utility of this case study, you will be given a social sensitivity test. This test is designed to assess your social sensitivity, tolerance, cleverness, and flexibility in similar situations.

However, in order to prepare yourself for your social sensitivity test, please reflect on how you feel about this conflict situation. In other words, look into yourself and reflect upon all the feelings that you have while working intimately with this situation. The main question to consider is, how do you feel about this conflict. To help you further in your upcoming test, we will ask you to list all the feelings that you have about this conflict situation.

Please go to the next page
Instructions Used in the Control Condition

Instructions

As part of an Ohio State University research program, the purpose of this experiment is to evaluate a case study about a conflict situation in channels of distribution. You have been selected for this task. Your cooperation and help are essential in determining the usefulness of this case study in future class discussions. In doing so, we want you to bear in your mind and feel in your heart that this conflict situation is yours. Therefore, it is absolutely important that you fully understand all the details and consider all the aspects of this conflict situation. Please do not consider any information other than what you find, extract, infer, and/or derive from the case study.

Previous experiments on several case studies about conflict indicated that some of these case studies were similar in structure, content, and utility. We think that the similarity was caused by the inclusion of more than one case study in a single experiment. Therefore, we decided to rerun our experiments using one and only one case study per experiment.

It is important to note that if we obtain results that are similar to those of previous experiments, then we have no other way but to conclude that the number of case studies in a single experiment makes no difference. However, if we obtain similar results, we have to draw a lottery and select one case study from each group of similar case studies and use it for future class discussion.

Please go to the next page
The Thought-Listing Question

Please list all the thoughts that you have about this conflict situation.
Attitude Questions

Social sensitivity test

Please answer the following questions regarding the conflict you've just read.

1. Please check all the statements with which you agree.

- We can't be called successful managers as long as we conflict with each other.
- Conflict is a necessary factor for creativeness and innovation.
- Conflict does not have any impact on performance in a channel of distribution.
- Conflict erodes the competitive edge of a channel of distribution.
- Conflict should be viewed as a result of pursuing goal.

2. For each statement below, please circle the response that represents your opinion.
   SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; U=Undecided; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree

   SA  A  U  D  SD  Conflict improves business practices.
   SA  A  U  D  SD  Conflict results in the disintegration of a channel of distribution.
   SA  A  U  D  SD  Conflict hinders progress and advancement.
   SA  A  U  D  SD  Conflict produces higher levels of customer service.

3. For each statement below, please circle the response that represents your opinion.

   Agree  Disagree  Conflict is a dangerous aspect of conducting business.
   Agree  Disagree  Conflict may be wrong, but it may be inevitable.
   Agree  Disagree  Conflict should be considered as a challenge to status quo.
   Agree  Disagree  Conflict is an essential stimulant for growth and prosperity.

4. For each pair of words below, please check the point that represents your opinion.

   This conflict is:
   Good________________________Bad
   Boring____________________Interesting
   Pleasing____________________Anger provoking
   Distressing_________________Comforting
   Surprising___________________Expected
   Joyous____________________Joyless

5. Please indicate how favorable or unfavorable you feel toward this conflict.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11
Very Favorable
Favorable
Very Unfavorable
Behavior Questions

6. Please check all the statements with which you agree.

___ Take Hudson Co. to court to enforce the terms of the contract.
___ Discuss the problem thoroughly with the new manager in the next meeting.
___ Don't do anything in response to Hudson's demand.
___ Reduce commission by 1% in order to enhance Hudson's profitability.
___ Establish the institutional market and as demanded.

7. For each statement below, please circle the response that represents your opinion.
SA=Strongly Agree; A=Agree; U=Undecided; D=Disagree; SD=Strongly Disagree

SA  A  U  D  SD
Promise Hudson increased informational and technical support.

SA  A  U  D  SD
Drop weak accounts and divert effort to Hudson's lines.

SA  A  U  D  SD
Reveal business details to foster better understanding.

SA  A  U  D  SD
Meet all the demands of Hudson Co.

8. For each statement below, please circle the response that represents your opinion.

Agree  Disagree
Decrease informational and technical support to Hudson Co.

Agree  Disagree
Seek a third-party intervention to reconcile differences.

Agree  Disagree
Experiment with one line in the institutional market.

Agree  Disagree
Broaden distribution base by venturing in the institutional market.

9. For each pair of words below, please check the point that represents your opinion.

Making compromises in order to resolve this conflict with Hudson Co. is:

Good____________________________________________________Bad
Stupid____________________________________________________Wise
Fair____________________________________________________Unfair
Wrong____________________________________________________Right
Unacceptable____________________________________________Acceptable
Skillful________________________________________________Unskillful

10. Please indicate how lenient or confrontational you would be in managing this conflict.

1  2  3  4  5  6  7  8  9  10  11
Very  Lenient  Very
Lenient  Confrontational
Biographical Questions

Please tell us something about yourself.

1. Social security or student number: _______ _______ _______

2. Gender

   M  F

3. Age:

   ___ Less than 18
   ___ 18-25
   ___ 26-33
   ___ 34-41
   ___ 42-49
   ___ 50 and above

4. Education

   ___ Freshman
   ___ Sophomore
   ___ Junior
   ___ Senior
   ___ Graduate

5. Business Experience

   ___ Less than 1 year
   ___ 2-4 years
   ___ 5-7 years
   ___ 8-10 years
   ___ More than 10 years

6. If you had any suspicions about the real purpose of this experiment, please tell us what did you think the real purpose was.

7. Please indicate whether or not you had participated in any previous experiment with the same experimenter this Summer.

   ___ Yes
   ___ No

8. Please indicate how useful you find this conflict scenario would be in future class discussions.

   0 1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11
   Not at all Very useful